INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVE EVALUATION PREPARATION

Feb 24th, 2021
**WELCOME!**
**ETAC INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVE WEBINAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We will be recording today’s webinar</th>
<th>Q&amp;A</th>
<th>We will not be providing technical support during today’s webinar. Recordings will be available after webinars are completed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • The recording and the slides will be available on ABET’s public website. | • You have opportunity to ask questions throughout the webinar using the Q&A button at the bottom of your Zoom screen.  
• Chat function is disabled.               |                                                                                                                                 |
| • All Institutional Representatives will receive a follow up email with the link to the recording and slides and instructions to their location on the ABET public website. |                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                 |

If we are unable to address all your question due to time constraints, please follow up with Frank Hart.
Today’s Agenda

• Introductions/ETAC Overview
• Timeline
  – Prepare Self-Study Report
  – Pre-visit activities
• Q&A

Our mutual goal is to have a successful and productive accreditation visit!
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Overview and Timeline
Overview

- Programs evaluated against a set of international standards
- ABET/ETAC accredits PROGRAMS, not Institutions
- Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (APPM)
- ETAC General Criteria
- ETAC accredits associate & bachelor degrees
- Programs will undergo preliminary self-study review followed by site visit
- ABET accredits thousands of programs in over in 30 countries
- Program Specific Criteria

Approximately 85,000 students graduate from ABET-accredited programs EACH YEAR!
Difficult and Challenging Times

- Faculty and administrative staff working remotely
- Courses transitioning to fully-online
- Laboratories unavailable
- Grading systems change to pass/fail (or some other variation)
- Students leave campus and continue under difficult circumstances
- Data are difficult to collect and documentation difficult to produce

Programs and processes will be evaluated for compliance with the criteria and the APPM based on the duration of the accreditation cycle—not just the last 18 months!

ABET will NOT be judging programs based on their COVID responses

Suggestions in this presentation are only guidance. ABET encourages flexibility as we prepare for individual reviews.
Accreditation Timeline

Jan-Aug
Accreditation Request & Pre-Visit Activities

- Institution requests accreditation
- Prepare Self-Study Report
- Team Assigned
- Preparations

Aug-Nov
Prior to visit

If virtual reviews:
- Prepare recorded facility tours
- Provide access to display materials

Sept-Jan
Visit & Due Process

- Evaluations
- Draft Statement Prepared
- 7-Day Response

Oct-Mar
Draft Statements & Due Process

- Institution Due Process
- Prepare Statement for Commission

July
ETAC Commission Action

- ETAC meets to vote final action
- Institution notified
Self-Study Report (SSR) Preparations
Self-Study Report (SSR)

- Demonstrates program’s compliance with key criteria requirements
- Must be completed for each program and degree
- Multi-Mode or Multi-Site
  - Program(s) must demonstrate criteria compliance in all modalities/routes to a degree
  - Assessment and continuous improvement for each delivery method (e.g., F2F, online, hybrid, or multiple locations)
Self-Study Report (SSR)

- Describes how your program satisfies the criteria. It should be:
  - Clear
  - Concise
  - Contain focused information

- Written for the program evaluator (PEV) assigned to review the program

- Based on your self-study report, PEV will do an initial evaluation
PEV’s Review of SSR

• The documents and guides used by the program evaluators are available to the public.

• ETAC Program Evaluator Workbook

• Also, ETAC has created a “self-evaluation tool” for use by programs.
# Prepare to Write the SSR

Download key documents from [https://www.abet.org/accreditation/accreditation-criteria/](https://www.abet.org/accreditation/accreditation-criteria/)

**Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manuals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission (ETAC)**

- **2021-2022 Criteria**
- **2020-2021 Criteria**
- **2019-2020 Criteria**
- ETAC Program Evaluator Workbook
- Facilities — Sample EAC Virtual Lab Tour (Video)
Prepare to Write the SSR (continued)

- Self-Study Questionnaire or SSQ (on the ABET website)
  
  http://www.abet.org/accreditation-criteria/

- Accreditation Changes

- https://www.abet.org/accreditation/accreditation-criteria/accreditation-changes/

Email  accreditation@abet.org  if have additional questions

The SSQ “guides” your SSR contents by asking questions!
False Assumptions

• You can wait to start the self-study report—no rush!
• You do not need to answer all the questions
• The faculty do not need to be involved in the self-study report development
• You do not need to include a review of any significant changes since the last review
General SSR Requirements

- The SSR is both a quantitative and qualitative assessment of strengths and limitations of the program.
- Include information about:
  - All methods of instructional delivery
  - All possible paths to degree
  - All remote or online offerings
- Program name MUST BE IDENTICAL to that used in institutional publications, the ABET RFE and on the transcripts of graduates
- The SSR focuses primarily on accreditation criteria
General SSR Requirements

• The self-study report and any required supplemental materials (not display materials) should be uploaded on your Institution’s ABET general review page in the AMS (Dashboard/Reviews/2021 ETAC General Review) as pdf read-only files by July 1\textsuperscript{st}

• Please do not send Self-Study Reports
  • In an email
  • As a hard copy through the mail
  • On a data stick through the mail
  • The self-study report and supplement materials must be self-contained in the medium submitted and not include external hyperlinks
General SSR Requirements

• Your approved Team Chair and PEVs will be able to access the self-study, its appendices or any supplemental materials via the ABET secure site.

• The institution’s primary contact must coordinate with the Team Chair to confirm distribution approach to the transcripts for each program.
General SSR Requirements

• It is really helpful if programs only answer the self-study questionnaire's questions and not add extraneous material, even if you are proud of the program’s activities or capabilities.

• Adding irrelevant material makes the evaluator’s job more difficult as they focus on compliance with the criteria.

• The questionnaire's questions were written to focus you on the questions that evaluators must answer!

• The PEV worksheet (or program self-evaluation tool) was devised by dissecting the criteria and APPM requirements.
Common Issues Found in SSRs (by Criterion)
ETAC Criteria

General Criteria

1. Students
2. Program Educational Objectives
3. Student Outcomes
   - Now mapped to elements 1-5 (previously a-k/a-i)
   - If program uses different outcomes, provide map to new elements, 1-5
4. Continuous Improvement
5. Curriculum
6. Faculty
7. Facilities
8. Instructional Support

Other requirements

Program Criteria

Program criteria limited to curriculum and faculty

Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (APPM)
Criterion 1. Students

- Records of Student Work/Transcripts
  - Will be evaluated using a form like this one
  - Program name and degree awarded must be exactly as shown on the RFE

- Common issues:
  - Lack of documentation on why prerequisite requirements are not met
  - Inconsistencies in identification of which campus is awarding the degree and campuses identified in the RFE

TRANSCRIPT ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETAC Curricular Category</th>
<th>ETAC Criteria Requirement</th>
<th>Number of Credits*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Credits Actually Earned by Student #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/3 ≤ 2/3 total credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Specific Topics</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of Content (BS degrees)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Transcript Analysis Questions</th>
<th>Is this requirement met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transcript demonstrates the student meets all program graduation requirements?</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript demonstrates the student follows all prerequisite requirements and any waivers are documented? (PEV should flag any violations.)</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree audit information matches the program’s published degree requirements?</td>
<td>YES or NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion 2. Program Educational Objectives

Constituents’ involvement in the review and revision process:

• PEOs not reviewed periodically and systematically or lacking documentation. While not required, a table or flowchart illustrating the following can be helpful to summarize the review process:
  • Key constituents involved in the review of PEOs
  • Timetable for those constituents’ review of the PEOs (schedule and when last accomplished)
  • Manner of the review (survey tool or process)
  • How review results are utilized (who does what)
It is necessary to show how the review processes and their results are documented, evidence of which will be necessary in the ABET review process.

The PEO statements themselves will be reviewed for compliance with the criteria definition’s of a PEO.

- If the PEO statement does not appear to meet the criteria’s definition, it is imperative that the constituency review process endorsing the statement is well documented.
Criterion 3. Student Outcome

- One or more of the ETAC (1) – (5) elements (or sub-elements) not addressed by the program’s student outcomes
- Lack of process and documentation for the periodic review and revision of the program’s student outcomes
- Review process not documented to show periodic review
- Note that the criterion does not specify who must do the review
Criterion 4. Continuous Improvement

- Process not documented or appropriate
- Assessment processes do not address all student outcomes
- Course level, e.g., course learning outcomes, assessment and individual course improvement actions without a program/student outcome level process
- Student outcome or performance indicator not being assessed by an appropriate instrument
- Assessment processes do not discern attainment of each student outcome (or its performance indicator if they are being used)
**Criterion 4. Continuous Improvement**

- Assessment activity applies to multiple student outcomes, e.g., lumps several student outcomes together
- Overreliance on indirect evidence as assessment data
- Data collected in courses with multiple programs’ students but not disaggregated by program
- Death by assessment—too much, with too little result
- ETAC urges programs to focus on continuous improvement—using assessment and evaluation of attainment of student outcomes;
  
  **rather than**

- A misguided focus on only assessment!!
Criterion 4. Continuous Improvement

- Assessment methods are ad hoc or inconsistently used
- No documentation of evaluation of the assessment data
- Data are collected and evaluated, but the information does not lead to continuous improvement actions when warranted
- Use of inappropriate means to avoid continuous improvement
  - Averaging of averages to determine attainment levels
  - Set low bar to avoid improvement action
Criterion 5. Curriculum*

- Insufficient documentation of advisory committee engagement in curriculum/advisement
- Curriculum does not include the application of integral and differential calculus at the level appropriate to the student outcomes and the discipline.
- Curriculum/student instruction does not include the use of engineering standards and codes
- Curriculum/student instruction does not address ethics, diversity and inclusion awareness, quality, or continuous improvement

* Common but not all issues found with the criterion.
Criterion 6. Faculty

- Faculty numbers not adequate for advising, interaction, or professional development
- Faculty size currently adequate but factors such as program growth and attrition could jeopardize the adequacy of faculty size
- Faculty lack professional development activity or involvement with industry
Criterion 7. Facilities

• Equipment needs upgrade, repair, or maintenance
• Program lacks planning for staff or other resources related to maintenance or upgrades
• Students do not have access to appropriate modern equipment or tools of the discipline
• Space and equipment currently adequate, but reason to anticipate that increased enrollment or current budgeting trends may jeopardize it.
Criterion 8. Institutional Support

• Support for laboratories (e.g., equipment or safety requirements)

• Insufficient technical support staff

• Evidence of excessive faculty turnover

• Lack of continuity of program leadership
Program Criteria

- Describe how the program satisfies any applicable program criteria.
- This is often a link to specific topics as covered in program’s courses.
- Reference to materials that will be available is also helpful.
- If already covered elsewhere in the self study-report, provide appropriate references.
Self-Study Report Tips

• ABET offers a self-study workshop in 18 March or 7 April 2021 (which will have a fee)

• Proofread by someone not heavily involved in writing the program’s SSR.

• Once it is written, go through your self-study report and evaluate your program using the PEV T351 (in PEV workbook) or the program self-evaluation document.
Other tasks before July
Visiting Team

**Team Chair**
Primary Contact before and after the visit
Volunteers selected by ETAC ExCom
Will decide communication protocol

**Program Evaluators**
ABET Experts
Volunteers selected by professional society

**Observers**
No vote in accreditation process
PEV in training, ABET staff or state board member

- **Technically competent**
- **Trained & Evaluated by ABET**
- **Refresher training**
- **Organized**
- **Professional**
- **Interpersonally Skilled**
- **Team Oriented**
Before the Visit—after Team Approved

Transcripts
- Samples from each program
- Document all paths to graduation

Logistics
- Decision about review modality (virtual or F2F) not known

Additional information
- Clarification of self-study report
- Additional display materials

Follow-up with Team Chair on Communication Protocol
Before July 1st

- Team Chair approved
- Self-Study report uploaded
- Evaluation dates set
- PEVs approved

Also be prepared to provide after July - August

- Transcripts for each program
  - Team chair can provide guidance on number of transcripts
  - Student names should be removed and replaced by a tracking system
- Explanation and documentation of course substitutions
- Documentation of approval of transfer/substitution of courses
- Graduation audit form or process documentation

Follow-up with Team Chair: Transcript and Enrollment documentation
Tasks to complete before July summer meeting

- May - June
  - Team Chair Approval

- May - July
  - PEV Approvals

- July 1st
  - Self-Study Report Due

- Now to Evaluation
  - Prepare display materials
Thank you!
Any questions?

April Cheung: Cheung16@purdue.edu
Tom Hall: Hallt@nsula.edu
Scott Danielson: Scott.Danielson@asu.edu
Grant Crawford: Grant.Crawford@quinnipiac.edu

Please provide us your feedback on this session

fpls.in/etac-gr

- Survey is only for the Institutional Representatives
- There are 5 very short questions
- Poll should begin automatically when this meeting ends
- Link can be opened using any browser or a smart phone