

Recommendations for Streamlining Exit Meetings

Revision: Created April 2018

Last Update: January 2022

Introduction and Objectives

Requested by the AAC in 2017 after multiple listening sessions at various academic venues with deans and other senior university administrators.

- Streamline the exit interview: reduce the length and duration, reduce repetition and monotony, and limit/eliminate information already known to the institution and programs
- Harmonize this effort across all four Commissions

Section I. General Considerations and Recommendations:

1. Maintain a higher level of formality and completeness for programs and institutions that are new to ABET versus programs and institutions that are experienced with ABET accreditation.
2. Maintain a higher level of formality and completeness for reviews with poor outcomes.
3. Ensure that the exit interview is properly respectful in its tone and content. In some cultures, more formality and more detail may be deemed appropriate, and the teams must always represent ABET in a manner that respects cultural norms.
4. Consider the audience in attendance – dean vs. provost/president. If it is the former, then s/he has already been briefed and the exit interview may be streamlined.
5. At the discretion of the Team Chair(s), the exit statement may be read by a single individual or multiple/all members of the team(s).

Section II. Recommendations for Exit Statement Streamlining:

1. Institutional and program introductory sections
 - a. Provide institutional context of the offering unit only – no statistics, etc. are to be read – the institution already knows this information and provided it to the team!
 - b. The TC should work with the dean or designee to review the boilerplate information that appears in the institutional summary section of the exit statement. The PEVs should do the same with the program heads. An update to all statistics should be made available when the team arrives on campus.
2. Strengths
 - a. One or two strengths only per program, others may be included in the draft. Keep the description brief.
3. Shortcomings
 - a. Present using standard, three-part construct.

- b. If a shortcoming is common to all programs, it should be identified as such and read by the team chair. It should appear on all PAF's.
- 4. Read information on the seven-day and 30-day due-process responses. Reference the rest of the process that the PAF details.

Section III. Recommendations for Exit Statement Streamlining for Very Large Visits:

- 1. Institutional and program introductory sections
 - a. Provide institutional context of the offering unit only – no statistics, etc. are to be read – the institution already knows this information and provided it to the team!
 - b. The TC should work with the dean or designee to review the boilerplate information that appears in the institutional summary section of the exit statement. The PEVs should do the same with the program heads. An update to all statistics should be made available when the team arrives on campus.
- 2. Strengths
 - a. One or two strengths only per program, others may be included in the draft. Keep the description brief.
- 3. Shortcomings
 - a. Use and document the three-part construct on the PAF and other documents to reduce the burden on the team members.
 - b. Only cite the relevant portion of the criterion/policy and what the team observed.
 - c. If a shortcoming is common to all programs, it should be identified as such and read by the team chair. It should appear on all PAF's.
- 4. Read information on the seven-day and 30-day due-process responses. Reference the rest of the process that the PAF details.