Welcome to the
EAC Briefing
for Institutional
Representatives
and Team Chairs
We are glad you are here!
Agenda

• Welcome!
• Who is here and why
• About ABET & the accreditation process
• Before, during, and after the visit
• Shortcoming data
• Final thoughts
• Questions and responses
Presenting Team and Goals
Today’s EAC Presenters

• Patsy Brackin, *Past Chair*

• Mo Hosni, *Chair*

• Lorraine Fleming, *Chair Elect*

• Lizette Chevalier, *Vice Chair of Operations*

• Chris Taylor, *Vice Chair of Ops Elect*
EAC Adjuncts

Dayne Aldridge
Adjunct Accreditation Director

Susan Conry
Adjunct Accreditation Director

Doug Bowman
Adjunct Accreditation Director

Winston Erevelles
Adjunct Accreditation Director
Intended audience

Institutional Representatives
- Representing institutions undergoing evaluation in the 2023-2024 cycle

Engineering Accreditation Commission Members
- Executive Committee
- 2023-2024 EAC Members
- Other Team Chairs

ABET Staff
Why are we here?

• Set the stage for successful evaluations
• Develop common understanding and expectations of activities
  • Preparing for the visit
  • During the visit
  • Following the visit
• Answer questions!
About ABET
What is ABET?

- Nonprofit, non-governmental agency that accredits programs in:
  - Applied and Natural Science
  - Computing
  - Engineering
  - Engineering Technology
- >2,200 experts from industry, academia, and government support QA activities
- ISO 9001:2015 certification
Who is ABET?

• 35 Member Societies
• ABET Volunteers
• Headquarters Staff (full-time)
  • President
  • Chief Accreditation Officer
  • Senior Director, Accreditation Operations
  • International Accreditation Manager
Member Societies
ABET Volunteers

• Team Chairs
• Program Evaluators
• Board of Directors
• Board of Delegates
• ABET Councils
  • Academic Advisory Council
  • Accreditation Council
  • Global Council
  • Inclusion, Diversity, and Equity Advisory Council
  • Industry Advisory Council

www.abet.org/about-abet/governance/
Accreditation Commissions

Composition

• Members
  • Team Chairs

• Executive Committee
  • Editors 1 and Editors 2

• Supporting staff
  • Adjuncts
  • Staff liaisons

EAC – Engineering Accreditation Commission

CAC – Computing Accreditation Commission

ETAC – Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission

ANSAC – Applied & Natural Science Accreditation Commission
What is ABET Accreditation?

• Periodic review of educational program
• Provides quality assurance
• Ensures program meets quality standards of the profession for which the program prepares graduates
• Verify program compliance with criteria and Accreditation Policies and Procedures Manual (APPM)

Not a ranking system
What is accreditation? And why do it?

Accreditation requires a periodic review and evaluation 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.
# EAC Review Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2022-23 Accreditation Cycle</th>
<th>2023-24 Accreditation Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INSTITUTIONS</td>
<td>PROGRAMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Review</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Review</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Report</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Visit</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONSITE</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRTUAL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO VISIT IR</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNATIONAL</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABET accreditation process
Accreditation Timeline: 18-21* Month Process

(*If required)
By OCT 1*
Readiness
review

By JAN 31 – Institution submits Request for Evaluation

FEB – JUN
Team members assigned; visit dates set; Institution prepares Self-study Report

By JULY 1
Institution Submits Self-Study Report

Pre-visit Preparations; Prepare materials; plan visit

(SEPT to DEC– Visits take place, followed by 7-day response period

2 to 3 Months after the Visit: Draft Statement edited and sent to Institutions

(Optional) 30-Day and Post-30-Day Due Process Responses from Institutions

(Optional) Draft Statement revised by EAC

JULY – Commission meets to take final action;

By AUGUST 31 – Institutions notified of final action;

OCTOBER – Accreditation status publicly released

Self Study Report (SSR) and Supplemental Materials
Self-Study Report (SSR)

- Document describing how the program meets the ABET criteria
- Provides “first impressions” of the program to the visit team
- Each program requires its own self-study report
- Templates available at:
  - https://www.abet.org/accreditation/accreditation-criteria/self-study-templates/
Self-Study Report Content

Template provides a good guide to required content

- **Background information**
  - history
  - Contact information
  - locations
  - previous evaluation results

- **Narratives on**
  - General criteria
  - Program criteria (when applicable)
  - Safety

- **Appendices**
  - Syllabi
  - CVs
  - equipment
  - Institutional summary

- Submission attesting to compliance
Supplemental Materials

• Uploaded with Self-Study Report
  • General institution catalog (as PDF), includes:
    • Program curricular requirements
    • Course details
    • Institutional information applicable at time of review
  • Promotional brochures and other literature describing program offerings of the institution
SSR and Materials Submission

- SSR and Supplemental Materials must be submitted via the ABET Accreditation Management System (AMS)
  - No email
  - No hardcopy
  - No data stick
- Separate submission for each program
- Visit team accesses material via AMS
Pre-visit Planning and Preparations
### Visit Team Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Evaluator</th>
<th>PEV 2...</th>
<th>...PEV n</th>
<th>Observer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEV 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If you have simultaneous or joint visits by more than one commission, you will have a Team Chair and team for each commission.*
Team chairs (TCs)

• Experienced program evaluators
  • Nominated by ABET Member Societies
  • Recommended by the EAC
  • Approved by ABET Engineering Area Delegation
• Institutions review the TC for any conflict of interest
Program Evaluators (PEVs)

- Assigned by relevant member society
- Trained by ABET and member society
- Institution/program reviews PEV for conflict of interest

Please approve TC and PEV nominations in a timely manner
Observers

• Sources:
  • Member societies may assign for training purposes
  • Local and state boards may assign
  • International groups may request
• Observers do not vote on recommended accreditation action
• Institution may decline observers
ABET Competencies

- Technically Current
- Professional
- Team-oriented
- Effective Communication
- Interpersonally Skilled
- Organized
Tips for a Successful Visit

• Good communication with TC
• Review COI requests quickly
• Provide requested info in a timely manner
• Let TC know of any issues
• Finalize interview and review schedules prior to visit
• Discuss delivery method for additional materials (discussed shortly)
Supporting Materials

- Materials beyond SSR upload
- Provided to demonstrate compliance with criteria and APPM
- If institutional LMS/cloud storage is used
  - Ensure team has appropriate access
  - Provide team with necessary training
- English translation/translators must be provided for non-English materials (APPM I.D.1.g)
Materials – Transcripts

- Requested by TC
- Provide worksheets/audit forms to assist PEV with transcript review
- Redacting names is optional
- Should not be uploaded to AMS
  - Coordinate delivery method with TC
Materials – Criteria 1-3

- **Criterion 1 – Students**
  - Transcripts, graduation audit forms, prerequisite waiver documentation, etc…

- **Criterion 2 – Program Educational Objectives**
  - Meeting minutes and/or survey results where constituents discuss PEOs

- **Criterion 3 – Student Outcomes**
  - Already provided in SSR and website
Materials – Criterion 4

- **Criterion 4 – Continuous Improvement**
  
  *Evidence demonstrating your CI process*

- **Data collection**
  - Samples of assessed student work

- **Assessment**
  - Instruments used, assessment criteria (e.g., rubrics), assessment results

- **Evaluation** – documentation of evaluation

- **Use of results** as input for the program’s continuous improvement actions
  - Meeting minutes, specific actions, results of improvements
Materials – Criterion 5

• Criterion 5 – Curriculum
  • Math/Science and Engineering Requirement
    • evidence demonstrating compliance credit hour requirements
  • Major engineering design experience
    • Should include evidence (e.g., student work, final design project reports, syllabi) that the design projects:
      • Incorporate applicable engineering standards & multiple constraints
      • Based on knowledge and skills acquired in earlier course work
      • Complies with ABET definition of “engineering design” (not a research project)
      • Use of rubrics or other tools for evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMELINE - Review of Major Design Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With SSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 days before visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 days before visit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Materials – Other criteria

- **Program Criteria** (if applicable) – evidence of coverage of required curriculum topics
  - E.g., sample assignments, samples of graded student work, sample lecture materials, etc.…

- Additional documentation for **Criterion 6 Faculty, Criterion 7 Facilities, and Criterion 8 Institutional Support** may be requested by the PEV.
Summary of Pre-Visit Planning

• Communicate early and often with TC
  • Avoid misunderstandings
  • Reduce surprises
  • Provide time to address issues
• ABET Adjuncts, HQ staff, and IT team available to help
• We are all in this together. Reach out to your TC with any questions
The Visit
Objectives of Visit

• Validate the SSR
• Tour lab and facilities
• Interview administration, faculty, staff, students, and advisory board
• Review support materials not provided electronically before the visit
• Provide institution with preliminary assessment of program compliance
• Assist programs in quality improvement efforts
## Typical Visit Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 0 (Sunday)</th>
<th>Lab &amp; facility tours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PEVs meet program chairs/TC meet dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PEVs review course materials as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABET team review Day 0 findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1 (Monday)</td>
<td>Dean’s presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PEVs brief program chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PEVs conduct interviews with faculty and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PEVs meet with alumni/advisory boards &amp; support departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TC brief dean and meets with institution officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABET team review Day 1 findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2 (Tuesday)</td>
<td>Meetings with faculty &amp; staff, as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team finalizes findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PEVs brief program chairs/TC briefs dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team draft exit statements &amp; forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exit meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exit Meeting

**Purpose:**

*Report team findings to institution’s CEO and other institution representatives*

- TC will leave copy of team’s initial findings
- No recording or transcribing allowed
- CEO or leader of institution required to attend
- All other attendees are at the discretion of institution
Post-Visit Feedback

• Key to our continuous improvement
  • Institutions
    • Dean (or designee) evaluates team chair(s)
    • Program chairs evaluate PEVs
  • Team chairs evaluate PEVs
  • PEVs evaluate TC and other PEVs
  • No influence on accreditation outcomes
The Post-Review Process

It’s not over until the commission votes
Post-Review 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 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TC</th>
<th>Team Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED1, ED2</td>
<td>Editor, Member of EAC Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>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(s) identified in the visit
- DON’T WAIT! After the visit, 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

DON’T WAIT! After the visit, begin drafting this response
Post-Review Process Notes

- Communicate with Team Chair throughout the process
- Upload institutional documents and responses to AMS
- Address and resolve shortcomings 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 FINAL only when the Commission votes!**

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shortcoming</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deficiency</strong></td>
<td>A criterion, policy, or procedure is not 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>
</tbody>
</table>
## Other findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Exceptionally strong, effective practice or condition. A statement that describes what was observed, what makes it stand above the norm, and how it impacts the program positively.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation</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>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL REVIEW**

- **existing programs**
  - **NGR (6 years)**
  - IR or IV (2 years)
    - SCR or SCV (2 years)

- **new programs**
  - **NGR (6 years)**
  - IR or IV (2 years)
    - NA

- **following SCR or SCV**
  - **NGR (6 years)**
  - IR or IV (2 years)
    - SCR or SCV (2 years) or NA

**INTERIM REVIEW**

- **following IR or IV**
  - **RE or VE (2 or 4 years)**
  - IR or IV (2 years)
    - SCR or SCV (2 years)
  - SCR or SCV (2 years) or NA

- **following SCR or SCV**
  - **SE (2 or 4 years)**
  - IR or IV (2 years)
    - SCR or SCV (2 years) or NA

---

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.
Resolving Shortcomings

Number of Weaknesses and Deficiencies During Due-Process
### Accreditation Action Statistics for General Reviews 2021-22 Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Percent of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Next General Review*</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Report</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Visit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not To Accredit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show Cause Report</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show Cause Visit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination (Action by Institution)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn (Action by Institution)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>761</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Extended Reports
## Historical Statistics on Accreditation Action
### Number of Programs (%)

**Onsite vs Virtual vs Both**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Onsite</th>
<th>Virtual</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next General Review</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Report</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Visit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show Cause Report/Visit</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not To Accredite</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consistency in the Accreditation Evaluation
Consistency

• Each institutional context is unique
• Consistency is a top priority
• **Goal:** Programs with similar observed shortcomings accorded the same accreditation action
Consistency – Team

Consistency across all programs

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

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 multiple 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

Editors 2 check across all reports

Editors 1 check across all reports

Team chairs check across evaluators
Common Shortcomings
## EAC Shortcoming Statistics 2021-22
### Criteria 1-4

<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>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</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>108</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</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>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</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>10</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# EAC Shortcoming Statistics 2021-22
## Criteria 5-8

<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>22</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion 6: Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion 7: Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</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>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EAC Shortcoming Statistics 2021-22
**Program, APPM and Master’s**

<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>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPM (Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master’s Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion 1: Students

- All students who graduate must meet graduation requirements
  - Provide worksheets that you use to verify that students have met graduation requirements
  - Explain any unusual occurrences in transcripts provided
  - Documentation is necessary for course substitutions and prerequisite waivers
- Students must be advised on careers and curricular issues
  - Professional staff may advise on curricular matters
  - Career services can advise on careers
Criterion 2: Program Educational Objectives

- PEOs must be consistent with ABET’s definition*

- Requires a systematically, utilized and effective process, involving ALL program constituencies
  - Incomplete process, or
  - PEO review process not followed

- You specify your constituencies – if they are specified, you must involve them in the periodic review

*Program educational objectives are broad statements that describe what graduates are expected to attain within a few years after graduation. Program educational objectives are based on the needs of the program’s constituencies.
Criterion 3: Student Outcomes

• Most programs adopt Student Outcomes 1-7 verbatim

• Explain how Student Outcomes support your Program Educational Objectives and Mission
Criterion 4: Continuous Improvement

• Process not clear
  • Must show results for your program – not combined programs (e.g., EE and CpE)
• Where do you assess?
• How often do you assess?
• What instruments do you use to assess?
• Who does the assessment?
• What is your evaluation of the extent to which the student outcomes are being attained?
• Assessment results not used as input for continuous program improvement
Criterion 5: Curriculum

- Carefully review the assignment of courses into categories (math/basic science, engineering topics)
  - Computer Science is NOT a basic science
  - If a course is part science and part engineering, be prepared to explain the allocation using homework problems, tests, syllabi, etc.
- Ensure that you meet
  - 30 semester credit hours of a combination of college-level mathematics and basic sciences with experimental experience appropriate to the program.
  - a minimum of 45 semester credit hours (or equivalent) of engineering topics appropriate to the program, consisting of engineering and computer sciences and engineering design, and utilizing modern engineering tools.
- Culminating major engineering design experience:
  - Incorporates appropriate engineering standards and multiple constraints
  - Based on knowledge and skills in acquired in earlier course work
  - Utilizes aspects of design process (not research)
Criteria 6-8

C6: Faculty
• Adequate number / lack of professional development
• Sufficient authority
• Competence in all required program areas

C7: Facilities
• Issues with maintenance or technical support of labs
• Consider computing, classrooms, and offices

C8: Institutional support
• Inadequate support for labs
• High turnover or unfilled positions with faculty or staff
• Inadequate resources to create an environment in which the student outcomes can be attained
APPM (Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual)

- Incorrect accreditation citations
- Required data not published – PEOs, SOs, annual student enrollment and graduation data specific to the program
- Inconsistent references to program names
  - Transcripts, degrees, accreditation request, publications
- Facilities and student lab work safety
  - Team does not perform safety inspections and does not certify compliance
  - Major safety rules are posted
  - Ensure that you are following your program’s safety rules.
Concluding Thoughts
Preparing for Successful Review

• Commitment and involvement of college leadership
• Open and timely communication with visit team
• Organized, accessible supporting materials
• Timely due process responses
What if…

• Program thinks PEV does not understand or is overly picky?
• PEV chooses a disgruntled faculty member to interview
• Something unusual happens during the visit

Talk to your TC
More Information

• Webinar recording
• Copy of these slides
• Accreditation Policy and Procedures Manual (APPM)
• 2023-24 Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Program

See here:
www.abet.org/accreditation/accreditation-criteria/
Comments and Questions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the Visit, can advisory board members meet virtually with PEVs or do some (or all?) advisory board members</td>
<td>They may participate virtually. Only a representative number of advisory board members are expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the alumni/advisory board - can that be virtual or should we try to get those groups on campus in person?</td>
<td>Ideally in person. But we understand that sometimes the industry/advisory board members are not available. Usually it is only a representative number of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If one of our constituents is &quot;employers&quot;, is it sufficient to say that they are represented by the members of our Industrial Advisory Board or should we rephrase our constituent to be &quot;the Industrial Advisory Board&quot;?</td>
<td>That can be a sufficient way to obtain feedback from employers. What the program needs to do is demonstrate that it is in compliance with the criterion. Specifically, the program will need to ensure that the feedback received through the IAB is sufficient to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the PEOs have not been reviewed for some reasons. Is this considered a deficiency?</td>
<td>That would likely be a weakness or a deficiency, depending on the circumstances; however, this is something that could potentially be addressed prior to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should the advisory board be present in person or on-line?</td>
<td>No. This is what it says:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the Student Outcomes the same for undergraduate and master programs?</td>
<td><a href="https://www.abet.org/accreditation/accreditation-">https://www.abet.org/accreditation/accreditation-</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the programs adopt new SOs as of now?</td>
<td>As long as SO 1-7 are included, the program may adopt additional SOs. But these must be evaluated under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are teaching males and females separately in saudi arabai. Do we have to prepare a different SOs evaluation</td>
<td>If the students are separated, the SOs may be different. The program needs to demonstrate that all the criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We assess 5 SO's on the capstone project and two junior</td>
<td>Annual assessment would usually be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have small number of graduates in the EE &amp; CPE programs (in the same department) We have a couple of</td>
<td>The program needs to determine how to separate the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At one point I was told by two different folks with ABET that it was OK to include only student samples for items used for assessment. From one of the responses here it sounds like</td>
<td>To address C4 continuous improvement, the PEV only needs student work directly related to the assessment. However, student work might be necessary to satisfy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria 4: What is a good way to summarize all assessment results for the different student outcomes? Should this be reported as simply attained or not attained or should it be an averaged number (say 1-4 or %)? Should assessments be summarized for the period since the last visit or listed by year for every course assessed?</td>
<td>The criterion does not require a specific way of doing this. I would recommend considering different options and selecting ways that the program finds most useful for identifying ways to improve the program. The whole goal of the criterion is to identify ways to improve student attainment of the student outcomes. How you organize the data is also up to the program. Of course, it would be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how may years of data is to be submitted</td>
<td>For the C4, you will want to demonstrate that the assessment is conducted in accordance with the plan established by the program. Assessment may not be done every year — which would mean that the data would</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Under continuous improvement how do you address where the program interprets the SO achievement at a freshman or sophmore level but the PEV interprets the level of achievement at a junior or senior level. The SOs are at the time of graduation, but there are variuos interpretations of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The criterion requires the program to be able to assess and evaluate the extent to which the student outcomes are being attained. It does not require that all outcomes are being attained at a specific level. It does require that those results are systematically utilized as input for the assessment or whether the program evaluates the outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What if there are team projects/grade including students from multiple majors? How should we separate the results?</td>
<td>All projects names should be provided. The PEVs will select which ones they want to look at.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you need science and math students assessment results to demonstrate compliance with with maths and science requirements?</td>
<td>The transcripts should provide sufficient information to demonstrate compliance with the math and science requirements. But other information may be necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For list of design projects with SSR, this is only a listing (ie titles etc. that is required) and actual reports can be made.</td>
<td>The list of projects — with titles. The PEV will select An engineering project should include multiple constraints and utilize standards. Please review ABET.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a requirement to have 30 hours of math and science. Can these include courses that are taught by engineering?</td>
<td>The math and science requirement must be math and science topics even if they are taught by engineering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the criteria to differentiate between an engineering project and scientific project.</td>
<td>An engineering project should include multiple constraints and utilize standards. Please review ABET.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you confirm if the resumes for faculty are needed for current faculty only, or also the faculty in previous courses, e.g. engineering?</td>
<td>Current faculty CVs are needed for engineering classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do we need the CV’s for math and science faculty or just the faculty that are teaching the program specific courses?</td>
<td>M&amp;S faculty CVs are not generally submitted in the SSR unless they teach engineering classes. If the PEV needs to ensure compliance with a criterion, they might request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is PE licensure to teach design engineering courses in civil or environmental engineering programs over the PEV’s?</td>
<td>There is no requirement in the general criteria. The program criteria may have additional requirements such as yes — the engineering faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the correct way to count faculty supporting a program? Should faculty from support programs (especially engineering) be counted?</td>
<td>Generally it does not include math and science faculty. So yes — the engineering faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What should our faculty expect during the faculty interview with the PEVs?</td>
<td>Generally, the PEV will ask questions to tease out information related to compliance with the criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do institutions still need to provide Lab Videos, if the visit is expected to be in person - so no lab videos.</td>
<td>The visit are expected to be in person - so no lab videos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the safety section mentioned in the presentation (and in the APPM) an independent section? Or is it a part of the safety section?</td>
<td>Safety is generally considered under APPM. It is mostly considered during the site visit while touring labs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When visiting the labs, is it required to have all equipment operating at the moment?</td>
<td>Generally, lab visits occur on Sunday. The technician should be available. If equipment is broken, this could be an issue. But if it not being utilized for the semester, it can be turned off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can institutions still opt in to the DEI pilot?</td>
<td>Not anymore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hope that there are some programs in states such as TN should be available. If equipment is broken, this could be an issue. But if it not being utilized for the semester, it can be turned off.</td>
<td>A diverse sampling of institutions is included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs participating in the DEI pilot were assigned? Or how do I know if I have to adress that section in the SSR?</td>
<td>Institutions were given the option to volunteer to participate in the DEI pilot. If your institution did not participate in the DEI pilot, the list of design projects should be included with the supplemental materials. Other student work as necessary to show compliance should be included with supplemental materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to the template, supplemental materials also is to include evidence for Crit 5. But this looks to be provided to the reviewers at least 30 days out. Is this the 'student work' that must be submitted?</td>
<td>The remaining student work may be provided only if it is completed and ready for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to the template, supplemental materials also is to include evidence for Crit 5. But this looks to be provided to the reviewers at least 30 days out. Is this the 'student work' that must be submitted?</td>
<td>The list of design projects should be included with the supplemental materials. Other student work as necessary to show compliance should be included with supplemental materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the samples to be displayed are for one academic year?</td>
<td>It depends. Sufficient material to demonstrate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the samples to be displayed are for one academic year or more? or one semester materials are sufficient as samples?</td>
<td>You will want to provide samples that completely cover your assessment cycle. If you assess all of your student outcomes every semester, it may be possible to include samples for only one semester. If not, you should include samples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are we expected to make textbooks available for the PEV?</td>
<td>Only if requested by PEV. The PEV might want to review the textbooks. This should be coordinated with them directly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are we expected to make textbooks available for the PEV?</td>
<td>The PEV may request access to textbooks. This should be coordinated with them directly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can sample transcripts requested for more detailed review</td>
<td>They will need to be electronic. But not uploaded. Work with PEVs directly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Can you point to a place on the ABET website where supplementary materials guidance is listed? | Please refer to the self study template. See this link to access it: https://www.abet.org/accreditation/accreditation-criteria/accreditation-policy-and-procedure-manual-
| Can you point to a place on the ABET website where supplementary materials guidance is listed? | You may also find the APPM (section I.E.5.b.(2)) helpful.                                                                                             |
| For compiling course “binders” for review, our understanding is a PEV may want to look at any required | Binders are reviewed for all criteria — not just assessment. The PEV may be looking for confirmation for assessment.                                |
| For evidence of student work, how many years you need                 | Usually it is for the most recent year. If a required course is not offered during that cycle, it might be expected that the program will need to go back to when it was offered. In addition, if the assessment cycle goes over multiple years, it would be expected that the information utilized. |
| How about redacting names for student work such as homework, tests, projects, etc, is it necessary? | Redacting the names is not required. But it should be in accordance with institution’s policies for protecting student identities.                                                                     |
| One question from earlier regarding supporting documents (course materials, etc.). Does ABET now require those to be | Some materials may be put on display on campus, especially if the institution has not moved to virtual.                                                                                                  |
| Previously, physical “binders” for courses were prepared, with representative assignments and student work, for review by PEVs during an in-person visit. What is now the | Generally virtual is preferred. Physical binders are less common nowadays.                                                                             |
| Some materials will be uploaded to AMS. We will be requested to upload additional materials to a cloud or LMS and give ABET access. The remaining materials for the site visit can then be in the cloud or LMS OR hard copy. Is this | Yes, the program can decide to make the remaining materials for the site visit available electronically or as hard copies. If it is made available electronically, it can be useful to provide it prior to the visit since navigating online. |
| Supplemental materials - the catalog - should we include               | The current catalog should be submitted                                                                                                               |
| We had our SSR report reviewed by an external evaluator through ABET Bridge and it seemed to be suggested that we don’t include a lot of support material as links to a Google | Ideally the SSR is self-contained. But links may be included for some materials.                                                                     |
| What if your institution is now using curriculog and is not using a pdf version of the catalog? Can we provide a link for you? | This needs to be provided as a moment in time. A link is not acceptable. The institution should determine how the catalog can be made available as a document. |
| when do display materials need to be made available to the team? Does that include course and Outcome documentation? | This is an excellent question to address with your team chair. If you plan to make the materials available electronically, I think 30 days prior to the visit is a good time. |
We had our SSR report reviewed by an external evaluator through ABET Bridge and it seemed to be suggested that we don’t include a lot of support material as links to a Google Appendices are preferred so that the document is self contained and a static snapshot. Content on links can change, which can cause communication challenges.

Are we still required to travel to the summer meeting in July?

No. There will not be an in-person meeting in July.

Does people that evaluate a program come from the society that is related to that program? For example evaluators of industrial Engineering come from IIE? What is the role of society in the evaluation process?

That is correct. The program evaluators (PEV) are qualified to review the programs. Some programs might have multiple societies that can provide PEVs — but those PEVs are qualified to review. The Team Chairs (TC)

For program names, what is the correct terminology? Is it the degree, e.g. Bachelor of Science in Mechanical

The institution determines program names. It was submitted with the RFE.

How is the date for the meeting selected? Who decides?

Suggested by institution. Confirmed with TC.

If a program chair is not available during the visit, will that be an issue?

The program chair is critical to the program, so it would be highly preferable for the chair to be available. While it may be possible to work around it, I would recommend considering changing the visit dates so that the program

If in the process of writing our self-study, we identify a weakness in curriculum, practices, or improvement processes AND we develop a plan to resolve it, how should we (1) document that in our self-study and (2) how will PEVs treat that in their review?

It is important to be in compliance and not just have a plan to be in compliance. It is great to have a plan and to get started on implementing it, but if it hasn’t been implemented at the time of the visit, as Anne mentioned, any appropriate shortcoming will be documented on the exit statement. Ideally the program will have sufficient time to implement the changes by the time they submit their 30-day due-process response. It is worth noting that

If in the process of writing our self-study, we identify a weakness in curriculum, practices, or improvement processes AND we develop a plan to resolve it, how should we (1) document that in our self-study and (2) how will PEVs treat that in their review?

The PEVs usually review the SSR and may have identified some shortcomings. Following up with the program, they might find that the shortcomings have been addressed or resolved. This might also occur during the visit. If, however, the shortcoming is not resolved by the time the visit has concluded, then the shortcoming will be noted

Is there a estimated time at which fall visit dates will be announced?

Suggested dates should be uploaded to AMS. An attempt will be made to assign a TC that can meet the suggested

Is there going to be a meeting that ABET usually sets up for the team chair and dean to meet?

The TC should reach out to the institution once assigned. If they do not, the Dean should reach out to the TC. They can arrange a meeting at their own convenience.

We have three careers taking accreditation (Chile, South America).

On-site is the plan unless something happens.

Will ABET have on-site visit for international program

The plan is for all visits to be in person.