



# Preparing Interim Reports 2023-24 Accreditation Cycle

*Presented by the*

**Engineering Accreditation Commission**

*to*

**Institutional Representatives**

**March 3, 2023**



# Welcome!

**Mo Hosni, ABET EAC Chair**

# Notes

- 1) The Chat feed is disabled.
- 2) Please post questions on the Q&A feed. One of the presenters will answer your question on the feed or address it during the webinar.
- 3) These slides and a recording of the presentation will be posted **shortly**. We will email the link to you.

# Introductions

- Panelists
  - Mo Hosni, EAC Chair
  - Lorraine Fleming, EAC Chair-Elect
  - Patsy Brackin, EAC Past Chair
  - Anne Germain, EAC ExCom
  - Doug Bowman, EAC Adjunct

# Webinar Content

- 1) Description of Interim Reviews
- 2) Review Process
- 3) Guidance on Writing the Interim Report



# **Interim Reviews: Description, Types, and Process**

# Description of Interim Reviews

- Who?
  - Programs that received a **D** or **W** shortcoming in the most recent review.
- What is Reviewed?
  - Reports that address unresolved shortcomings only.
- How?
  - Submit RFE followed by a report (or visit) that addresses the unresolved shortcomings only.

# Interim Review Types

Interim Review Requires a **REPORT** if Accreditation Action is

- **Interim Report (IR)** (*result of a Weakness (W) shortcoming*)
- **Show Cause Report (SCR)** (*result of a Deficiency (D) shortcoming*)

Interim Review Requires a **VISIT** if Accreditation Action is

- **Interim Visit (IV)** (*result of a Weakness (W) shortcoming*)
- **Show Cause Visit (SCV)** (*result of a Deficiency (D) shortcoming*)



# Interim Review Process

DATE	ACTIVITY
by January 31	Request for Evaluation (RFE)
April/May	Team Chair (TC) assigned ( <i>IR...no PEV; IV ...PEV(s) assigned</i> )
by July 1	Submit Interim Report in AMS
TBD (by Team Chair & Dean)	Campus Visit (IV only)
9/15 or post-visit	Draft Statement prepared by TC
<i>Review by EAC Editing Chain</i>	
~ Dec/Jan	Draft Statement posted in AMS
30 days later	Institution 30-day Due-Process Response due
<i>Review by EAC Editing Chain</i>	
TBD (by Team Chair)	Institution <b>Post 30-day</b> Due-Process Response due TC must agree to receive report Limited to information not available on the date of the 30-day due process report
<i>Review by EAC Editing Chain</i>	



**Lorraine Fleming**  
**ABET EAC Chair Elect**



# **Guidance on Writing the Reports**

# What Criteria to Use...

## For 2023-24 Cycle the program may use...

- 2023 -24 EAC criteria or
- 2021 -22 EAC criteria, if the report is in response to a 2021-22 accreditation action or
- 2019 -20 EAC criteria, if the report is in response to a 2019-20 accreditation action
- All programs under interim review (IR/IV/SCR/SCV) at an institution **must** use same accreditation year criteria
- Use the **2023-24** Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (APPM).

# Guidance for Interim Reports

- Use the **Interim Report Questionnaire** from the ABET website
- Separate reports are required for each program that has unresolved shortcomings even if multiple programs had identical shortcomings
- Submission
  - May submit reports either as separate files or one combined file for all program reports
  - Report(s) should be uploaded into AMS by dean or dean's delegate, not by individual programs
  - Reports are due by July 1<sup>st</sup>

# Guidance for Interim Reports

(continued)

## CONTENT

- For each unresolved shortcoming (D/W, C is optional) in the Final Statement:
  - Begin with the shortcoming statement verbatim from the Final Statement
  - Provide information relevant to the shortcoming ONLY!.
  - Describe actions taken to resolve the shortcoming. Focus only on the shortcoming. Note that a plan does not resolve a shortcoming
  - Provide evidence that the shortcoming has been resolved. If the body of evidence is large, use an appendix.
- **Be thorough but concise.** Not long but adequately address the resolution of the shortcoming, including evidence.



# Process of Review

# Team Chair's Review Process

- Reads the previous Final Statement(s)
- Evaluates the report to answer whether the ***shortcomings identified in the last review have been resolved***
- Focuses on shortcomings. However, if a new shortcoming is discovered during the review, it could be cited by the team chair.
- Contacts institutional rep to clarify contents in the report as necessary.
- Prepares draft statement.



# Draft Statement

- Summarizes shortcoming information
- Summarizes the status from the previous Final Statement
- Reviews provided evidence to resolve the shortcoming
- Evaluates shortcoming status. It may
  - remain
  - be resolved
  - be changed to a different level



**Patsy Brackin**  
**ABET EAC Past Chair**

# Draft Statement Example

## Example:

*The previous review noted that none of the senior design project reports for the culminating major design experience addressed the use of appropriate engineering standards.*

The interim report contains documentation of the changes made to incorporate engineering standards into the curriculum leading up to and culminating in the capstone design experience. However, examples of the resulting final reports that demonstrate that the design experience now incorporate appropriate engineering standards were not provided.

The Weakness remains.

# Program Action After Receiving Draft Statement

- Program must indicate their decision on responding in AMS.
  - If shortcomings remain, program can submit 30-day response
  - If no shortcomings remain, no 30-day response required.
- 30-day response is reviewed in the same manner as the interim report.

# Draft Final Statement

(Weakness is not resolved)

Draft Final Statement:

*The EAC acknowledges receipt of documentation that “standards” assessment have been added to the capstone design report rubric used by the program. The rubric would be made available to the students and used to grade the design reports. However, examples of the resulting final reports that demonstrate the design experience now incorporates appropriate engineering standards were not provided.*

The Weakness remains unresolved. In preparation for the next review, the EAC anticipates receipt of evidence demonstrating that the culminating design experience is based on the knowledge and skills acquired in earlier course work and incorporates appropriate engineering standards and multiple realistic constraints.

# Draft Final Statement

## (Weakness is resolved)

Draft Final Statement :

*The EAC acknowledges receipt of six student design reports that demonstrate appropriate engineering standards have been incorporated into the culminating design projects.*

The Weakness is resolved.

# What happens next?

- **IR review:**
  - if W remains...accreditation action...IR or IV
  - If W changes to C...accreditation action...Report Extended (RE)
  - If W resolved...accreditation action...Report Extended (RE)
- **SCR review:**
  - if D remains...the accreditation action...Not to Accredit (NA)
  - If D changes to W...accreditation action... IR or IV
  - if D resolved...accreditation action...Show Caused Extended (SCE)

**July...Commission votes on all accreditation actions**

**August...Decisions uploaded to AMS**



# Questions?

Submit questions on the Zoom Q&A feed







---

**Expectations and Examples:**

***What do team chairs look for?***

# Example: Criterion 1 Shortcoming

## Text from Final Statement:

- *This criterion requires that students must be advised regarding curriculum and career matters. The program indicated in the self-study report that students can discuss career or graduate school plans with faculty members; however, advising on career matters is not required. Interviews with faculty members and students confirmed that career advising is not routinely provided to all students. The Career Center is also available to students; however, the program does not require students to visit the Career Center for advising on career matters. Without career advice, students lack necessary understanding and are not prepared to choose their career path. Thus, the program lacks strength of compliance with this criterion.*

## Status after Due Process:

- *The program weakness is unresolved. In preparation for the next program review, the EAC anticipates documentation and implementation of a process that guarantees that all students receive career advising.*

# Example: Criterion 1 Shortcoming

- Example of what by itself will not resolve a shortcoming:
  - ✓ A revised advising procedure that includes career advising by faculty advisors
  - ✓ Faculty meeting minutes (in an appendix) documenting faculty approval of the new policy
  - ✓ Resources added to the program web page, including evidence that a link to that information was sent to students
- ✓ Example of additional evidence needed to resolve shortcoming:
  - ✓ Documentation showing that career advising was provided to students
    - ✓ For example, data from exit survey given to graduating seniors indicating that 100% of students said they have received career advising
  - ✓ Documentation of a change in the online registration software that places a career advising hold on student registration

Note that each program is unique and should determine an appropriate way to resolve shortcomings. The examples are provided to show possible ways to address the shortcoming.

# Example: Criterion 4 Shortcoming

## Text from Final Statement:

- *This criterion states that the program must regularly use appropriate, documented processes for assessing and evaluating the extent to which the student outcomes are being attained. The program does have a documented process assessing student outcomes (1) through (7). However, the program did not demonstrate assessments of verbal communication as required by outcome (3). Further, assessment of outcome (7) was limited to career fair experience and participation in advisory council panel discussions and was inadequate to determine the degree to which each student had attained an ability to acquire and apply new knowledge as needed, using appropriate learning strategies. Thus, the continuous improvement process is not comprehensive, and the program lacks strength of compliance with this criterion.*

## Status after Due Process:

- *The program weakness is unresolved. In preparation for the next program review, the EAC anticipates documentation showing implementation of appropriate processes for assessing and evaluating the extent to which student outcomes (3) and (7) are attained, and the use of the results for continuous improvement of the program.*

# Example: Criterion 4 Shortcoming

- Example of what by itself will not resolve shortcoming:
  - ✓ Documentation of a revised assessment plan to fully assess student outcomes (3) and (7)
  - ✓ Rubrics to be used to assess student outcomes (3) and (7)
- Example of additional evidence needed to resolve shortcoming:
  - ✓ Examples of assessment instruments used to assess student outcomes (3) and (7)
  - ✓ Data and evaluation results showing the level of attainment of outcomes (3) and (7) using the revised assessment process
  - ✓ Meeting minutes documenting decisions made to improve the program using the results of assessing and evaluating student outcomes (3) and (7)

Note that each program is unique and should determine an appropriate way to resolve shortcomings. The examples are provided to show possible ways to address the shortcoming.

# Example: Criterion 5 Shortcoming

## Text from the Final Statement:

- *This criterion requires the curriculum to include a minimum of 45 semester credit hours of engineering topics. A review of the course syllabi and materials indicates that many courses listed as engineering topics are more accurately categorized as basic science. The required coursework in the curriculum, without considering elective courses, includes 41 credits of engineering topics. As a result, students selecting certain elective courses may graduate without the required 45 credits of engineering topics. Without appropriate engineering topics content, graduates might not be adequately prepared for engineering practice. Thus, strength of compliance with this criterion is lacking.*

## Status after Due Process:

- *The program weakness is unresolved. In preparation for the next program review, the EAC anticipates documentation of a revised curriculum that contains 45 credits of engineering topics, and implementation of a plan to guarantee that all students currently in the pipeline take 45 credits of engineering topics prior to graduating.*



# Example: Criterion 5 Shortcoming

- Example of what by itself will not resolve shortcoming:
  - ✓ A revised curriculum, with a minimum of 45 credits of engineering topics
  - ✓ Adjustment of the list of electives to eliminate those that do not consist of engineering topics
  - ✓ Course syllabi, validating that course content is appropriately categorized as engineering topics
- Example of additional evidence to resolve shortcoming:
  - ✓ Documentation of university approval for the curriculum change
  - ✓ Student work showing appropriate engineering topics content for any modified courses
  - ✓ A procedure that ensures that all students in the pipeline will graduate with at least 45 hours of engineering topics
  - ✓ Transcripts from the most recent graduating class verifying that plan has been implemented

Note that each program is unique and should determine an appropriate way to resolve shortcomings. The examples are provided to show possible ways to address the shortcoming.

# Example: Criterion 7 Shortcoming

## Text from Final Statement:

- *This criterion requires that modern tools, equipment, computing resources, and laboratories appropriate to the program be available, accessible, and systematically maintained and upgraded to enable students to attain the student outcomes and to support program needs. The program uses laboratory equipment and instrumentation (e.g., analog scopes, current/voltmeters, machinery) that is many decades old and no longer current with industry standard. Further, the version of some software products (e.g., Matlab) used by students is over 15 years old and, as a result, is not compatible with the version currently used in industry. Without access to modern tools and equipment, student preparation for engineering practice is uncertain. Thus, the strength of compliance with this criterion is lacking.*

## Status after Due Process:

- *The program weakness is unresolved. In preparation for the next program review, the EAC anticipates documentation showing that the obsolete equipment and software have been upgraded and are being used by the students.*

# Example: Criterion 7 Shortcoming

- Example of what by itself will not resolve shortcoming:
  - ✓ Faculty meeting minutes of discussions to replace equipment and software
  - ✓ Letter from dean approving purchase of replacement equipment and software
  - ✓ Paid invoices (in an appendix) verifying that the purchases have been made
- Example of additional evidence needed to resolve shortcoming:
  - ✓ Photographs showing the new equipment in service for the program.
  - ✓ Student work samples from relevant courses demonstrating that the upgraded software and equipment are in use

Note that each program is unique and should determine an appropriate way to resolve shortcomings. The examples are provided to show possible ways to address the shortcoming.

# Example: APPM Shortcoming

## Text from Final Statement:

- *The Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (APPM) Section I.E.5.b. (1) requires that instructional and learning environments are adequate and safe for their intended purposes. The university's laboratory safety plan is not consistently followed by the program (e.g. chemical labeling and eyewash station inspection). This could result in unsafe conditions. Thus, the program lacks strength of compliance with this requirement.*

## Status after Due Process:

- *The program weakness is unresolved. In preparation for the next program review, the EAC anticipates evidence demonstrating that the university's laboratory safety plan is consistently followed by the program.*

# Example: APPM Shortcoming

- Example of what by itself will not resolve shortcoming:
  - ✓ Documentation of a new process to ensure that lab inspection plans are followed
  - ✓ Meeting minutes (in an appendix) documenting faculty approval of the new process
  - ✓ Safety training slides for students and schedule for training
  - ✓ Sample safety quizzes to be given to students prior to working in lab, along with schedule for administering
- Example of additional evidence needed to resolve shortcoming:
  - ✓ Photos of labeled chemicals
  - ✓ Inspection documents (in an appendix) demonstrating that the new process has been followed
  - ✓ Grades earned by students on safety quizzes
  - ✓ Links to videos showing students in lab using equipment safely.

Note that each program is unique and should determine an appropriate way to resolve shortcomings. The examples are provided to show possible ways to address the shortcoming.



# Questions?

Submit questions on the Zoom Q&A feed

The link to the slides & recording will be emailed to you.



# Interim Reviews with Visits

# Interim Reviews with Visits

## Two Types:

- Interim Visit Review Cases
  - Programs with prior Interim Visit actions (IV or SCV)
  - New program(s) initial accreditation visit
- Interim Report and Visit Review Cases
  - Program's interim review does not require a visit (IR/SCR) and simultaneously
  - At least one other program's interim review requires a visit (IV/SCV actions and/or new programs)



# IV and SCV Evaluations

*Colored text indicates where process differs from IR and SCR reviews.*

- Same review process as IR and SCR evaluations, with these additions:
  - PEV(s) assigned to visit along with TC.
  - The visit provides more opportunities to resolve shortcomings
  - New issues may become obvious during the visit resulting in additional shortcomings

# Process for Interim Visit Reviews (1/2)

- Institution submits Request for Evaluation by **January 31<sup>st</sup>** (about 6 months after accreditation action)
- Team Chair (TC) assigned in April or May
- TC works with institutional representative to determine visit dates
  - Number of days depends on reason for visit
  - Often shorter than general review (unless there are also new programs)
- PEV(s) assigned in May or June
  - Typically, one PEV per program, but depends on the reason for the visit
- Institution submits Interim Report (+ SSR for new programs) by **July 1<sup>st</sup>**
- Interim report should include what additional evidence the team should expect to see on the visit
- TC and PEV review interim report (PEV reviews SSR if new program)
- TC works with institutional representative to set up schedule to focus on resolving shortcomings
- PEV visits program focusing on resolving shortcomings

# Process for Interim Visit Reviews (2/2)

- Team reports out at Exit Meeting on all programs visited
- Program audits sent to the dean following Exit Meeting
- TC writes Draft Statement
- Draft Statement is reviewed by EAC Editors 1 and 2, and Adjunct
- Institution informed when Draft Statement is available in AMS
- Institution has 30 days to submit due-process response
- TC writes Final Statement, which goes through editing chain
- Post-30-day due-process information may be submitted if TC agrees
  - Final Statement goes through editing chain again
- Commission votes on accreditation actions during July meeting
- In August, the institution is contacted when Final Statement is available in AMS

# Interim Report and Visit

Evaluations sometimes occur where the institution has **both**

- Programs that have interim reviews not requiring a visit (IR/SCR actions)

and

- Programs that have interim reviews requiring a visit (IV/SCV actions) and/or
- Initial review for new programs

# Process for Interim Report and Visit (1/2)

- Programs with IR and SCR accreditation actions will follow normal interim report procedures.
- The visit for the IV and SCV programs will follow the visit procedures outlined in the previous few slides.
- If a new program is reviewed, a general review schedule is followed for that program.

# Process for Interim Report and Visit (2/2)

- The team reports out on all programs with visit reviews at the Exit Meeting
  - Programs with reports only (IR or SCR) not included in Exit Meeting
- Institution will receive one Draft Statement for all programs
- The rest of the process is the same as that of general reviews:
  - Draft Statement is written, edited and sent to institution
  - Program provides 30-Day Due-Process Response
  - Final Statement is written and edited
  - If TC agrees to accept Post-30-Day Due-Process Information:
    - Program submits Post-30-Day Due-Process Information
    - Final Statement is edited again
  - Commission votes in July following the review year