EXIT MEETING SCRIPT

**TO BE READ AT EXIT MEETING**

**DO NOT LEAVE A COPY WITH THE INSTITUTION**

***Please read appropriate language from each section unless otherwise instructed.***

**Section One: Meeting Purpose and Construct**

***NOTE: For multiple commissions, the Team Chairs should select a single individual to read Section One.***

**Part 1a: Acknowledgments**

*To be used for single Commission Exit Meeting:*

The XAC of ABET review team would like to begin by thanking <*Insert institution name*> and its officers; the dean, faculty & staff; and the students for the time and effort they have all invested to ensure our review was productive and that we were able to get full and candid answers to our questions. We especially appreciate the effort that went into obtaining additional information and arranging for answers in response to questions raised during our review.

The Exit Statement includes all findings from the team participating in this review.

*If EAC, continue with:* These findings include both institutional and program specific findings.

OR

*To be used for multiple Commissions Exit Meeting (simultaneous or joint reviews):*

The ABET review team, comprised of members from the <*list all that apply, they are in alphabetical order*>

* Applied and Natural Science Accreditation Commission (ANSAC), led by Team Chair xxx
* Computing Accreditation Commission (CAC), led by Team Chair xxx
* Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC), led by Team Chair xxx
* Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission (ETAC) led by Team Chair xxx

would like to begin by thanking <*Insert institution name*> and its officers; the dean, faculty & staff; and the students for the time and effort they have all invested to ensure our review was productive and that we were able to get full and candid answers to our questions. We especially appreciate the effort that went into obtaining additional information and arranging for answers in response to questions raised during our review.

The Exit Statement includes all findings from each of the Commissions participating in this review.

*If EAC is one of the Commissions, otherwise skip:* Please note that, in the case of programs accredited by the Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET, these findings include both institutional and program specific findings.

**Part 1b: Description of Review Type**

*For all General Review, Exit Meetings continue with:*

The review team would like to remind you that this is a General Review conducted under the latest Criteria and policies and procedures effective for the 20XX-20XX accreditation cycle. As such, the purpose of the review was to assess your programs for compliance against the eight general criteria, the Masters Level general criteria *(if applicable),* the applicable program criteria, and the Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual.

OR

*For Interim Review, Exit Meetings continue with:*

The review team wishes to remind *<Insert institution name>* that this is an Interim Visit Review conducted under the Criteria effective for the 20XX-20XX accreditation cycle and the policies and procedures for the current review cycle. As such, the purpose of the review was to assess your programs against the shortcomings identified during the prior review.

**Part 1c: Definitions**

A program’s accreditation action will be based upon the findings summarized in this statement. Actions will depend on the program’s range of compliance or non-compliance with the criteria. This range can be construed from the following terminology:

* Deficiency: A deficiency indicates that a criterion, policy, or procedure is not satisfied. Therefore, the program is not in compliance with the criterion, policy, or procedure.
* Weakness: A weakness indicates that a program lacks the strength of compliance with a criterion, policy, or procedure to ensure that the quality of the program will not be compromised. Therefore, remedial action is required to strengthen compliance with the criterion, policy, or procedure prior to the next review.
* Concern: A concern indicates that a program currently satisfies a criterion, policy, or procedure; however, the potential exists for the situation to change such that the criterion, policy, or procedure may not be satisfied.
* Observation: An observation is a comment or suggestion that does not relate directly to the current accreditation action but is offered to assist the institution in its continuing efforts to improve its programs.

The report we are about to present will concentrate on strengths and shortcomings of the programs, as the team perceives them. Please note that shortcomings framed at one level during the review may be revised and re-framed at higher or lower levels during subsequent stages of the accreditation process for reasons of consistency and interpretation of compliance with criteria, policy, or procedure.

Since the team’s comments are not the official Commission report, we request that you take no transcript or tape recording of this exit meeting. At the conclusion of this meeting, we will make the Program Audit available to you in the ABET Accreditation Management System (AMS) website, one for each program reviewed, which summarize the initial assessment of the programs being considered.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Section Two: Institutional Aspects**

***NOTE: For multiple commissions, the Team Chairs should select a single individual to read Section Two. (Unless all Commissions adopt institutional strengths, the EAC or ANSAC TC, if present, should head this section.)***

**Part 2a: Institutional Description**

*Read the general descriptive information about the institution.*

**Part 2b: Institutional Strengths (optional for IV)**

In reviewing the programs at <Insert institution name>, the review team identified several strengths. I would like to highlight a few of them now.

*1. a) observed facts that represent the strength, b) what makes it stand out above the norm, and c) what positive effect it has on the institution.*

*2. …*

**Part 2c: Shortcomings Common to All Programs**

***Skip this section if there are no shortcomings common to all programs across all Commission.*** *(NOTE: There is no such thing as an institutional shortcoming. However, in order to keep the exit statement concise, if there are shortcoming(s) common to* ***all*** *programs, the shortcoming(s) will be identified as such and read* ***only once at this point****.)*

In reviewing the programs at *<Insert institution name>*, the review teams from all Commissions identified the following shortcoming(s) that are common to all programs but will only be read once.

Program Weakness(es)

1. **Criterion #. Name**

* *Read the whole Criterion or applicable section of Criterion*
* *Cite what was observed*
* *Explain impact on the program’s compliance*

Program Concern(s)

**1. Criterion #. Name**

* *Read the whole Criterion or applicable section of Criterion*
* *Cite what was observed*
* *Explain impact on the program’s compliance*

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Section Three: Commission Presentation of Program Findings**

*For simultaneous or joint review exit meetings ONLY, the team chairs will decide on the order in which Commissions will report. The Team Chair from the first Commission to report will read:*

The team chair from each Commission represented here today will present their findings for the programs they reviewed.

***Note: The TC from each Commission will go through the three parts in this section.***

**Part 3a: Shortcomings Common to All Programs within a Single Commission (not already covered in Part 2c)**

***Skip this section if there are no shortcomings common to all programs within a single commission.*** *(NOTE:**There is no such thing as an institutional shortcoming. However, in order to keep the exit statement concise, if there are shortcoming(s) common to all programs in a single commission, the shortcoming(s) will be identified as such and read only by the Team Chair.)*

In reviewing the programs at *<Insert institution name>*, the XAC review team identified the following shortcoming(s) that are common to all XAC programs, but will only be read once.

Program Weakness (es)

1. **Criterion #. Name**

* *Read the whole Criterion or applicable section of Criterion*
* *Cite what was observed*
* *Explain impact on the program’s compliance*

Program Concern(s)

**1. Criterion #. Name**

* *Read the whole Criterion or applicable section of Criterion*
* *Cite what was observed*
* *Explain impact on the program’s compliance*

**Part 3b: Individual Program Exit Statements**

The XAC program evaluator(s) will now present their (his/her) findings for the program(s) that were (was) reviewed.

*Exit Statements are read alphabetically by program. If there are any Termination Statements, they should be included in the alphabetical line-up and read by the TC.*

*PEV name* will now read his/her exit statement for the <*Insert program name*>***.***

**PEV #1**

Program Strength(s) (optional for IV)

*a) 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*

*Construct for General Review:*

Program Weakness(es)

1. **Criterion # Name**
   * *Read the whole Criterion or applicable section of Criterion*
   * *Cite what was observed*
   * *Explain impact on the program’s compliance*

*Construct for Interim Review:*

1. **Criterion # Name**
   * *Summarize the previous shortcoming*
   * *Cite what was observed during this visit*
   * *State what the new shortcoming level is*

*Continue through all shortcomings at all levels until the program’s Exit Statement is delivered.*

*PEV name* will now read his exit statement for the <*Insert program name*>***.***

**PEV #2**

*Continue until all PEVs have read their Exit Statements.*

**Part 3c: Observer Comments**

*Skip this section if there are no observers on the team.*

*Determine before the exit meeting if the observer would like to address the exit meeting attendees. Skip this section if the observer does not want to address the group.*

I would like to provide the opportunity for our … observer, *Observer name,* to address the group.

**Part 3d: Close of Commission Presentation**

*For simultaneous/joint reviews, repeat at the end of each Commission’s presentation.*

This concludes the formal XAC statement. Please note that all future communication with the XAC team should be directed to me. I will share the information, as needed, with the other members of the team.

*Continue until each commission has presented.*

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Section Four: Wrap-up**

*NOTE: For multiple commissions, the Team Chairs should select a single individual to read Section 4.*

**Part 4a: Summary and Explanation of Future Process**

The Program Audit(s) that we will make available to you today summarize(s) the review 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 criteria. Shortcomings are shown as a Deficiency (D), Weakness (W), or Concern (C). The second part of the PAF is a detailed description of any identified shortcomings.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*Modify/insert the following language if you also have an IR for program(s) at this institution in addition to a visit.*

Please note that <*Insert program name(s)*> at <*Insert institution name*> is (are) also being evaluated (by the XAC) via interim report relative to the shortcomings identified during the prior review. Program Audit(s) will not be made available to the institution for this (these) program(s). However, the program(s) may, at its (their) discretion, submit due process response documentation addressing the findings of the draft statement.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I will now summarize the various steps of the accreditation process that will begin with the departure of the review team (From this point on, you will be communicating with each commission separately.):

* Seven-day response: Each program evaluated during this review has seven days to respond to the (respective) Team Chair in the case of errors of fact. Only factual errors will be considered in this portion of the review process. Please provide this response in electronic format uploaded to AMS. Additional material (beyond errors of fact) included with the seven-day response will be considered with the due-process response. If no errors are noted, no seven-day response is required; please notify the (respective) Team Chair if you will NOT be submitting a response.
* Draft Statement: Working in collaboration with the review team members, the Team Chair(s) will incorporate your seven-day response (if any) into a Draft Statement (for each Commission) that is edited and reviewed by two editors, each of whom is a member of the (XAC or associated) Executive Committee. Following a final editing step by ABET Headquarters, the Draft Statement and a letter of transmittal will be sent to your institution.
* Due-process response: You will have 30 days after the receipt of the Draft Statement to reply with your response to the team’s findings. Please upload responses in electronic format to AMS. You are not required to submit a due-process response. Please inform ABET (xac@abet.org) and the Team Chair if you will NOT be submitting a response.
* Final statement: I shall consult with Program Evaluators as necessary and incorporate the due-process response into the Final Statement. The statement will, again, be reviewed by the editors and sent to ABET Headquarters for final processing.
* Supplemental Information: If additional time beyond the 30-Day Due Process Response period is needed to respond to any shortcomings (e.g. to gather and analyze end-of-term assessment data), the Team Chair may, at his or her discretion and in consultation with the Commission Chair, accept additional information after the 30-Day Due Process period. Any such information must be received in time for proper consideration prior to the July Commission Meeting. This information will be considered during the Commission’s meeting and incorporated into a revised version of the final statement, as appropriate.
* Final action: At its annual meeting in July, (each of) the full <*Insert commission name for single commission review*> Accreditation Commission(s) will review all Final Statements (for their commission), any supplemental information, and recommended actions. Following discussion, a vote of the Commissioners will be taken for each program at each institution.
* Notification of final action: In August, ABET will send the Final Statement and transmittal letter informing you of the official accreditation actions for your programs.

**Part 4b: Conclusion**

This concludes our Exit Statement. Please note that all future communication should be directed to the Team Chair(s from the respective commission). This information will be shared, as needed, with the other members of the (each) team.

Again, we would like to thank you for your wonderful cooperation, and we support and commend you for undertaking the large effort involved in seeking accreditation.