ABET - Evil or Useful
How can the UECC help
Sharing Best Practices

• UECC website for departments to voluntarily submit self studies

• Forum to discuss what happened at your visit

• Meetings like this one
Good Things At ABET

• New Executive Director (Michael Milligan)

• New Director of Accreditation (Robert Fredell - former chief scientist at AF Academy)

• Dialog has begun to address needs of excellent programs where the minimal outcomes are largely irrelevant.
More Reasonable Interpretation of Criteria

• Direct measures are no longer required (but they still can help you)
• No longer need to make program improvements based on outcomes assessment - any assessment results are fine

More Reasonable Interpretation of Criteria
• Concept of holistic evaluation is now a part of the visitor pre training

More Reasonable Interpretation of Criteria
Criterion 2 Problem in 09-10

• Several instances in which programs were being required to show how results of C2 or C3 assessment and evaluation processes were being used to improve the program.

• This reflects application of old criteria.

• That's not in C2 or C3 any more. C4 refers to results of C2 and C3 processes as possible sources of information upon which continuous improvement could be based.
Criterion 2 FAQ’s

• What if the PEO’s really sound like outcomes (instead of objectives?)
  – If PEO’s are not PEO’s, there is a C2 shortcoming.

• What if PEO’s are ambiguous or reflect outcomes retooled to apply after graduation?
  – Team judgment – do they meet the intent of the Criterion?

• Is an assessment process for PEO’s that considers predominately data based on accomplishments of current undergraduates adequate?
  – Probably not
What Does Criterion 3 Say?

- The program must demonstrate that (a) – (k) are attained.
- Program outcomes are defined as (a) – (k) plus any additional ones articulated by the program.
- Program outcomes must foster attainment of the PEO’s.
- There must be an assessment and evaluation process that periodically documents and demonstrates the degree to which outcomes are attained.
Important – for Criterion 3

• The definition of program outcomes as being (a) – (k) plus locally articulated ones
  – The program may not have its outcomes expressed as (a) – (k) plus others. It may have just identified a set of outcomes. As long as the program has demonstrated attainment of (a) – (k) and its own outcomes, this element of the criterion is met.

• Requirement for assessment and evaluation is the same, but there is no language in Criterion 3 that results of the assessment process be applied to further development of the program. (Program improvement is now in Criterion 4.)
Criterion 3 Consistency Issues

• Be sure to apply this criterion in a holistic sense
• The process of assessment and evaluation needs to demonstrate the degree to which outcomes are attained, but …
  – There is no language that says all outcomes must be attained to the same degree
  – There is no language that says anything about a numeric scale measuring degree of attainment
  – There is no language that says the outcomes must be measured
  – There is nothing in Criterion 3 that says anything about use of the assessment and evaluation information for program improvement
Criterion 3 FAQ’s

• What about assessment data? What is adequate data?
  – Does it all have to be objective/direct? (NO)
  – Can it be subjective? (Some of it may be; nothing says it has to be)
  – Is the observation or conclusion of course instructor adequate? (What was his or her basis for the observation?)
  – Does evidence for each outcome have to be in the form of work the student has produced? (No, but the team needs to be convinced that outcome attainment has been demonstrated.)
What Does Criterion 4 Say?

• “Each program must show evidence of actions to improve the program. These actions should be based on available information, such as results from Criterion 2 and Criterion 3 processes.”

• The improvements can be based on any available information!