Preparing Interim Reports
2021-22 Accreditation Cycle

Presented by the

Engineering Accreditation Commission
to

Institutional Representatives

February 25, 2021

Welcome!

Dave Binning, EAC Chair

Notes

1) The Chat feed has been 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 tomorrow. We will email the link to you.

Introductions

- Panelists
  - Dave Binning, EAC Chair
  - Chris Weisbrook, EAC ExCom
  - Kathleen Kramer, EAC ExCom
  - Doug Bowman, EAC Adjunct

Agenda

1) Description of Interim Reviews
2) RFE and Guidance for Writing Reports
3) The Process of Review
4) Expectations and Examples
5) Draft and Final Statement

Upon Request: Interim Reviews with Visits

Interim Reviews:
Description, Types, and Process

Description of Interim Reviews

- An Interim Review addresses shortcomings (D, W, and C) remaining from the last accreditation action
  - Programs submit a focused report that addresses only unresolved shortcomings from previous review (not a comprehensive self-study report addressing all of the criteria)
  - Evaluation is relative to the question: *"Have the shortcomings identified in the last review been resolved?"*

Interim Review Types

The primary focus of this presentation:

- Interim Report Reviews (most common type)
  - Institution only has programs with prior interim report review actions [Interim Report (IR) or Show Cause Report (SCR)]

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Visit reviews will be covered at end of presentation, if requested:

- Interim Visit Reviews
  - Institution has programs with prior Interim Visit actions [(Interim Visit (IV) or Show Cause Visit (SCV)]
  - May have new programs to visit.
- Interim Report and Visit Reviews
  - Institution has programs that don't require a visit (IR/SCR actions) and
  - Programs that do require a visit (IV/SCV actions and/or new programs).

Process for Interim Report Reviews (1/2)

- Institution submits Request for Evaluation **by January 31st** (about 6 months after accreditation action is final)
- Team Chair is assigned in April or May (no PEVs)
- Institution submits Interim Report **by July 1st**
- TC reviews report and writes Draft Statement by September 15th
- Draft Statement is reviewed by Editors 1 and 2 and EAC Adjunct
- Institution is contacted when Draft Statement is available in AMS
- Institution has 30 days to submit a 30-Day Due-Process Response
- TC writes Final Statement, which goes through editing chain

Process for Interim Report Reviews (2/2)

- Post-30-Day Due-Process Information may be submitted only if TC agrees
  - This information should be limited to that which was not available during the 30-day due process period
  - The 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 on AMS

Request for Evaluation (RFE) and Guidance for Writing Reports

Request for Evaluation (RFE)

- Submit RFE by **January 31st** (approximately 6 months after accreditation action is final)

- All programs under interim review (IR, IV, SCR or SCV) must use criteria from same accreditation year

- **Institution should specify which criteria for interim review**

  - As a basis for interim reviews, ABET allows an institution to use either the current criteria (2021-22) OR

    - For a first cycle interim review you may opt to use the relevant old criteria (2019-20)

    - For a second cycle interim review you may opt to use the relevant old criteria (2017-18)

- If there are new programs, they will be evaluated using criteria for the current year

- Regardless of which criteria is specified, ALWAYS use the **current** APPM (2021-22 Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual)

Interim Reports

- An Interim Report is required for previous IR, IV, SCR and SCV accreditation actions
  - IR and IV actions follow W shortcomings
  - SCR and SCV actions follow D shortcomings
- Write a separate report for each program that has unresolved shortcomings even if multiple programs have identical shortcomings
- Reports are uploaded into AMS by dean or dean's delegate (not by individual programs)
- Submit reports either as separate files or combine reports for all programs into one file
- Reports are due July 1st

Guidance on Writing Interim Reports

- Use the Interim Report Questionnaire available on the ABET website. Link will be emailed to you tomorrow.

- For <u>each</u> unresolved shortcoming (D/W/C) as cited in the Final Statement:

  - Begin with the shortcoming statement, verbatim from the Final Statement.

  - Clearly describe actions taken to resolve the shortcoming. Focus only on the shortcoming.

  - Provide evidence that the shortcoming has been resolved.

  - If the body of evidence is large, include it in an appendix. Only provide what is relevant to the shortcoming.

  - Note that a plan to do something does not resolve a shortcoming.

  - Be thorough but concise. The report does not have to be long, but it should adequately address the shortcoming.

Process of Review

IR and SCR Evaluations

- TC reads the previous Final Statement(s) and reviews shortcomings (D, W, and C) that were *not previously resolved*.

- TC will evaluate the report relative to the question: ***"Have the shortcomings identified in the last review been resolved?"***

- Focus is on shortcomings remaining from the prior review
  - However, if a new shortcoming is discovered during the review, it may be cited by the team chair

- TC may contact institutional rep with questions to clarify content in report
  - For example, "Please explain how the assessment data in Table 3 were obtained."
  - This is ***not*** an opportunity for the institution to rewrite the interim report – just to give clarifications.

- All communication with team chair should go through institutional representative

Questions?

Submit questions on the Zoom Q&A feed

Expectations and Examples:

What is the team chair looking 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 <u>by itself</u> will not resolve 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 <u>additional evidence</u> 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 <u>by itself</u> 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 <u>additional evidence</u> 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 <u>by itself</u> 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 <u>additional evidence</u> 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 <u>by itself</u> 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 <u>additional evidence</u> needed to resolve shortcoming:
  - ✓ Photographs showing the new equipment in service
  - ✓ 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 <u>by itself</u> 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 <u>additional evidence</u> 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.

Draft and Final Statement Example

Draft Statement

- Shortcoming information will be summarized and the status from the previous Final Statement will be stated.

- Evidence to resolve this shortcoming as provided in interim report or during visit will be described and evaluated as to how/whether it resolves the shortcoming.

- The shortcoming status may remain, be resolved, or changed to a different level.

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 incorporates appropriate engineering standards were not provided.

The Weakness remains.

After Receiving Draft Statement

- If shortcomings remain, program can submit 30-day response.

Due-Process Statement Example A

(Weakness is not resolved)

Due-Process Statement:

The EAC acknowledges receipt of documentation that "standards" assessment had 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.

Due-Process Statement Example B
(Weakness is resolved)

Due-Process 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?

- If Weaknesses and Deficiencies are resolved, the action will be Report Extended (RE) or Show Cause Extended (SCE). Accreditation will extend until next general review.

- For an Interim Report review, if Weakness remains, the accreditation action will be for another interim review (IR or IV).

- For a Show Cause Report review, if Deficiency remains, the accreditation action will be NA (not to accredit).

- Commission votes on all accreditation actions at July Commission Meeting.

- Institution is informed in August of decisions.

Questions?

Submit questions on the Zoom Q&A feed

~~~~~~~~~~~~

Link to template, slides and recording of presentation:
https://www.abet.org/accreditation/accreditation-criteria/

This link will also be emailed to you tomorrow.

Interim Reviews with Visits

Interim Review Types with Visits

Two Types:

- Interim Visit Reviews

  - Institutions has only programs with prior Interim Visit actions (IV or SCV)

  - May have new programs to visit.

- Interim Report and Visit Reviews

  - Institution has programs that don't require a visit (IR/SCR actions) <u>and</u>

  - Programs that do require 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) are assigned to visit along with TC.
  - The visit will provide more opportunities to resolve shortcoming.
  - 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 31st** (about 6 months after accreditation action)

- Team Chair is 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) are 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 1st**

- 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 programs)

- 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 are sent to the dean following Exit Meeting
- TC writes Draft Statement
- Draft Statement is reviewed by Editors 1 and 2, and EAC adjunct
- Institution is contacted 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 on AMS

Interim Report and Visit

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

- Programs that don't require a visit (IR/SCR actions)

  and

- Programs that do require 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 <u>all programs with visit reviews</u> at the Exit Meeting
  - Programs with reports only (IR or SCR) are not included in Exit Meeting
- Institution will receive one Draft Statement for <u>all</u> 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
  - Institution receives notice of accreditation action in August

Questions?

Submit questions on the Zoom Q&A feed

~~~~~~~~~~

Link to template, slides and recording of presentation:
https://www.abet.org/accreditation/accreditation-criteria/

This link will also be emailed to you tomorrow.