**E605 Guide for Facilities Tour and Materials Review**

**PEV Guide for Day 0**

*Note: If an item is in the Self-Study Report, it does not have to be provided on Day 0.*

**Supplemental Materials**

*APPM I.E.5.b.(2)  Evaluators will review materials that are sufficient to demonstrate that the program is in compliance with the applicable criteria and policies. Much of this information should be incorporated into the Self –Study Report (see I.D.1.f); additional evidence of program compliance may be made available to evaluators prior to and during the visit, using an on-line storage location. The program should make the following on-site materials available to the team during the visit, without duplicating materials provided in the Self-Study Report.*

* *Materials addressing issues arising from the team’s review of the Self-Study Report or on-line instructional materials*
* *Documentation of actions taken by the program after submission of Self-Study Report as being available for review during the visit*
* *Materials necessary for the program to demonstrate compliance with the criteria and policies*
* *Representative examples of graded student work including, when applicable, major design or capstone projects*

1. Work with the program prior to the visit to discuss the supplemental materials that will be available during the visit. Note that programs may, but are not required to, provide supplemental materials prior to the visit.
2. For each criterion in which student work is used to show the criterion is met, do representative examples of student work demonstrate the achievement of the criterion?
3. Does coursework appear engaging and support learning?
4. Do the syllabi in the Self-Study Report, and any other supplemental materials as needed, support the curricular category (e.g., math/basic science or engineering topics)?
5. Is the culminating design experience based on the knowledge and skills acquired in earlier course work?
6. Does the culminating design experience incorporate sufficient design? (Note: research projects are generally not design projects.)
7. Does the culminating design experience incorporate appropriate engineering standards?
8. Does the culminating design experience incorporate appropriate multiple realistic constraints?
9. Are the curricular elements of program criteria (civil engineering, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, chemical engineering, etc.) met?

**C2 Program Educational Objectives**

*APPM I.E.5.b.(3) The review team will examine evidence that the program educational objectives (PEOs) stated for each program are based on the needs of the stated program constituencies.*

*APPM I.E.5.b.(4) The review team will examine evidence of a documented, systematically utilized, and effective process, involving constituents, for periodic review of the PEOs stated for each program.*

1. Are the program’s constituencies specified?
2. Does evidence exist that the program educational objectives meet the needs of each constituency group? Look for documentation to show input (e.g., faculty meeting minutes, advisory board minutes, etc.).
3. Is there a process for the periodic review (and possible modification if needed) of program educational objectives?

**C4 Continuous Improvement**

*APPM I.E.5.b.(5) The review team will examine evidence of the assessment, evaluation, and attainment of student outcomes (SOs) for each program.*

*APPM I.E.5.b.(6) The review team will examine evidence of actions taken to improve the program.*

1. Is there a regular process for assessment and evaluation of the student outcomes?
2. What evidence shows the degree to which each student outcome is met? At least some of the assessment instruments for each student outcome should be direct measures.
3. Is each student outcome evaluated separately?
4. Is assessment data disaggregated for courses in which there are students from multiple programs?
5. Has documentation of the evaluation process been provided?
6. What documentation shows that the assessment data are used as input for continuous improvement of the program?
7. Have improvement actions been documented and implemented?

**Facility Tours**

*APPM I.E.5.b.(1) The review team will examine facilities to assure the instructional and learning environments are adequate and are safe for the intended purposes. Neither ABET nor its representatives offer opinions as to whether, or certify that, the institution’s facilities comply with any or all applicable rules or regulations pertaining to: fire, safety, building, and health codes, or consensus standards and recognized best practices for safety.*

Observations on Tour of Facilities

*Note: We are not safety experts, but we should identify obvious safety issues.*

1. What type of work is done in the laboratory? Does it pose a threat such as fire, chemicals contacting a human body, soil particles or gas in the air, etc.?
2. Does the size of the laboratory appear adequate to accommodate the number of students in a laboratory session?
3. Is there proper supervision during usage of the laboratory?
4. Are instructional and learning environments clean and free of hazards?
5. Do students and others in labs wear personal protective equipment?
6. Are laboratory safety policies and procedures enforced?
7. Are there routine safety inspections of labs by appropriate personnel?
8. Are laboratories clean and free of hazards?
9. Is safety signage present and clearly visible?
10. Are fume hoods, emergency showers, and eye wash stations properly maintained and fire extinguisher inspections up to date?
11. Are materials labeled and properly stored?
12. If applicable, are gas cylinders secured properly and engine fuels kept in proper containers and stored appropriately?
13. If applicable, is there proper ventilation to prevent buildup of toxic gases and are gas sensors used to alert occupants of toxic gases?
14. Are extension cords and cables appropriately used and secured?