Welcome to the

EAC Briefing
for Institutional
Representatives
and Team Chairs

We are glad you are here!

August 19, 2021
August 20, 2021
Today’s Presenters

- **Patsy Brackin**
  - EAC Chair
  - 2021-22

- **Dave Binning**
  - EAC Past Chair
  - 2021-22

- **Mo Hosni**
  - EAC Chair Elect
  - 2021-22

- **Lorraine Fleming**
  - EAC Vice Chair of Operations
  - 2021-22
# Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics and activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome – Who is here, why are we here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for a successful evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The campus visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The post-visit process – Accreditation evaluation and actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim actions; Consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common shortcomings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concluding thoughts/ Q&amp;A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who Attends These Meetings?

Institutional representatives
- representing institutions undergoing evaluation in the 2021-2022 cycle

Engineering Accreditation Commission members
- Executive Committee
- 2021-2022 EAC members
- other Team Chairs

ABET Staff
Why Are We All Here?

- To set the stage for a successful set of evaluation visits in the 2021-22 cycle by developing common understanding and expectations of activities
  - In preparation for the visit
  - During the visit
  - Following the visit
What is ABET?

1) ABET is a nonprofit, non-governmental agency that accredits programs in applied and natural science, computing, engineering and engineering technology.

2) Our more than 2,200 experts come from industry, academia and government. They give their time and effort supporting quality assurance activities around the world by serving as Program Evaluators, commissioners, board members and advisors.

3) ABET has ISO 9001:2015 certification.
Who is ABET?

- 35 Member Societies
- Headquarters staff:
  - President – Michael Milligan
  - Chief Accreditation Officer – Joe Sussman
  - Senior Director, Accreditation Operations – Jane Emmet
  - Accreditation Manager – Ellen L. Stokes
  - International Accreditation Manager – Sherri Hersh
- ABET Volunteers
Who are the ABET volunteers?

• Board of Directors – William Wepfer, President
• Board of Delegates – S.K. Ramesh, Chair
• ABET Councils
  • Academic Advisory Council – TBD, Chair
  • Accreditation Council – Ann L. Kenimer, Chair
  • Global Council – Jamie Rogers, Chair
  • Inclusion, Diversity and Equity Advisory Council – Mary Leigh Wolfe, Chair
  • Industry Advisory Council – Jeffrey Abell, Chair
• Accreditation Commissions
• Program Evaluators
ABET Accreditation Commissions

• Four Accreditation Commissions:
  • EAC: Engineering Accreditation Commission
  • CAC: Computing Accreditation Commission
  • ETAC: Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission
  • ANSAC: Applied and Natural Science Accreditation Commission

• Each commission:
  • Commission Members: Team Chairs
  • Executive Committee: Editor1, Editor 2
  • Supporting staff: Adjuncts (EAC: M. Dayne Aldridge, Douglas R. Bowman, Susan Conry, Winston Erevelles)/Staff Liaisons
Role of Member Societies

• Provide representative(s) on Board of Delegates
• Provide experts who develop our criteria and policies
• Propose the Program Criteria
• Select the Program Evaluators for each discipline
What is Accreditation? And why do it?

Accreditation is a periodic review process to determine if educational programs meet defined standards of quality.

ABET accreditation is not a ranking system.

Quality Assurance:
ABET accreditation provides assurance that a college or university program meets the quality standards of the profession for which that program prepares graduates.
More about Accreditation

More information:

https://www.abet.org/accreditation/what-is-accreditation/why-abet-accreditation-matters/
Who Is on Your Team?

Team Chair(s)*

Program Evaluator
PEV 1

PEV 2...

...PEV n

Observer

May have simultaneous or joint visits by more than one commissions; therefore, will have a Team Chair for all commissions/programs evaluated.
Who Are the Team Chairs?

• Experienced program evaluators
  • Nominated by ABET Member Societies
  • Elected by the EAC
  • Approved by ABET Engineering Area Delegation
• New team chairs mentored by experienced peers
  • Often co-chairs on first visit
• Institution may decline a team chair
• Evaluated by institution, PEVs, and Editor 1
Who Are the Program Evaluators?

- Assigned by the professional society of the program being evaluated
- Trained by ABET
- Evaluated by team chair, PEVs, and program
- Institution can decline a proposed PEV
- Please approve TC and PEV nominations timely to finalize your visit team and facilitate preparations
Who Are the Observers?

- Professional societies may require new PEVs to observe a visit prior to serving
- Local/state boards may assign
- International groups may request
- Observers shadow PEVs, but have no vote in the recommended action
- The institution may decline observers generally or specifically
ABET Competencies

- Technically Current
- Professional
- Team-oriented
- Effective Communication
- Interpersonally Skilled
- Organized
Post-Visit Feedback

• Key to our continuous improvement
  • Institutions
    • TC evaluation (Dean or a designee)
    • PEV evaluations (Program Chairs)
  • Team chairs
    • PEV evaluations
• No influence on accreditation outcomes
Accreditation Timeline: 18-21* Month Process

**January**
Institution requests review of programs

**February – May**
Institution prepares self-evaluation (Program Self-Study Report)

**March – June**
Team members assigned, dates set, Self-Study Report submitted

**April – May**
Draft statements edited and sent to institutions

**May – June**
Necessary changes to statement, if any, are made

**June**
Institutions respond to draft statement and return to ABET

**July**
Commission meets to take final action

**October**
Institutions notified of final action

**Year 1**

**November* Readiness Review (if required)**

**Year 2**

**January – April**
Accreditation status publically released

**October**
Accreditation status publically released
Pre-Visit Preparations
Ongoing COVID 19 Impact on Program Delivery

• We understand that for the academic year, you may have encountered the following:
  • Faculty and staff working remotely
  • Courses transitioning online
  • Laboratories becoming unavailable
  • Grading system changes to pass/fail
  • Students studying under difficult circumstances
  • Data collection and documentation disrupted
Programs Will NOT Be Judged By Their COVID-19 Response

- Evaluation of compliance with ABET criteria and APPM will be based on the entire accreditation cycle
- Our approach and decision-making will be reasonable without compromising the quality and integrity of the review
Pre-Virtual Visit Preparations

- Maintain open line of communications with your team chair throughout the planning phase
- Zoom video conferencing is the preferred platform
  - If your institution cannot use Zoom, you will need to find an alternative platform and make it available to the team
  - It is at the TC discretion, in consultation with ABET HQ, to accept an alternative platform
Pre-Visit Preparations

- Help TCs and PEVs to resolve questions on Self-Study Reports and transcripts
  - Advance communication makes for a more effective review
  - Many questions can be answered before the visit
  - Preparations can be made if questions need to be addressed during the visit
- Finalize interview and visit schedules
- Agree on review materials and sharing platform
- Copy all communications between PEVs and program leads to dean and TCs
Facility Tours Require More Preparation

- Allow PEVs to view facilities and instruments/equipment
  - Annotated photographs, correlate with the Self-Study Report
  - Link to sample video: https://vimeo.com/440364471/58abead4

- As soon as possible, provide narrated, pre-recorded videos
  - Cover all labs, classrooms, library, and computing services utilized by the programs
  - Short videos (~10 min videos/lab or other location)
  - Smartphone quality suffice, but need both audio and video
  - Include name, location, signage, general layout, safety, courses supported, instructional equipment, etc.
  - Test early a sample video with the visit team
  - If facilities not accessible, the narrated videos are the back up

- Set up live walk-throughs to address questions/follow ups
Objectives of the Campus Visit

- Tour labs and facilities
- Interview administration, faculty, staff, students, and Advisory Board
- Provide the institution with a preliminary assessment of its strengths and shortcomings
- Assist the institution and its programs in quality improvement efforts
Visit Duration

• Visits are typically three days, but virtual visits may be extended up to one week
• Virtual visits
  • Participants may be in multiple time zones
  • Additional time may be required in virtual mode
Typical Visit

• Day 0 (Sunday) – lab & facility tours; PEVs meet program chairs; TC meet dean; and program chairs; PEVs review course materials; TC & PEVs review Day 0 findings

• Day 1 (Monday) – Dean’s presentation; PEVs brief program chairs, conduct interviews with faculty and students; meet with alumni/advisory boards and support departments; TC brief dean and meets with institution officials; TC & PEVs review Day 1 findings

• Day 2 (Tuesday) – follow up meetings with faculty & staff if needed; Team finalizes findings; PEVs brief program chairs; TC briefs dean; Team draft exit statements & forms; Exit meeting
Harmonized Information Technology Key to Successful Virtual Visits

• Identify all personnel involved in the review
• Identify your IT point of contact for the team and ABET HQ IT personnel
• Zoom is the default ABET video conferencing platform
  • TC and PEVs expected to set up meetings
  • Institution needs to provide support
• If the institution requires different video conferencing platform, it is required to:
  • provide access, training, and support, and
  • set up meetings for the team
Test Hardware and Apps before the Visit

- Establish and test minimum IT requirements
  - Bandwidth, connectivity, and security
  - Wired (ethernet) connectivity always preferred
  - Ensure stable connectivity and good video quality for interviews
  - Provide A/V hardware, training, and support to all participants

- Orchestrate interviews to ensure smooth transitions
  - Build in breaks between interviews for flexibility
  - Assign IT personnel and program coordinators available for trouble shooting and managing schedule

- Set up backup plans and alternative contact channels with Team Chair(s) and PEVs
Planning and Materials

• Provide all materials electronically using institutional system, Dropbox, email, etc.
  • No printed, USB, or physical formats will be requested or accepted
Review Materials

• Implementation of curriculum
  • Evidence of appropriate classification of engineering, math, and basic science topics

• Examples of student work that demonstrates:
  • Attainment of student outcomes
    • Student work used for outcome assessment
  • Demonstration of required components of culminating design experience
    • Sufficient complexity in design
    • Use of applicable engineering standards and multiple realistic constraints
Support/Display Materials Defined by APPM I.E.5.b. (2) – (8)

• All visits have the same requirements
  • Timing, methods of submission, organization, and presentation may be different
• Determine with the TC (and PEVs) the materials needed and how they will be made available
  • Note: the APPM does NOT require access to textbooks
  • Note: “good, the bad & ugly” examples of student work are not required
• All review materials must be made available at least one month prior to the start date of a virtual visit
Institution Responsible for Making Support/Display Materials Accessible

- If institutional system is used to provide evidence and documentation, the visit team must be given access to the network and software
  - Guidance and training on the institutional system must be provided so that team members can efficiently process evidence and documentation
  - Timeliness and testing are critical for the team to conduct its work
- Translation must be provided where the language of evidence, documents, and instruction is not English (follows APPM I.D.1.g.)
Facility Tours and Interviews

• Programs to provide tours of facilities and labs
  • Combination of narrated/annotated pre-recorded video and interactive videoconference walk-through could be best practice

• Interviews to be conducted by video conferencing
  • Administration, faculty, students, staff, supporting departments, advisory board, etc.
  • No recording allowed
Interviews Require Special Attention

No recordings allowed

Ensure private, well-connected, and suitably equipped location for one-on-one interviews

For group interviews, establish participant location, IT requirements, and A/V hardware for productive meetings

Testing required at each interview location

Make institutional IT staff available for set up, testing, and troubleshooting prior to and during the visit
Exit Meeting

- **Purpose**: Report team findings to the institution CEO and other institution representatives
- Team chair makes introductory remarks and invites PEVs to read their exit statements
- Statements may include strengths, deficiencies, weaknesses, concerns, and observations (suggestions for improvement)
- Program Audit Form (PAF) that documents the team findings is shared with the Dean
- The programs are encouraged to start working on any shortcomings immediately after the visit
Exit Meeting

- Content and protocol similar to conventional visits, but plan for shorter duration
- Set up and test video conference before the visit
  - Institution IT support in all visit phases and tasks key to effective execution
- Coordinate with TC on participants
- No recordings allowed
Planning and Next Steps Summary

- Visit teams received training for virtual visits
- Communicate early and often with the team to assure a trouble-free and productive visit
- A team of ABET Adjunct Accreditation Directors, HQ Staff, and an IT team will also be available to teams
- We are all in this together. If you have questions, reach out to your TC!
Important to Know about Exit Findings

- Shortcomings reflected on the PAF
- In rare situations, a shortcoming not indicated on the PAF may be included in the draft statement
- A shortcoming identified at one level by the team may be framed at a different level later in the editing process for consistency in application of criteria across institutions
- An observation may be cited as a shortcoming in the draft statement for consistency in application of criteria
- After the visit, all communication with the visit team must be through the TC
  - No direct contact with PEVs after visit
The Post-Visit Process

It’s not over until the commission votes
Post-Visit Process

Exit statements + 7-day response

Draft Statement

Draft to Institution

30-day & optional Post-30-day responses

Draft FINAL Statement

Final Statement

TC edits and compiles documents into draft statement

ED1, ED2 and Adjunct edit draft statement to create draft to institution

Institution has 30-days after receipt to respond.

Responses are incorporated into the draft statement by TC to create the draft final statement

ED1, ED2 & Adjunct edit draft FINAL statement.

THE COMMISSION VOTES!

Final Statement and Accreditation Letter sent to institution.

Key

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Team Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED1, ED2</td>
<td>Editor, Member of EAC Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Very experienced ABET Staff Editor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES

7-day response
- Correct errors of fact ONLY
- For example, graduation data, enrollment data, number of faculty members
- Hold ALL other material until the 30-day due process response

30-day due process response
- Provide evidence to address shortcoming identified in the visit
- DON’T WAIT to begin drafting this response

POST 30-day due process response
- At sole discretion of TC
- Must submit 30-day due response
- Provide evidence that was NOT available at the time of the 30-day due process response
Important in Post-Visit Process

- Communicate with Team Chair throughout the process
- Upload all institutional documents and responses to AMS
- Address and resolve shortcoming quickly. Resolution of shortcomings is the desired result!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGET DATES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Statement (uploaded)</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission Votes</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Statement (uploaded)</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accreditation actions are FINAL when the Commission votes!

(Only “Not to Accredit” actions can be appealed.)
Accreditation Evaluation and Actions

What words might I hear?  
What do they mean?
## Shortcoming Definitions

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deficiency</strong></td>
<td>A criterion, policy, or procedure is <em>not</em> satisfied. Therefore, the program is not in compliance with the criterion, policy, or procedure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weakness</strong></td>
<td>A program lacks the strength of compliance with a criterion, policy, or procedure to ensure that the quality of the program will not be compromised. Therefore, remedial action is required to strengthen compliance with the criterion, policy, or procedure prior to the next evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concern</strong></td>
<td>A program currently satisfies a criterion, policy, or procedure; however, the potential exists for the situation to change such that the criterion, policy, or procedure may not be satisfied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observation</strong></td>
<td>A comment or suggestion which does not relate directly to the accreditation action but is offered to assist the institution in its continuing efforts to improve its programs (i.e. friendly advice).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Accreditation Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF REVIEW</th>
<th>D and W Shortcomings (duration)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No W's, No D's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL REVIEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existing programs</td>
<td>NGR (6 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new programs</td>
<td>NGR (6 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>following SCR or SCV</td>
<td>NGR (6 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERIM REVIEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>following IR or IV</td>
<td>RE or VE (2 or 4 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>following SCR or SCV</td>
<td>SE (2 or 4 years)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ NA—Accreditation action for programs that have not resolved a Deficiency (D) within two years following an SCR or SCV.

² When the accreditation action is a second consecutive interim review, the remaining shortcomings will be scrutinized during the next general review visit.

³ Interim evaluations only.

⁴ Initiated by institutions for programs being discontinued or for which accreditation is no longer being maintained.
### Historical Statistics on Accreditation Action

#### Number of Programs (%)

**On Campus Visits vs Virtual Visits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>On Campus</th>
<th>Virtual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next General Review</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Report</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Visit</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show Cause Report/Visit</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not To Accredit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EAC Shortcoming Statistics 2020-21
### Criteria 1, 2, 3, & 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shortcoming Level</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion 1: Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion 2: PEOs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion 3: Student Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion 4: Continuous Improvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# EAC Shortcoming Statistics 2020-21
## Criteria 5, 6, 7 and 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shortcoming Level</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion 5: Curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion 6: Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion 7: Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion 8: Institutional Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# EAC Shortcoming Statistics 2020-21
## Program Criteria, APPM and Master’s Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shortcoming Level</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPM</strong> (Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master’s Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interim Evaluations
Interim Actions

- Interim Report (IR or SCR)
  - When the resolution of shortcomings can be documented with a report (e.g., faculty hiring)
  - A different team chair assigned to review the interim report
  - No PEV(s) assigned
  - No campus visit

- Interim Visit (IV or SCV)
  - When the resolution of shortcomings cannot be determined by review of a report, or when previous written information has not been effective in providing the necessary evidence
  - A new team performs a visit
Interim Evaluation

• IRs or IVs resulting from the 2021-22 cycle will take place in the 2023-24 cycle
  • Institution will submit report by July 1, 2023

• ABET HQ forwards the previous final statement to the TC

• If an institution has programs with both IV and IR actions, the TC for the IV will also review the IR
  • TC may discuss IR issues with the dean during the visit
  • No PEV will be assigned for IR reviews.

• The applicable criteria are the ones that were in effect at the time the shortcomings were identified, unless the institution requests that later criteria be applied
  • All programs under interim evaluation must use the criteria from the same ABET evaluation cycle
Consistency
Accreditation Decisions Not Simple!

- Each institutional context is unique
- The EAC works very hard to ensure consistency
- The overriding goal is to achieve an end result in which programs with similar observed shortcomings accorded the same actions
Team Level Consistency

Consistency across all programs

- Consistent depth and evaluation completeness
- Consistent use of shortcoming terminology
- Consistent interim recommendation (IR vs IV)
Commission Level Consistency

Commission strives for consistency

- Consistent across all programs and across all institutions
- Consistent with those given for other programs with similar shortcomings (weaknesses, deficiencies).
- Consistency is checked at five levels
Consistency Checks

ABET HQ: Accreditation Director

Director checks higher-level consistency

Professional Societies

EAC Meeting

Adjuncts

Editors 2

Editors 1

Team Chair

Team Chair

Team Chair

PEV PEV PEV PEV PEV

EAC Consistency Committee: Final check

Adjuncts check across all reports they receive

Editor 2s check across all reports they receive

Editor 1s check across all reports they receive

Team chairs check across evaluators
Common Shortcomings
Criterion 1-3

• Criterion 1: Students
  • Ad hoc advising on career or curricular issues
  • Lack of documentation on prerequisite exemptions or course substitutions

• Criterion 2: Program Educational Objectives
  • Lack of documented process for periodical PEO review
  • Incomplete process, or process not followed for PEO review
  • PEOs not consistent with the definition

• Criterion 3: Student Outcomes
  • All aspects of (1)–(7) not included or not evaluated
Criterion 4 and 5

- Criterion 4: Continuous Improvement
  - Assessment results not used for continuous program improvement
  - Data not separated for similar programs (e.g., EE and CpE)

- Criterion 5: Curriculum
  - Inconsistent assignment of courses into categories (math/basic science, engineering topics)
  - Insufficient hours in math/basic science or engineering topics
  - No use of constraints / standards in culminating design
Criterion 6-8 and APPM

• Criterion 6: Faculty
  • Adequate number / lack of professional development

• Criterion 7: Facilities
  • Issues with maintenance or technical support of labs

• Criterion 8: Institutional Support
  • Inadequate support for labs or personnel

• APPM
  • Incorrect accreditation citations
  • Inconsistent references to program names
    • Transcripts, degrees, accreditation request, publications
  • Facilities and student lab work safety
    • But: Team does not perform safety inspections and does not certify compliance
Concluding Thoughts
Preparation for a Successful Review

- Commitment and involvement of college leadership
- Open and timely communication with visit team
- Organized, accessible supporting materials
- Timely due process responses
Nobody Wants to Think About It, But What If…

The program thinks the PEV does not understand or is overly picky

PEV chooses a disgruntled faculty member to interview

Something unusual happens during the visit

Don’t worry, talk to your Team Chair!
More Information

• A copy of the webinar & these slides can be accessed from: https://www.abet.org/accreditation/accreditation-criteria/

• Other reference material (www.abet.org):
  ▪ Accreditation Policy and Procedures (APPM)
  ▪ 2021-22 Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Program
Comments and Questions