Going Global
Accreditation Takes Off Worldwide
ABET Vision

ABET will provide world leadership in assuring quality and in stimulating innovation in applied science, computing, engineering, and technology education.

ABET Mission

ABET serves the public through the promotion and advancement of education in applied science, computing, engineering, and technology. ABET will:

- Accredite educational programs.
- Promote quality and innovation in education.
- Consult and assist in the development and advancement of education worldwide in a financially self-sustaining manner.
- Communicate with our constituencies and the public regarding activities and accomplishments.
- Anticipate and prepare for the changing environment and the future needs of constituencies.
- Manage the operations and resources to be effective and fiscally responsible.
## Contents

From the President - L.S. “Skip” Fletcher ................................................................. 2
From the Executive Director - George D. Peterson ................................................. 3
The Board of Directors .............................................................................................. 4
2008 Activity Highlights .......................................................................................... 6
Financial Highlights ................................................................................................. 9
ABET Accreditation Council .................................................................................... 15
Applied Science Accreditation Commission (ASAC) ............................................. 17
Computing Accreditation Commission (CAC) ....................................................... 19
Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) ..................................................... 22
Technology Accreditation Commission (TAC) ....................................................... 26
Accreditation Statistics ............................................................................................. 30
  Part A - 2007-2008 Accreditation Cycle Data .................................................. 30
  Part B - Accreditation Trend Data .................................................................. 34
  Part C - Volunteer Pool Characteristics ......................................................... 36
International Activities Council (INTAC) .............................................................. 37
Charting Tomorrow - Annual Meeting Highlights ............................................... 38
Award Recipients ................................................................................................... 40
  Linton E. Grinter Distinguished Service Award ................................................ 40
  ABET Fellows ................................................................................................. 41
  President’s Award for Diversity ..................................................................... 42
ABET Leadership ..................................................................................................... 43
More Information ..................................................................................................... 44
This year, ABET went global. That doesn’t mean that ABET wasn’t a global organization before this time. It always has been to some extent. Almost from its founding, ABET’s predecessor organization, the Engineers’ Council for Professional Development (ECPD), was cooperating with international bodies such as the Engineering Institute of Canada in 1940. For the past few decades, ABET volunteers have evaluated international programs, and many such programs were granted substantial equivalency. Additionally, ABET has been involved in mutual recognition agreements since the 1970s, as well as memoranda of understanding, to assist non-U.S. organizations initiate their quality assurance efforts.

However, this year, ABET launched one of the most significant changes in its recent history — international accreditation and refinement of the ABET international travel policy. As a member of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics (AIAA), I see many parallels between this change for ABET and the advent of jet propulsion in the 1950s. The introduction of this technical phenomenon enabled aircraft to fly higher, faster, and farther than the piston-powered airliners that were common after World War II. Jet propulsion changed the way by which commercial aviation was conducted, making it technically feasible and cost-effective for passenger carriers to open routes to destinations near and far. Now, travel across oceans within a single day is not only possible but plausible.

Probably more important, the introduction of jet propulsion changed the lives of many people who could now take advantage of international flight. It offered more speed, comfort, and efficiency for passengers, especially over long distances, and enabled many to go farther than they would have otherwise imagined. It opened the prospect of international travel to individuals of many nationalities and socioeconomic groups, and it made our planet a smaller and more closely knit world.

Like jet propulsion, international accreditation will provide global mobility for many technical graduates from all over the world. ABET accreditation will increase the professional opportunities of graduates from ABET-accredited programs as they pursue employment, education, licensure and certification, and other opportunities at home and abroad.

ABET accreditation of programs at non-U.S. institutions came to fruition this year, and the fall of 2007 saw the first accreditation visits to programs outside of the United States that were not duly established in the U.S. or extensions of programs within the United States. These accreditation visits commenced with representatives from two commissions going to 22 programs on four continents. The Engineering Accreditation Commission visited 18 programs in four countries — Germany, Kuwait, Mexico, and Turkey. In addition, the Computing Accreditation Commission sent volunteers to four programs in three countries — Mexico, South Africa, and the United Arab Emirates. These international visits were conducted using the same accreditation criteria and the same policies and procedures that are employed during visits within the United States.

Furthermore, this past year, ABET was involved in another step towards facilitating the mobility of technical graduates. On November 6, 2007, representatives from six international accrediting bodies signed the historic Seoul Declaration, agreeing on a “shared vision of establishing an accord on the accreditation of educational programs in the computing and IT-related disciplines.” ABET and five other signatories modeled this mutual recognition agreement after the Washington Accord, which recommends that engineering graduates from recognized programs be afforded the same rights and privileges as those graduates in the home country. This major step will certainly promote the mobility of computing professionals, and the years to come will see more signatories enter into the agreement.

“This year, ABET launched one of the most significant changes in its recent history.”

While the expansion into the area of international accreditation and the signing of the Seoul Declaration are unquestionably significant, these are not the sum of ABET’s accomplishments over the 2007-2008 fiscal year. The organization continued to help faculty, both in the U.S. and abroad, improve their programs and institutions with workshops, the Institute for the Development of Excellence in Assessment Leadership (IDEAL), and the Best Assessment Processes Symposium. The ABET Board of Directors addressed in great depth three emerging issues — educational delivery, globalization, and governance — that are likely to become part of ABET’s next strategic plan. Further, the Board of Directors established the ABET Foundation to complement and support special ABET programs. This organization’s outstanding volunteers and staff, especially its Executive Department, have done a superb job in supporting these and other initiatives.

It has been a great privilege to serve as ABET’s President during a year of such unprecedented change, growth, and development, particularly as international accreditation, the Seoul Declaration, and many other activities have taken flight.

L.S. “Skip” Fletcher, Ph.D.
2008 ABET President
Preparing Students for the Global Market: Not a New Need

Anyone who has watched a news broadcast or read an Internet article in the past six months knows that the global economy is in crisis. In the United States, this has impacted everything from Wall Street, as some of the world’s strongest financial institutions have been reduced to rubble, to Main Street, where bank foreclosure and “for sale” signs dot many front lawns. Now more than ever, we are realizing how interconnected our economy is with those of the rest of the world. As the U.S. economy falters, so do those of Europe and Asia and the Middle East. That is because we live in a global marketplace, and the technical students we are preparing today must be prepared to face that marketplace tomorrow.

However, this situation should not be thought of as something new. It dates back decades, if not centuries. I am reminded of the bust of Herbert Hoover, the 31st president of the United States, that adorned the lobby of the United Engineering Center, where the ABET offices were located until 1994. Hoover was one of those technically trained, globe-trotting graduates, having studied mining engineering at Stanford in the 1890s. His early career took him to Western Australia, where he led an expansion program for a gold mine. Beginning in 1899, he worked as the leading engineer for a private corporation in China and directed the building of barricades during the Boxer Rebellion. Hoover went on to devise methods to recover lost zinc during mining operations, co-found a mining corporation, serve as an independent mining consultant, and lecture worldwide about mining until World War I, when his career in public service began.

ABET’s predecessor organization, the Engineers’ Council for Professional Development, was founded in 1932, near the end of Hoover’s sole presidential term. It is a fascinating coincidence that the foremost leader of the country at that time was an engineer who had worked for international corporations and spent much of his technical career abroad. His career is similar to those of many working professionals today, and it is certain to reflect the trajectory of some technical professionals of the future. It is the charge of the programs that ABET accredits to prepare their students for such diverse career possibilities in an ever-changing world.

Despite some consternation, ABET has been pushing the concept of preparing technical students with a broad education for several decades now and refocused with the introduction of the program outcomes criteria, commonly referred to as (a) through (k) or (a) through (i), depending on the discipline. These criteria insist that students attain an understanding of professional and ethical responsibility, as well as the broad education necessary to understand the impact of technical solutions in a global, economic, environmental, and societal context. They also maintain that students must have a knowledge of contemporary issues and the ability to communicate effectively. It is these professional abilities, along with their top-notch technical skills, that will carry students through as both large and small firms increase international operations.

This is one of the many reasons why ABET is placing greater emphasis on the international leadership aspect of its charge, without diverting resources from its domestic responsibilities.

In particular, I am pleased to undertake a new role within the organization, that of Managing Director for International Business Development and Executive Director Emeritus, effective November 1. Having participated in ABET’s goal of providing world leadership in quality assurance over the past 15 years, I look forward to being a part of ABET’s international vision for the next few years of its development. I also look forward to working closely with the leadership to help ensure that this organization continues to be a standard-setter, a recognized leader in accreditation, as it makes its way along the next leg of its journey.

George D. Peterson, Ph.D., P.E.
ABET Executive Director
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2008 Activity Highlights

Accreditation Expands at Home and Abroad
The 2007-2008 accreditation cycle saw the first of ABET’s accreditation visits to non-domestic programs, that is programs housed outside of the United States that were not an extension of U.S. programs. These commenced with representatives from the Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) visiting one program in Germany, seven programs in Kuwait, nine programs in Mexico, and one program in Turkey. In addition, volunteers from the Computing Accreditation Commission (CAC) visited two programs in Mexico, one program in South Africa, and one program in United Arab Emirates.

Furthermore, ABET reviewed an astounding number of programs within the United States with more than 720 programs evaluated across its four commissions. This includes 22 in the area of applied science, representing a rise of more than 68 percent, and nearly 100 for computing, a rise of 15 percent over the previous year. There were 442 evaluations in the area of engineering, up from 417 the previous year, and 141 programs evaluated for technology.

ABET and Other Computing Organizations Sign the Seoul Declaration
On November 6, 2007, at a symposium in Seoul, Korea, representatives of six accrediting bodies signed a historic declaration of intent. Signatories of the Seoul Declaration agreed on a “shared vision of establishing an accord on the accreditation of educational programs in the computing and IT-related disciplines.” Modeled after the Washington Accord, an agreement among engineering accreditors, the Seoul Accord will be the first within the computing professions. The six signatories of the declaration were ABET, the Australian Computer Society (ACS), the British Computer Society (BCS), the Canadian Information Processing Society (CIPS), the Japan Accreditation Board for Engineering Education (JABEE), and the Accreditation Board for Engineering Education of Korea (ABEEK). Joe Turner, a member-at-large of the Executive Committee of ABET’s Computing Accreditation Commission (CAC) was ABET’s representative at the symposium and declaration signing.
ABET Board Approves Establishment of ABET Foundation
At its fall 2007 meeting, the ABET Board of Directors approved the formation of an ABET Foundation “to advance, promote, and support the charitable, educational, and scientific purposes of ABET.” Among its purposes are to create an endowment fund for ABET, operate a consultancy service for programs seeking ABET accreditation, assist other countries in developing accreditation systems for scientific and technical education programs, and support research activities related to ABET’s activities and goals. To begin, the foundation’s Board of Trustees consists of three former ABET Presidents.

ABET Lifts Longtime Ban on Dual-Level Accreditation in Engineering Fields
In 2006 and 2007, responding to the report “Engineer of 2020” issued by the National Academy of Engineering and to initiatives from some of its member societies, ABET sought comments from its constituencies with respect to the ABET/Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) longstanding policy II.B.8.a of the Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual: “Engineering programs may be accredited at either the baccalaureate or master’s level. A program may be accredited at only one level in a particular curriculum at a particular institution.” Following close review of comments received, the ABET Board of Directors approved a change to the policy that will allow institutions to seek accreditation for their engineering programs at two levels within the same discipline concurrently. The change was approved in March 2008 and will take effect with the 2009-2010 accreditation cycle.

Accreditation Council Leads Criteria Harmonization Efforts
Criteria harmonization is an effort to use common criteria wording across the four ABET commissions where the intended meaning is the same. Harmonization is not about forcing commonality where differences are necessary and intentional. This project is addressing unintended differences that are a source of confusion for the institutions, ABET volunteers, and headquarters staff.

INCOSE Becomes a Member Society
At its fall 2007 meeting, the ABET Board of Directors approved an application for membership from the International Council on Systems Engineering (INCOSE). Founded in 1990, this organization’s mission is to advance the state of the art and practice of systems engineering in industry, academia, and government. Currently, INCOSE has 6,000 members, ranging from the level of students to senior practitioners. INCOSE received the needed ratifying votes on July 15 and took its seat on the ABET Board at the fall 2008 meeting. This addition brought the number of professional and technical societies that comprise ABET up to 29.

ABET Signs Memoranda of Understanding with Israeli and Egyptian Organizations
ABET signed two memoranda of understanding — one with the Council for Higher Education in Israel and one with National Authority for Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Education of Egypt. In general, a memorandum of understanding (MOU) is intended to improve the quality of applied science, computing, engineering, and/or technology education. The MOU provides a mechanism for the exchange of information and collaboration on accreditation. An MOU may lead to a mutual recognition agreement at some time in the future, but the agreement does not impart any rights or privileges to graduates of accredited programs. These two latest agreements bring ABET’s total MOUs to 14.

ABET Board Strategic Task Groups Take on Challenges Around Educational Delivery, Globalization, Governance
One of the major functions of a board of directors is determining the strategic issues that will ultimately set its organization’s future course. At its spring meeting in 2007, the ABET Board determined that the organization’s top strategic issues revolve around (1) educational delivery, particularly what the emergence of new educational paradigms and degree paths mean for quality assurance; (2) globalization and the increasingly borderless nature of technical education and employment, as well as the opportunities and challenges that the global marketplace presents for an accrediting body; and (3) governance, specifically whether ABET’s current operating structure is optimal and if the organization has the representation needed to operate effectively in the changing environment. This year, the Board appointed volunteers to serve on Strategic Issues Task Groups, one addressing each of these areas. Their work will likely lay the foundation for ABET’s strategic thrust.

ABET Begins New Webinar Series
In December 2007, ABET began a new series of webinars — interactive, Internet-based seminars that include on-screen audio and visual presentations and multiple opportunities for participants to pose questions to the presenter. ABET’s new series enabled an unlimited number of faculty members at a single location to learn about program assessment basics, accreditation visit preparations, and other topics of interest without incurring travel expenses. There were a total of 13 webinars with 10 different assessment or accreditation topics, including “Accreditation for Non-U.S. Based Programs,” “Preparing for the Site Visit” from each of the four commissions, “Defining Program Outcomes,” and “Developing Rubrics.”
Partnership to Advance Volunteer Excellence (PAVE) Brings About Industry Recruitment Fliers, Team Chair Competency Model, and Much More

The PAVE initiative, which kicked off late in 2006, continued to introduce improvements to the means by which ABET volunteers are recruited, selected, trained, and evaluated. During 2007-2008, there were revisions and updates to the program evaluator competency model, the online program evaluator application form, its accompanying recruitment and selection guide, and the program evaluator candidate pre-work. The centralized program evaluator training, which includes the pre-work as well as a day and a half of face-to-face training, prepared a total of 119 candidates this year. A volunteer recruitment flier that specifically targets professionals from industry and government was developed, and a team chair competency model was created, revised, and approved by the ABET Board of Directors. In addition, the program evaluator performance assessment tools were revised and made more user-friendly, and a plan was developed to analyze and report the results of volunteer performance evaluations to the accreditation commissions, ABET member societies, and the individual volunteer.

Faculty Workshops on Assessing Program Outcomes Gives Nearly 400 a Foundation in Continuous Quality Improvement

ABET hosted seven faculty workshops in 2008. The year’s schedule included workshops in San Antonio, Tampa, Nashville, and Pittsburgh; two workshops in Baltimore; and a workshop preceding this year’s Commission Summit in Louisville. In total, approximately 390 participants benefitted from these day-long opportunities to sharpen their assessment knowledge.

Institute for the Development of Excellence in Assessment Leadership ( IDEAL ) Meets Increasing Demand with Two Sessions in One Year

Demand for IDEAL has been exceptionally strong, and 2008 was the first year in which two sessions were conducted. The first, held in Phoenix from January 7 through 11, hosted 39 participants, while the second, held in Baltimore from August 4 through 8, had 37 participants. ABET conducted these four-and-a-half-day intensive professional development workshops specifically to help individuals with limited assessment experience prepare to lead the development and implementation of an assessment plan for their programs or institutions. After completing the Institute, participants are designated as IDEAL Scholars, which entitles them to a year of extensive support as they implement their assessment plans.

Best Assessment Processes Symposium Marks 10th Anniversary

The Best Assessment Processes Symposium celebrated its 10th anniversary in 2008. This two-day event provides interactive and presentation-based opportunities for applied science, computing, engineering, and technology educators to learn about assessment methods and how they can be used to validate and improve student learning outcomes. Peter Ewell, Vice President of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, served as keynote, and special 10th Anniversary Presenters, who were instrumental in developing the symposium early on, delivered invited presentations throughout the event.

2008 Society Summit Brings Together Volunteers and Staff to Share Best Practices for Recruiting, Training, and More

On October 6, ABET hosted its second annual Society Summit. This event brought together individuals who have direct responsibility for their ABET member society’s accreditation activities to share best practices and work to improve the accreditation experience for all involved. Forty-three individuals representing 18 different ABET societies attended. The program included progress reports about PAVE, as well as presentations from society representatives on strategies for recruiting program evaluator candidates and preparations for program evaluators who are assigned to visits outside of the U.S. Also covered were training volunteers on program criteria and preparing them to serve as mentors for new candidates, the use of performance evaluations for volunteer recognition and remediation, and approaches to refresher and remedial training.
Financial Highlights

Independent Auditors’ Report
We have audited the accompanying statements of financial position of Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, Inc. (ABET), (a non-profit organization) as of September 30, 2008 and 2007, and the related statements of activities and cash flows for the years then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of ABET’s management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audits.

We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, Inc., as of September 30, 2008 and 2007, and the changes in its net assets and its cash flows for the years then ended in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

Shapiro & Duffalo, P.C.
January 14, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements of Financial Position</th>
<th>See Notes to Financial Statements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>Liabilities and Net Assets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current assets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments – at fair value</td>
<td>2008: 2,468,030, 2007: 1,878,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable, less allowance for doubtful accounts of $35,000 and $44,521, respectively for 2008 and 2007</td>
<td>2008: 426,537, 2007: 1,079,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses and other current assets</td>
<td>2008: 102,114, 2007: 97,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total current assets</td>
<td>2008: 4,183,888, 2007: 4,183,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed assets, at cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information management systems</td>
<td>2008: 705,021, 2007: 705,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>2008: 635,901, 2007: 662,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and fixtures</td>
<td>2008: 198,908, 2007: 198,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer software</td>
<td>2008: 38,354, 2007: 12,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: accumulated depreciation and amortization</td>
<td>2008: (958,822), 2007: (914,204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total fixed assets — net</td>
<td>2008: 787,584, 2007: 793,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total assets</td>
<td>2008: $4,971,472, 2007: $4,977,101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Statements of Activities
See Notes to Financial Statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unrestricted Net Assets</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support and revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation revenues</td>
<td>$4,911,861</td>
<td>$3,652,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services revenues</td>
<td>555,635</td>
<td>328,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECEI revenues</td>
<td>11,633</td>
<td>83,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy international revenues</td>
<td>77,950</td>
<td>121,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments — member societies</td>
<td>1,204,428</td>
<td>1,234,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive meeting revenues</td>
<td>1,995</td>
<td>113,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>4,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>120,447</td>
<td>129,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special projects revenues</td>
<td>6,182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,890,746</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,668,284</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash Flows From Operating Activities</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) in unrestricted net assets</td>
<td>$550,473</td>
<td>($263,273)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjustments to reconcile increase (decrease) in unrestricted net assets to net cash provided by (used in) operating activities

- **Depreciation and amortization**: 165,470 (133,712)
- **Deferred rent**: (16,737) (13,823)
- **Equipment donations**: (4,851)
- **Unrealized (gain) on investment in marketable securities**: (531)
- **Realized (gain) loss on sale of investment in marketable securities**: (6,768)
- **Bad debt reserve**: (9,521) (3,886)

Increase (decrease) in liabilities

- **Accrued expenses and other current liabilities**: (63,596) (33,696)
- **Deferred revenues**: (535,042) 1,059,429

Total adjustments | 193,256 | 233,264 |

Net cash provided by (used in) operating activities | 743,729 | (30,009) |

## Statements of Cash Flows
See Notes to Financial Statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash Flows From Operating Activities</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) in unrestricted net assets</td>
<td>$550,473</td>
<td>($263,273)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation expenses</td>
<td>2,720,484</td>
<td>2,440,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services expenses</td>
<td>1,004,666</td>
<td>761,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECEI expenses</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>166,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy international expenses</td>
<td>2,898</td>
<td>48,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance, planning, and operations</td>
<td>2,609,352</td>
<td>2,391,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special projects expenses</td>
<td>2,741</td>
<td>122,707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Net decrease in assets | 550,473 | ($263,273) |
| Net assets, beginning of year | 239,653 | 502,926 |
| Net assets, end of year | $790,126 | $239,653 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash Flows From Investing Activities</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchases of fixed assets</td>
<td>(66,432)</td>
<td>(60,504)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from sale of marketable debt securities</td>
<td>1,356,875</td>
<td>2,099,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases of investments</td>
<td>(1,946,450)</td>
<td>(2,576,914)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Net cash used in investing activities | (656,007) | (538,418) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash Flows From Financing Activities</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital lease payments</td>
<td>(29,151)</td>
<td>(25,102)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Net cash used in financing activities | (29,151) | (25,102) |

| Net Decrease in Cash And Cash Equivalents | 58,571 | (593,529) |

| Cash And Cash Equivalents, Beginning Of Year | 1,128,636 | 1,722,165 |

| Cash And Cash Equivalents, End Of Year | 1,187,207 | 1,128,636 |

Supplemental cash flow information

| Net decrease in cash and cash equivalents | $6,415 | $5,910 |

Interest paid during the year |
Notes to Financial Statements

Note 1 - Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

Organization
Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, Inc., which is doing business as ABET, Inc. (ABET) was organized in 1932 and incorporated in 1963 as a tax-exempt organization under the Internal Revenue Code Section Number 501(c)(3). ABET accredits applied science, computing, engineering, and technology, programs at colleges and universities throughout the United States as well as internationally. ABET also conducts faculty improvement workshops. The Engineering Credentials Evaluation International (ECEI) (See Note 8) is a division of ABET that evaluates the credentials of engineers educated outside of the United States. The organization is supported primarily by membership assessments and accreditation fees.

Revenue and Cost Recognition
The financial statements of ABET have been prepared on an accrual basis. Income from membership assessments is recognized over the period to which the assessment relates and income from fees are recorded when the related services are performed. Accreditation visit income is recognized as deferred revenue until the organization releases its final reports. Unless specifically restricted by the donor or the grantor, all contributions and grants are considered to be available for unrestricted use. Unrestricted contributions received for the organization’s programs are recognized as income when received.

Cash and Cash Equivalents
ABET considers all highly liquid investments with a maturity of three months or less when purchased, to be cash and cash equivalents.

The organization maintains four operating cash accounts in a brokerage firm located in the Baltimore area. These cash balances at times during the year may exceed Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation insured limits. At September 30, 2008, the organization had not incurred any losses relating to these funds.

Accounts Receivable
Accounts receivable are stated at the amount the organization expects to collect from outstanding balances. The organization provides for probable uncollectible amounts through a charge to earnings and a credit to a valuation allowance based on its assessment of the current status of individual accounts. Balances that are still outstanding after the organization has used reasonable collection efforts are written off through a charge to the valuation allowance and a credit to accounts receivable.

Depreciation
Fixed assets are recorded at cost and depreciated over their estimated useful lives by use of the straight-line method over 3 to 10 years.

Leasehold improvements are amortized over the shorter of the remaining term of lease or the useful life of the improvement utilizing the straight-line method.

Donated Services
The organization has not reflected donated services relating to accreditation visits on its financial statements, since these services do not meet the criteria for SFAS No. 116.

Investments
The organization carries investments in marketable debt securities and certificates of deposit. All investments have a term of one year or less and have a readily determinable fair market value. Investments are displayed at fair market value on the statement of financial position with unrealized gains and losses being included in investment income on the statement of activities.

Use of Estimates
The preparation of financial statements in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect certain reported amounts and disclosures. Accordingly actual results could differ from those estimates.

Note 2 - Retirement Plan
A retirement plan is provided by ABET on an optional basis. The plan is carried through TIAA/CREF. The basic plan provides for a 5% contribution from the employee and an 8% contribution from ABET. In addition to the retirement plan, ABET offers a Supplemental Retirement Annuity Plan through TIAA/CREF. For the years ended September 30, 2008 and 2007, ABET contributed $133,134 and $148,172, respectively to the plan.
Note 3 – Deferred Rent
In accordance with Financial Accounting Standards Board Statement No. 13, operating lease agreements that provide for rent holidays and uneven annual payments are to be amortized on a straight-line basis over the life of the noncancellable lease terms. The effect on this statement is to reduce the rent expense by $16,737 over the amount of actual rent payments disbursed during the year ended September 30, 2008.

Note 4 – Concentration of Credit Risk
Financial instruments which potentially subject the organization to concentrations of credit risk are trade receivables. The credit risk associated with trade receivables is limited, because the organization deals with large numbers of customers in a wide geographic area. The organization places temporary cash investments with credit-worthy, high quality financial institutions. As of September 30, 2008, the organization had no significant concentrations of credit risk.

Note 5 – Investments
Investments consist of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of deposit</td>
<td>$2,468,030</td>
<td>$1,878,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of cost over fair value over cost and (excess) of fair value over cost</td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>(531)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>$2,470,701</td>
<td>$1,877,924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 6 – Capital Leases
ABET entered into a capital lease during the year ended September 30, 2008, with a third party. The economic substance of the lease is that ABET is financing the acquisition of the asset through the lease, and, accordingly, it is recorded in ABET’s assets and liabilities. The capital lease is being amortized using the straight-line method over 5-year period.

The following is a schedule by years of future minimum payments required under the lease together with their present value as of September 30, 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Ending September 30,</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$21,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>21,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>21,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>21,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>42,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total minimum lease payments</td>
<td>129,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less amount representing interest</td>
<td>$43,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present value of minimum lease payments</td>
<td>$86,001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interest expense for the year ended September 30, 2008 was $6,415.

Note 7 – Rental Commitment
ABET is currently leasing office space under a noncancellable operating lease that expires in September 2014. The following is a schedule of future minimum rental payments under the lease and does not include operating and tax escalations that are adjusted on a periodic basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Ending September 30,</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$308,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>315,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>322,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>329,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>336,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>344,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total minimum lease payments</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,957,898</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rent expense which includes maintenance and utilities amounted to $354,704 for the year ended September 30, 2008.

Note 8 – ECEI
On October 28, 2006, the ABET Board of Directors approved the motion to suspend ABET’s credentials evaluation service (ECEI) and establish a timetable of related steps to include the finalization of current applications and a cessation of new applications. These actions were completed April 30, 2007.

Note 9 – Reclassifications
Certain items in the 2007 report have been reclassified to conform to current year classifications. Such reclassifications had no effect on previously reported decrease in net assets.

Note 10 – Noncash Transactions
During the year ended September 30, 2008, the organization acquired equipment by entering into capital lease obligations totaling $88,424.

During the year ended September 30, 2008, the organization received donated equipment in the amount of $4,851.
INDEPENDENT AUDITORS’ REPORT on Additional Information

Our report on our audits of the basic financial statements of ABET, Inc. as of September 30, 2008 and 2007, appears on pages 9 and 10 of this publication. Our audits were conducted for the purpose of forming an opinion on the basic financial statements taken as a whole. The additional information on these pages is presented for purposes of additional analysis and is not a required part of the basic financial statements. Such information has not been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements, and, accordingly, we express no opinion on it.

Shapiro & Duffalo, P.C.
January 14, 2009

Schedules of Operating Expenses
For the years ended September 30,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Expenses</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and related expenses</td>
<td>$728,285</td>
<td>$693,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional fees</td>
<td>44,798</td>
<td>55,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and administrative</td>
<td>67,190</td>
<td>66,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff travel</td>
<td>30,015</td>
<td>27,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors travel expense</td>
<td>4,948</td>
<td>5,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission officer travel</td>
<td>325,506</td>
<td>279,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant travel</td>
<td>2,488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer travel</td>
<td>1,309,302</td>
<td>1,079,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAVE expenses</td>
<td>2,034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosted meeting expenses</td>
<td>201,607</td>
<td>229,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other expenses</td>
<td>6,799</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,720,484</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,440,749</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Services Expenses</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and related expenses</td>
<td>$576,892</td>
<td>$477,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional fees</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and administrative</td>
<td>148,900</td>
<td>62,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff travel</td>
<td>23,304</td>
<td>41,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors travel expense</td>
<td>4,982</td>
<td>1,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant travel</td>
<td>4,245</td>
<td>1,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer travel</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>4,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosted meeting expenses</td>
<td>208,039</td>
<td>135,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other expenses</td>
<td>4,026</td>
<td>3,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>31,941</td>
<td>33,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,004,686</strong></td>
<td><strong>$761,715</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECEI Expenses</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and related expenses</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$102,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional fees</td>
<td>12,150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and administrative</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>16,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy expense</td>
<td>34,151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development and morale</td>
<td>430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual membership dues</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document verification and translation</td>
<td>(147)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$112</strong></td>
<td><strong>$166,460</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legacy International Expenses</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and related expenses</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$20,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and administrative</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive travel</td>
<td>6,685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosted meeting expenses</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer travel</td>
<td>21,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other expenses</td>
<td>1,664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,898</strong></td>
<td><strong>$48,851</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Governance, Planning, and Operations Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and related expenses</td>
<td>$1,287,750</td>
<td>$1,171,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional fees</td>
<td>264,040</td>
<td>157,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and administrative</td>
<td>250,832</td>
<td>177,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy expense</td>
<td>354,704</td>
<td>318,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting registration expenses</td>
<td>1,891</td>
<td>2,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff travel</td>
<td>37,304</td>
<td>42,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors travel expense</td>
<td>47,658</td>
<td>32,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant travel</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer travel and recognition expense</td>
<td>29,115</td>
<td>33,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosted meeting expenses</td>
<td>28,101</td>
<td>209,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation and amortization</td>
<td>165,470</td>
<td>133,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous expenses</td>
<td>10,687</td>
<td>1,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank fees</td>
<td>46,875</td>
<td>16,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest expense</td>
<td>6,415</td>
<td>5,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance expense</td>
<td>55,748</td>
<td>59,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development and morale</td>
<td>5,814</td>
<td>8,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer recognition expense</td>
<td>4,306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual membership dues</td>
<td>4,987</td>
<td>5,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership dues — organizations</td>
<td>16,647</td>
<td>10,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad debt expense</td>
<td>(9,091)</td>
<td>5,015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $2,609,352 $2,391,075

### Special Projects Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and related expenses</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$49,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional fees</td>
<td>2,723</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and administrative</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff travel</td>
<td></td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant travel</td>
<td>(793)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer travel</td>
<td>4,534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project specific expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>61,460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $2,741 $122,707

*See Independent Auditor’s Report on Additional Information (pages 9 through 12).*
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The ABET Accreditation Council was established in 2001. The council exists to improve the accreditation process with emphasis on sharing best practices and achieving appropriate consistency across the four ABET commissions. The work encompasses policies, processes, procedures, and criteria. Council membership includes a chair (two-year term) and the chair, chair-elect, and past chair from each of the four commissions. The chair of the International Activities Council serves as a non-voting member.

The most significant initiative this year was the criteria harmonization effort. Additional council activities included establishment of the Accreditation Council Training Committee; further alignment of processes, forms, and procedures; and work on common issues that span the commissions.

**Criteria Harmonization**

The cross-commission *ad hoc* Criteria Harmonization Committee created a set of draft harmonized criteria this year. The committee consisted of two representatives from each commission with support from the ABET staff. The committee initiated the task with a meeting in Baltimore and then labored diligently to get the criteria ready for July consideration by the commissions. ABET staff assisted greatly with the administration of an online survey to gather feedback on an early draft. The survey results confirmed that the committee was headed in the right direction. The coordination effort was truly herculean, and the council chair expresses his gratitude to all involved in the effort.

To assist in communication with stakeholders about the criteria harmonization effort, the council’s chairs produced a set of “frequently asked questions,” which includes the following information:

**What is criteria harmonization?**
Criteria harmonization is an effort to use common criteria wording across the four ABET commissions where the intended meaning is the same. Harmonization is NOT about forcing commonality where differences are necessary and intentional.

**Why harmonize?**

- To help institutions. It is becoming increasingly common for a campus visit to involve multiple commissions. Unintended differences are a source of confusion and frustration for institutions and especially for jointly-accredited programs.
- To help ABET volunteers. New program evaluators now share common training; however, they must devote more of their valuable time to learn commission nuances where intended differences are mixed with unintended differences.
- To help ABET headquarters staff. Unnecessary differences in criteria stand in the way of alignment of staff processes and artifacts. This makes resources sharing and load leveling very difficult for the small headquarters staff.

The criteria harmonization will be presented to the Board in fall 2008 to begin the review and comment period. As the criteria are refined, associated forms and training materials will be developed to support institutions and visiting teams.

**Training**

This year, the ABET Board approved changes to the Rules of Procedure (ROP) to create the Accreditation Council Training Committee. The Training Committee’s mission is to continue the goals of the Project to Advance Volunteer Excellence (PAVE) initiative through training to:

- Enhance the value of the experience volunteers gain from participating in ABET activities.
- Improve the accreditation process for team chairs and program evaluators.
- Assist member societies in carrying out their volunteer-related accreditation functions.

The committee consists of a chair, the training committee chairs from each of the four commissions, and four at-large representatives from member societies. The committee began its activities in fall 2008.

**Other Initiatives**

In the spirit of the criteria harmonization effort, the council continued work to increase uniformity of policies, processes, and documents across the commissions. These efforts include:

- Training for new Executive Committee members. This session acquaints all commissions’ new Executive Committee members with their duties and begins to form the cross-commission personal relationships that further the council’s work.
- Training on joint and simultaneous visits for team chairs. A significant number of visits now involve multiple commissions. This training enables teams to work together more efficiently before, during, and after the visits.
- Forms harmonization. Criteria harmonization allows more uniformity of commission forms. Efforts are underway to align self-study templates and other supporting documents. Council members are also supporting Board initiatives on alternate educational delivery means, program naming issues, and other strategic issues.

This was a highly successful year for the council, and we look forward to new challenges and further progress on current initiatives.
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In 2007-2008, for the first time, ASAC accredited a program under its general criteria alone, as well as accrediting a program under the combined Environmental, Health, and Safety criteria that the ABET Board had approved following the American Industrial Hygiene Association (AIHA) and the American Society of Safety Engineers (ASSE) entering into a memorandum of understanding regarding accreditation of these programs. Additionally, ASAC accredited two programs that were delivered through an online delivery mode.

**ASAC Operations**

At the Summer Commission Meeting, ASAC training for both new and sitting commissioners was heavily focused on evaluation under outcomes-based assessment, the implementation of AC2001, and the conduct of campus visits where more than a single ABET commission is on site simultaneously.

During 2007-2008, the ASAC had five standing committees: Consistency, Criteria, Forms, Nominating, and Training. The Criteria Committee provided ASAC’s input to the proposed criteria harmonization with the other commissions.

One of ASAC’s focuses during the 2007-2008 cycle was bringing the ASAC documentation in line with the other commissions, through the efforts of the Accreditation Council: ASAC prepared a renumbered Program Audit Form, Self-Study Questionnaire, and draft statements reflecting the renumbered criteria, as well as doing the same for the forms used by program evaluators. In addition, ASAC prepared a mock self-study for use in program evaluator training.

“ASAC is pursuing new program areas that might be interested in ABET accreditation, including... ‘Homeland Security.’”

ASAC Chair Ralph Hodek and Past Chair Michael Bisesi pursued ASAC’s longstanding proposal that ABET embark upon a campaign to advertise the value added of accreditation to ABET’s diverse constituencies. In addition, ASAC is pursuing new program areas that might be interested in ABET accreditation, including both international and domestic programs titled “Applied Science,” as well as programs under the growing program area of “Homeland Security.”
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Process Innovation and Improvements

In response to suggestions from previous CAC consistency committees, the draft final evaluation reports were distributed to the 2007-2008 Consistency Committee in advance of the Summer Commission Meeting. This allowed the Consistency Committee to anticipate issues and work with commissioners during the meeting to help eliminate potential consistency problems. The process proved to be very successful and likely will be used again next year.

The Executive Committee continued its aggressive enforcement of the time limits for team chairs and editors to complete their work. Despite increased workload due to the growth in the number of programs being evaluated, all deadlines were met. The working relationship between CAC and CSAB continued to be positive. CAC is in the unique position of having a single society that serves as the interface for other professional societies with an interest in computing accreditation. In 2008, this cooperative and collaborative relationship again was evident in the work of the joint CAC/CSAB Criteria Committee and their leadership in the cross-commission criteria harmonization effort. A similar working relationship was initiated with the respective training committees in supporting the Partnership to Advance Volunteer Excellence (PAVE) initiative and the effort to train program evaluators on our new criteria. CAC and CSAB took advantage of this singular relationship by coordinating the work of key committees. Once per year, the two executive committees meet jointly to discuss issues of concern to both the CAC and CSAB, to further improve processes. No discussion of actions involving accreditation of any programs is held at these joint meetings.

Growth

CAC continues its substantial growth in requests for evaluation from new programs. For the second straight year, CAC evaluated more than 100 programs in a single cycle. The forecast is for this to continue in the 2008-2009 cycle. To handle the increased workload, the ABET Board allowed CAC to promote some alternates to the commission to cover the number of visits. CAC is grateful to the Board for its support.

Criteria

This year, 12 pilot visits of 18 programs (including computer science, information systems, and information technology) were conducted using proposed general and program criteria. In the 2008-2009 cycle, the general and program criteria will be used for all CAC programs from institutions that have a new program under evaluation, and they will be used for about half of the other CAC programs undergoing re-evaluation. Full implementation of the general and program criteria will take place effective with the 2009-2010 cycle. The commission’s Rollout Committee, led by Allen Parrish, coordinated and helped keep us on track in managing the rollout of these new criteria.

This year also saw culmination of the ABET Accreditation Council-coordinated effort to harmonize the criteria, so that the wording in areas that tend to mean the same thing to the different commissions is identical and less confusing. The benefit to institutions, evaluation teams, and headquarters staff is considerable if the criteria are harmonized in this way. CAC’s David Feinstein led the cross-commission harmonization team, and Frank Young was the other CAC member of that team. The team’s recommendations were reviewed by the four commissions at the summer meeting and approved almost verbatim by CAC. CAC’s actions on the criteria harmonization will be synthesized with those of the other ABET commissions to determine the extent of harmonization obtained. The final recommendations from this synthesis process are expected to be presented to the ABET Board in fall 2008.

Documents, Training, and Outreach

With the rollout of the new criteria, there is a need to develop new documents to support the criteria changes and related process changes. The CAC’s Documents Committee, under Harold Grossman’s leadership, did a yeoman’s job in providing the needed materials for the coming year’s evaluations. Joe Turner, Chair of Training, and Susan Schall, CAC’s Liaison to the ABET Board of Directors, continue to help lead the PAVE Project. Also, Past Chair Larry Jones is a member of the PAVE Steering Committee. Joe prepared useful training materials for the commission to facilitate our large-scale transition to the new criteria in the coming year.

CAC and the Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) again conducted a training session for team chairs of simultaneous visits. These types of visits are becoming more frequent as institutions whose suite of ABET programs spans multiple commissions desire alignment of the programs’ respective accreditation cycles. CAC now conducts almost half of its general review evaluations in partnership with at least one other commission.

The Chair, Chair-Elect, and CAC Adjunct Accreditation Director participated in the Commission Summit activities at the beginning of the 2007 ABET Annual Meeting. The plenary session, coordinated by CAC, provided tips on preparing the self-study document. The commission-specific afternoon session was devoted to training on assessment and an introduction to the new proposed criteria.

CAC continues its efforts to attract a gender-diverse volunteer corps to its commission and its leadership. Twenty percent of next year’s commissioners are women, as is one-third of the incoming Executive Committee. Our greatest challenge remains the recruitment of commissioners from industry. However, we have made progress in this area as well, increasing our industry representation to over 25 percent in next year’s commission. The ability to increase industry-based commissioners is directly related to our ability to increase industry-based program evaluators.

Program Naming

Another challenge facing CAC is the plethora of program names that are used by computing programs globally. Many names are used for seemingly similar programs, and sometimes the same
Another challenge facing CAC is the plethora of program names that are used by computing programs globally."

is exacerbated by ABET’s recent decision to accredit programs outside of the United States, and therefore this problem is receiving increasing recognition from other ABET commissions.

International Computing Accord
ABET participated in international discussions regarding the development of an accord for computing programs that resembles accords in which ABET currently participates for engineering and technology programs. Such an accord signifies that the signatories believe that the accreditation processes used in the respective countries provides substantially equivalent evidence that graduates of accredited programs meet agreed-upon standards. Further discussions and possible action are expected in the coming year.
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Process Improvement
In 2008, the Engineering Accreditation Commission piloted a new step in the process for determining accreditation actions. The overall goals for piloting panels were to increase opportunities for commissioners to participate in discussions of individual statements, to ensure each statement is reviewed adequately, to continue to ensure correct accreditation actions for programs, and to maintain/increase confidence in the engineering education stakeholder community that accreditation actions are determined through a credible process. The specific objectives of the panels as implemented in 2008 were to (1) review program statements to identify any issues that should be brought before the whole commission and (2) prepare team chairs to report on only panel-recommended issues to the full commission.

“In Commissioners also agreed that their level of participation in the overall process was higher in the panel compared to the previous process.”

There were seven panels; each was chaired by a member of the Executive Committee. Following the panel sessions, the full commission reconvened and voting proceeded with each team chair moving the recommended actions. A script was provided to the team chairs to follow for making the motion and subsequent discussion.

Following the commission meeting, all commissioners were asked to complete an online survey on the effectiveness of the panels. All 56 respondents recommended that the process be continued next year. The commissioners agreed that the panel process will be viewed by our stakeholder community as a credible process for determining accreditation actions. Commissioners also agreed that their level of participation in the overall process was higher in the panel compared to the previous process. The two major recommended improvements had to do with logistics: individual meeting rooms for panels and access to the statements earlier to improve preparation for the panels. The Executive Committee will review the survey results and make improvements as recommended for 2009.

Analysis of Accreditation Actions and Trends
Criterion 2 (Program Educational Objectives) and Criterion 3 (Program Outcomes) continue to be the areas in which there are the most shortcomings (deficiencies, weaknesses, and concerns). Common shortcomings related to these two criteria included the following:

- Inadequate evidence that the process in which the objectives are determined and periodically evaluated is based on the needs of constituencies (Criterion 2).
- Confusion between the definition of program educational objectives (Criterion 2) and program outcomes (Criterion 3).
- Inadequate evidence of using the results of evaluation of objectives (Criterion 2) and/or assessment of outcomes (Criterion 3) to improve the program.
- Inadequate evidence demonstrating achievement of objectives (Criterion 2) or outcomes (Criterion 3).

Other common shortcomings included issues around student advising, student monitoring, engineering design (weak major design experience), adequacy of facilities (including laboratories), and program criteria issues related to curriculum content.

2007–2008 EAC Goals
The EAC had similar goals for the 2007-2008 cycle as for the 2006-2007 evaluation cycle. The overall goal of producing draft and final statements in a timely fashion was expressed in some specific timeline goals:

- Receive all Interim Report draft statements from team chairs by September 15, 2007 — 42.5 percent of the statements were submitted by September 15 and 82.5 percent submitted by September 30.
- Complete Editor 2 revisions of all Interim Report draft statements by October 31, 2007 — 70 percent of the statements were edited by October 31 and 90 percent were completed by December 31.
- Send draft statements for all General and Interim Visits to institutions no later than March 1, 2008 — 76.4 percent of the statements were sent by March 1 and 92.1 percent were sent by March 31.
- Complete final editing of all final statements by May 15, 2008 — 51.2 percent were complete by May 15 and 90 percent were complete by May 31.

A second overall goal was to continue to make dramatic improvements in the quality of training, specifically by making major revisions to training materials instead of making minor revisions to earlier versions and, thus, do away with “death by PowerPoint” presentations. In 2008, improvement efforts focused on new and continuing team chair training.

“In 2008, improvement efforts focused on new and continuing team chair training.”

A third goal was to promote good communications within the EAC, between the EAC and ABET headquarters, and between the EAC and other commissions.

2008 EAC Summer Meeting Overview
The commission debated, modified, and approved harmonized criteria (first reading), with the understanding that a public comment period would occur and the commission would review the criteria in 2009. In addition, the commission approved the
following items related to program criteria to be submitted to
the ABET Board for approval:

- Program Criteria for Biological and Similarly Named Engineering Programs: Add the word “food” so the first sentence of the criteria reads, “These program criteria apply to engineering programs including ‘biological,’ ‘biological systems,’ ‘food,’ and similar modifiers in their titles, with the exception of bioengineering and biomedical engineering programs.”

- Program Criteria for Software and Similarly Named Engineering Programs: Strike the word “and” and add an additional phrase so that the text of the program Criterion 1 reads, “The curriculum must provide both breadth and depth across the range of engineering and computer science topics implied by the title and objectives of the program. The program must demonstrate that graduates have: the ability to analyze, design, verify, validate, implement, apply, and maintain software systems; the ability to appropriately apply discrete mathematics, probability and statistics, and relevant topics in computer science and supporting disciplines to complex software systems; the ability to work in one or more significant application domains; and the ability to manage the development of software systems.”

- Add new Program Criteria for Systems Engineering Programs Without Modifiers in Their Titles with lead societies American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers, Institute of Industrial Engineers, Instrument Society of America, International Council on Systems Engineering, and SAE International. These program criteria apply to systems engineering programs without modifiers in their title. Currently, there are no program-specific criteria beyond the General Criteria.

### 2007–2008 Committees and Task Forces

The EAC had the following six standing committees and one ad hoc committee during the 2007-2008 evaluation cycle:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
<td>Mary Leigh Wolfe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency Committee</td>
<td>Gerald Jakubowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Committee</td>
<td>Pete Carrato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Committee</td>
<td>Bruce Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominating Committee</td>
<td>Gerald Jakubowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Committee</td>
<td>Susan Conry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Hoc Consistency Task Force</td>
<td>Gerald Jakubowski</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Analysis of Accreditation Actions and Trends
All but one of the programs that Technology Accreditation Commission reviewed this year received a positive accreditation action from the commission. Most of the findings reported dealt with shortcomings in continuous improvement plans and in the assessment of objectives and outcomes. This result is not surprising as programs continue to transition to the performance requirements of outcomes-based accreditation criteria. These findings have been consistent since their implementation four years ago.

Once again, good responsiveness on behalf of the institutions resulted in a significant number of findings being resolved or reduced in level during due process. The number of Interim Report accreditation actions continues to substantially outpace the number of Interim Visit actions.

Programs for Institutions and Faculty
This year, TAC hosted or participated in the following outreach activities for deans, department chairs, and other institutional representatives:
- The Commission Summit activities at the beginning of the ABET Annual Meeting.
- The 2008 Best Assessment Processes Symposium.
- An Institutional Representatives Briefing in Pittsburgh, immediately prior to the American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference.
- An Institutional Representatives’ Orientation session held in conjunction with the Summer Commission Meeting.

TAC Committees
Executive Committee
Mike Robinson, Chair
The TAC Executive Committee considered issues of policy, internal procedures, relationships with other ABET commissions, interpretations of the criteria, training of commission members and program evaluators, communications with educational institutions, accreditation visits in foreign countries, and improvement of the accreditation process. The members of the Executive Committee also served as editors for accreditation statements prepared by commission members and as team chairs for accreditation visits. The Executive Committee is to be commended for extraordinary diligence during this cycle. Even though the illness of one of the Executive Committee members increased the workload of each member, the Executive Committee was able to complete the preparation of all materials for commission review at the summer meeting on schedule.

Operations Committee
Kevin Taylor, Vice Chair of Operations
The responsibilities assigned to this critical position are to coordinate and monitor the current year’s workload of evaluation visits and report actions, working with the team chairs and ABET headquarters to ensure that preparations are made and carried out properly. The following major tasks were completed this cycle:
- Assigned or reassigned team chairs, editors/panelists, and reviewers as required for the current cycle and in proposed draft form for the next accreditation cycle.
- Ensured that the makeup of accreditation visiting teams was balanced (with regard to factors such as experience and employment), free of apparent conflicts of interest, and appropriate for the programs being evaluated.
- Monitored the scheduling, timing, and progress of each accreditation visit and assisted team chairs faced with emergency or unusual conditions during a visit.

“The [TAC] Executive Committee was able to complete the preparation of all materials for commission review at the summer meeting on schedule.”

This cycle, there were significant adjustments in editing assignments to be made, due in part to the illness of one of the Executive Committee members, as well as changes in program evaluator assignments. Even so, the outstanding efforts of the Vice Chair of Operations resulted in all statements being prepared on schedule for review at the TAC Summer Meeting.

Criteria Committee
Tom Currin, Chair
Warren Hill, Co-Chair
The Criteria Committee was very active during the 2007-2008 cycle. The development and approval of harmonized criteria, the development of distinct outcomes for associate and baccalaureate programs, and the approval of changes to Nuclear Engineering Technology and Bioengineering Technology program criteria for submission to the commission were outstanding accomplishments of the Criteria Committee during the cycle.

One of the highest priorities of the committee was the development and review of the harmonized criteria. The committee chair and vice chair and the TAC Chair represented TAC on the ad hoc cross-commission criteria committee that developed the first draft of the criteria harmonization. The TAC Criteria Committee reviewed the various drafts that were developed and moved for the adoption of the final draft of the criteria by the commission.

A greater distinction between the outcomes of associate and baccalaureate degree graduates was recommended by the criteria committee. The need for this action was twofold. The decrease in the number of accredited associate degree programs has been one of the most difficult issues TAC faced during the last several years. In addition, a greater distinction between the learned capabilities of baccalaureate and associate graduates would support the participation of ABET in the Dublin and Sydney Accords. After considering several alternatives, the committee recommended a distinct set of outcomes for the associate and baccalaureate programs that is very similar to the distinction currently in the ASAC criteria. The changes in the program outcomes and the curriculum elements of the TAC criteria would not affect the proposed harmonized portions of the general criteria.
If approved by the Board of Directors, this set of criteria will not only provide an improved set of criteria for the support of associate programs and improved support of participation in the Dublin and Sydney Accords, but also a more unified treatment of associate programs in the two ABET commissions that accredit those programs.

**Documents Committee**
*Lewis Bellinger, Chair*
*Mohammad Zahraee, Co-Chair*

The Documents Committee was also very active in the 2007-2008 cycle. All documents were reviewed for consistency with the Renumbered Criteria, which will be implemented in the 2008-2009 cycle. Twelve TAC forms were amended both for consistency with the renumbered criteria and to support various general improvement actions. In addition, all forms and documents are under review so as to identify where revisions may be needed to comply with the harmonization project.

**Training Committee**
*Eric Tappert, Chair*
*Kevin Taylor, Co-Chair*

The TAC training committee supported the PAVE training effort by revising all TAC-specific training materials to reflect the renumbered criteria and incorporate trainee and facilitator comments. The committee is preparing to assist the cross-commission training committee’s efforts to continue to improve the program evaluator training program.

The new commissioner training presentation was extensively revised to better serve the needs of the new members of the commission. This revision was led by commissioners who were in the process of making their first or second visits as team chairs so that the perspective reflecting the needs of new commissioners could be achieved.

Commissioner training was completely revamped this cycle and included two major focuses. One focus was a review of the new renumbered criteria, including an analysis of all the changes and the effect of those changes on the accreditation process. A second focus was an extensive discussion of the details of writing a good statement. Examples of good and poor findings are discussed in an effort to foster professionalism and completeness in the documentation of accreditation visits. Considerable time was spent in small groups critiquing both poor and good write-up of findings.

**Summer Commission Meeting**

Accreditation actions by the full commission, training of TAC members, and interaction with institutional representatives are the primary reasons for the Summer Commission Meeting in Arlington, VA. The new members of the commission attended an intensive training session just before the formal start of the meeting. Both new and returning commissioners participated in team chair training. However, the agenda of the 2007-2008 commission was reorganized so that the training actually occurred at the beginning of the 2008-2009 commission. (This reorganization of the commission agenda allowed retiring commissioners to be dismissed earlier.)

“**The committee recommended a distinct set of outcomes for the associate and baccalaureate programs.**”

The most outstanding work of the commission was in the area of criteria. The proposed harmonized criteria were approved by the commission with minor amendments. Proposed revisions to the program outcomes and the curriculum criteria were approved, which established a distinction between the minimal learned capabilities of graduates of associate and baccalaureate programs. This new program outcomes criterion is more compatible with the Dublin and Sydney Accords and is similar to the treatment of associate programs in the ASAC criteria. Finally, the commission approved amended program criteria for Bioengineering Technology and Nuclear Engineering Technology programs for second reading and submission to the ABET Board of Directors for approval.
Statistics

Part A
2007–2008 Cycle Data

Table 1
Evaluations Conducted
(Number of Programs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ASAC</th>
<th>CAC</th>
<th>EAC</th>
<th>TAC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Review</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Report</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Visit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Evaluations Conducted by Commission

ASAC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36% IR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59% GR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EAC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72% GR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TAC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54% GR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acronym Key

GR General Review
IR Interim Review
IV Interim Visit
NA Not to Accredit
NGR Next General Review
SC Show Cause

Table 2
Programs Visited by Curricular Area*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Associate Bachelor Master</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering and Biomedical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting and Design (General)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting and Design (Mechanical)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Mechanics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering, Engineering Physics &amp; Engineering Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental, Health, and Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industrial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Hygiene</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metallurgical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval Architecture and Marine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear and Radiological</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveying and Geomatics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Individual programs may embrace more than one curricular area and, thus, may be counted in more than one row.
### Table 3

**Actions for General Reviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ASAC</th>
<th>CAC</th>
<th>EAC</th>
<th>TAC</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGR</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actions for General Reviews Across All Commissions, 2007–2008**

- **NGR**: 59.0%
- **IR**: 35.3%
- **IV**: 2.9%
- **SC**: 2.7%

*Counted more than once in this table.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>ASAC</th>
<th>CAC</th>
<th>EAC</th>
<th>TAC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aeronautical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Conditioning</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering and Biomedical</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting and Design (General)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting and Design (Mechanical)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electromechanical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Mechanics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering, Engineering Physics &amp; Science</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental, Health, and Safety</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Physics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Hygiene</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation and Control Systems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metallurgical</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval Architecture and Marine</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear and Radiological</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveying and Geomatics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Individual programs may embrace more than one curricular area and, thus, may be counted more than once in this table.
Accredited Programs by Commission

- ASAC: 2% (71)
- CAC: 13% (369)
- TAC: 22% (649)
- EAC: 63% (1,853)

Institutions by Commission

- ASAC: 6% (57)
- CAC: 28% (256)
- TAC: 25% (233)
- EAC: 41% (383)

10 Largest Curricular Areas by Number of Accredited Programs

- Electrical
- Mechanical
- Civil
- Computer
- Computer Science
- Chemical
- Industrial
- Bioengineering and Biomedical
- Others
- Aerospace
Statistics

Part B
Accreditation Trend Data

Table 1
Number of Accredited Programs and Institutions Having Accredited Programs, 1998–2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ASAC Pgm</th>
<th>ASAC Inst</th>
<th>CAC Pgm</th>
<th>CAC Inst</th>
<th>EAC Pgm</th>
<th>EAC Inst</th>
<th>TAC Pgm</th>
<th>TAC Inst</th>
<th>All* Pgm</th>
<th>All* Inst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>2480</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>2549</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2589</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2651</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2689</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>2758</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>2830</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>2881</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>2958</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>2916</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>2871</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Individual programs may embrace more than one curricular area and, thus, the totals may be lower than the sums of the commissions.

** Data above may differ from that reported in previous versions of this publication as a result of retroactive accreditation.

Increase/Decrease in Number of Accredited Programs by Commission, 1998–2008

[Graph showing the increase/decrease in number of accredited programs by commission from 1998 to 2008]
Table 2
Actions for General Reviews, 1998–2008* [percentages]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ASAC NGR</th>
<th>ASAC IR</th>
<th>ASAC IV</th>
<th>ASAC SC</th>
<th>ASAC NA</th>
<th>CAC* NGR</th>
<th>CAC* IR</th>
<th>CAC* IV</th>
<th>CAC* SC</th>
<th>CAC* NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>EAC NGR</th>
<th>EAC IR</th>
<th>EAC IV</th>
<th>EAC SC</th>
<th>EAC NA</th>
<th>TAC NGR</th>
<th>TAC IR</th>
<th>TAC IV</th>
<th>TAC SC</th>
<th>TAC NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CSAC/CSAB actions are shown as the ABET equivalents for 1998–2001: NGR (6V), IR (6VR), IV (3V), SC, and NA.

NGR Actions for General Reviews

IV Actions for General Reviews
Part C
Volunteer Pool Characteristics*

* Data are self-reported and are current as of the time of publication.

Gender
- Male: 86% (1216)
- Female: 14% (201)

Age
- 50-59: 38% (412)
- 40-49: 18% (193)
- 60-69: 31% (336)
- 70-79: 11% (117)
- 30-39: 2% (20)

Ethnicity
- White, Not of Hispanic Origin: 83% (1093)
- Asian or Pacific Islander: 12% (157)
- Black, Not of Hispanic Origin: 2% (31)
- Hispanic: 2% (27)
- American Indian or Alaskan Native: 1% (9)

Current Job Sector
- Academe: 68% (1,028)
- Industry: 32% (482)

* Data are self-reported and are current as of the time of publication.
The Role of the International Activities Council (INTAC)

As international accreditation activities are assumed by the commissions, the role and future operations of INTAC will be determined by the ABET Board. Certainly, until all interim substantial equivalency actions are complete, the review of those interim reports and actions to be taken will remain the role of INTAC. Most of the actions and operations now done by INTAC on a recurring basis will, in the future, be done on a non-scheduled basis and could be handled by ad hoc committees assigned by the ABET Board or Executive Committee. The future operations of INTAC or a standing committee or council similar to INTAC will be determined by the ABET Board.

Training for Evaluators Conducting Non-Domestic Visits

The online training module for program evaluators conducting non-domestic visits was completed in summer 2008.

Seoul Declaration

The Seoul Declaration was signed by the initial signatory accreditation agencies in Korea, Australia, Canada, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States (ABET). The Seoul Declaration is a multinational, mutual recognition agreement among agencies responsible for accreditation or recognition of tertiary-level computing and IT-related qualifications. These agencies have chosen to work collectively to assist the mobility of computing and IT-related professionals holding suitable qualifications and to improve the quality of tertiary-level computing and IT-related education.

Consultancies

ABET and the recently formed ABET Foundation recognize the need for providing assistance to programs and institutions seeking guidance in their outcomes based assessment and accreditation processes. How that assistance is provided without a conflict of interest is being determined. Maintaining the quality and integrity of the ABET accreditation process is paramount when providing that assistance.

ABET has taken on the role of mentoring other accreditation agencies and improving their processes using memoranda of understanding. ABET intends to remain flexible to allow the mentoring to respond to the issues and needs of each individual agency. In each case, ABET usually mentors other accreditation agencies and helps to improve their processes in preparation for the agencies to become full signatories to an accord. This activity fits well within ABET’s mission.
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"ABET has taken on the role of mentoring other accreditation agencies and improving their processes using memoranda of understanding."
Charting Tomorrow

Charting Tomorrow was held at the Seelbach Hilton Louisville Hotel on Thursday, October 30, and Friday, October 31, 2008. At the outset, ABET sought to convene a different kind of meeting — to provide a forum for knowledge sharing and discussion that would influence ABET’s future direction. The conference used questions as thought-starters for discussion and introduced expert speakers who would frame the context and imperatives for finding the best answers.

James J. Duderstadt, the author of Engineering for a Changing World: A Roadmap to the Future of Engineering Practice, Research, and Education, served as the keynote and offered a provocative view of the future of technological education based on the findings of his report. Then, participants broke into concurrent, area-specific “Anticipating Needed Competencies” sessions, followed by concurrent sessions about “Adapting to Millennial Learning Models” and “Organizing to Improve the Pipeline.” On Friday afternoon, there was a guided discussion about “Rethinking Quality Assurance: Implications for ABET Policies, Procedures, and Processes,” and finally a wrap-up panel when ABET’s leadership listened to comments about the preliminary findings and other concerns that the participants had. A monograph documenting the meeting’s outcomes was distributed to all ABET participants and key constituencies after the meeting’s conclusion.

On Adapting to Millennial Learning Models

- Faculty will need to evolve from professors to learning managers, by being collaborative, having broad knowledge, and integrating coaching and counseling into teaching formats while creating new ones made possible by the students themselves.
- In a future of “knowledge co-creation,” faculty members will be instructional design partners with emerging technology companies, such as gaming companies. These faculty are continually considering their curricula and teaching plans — seeing limitations of the current methods and the opportunities to meet an emerging need with a solution in the interest of learning.
- Administrators can support the evolution of faculty as learning managers through the implementation of technological infrastructure, and support of mentoring and coaching environments.
- ABET can provide a vehicle for assuring quality in the way in which new developments are vetted and upgraded into competencies, in evaluating outcomes, and in supporting institution and faculty alike in collaborating with additional stakeholders in new learning paradigms.
- Faculty have to decide what of all possible technological education content is leveraged by new technology (i.e. gaming technology) and what is not best leveraged this way.

On Organizing to Improve the Pipeline

- Redistribute the load carried by faculty.
- Ignite employer accountability.
- Modernize STEM brands.
- Methodically provoke culture change.
- Rewind the issue to the beginning and highlight the need to engage parents, early childhood educators and counselors (pre-K through 8th grades) and thereby provoke culture change.
- Capture the attention of a society that depends on the sciences, technological advancement, computer proficiency and engineering innovation for its livelihood.

Increasing the Number of Underrepresented Minorities

- Demand that our systems provide all students with a quality educational experience.
- Demand that every classroom has a qualified teacher.
- Have the courage to confront barriers and be admitted to and receive support from our finest educational institutions.
- Work closely with each other at each point along the spectrum from pre-K to graduate school.
- Do all these things with a sense of urgency.
- Finally, realize that action has the greatest impact on these problems and that this is marathon, not a sprint.
Meeting participants convert the “pipeline” model for entry into and matriculation through STEM fields into a “pathway.”

2008 ABET Annual Meeting participants considered how “millennials” learn and co-create knowledge.


(Below) Facilitators Karen Hinchliffe and Jen Comeau consult before Friday morning’s concurrent sessions.
Linton E. Grinter Distinguished Service Award

Dr. Linton E. Grinter received the first Distinguished Service Award from ABET’s predecessor, the Engineers’ Council for Professional Development (ECPD). The 1972 ECPD Executive Committee not only bestowed the award but decided that henceforth the award be called the Linton E. Grinter Distinguished Service Award. Dr. Grinter showed an outstanding record of leadership, both within the academic arena and as a member of ECPD. Recipients of the Linton E. Grinter Distinguished Service Award, ABET’s highest honor, are those ABET volunteers who follow in Grinter’s footsteps and who surpass even the highest service expectations of the organization. They are acknowledged for outstanding contributions to the technical disciplines through their work in ABET-related activities.

Award Recipients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Linton E. Grinter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>William L. Everitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>R. Harold Hazen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>William Phelps Kimball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>M.R. Lohmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Ernst Weber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Robert B. Beckmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Gene M. Nordby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>William H. Corcoran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Richard G. Cunningham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>George Burnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Leland J. Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Paul F. Allmendinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>James H. Mulligan, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Richard Ungrodt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Richard E. Grace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>William Sangster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Irene C. Peden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Edward W. Ernst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>John W. Prados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Leslie F. Benmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Stanley M. Brodsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Robert R. Furgason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Albert T. Kersich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Richard P. D’Onofrio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Winfred M. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Edwin C. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>L.S. “Skip” Fletcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Lee W. Saperstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Jerry R. Yeargan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Richard C. Seagrave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2008 ABET’s Award Recipients (from left to right): Fellow Carl McHargue, Fellow Mario Gonzalez, ABET Accreditation Manager Ellen Stokes accepting for Fellow Daniel Hodge, Grinter recipient Richard C. Seagrave, Fellow Robert Laurenson, and Fellow Mark Pagano.

Fellow Carl J. McHargue, D.Eng. — “For outstanding service to ABET as The Minerals, Metals, and Materials Society representative, for excellent leadership and guidance during the transition to Engineering Criteria 2000, and for stellar work on the International Activities Committee in serving the international engineering community.”

Fellow Mario J. Gonzalez, Ph.D., P.E. — “For his long-term diplomacy as an advocate for ABET in the international accreditation community, and in the recruitment and retention of groups underrepresented in engineering education.”

Fellow Daniel B. Hodge, Ph.D., P.E. — “For his commitment to quality improvement in all aspects of ABET accreditation and for his leadership in development of an integrated and unified approach across all commissions.”

Grinter Recipient Richard C. Seagrave, Ph.D. — “For his outstanding, sustained, distinguished, and innovative leadership of first the Engineering Accreditation Commission and then the ABET Board of Directors at a time of radical change in ABET; his committed and diplomatic style assured an orderly transition to a performance, quality assurance-based method of accreditation.”

Robert M. Laurenson, Ph.D., P.E. — “For his long term contributions to continuous improvement of ABET processes and procedures through the Engineering Accreditation Commission and the implementation of the Partnership to Advance Volunteer Excellence (PAVE).”

Mark A. Pagano, Ph.D. — “For outstanding contributions within the Technology Accreditation Commission and, through the Technological Education Initiative, to the broader technology community.”
The Fellow of ABET award recognizes individuals who have given sustained quality service to the ABET-related professions, in general, and to education in the ABET disciplines, in particular, through the activities of ABET.
President’s Award for Diversity

The President’s Award for Diversity recognizes U.S.-based educational units, individuals, associations, and firms for extraordinary success in achieving diversity and inclusiveness or for facilitating diversity and inclusiveness in the technological segments of our society.

Tulane University’s Industrial Hygiene Program in its School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine and its partners in a cooperative program at Xavier University of Louisiana 2005
The University of Maryland Baltimore County’s Graduate School 2005
The University of Texas at San Antonio’s College of Engineering 2005
Florida International University’s College of Engineering and Computing 2006
Pace University’s Ivan G. Seidenberg School of Computer Science and Information Systems 2006
The University of Texas at El Paso’s College of Engineering 2006
California State University, Los Angeles’ College of Engineering, Computer Science, and Technology 2007
Oklahoma State University-Okmulgee’s Information Technologies Division 2007
Lee Snapp 2007
The College of Engineering and the Office of Diversity Initiatives at Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, Daytona Beach 2008
The School of Engineering and Applied Science at The George Washington University 2008
The CyberCity Technology Summer Program at James Madison University 2008
The Multicultural Engineering Program at Northern Arizona University and Its Director Fonda Swimmer 2008

The Multicultural Engineering Program at Northern Arizona University and Its Director Fonda Swimmer — “For their long-term and collaborative efforts to aid African-American, Hispanic, Native American, female, disabled, and first generation students in engineering, computer science, and construction management in enhancing their academic performance and reaching their full potential.”

The CyberCity Technology Summer Program at James Madison University — “For the development and operation of a successful hands-on, project-based university campus summer program for underrepresented high school students and their teachers that increases awareness of information technology skills and careers and enhances the students’ aspirations for a college education.”

The School of Engineering and Applied Science at The George Washington University — “For its commitment and achievement in hiring female faculty and in recruiting, retaining, and graduating a significant number of women in undergraduate and graduate engineering programs while providing the graduates with leadership skills and opportunities as they enter engineering practice.”

The College of Engineering and the Office of Diversity Initiatives at Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, Daytona Beach — “For the successful, broad, and ongoing spectrum of initiatives, including K-12 Outreach, Bridge Programs, Curriculum Enhancement, Faculty Development, and Work-Life Balance, to attract women to science, math, and engineering, to retain them through graduation, and to support them as they embark on their professional careers.”
ABET Leadership

Presidents
1932-35 C. F. Hirshfeld
1935-38 Charles F. Scott
1938-40 John P. H. Perry
1940-43 Robert E. Doherty
1943-46 Everett S. Lee
1946-49 James W. Parker
1949-52 Harry S. Rogers
1952-55 L. F. Grant
1955-56 Thorndike Saville
1956-58 M. D. Hooven
1958-61 William L. Everitt
1961-63 Ralph A. Morgen
1963-65 W. Scott Hill
1965-67 Linton E. Grinter
1967-68 Arthur W. Weber
1968-70 Earl Weber
1970-72 Melvin R. Lohmann
1972-74 Richard A. Forberg
1974-76 Robert B. Beckmann
1976-78 Paul F. Allmendinger
1978-80 Richard G. Cunningham
1980-83 Leland J. Walker
1983-85 Gordon H. Millar
1985-86 Gene M. Nordby
1986-87 Gordon H. Geiger
1987-88 Russel C. Jones
1988-89 Francis J. Cashin
1989-90 Edward W. Ernst
1990-91 Leslie F. Benmark
1991-92 John W. Prados
1992-93 Albert T. Kersich
1993-94 Robert R. Furgason
1994-95 Jerrier A. Haddad
1995-96 Winfred M. Phillips
1996-97 Stanley I. Proctor
1997-98 Eleanor Baum
1998-99 C. R. “Chuck” Pennoni
1999-2000 Lee W. Saperstein
2000-01 Joe R. Fowler
2001-02 Jerry R. Yeargan

2002-03 Larry D. Nixon
2003-04 John D. Lorenz
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2005-06 Richard C. Seagave
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2007-08 L. S. “Skip” Fletcher
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Accreditation
- Accreditation Director – Maryanne Weiss
- Accreditation Manager – Ellen Stokes
- International Accreditation Specialist – Sherri Hersh
- Assistant to the Accreditation Director – Beth Mundy

Applied Science
- Adjunct Accreditation Director, Applied Science – Amanda Reid
- ASAC Administrative Assistant – Elayna Lambert

Computing
- Adjunct Accreditation Director, Computing – Doris K. Lidtke
- CAC Administrative Assistant – Norma Belton

Engineering
- Adjunct Accreditation Director, Engineering – M, Dayne Aldridge
- EAC Administrative Assistant – Stephanie Jackson

Technology
- Adjunct Accreditation Director, Technology – David Hornbeck
- TAC Administrative Assistant – Dorothea Lindsey

Governance
- Executive Director – George D. Peterson
- Deputy Executive Director – Kate Aberle
- Executive Assistant – Rachelle Daucher
- International Relations Coordinator – Daniela Iacona

Operations
- Associate Executive Director, Finance and Operations, and CFO – Lance Hoboy
- Office Manager – Jennifer Knode
- Office Operations Coordinator – Deanna Williams

Finance and Accounting
- Accounting Manager – Jessica Silwick
- Staff Accountant – Kim Turner
- Accounting Clerk – LaTasha McKinney

Information Systems and Technology
- Information Systems and Technology Director – Frank Sarlo
- Lead Software Engineer – Hwan-Kyung Chung
- Web Applications Developer – James Ashby
- Senior PC Support\Desktop Specialist – Jaye Brebnor

Professional Services
- Associate Executive Director, Professional Services – Gloria Rogers
- Assistant to the Associate Executive Director, Professional Services – Regina Crites

Communications
- Communications Specialist – Keryl Cryer

Meetings and Member Services
- Meetings and Member Services Manager – Donna Clark
- Professional Services Administrative Assistant – Hope Joseph-Nelson
More Information

Upcoming Events

2009 Summer Commission Meeting and Institutional Representatives’ Days:
July 14 – 19, 2009
Arlington, VA

2009 Annual Meeting:
October 29 – 30, 2009
San Antonio, TX

2009 Fall Board of Directors Meeting:
October 31, 2009
San Antonio, TX

Further Resources

ABET Headquarters:
111 Market Place, Suite 1050
Baltimore, MD 21202-4012
Tel: 410.347.7700
Fax: 410.625.2238
www.abet.org

ABET Online – www.abet.org:
Accreditation Criteria
Workshop Schedules
How to Become an ABET Volunteer
Annual Meeting Information
CommunityMatters Newsletter
Publications List and Order Form
Society Portal
and much more
ABET is a federation of 29 professional and technical societies representing the fields of applied science, computing, engineering, and technology:

American Academy of Environmental Engineers (AAEE)
American Congress on Surveying and Mapping (ACSM)
American Industrial Hygiene Association (AIHA)
American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc. (AIAA)
American Institute of Chemical Engineers (AIChE)
American Nuclear Society (ANS)
American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers (ASABE)
American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE)
American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE)
American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers, Inc. (ASHRAE)
American Society of Safety Engineers (ASSE)
ASME
Biomedical Engineering Society (BMES)
CSAB, Inc.
Health Physics Society (HPS)
IEEE, Inc.
Institute of Industrial Engineers, Inc. (IIE)
International Council on Systems Engineering (INCOSE)
ISA
Materials Research Society (MRS)
National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying (NCEES)
National Institute of Ceramic Engineers (NICE)
National Society of Professional Engineers (NSPE)
SAE International
Society of Manufacturing Engineers (SME)
Society for Mining, Metallurgy, and Exploration, Inc. (SME–AIME)
Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers (SNAME)
Society of Petroleum Engineers (SPE)
The Minerals, Metals, and Materials Society (TMS)