

## E351 PROGRAM EVALUATOR REPORT FOR 2018-2019 VISITS

### Instructions

*The Program Evaluator Report is **required** for each program being evaluated. It is completed by the Program Evaluator prior to and during the visit and left with the Team Chair. **Some technical societies require their evaluators to submit additional information. It is the responsibility of the evaluator to determine and meet this requirement.***

*A complete Program Evaluator Package consists of the following:*

- *Program Audit Form (E301)*
- *Program Evaluator Worksheet (E341)*
- *This Program Evaluator Report Form (E351), which includes*
  - *Basic Information Sheet*
  - *Curriculum Analysis*
  - *Transcript Analysis*
  - *Recommended Accreditation Action*
  - *Exit Statement*

*For a General Review Visit, complete all forms listed above and submit them to the Team Chair at the conclusion of the visit.*

*For an Interim Visit, the curriculum analysis and/or the transcript analysis may not be relevant. Complete those tables only if they are relevant to the identified shortcomings.*

*Complete the Curriculum Analysis Form and the Transcript Analysis Form (both a part of this E351 Program Evaluator Form) and the first column of the E341 Program Evaluator Worksheet before the visit. Submit a copy to the Team Chair before the visit or at the first team meeting as directed. Modify the forms during the visit as required.*

*The **Program Evaluator Worksheet (E341)**, the appropriate **Program Audit Form (E301/302/303/311)**, the **Recommended Accreditation Action (in E351)**, and the **Exit Statement to the Institution (in E351)** are of particular importance. Together, these form a basis from which the Team Chair will draft the Statement to the Institution. Only a copy of the **Program Audit Form** is to be left with the institution. Please, pay close attention to the instructions on these forms.*

ABET  
Engineering Accreditation Commission

**PROGRAM EVALUATOR REPORT FOR 2018-2019 VISITS**  
**BASIC INFORMATION SHEET**  
*(RFE: Request for Evaluation Form)*

Evaluation of B.S. Program in Construction Engineering  
*RFE* *Program Title as shown on the RFE*  
*Degree*  
*Designation*

At Sample University  
*Official name of institution as shown on the RFE*

Dates of Visit: October 20-23, 2019

Evaluated by: Mary Smith  
*Name*

1111 ASCE Drive, Washington, DC 00000  
*Address*

(123) 456-7890      (123) 456-7890  
*Office Phone*      *Home Phone*

MSmith@abc.com  
*e-mail*

Society Represented by Program Evaluator: American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE)  
*Society*

Evaluation conducted in accordance with EAC General Criteria and the following applicable Program Criteria:

Construction and Similarly Named Engineering Programs (2018-2019)  
*Program Criteria*

LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

NAME	POSITION
Shelly New/Dr. Bill Old/Melvin Medium Cormicle /Sara Middle	Senior Lecturers
Dr. Abe Lincoln	CE Professor
Dr. George Washington	Program Chair
Dr. Tom Jefferson	CNE Professor-in-Charge
Dr. Adams	Assistant Professor
Dr. Franklin	Associate Professor
Kelly Superstar/Brad Average	Students (Sophomore/Junior)
CNE 3ZZ class (Concrete, Timber and Steel Construction)	Senior CNE students
Bill Bigbucks/Mary Local/Austin Meyn	Advisory Committee

ABET  
Engineering Accreditation Commission

**CURRICULUM ANALYSIS for BACHELOR'S LEVEL PROGRAM  
(Not applicable to Master's Level Program)**

Institution Sample University Program Construction Engineering

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS WORKSHEET PRIOR TO YOUR ARRIVAL AT THE INSTITUTION AND PROVIDE ONE COPY OF THE CURRICULUM ANALYSIS TO YOUR TEAM CHAIR BEFORE OR AT THE START OF THE VISIT AS DIRECTED. INCLUDE A COPY IN YOUR REPORT, REVISED AS NECESSARY TO REFLECT YOUR ANALYSIS OF ACTUAL COURSE CONTENT DURING THE VISIT.

Curricular Category	Number of Credits*			
	Criteria Requirement	Table 5-1 of Self-Study		PEV's Evaluation
College-level Mathematics and Basic Sciences	31.5*/32*	32-35**		31.5-34.5**
Engineering Topics	47.25/47.625	63-66**		63.5-66.5**
General Education	n/a	28		28
Please List Below Any Applicable Program Criteria:				
	Is Program Criteria Requirement Met? (per Table 5-1 of Self-Study)		Is Program Criteria Requirement Met? (per PEV evaluation)	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
<i>Math to Diff Q/Calc + Sciences/Physics</i>	✓		✓	
Analyze Design in a Specialty Field	✓		✓	
Apply methods, materials, concepts, analyses, etc.	✓		✓	
Management Topics	✓		✓	

\* One year is the lesser of 32 semester hours (or equivalent) or one-fourth of the total credits required for graduation.

\*\* Quarter credit range reflects differences between emphasis options; a comprehensive review of the curriculum was required to get to this level – see evaluation for details and related “concern”

Are curricular requirements met in each of the following areas?	YES	NO
Major design experience based on knowledge and skills acquired in earlier course work.	✓	
Major design experience incorporates appropriate engineering standards and multiple realistic constraints.	✓	
Other requirements contained in applicable program criteria	✓	

If “no” is checked in any of the above categories, please describe the specific weakness or deficiency on the PEV Worksheet (E341) and Program Audit Form (E301) as appropriate.

ABET  
Engineering Accreditation Commission

**TRANSCRIPT ANALYSIS for BACHELOR'S LEVEL PROGRAM**

Institution  [as shown on the RFE]  Program  [as shown on the RFE]

PLEASE COMPLETE TWO DRAFT COPIES OF THIS WORKSHEET PRIOR TO YOUR ARRIVAL AT THE INSTITUTION AND PROVIDE ONE COPY TO YOUR TEAM CHAIR AT THE START OF THE VISIT. PLEASE INCLUDE A COPY IN YOUR REPORT, REVISED IF NECESSARY TO REFLECT YOUR ANALYSIS OF ACTUAL COURSE CONTENT.

ABET Curricular Category	ABET Criteria Requirement	Number of Credits*									
		Credits Actually Earned by Student Number									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
College-level Mathematics and Basic Sciences	31.5*/32*	32.25	32.25	34.25	35.25	34.25	35.25				
Engineering Topics	47.25/47.625	66.75	65.75	66.75	48.75	64.75	64.75				
General Education	n/a	51	42	38	73	46	36				
Please List Below Any Applicable Program Criteria:		Is Program Criteria Requirement Met? YES or NO									
<i>Math to Diff Q/Calc + Physics</i>		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Analyze Design in a Specialty Field		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Apply methods, materials, concepts analyses		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Management Topics		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				

\* Computed as in curriculum analysis table.

ABET  
Engineering Accreditation Commission

**TRANSCRIPT ANALYSIS for MASTER'S LEVEL PROGRAM**

Institution  [as shown on the RFE]  Program  [as shown on the RFE]

PLEASE COMPLETE TWO DRAFT COPIES OF THIS WORKSHEET PRIOR TO YOUR ARRIVAL AT THE INSTITUTION AND PROVIDE ONE COPY TO YOUR TEAM CHAIR AT THE START OF THE VISIT. PLEASE INCLUDE A COPY IN YOUR REPORT, REVISED IF NECESSARY TO REFLECT YOUR ANALYSIS OF ACTUAL COURSE CONTENT.

ABET Curricular Category	Number of Credits*										
	ABET Criteria Requirement	Credits Actually Earned by Student Number									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
College-level Mathematics and Basic Sciences*	one year*										
Engineering Topics*	one-and-one-half years*										
30 semester hours or equivalent beyond baccalaureate program											
<b>Other Criteria:</b>	<b>Is Criteria Requirement Met? YES or NO</b>										
Curricular components of the baccalaureate level program criteria relevant to the master's level program name											
Mastery of a specific field of study or area of professional practice consistent with the master's program name and at a level beyond the minimum requirements of baccalaureate level programs											

\*If the student has graduated from an EAC of ABET accredited baccalaureate program, the presumption is that these items have been satisfied.

## RECOMMENDED ACCREDITATION ACTION FORM

**Institution** Sample University      **Program** Construction Engineering

**Evaluator** Mary Smith

- NGR      This action indicates that the program has no Deficiencies or Weaknesses. This action is taken only after a Comprehensive General Review and has a typical duration of six years.
- RE      This action indicates that satisfactory remedial action has been taken by the institution with respect to Weaknesses identified in the prior IR action. This action is taken only after an IR review. This action extends accreditation to the next General Review and has a typical duration of either two or four years.
- VE      This action indicates that satisfactory remedial action has been taken by the institution with respect to Weaknesses identified in the prior IV action. This action is taken only after an IV review. This action extends accreditation to the next General Review and has a typical duration of either two or four years.
- SE      This action indicates that satisfactory remedial action has been taken by the institution with respect to all Deficiencies and Weaknesses identified in the prior SC action. This action is taken only after either a SCR or SCV review. This action typically extends accreditation to the next General Review and has a typical duration of either two or four years.
- IR      This action indicates that the program has no Deficiencies but has one or more Weaknesses. The Weaknesses are such that a progress report will be required to evaluate the remedial actions taken by the institution. This action has a typical duration of two years.
- IV      This action indicates that the program has no Deficiencies but has one or more Weaknesses. The Weaknesses are such that an on-site review will be required to evaluate the remedial actions taken by the institution. This action has a typical duration of two years.
- SCR      This action indicates that a currently accredited program has one or more Deficiencies. The Deficiencies are such that a progress report will be required to evaluate the remedial actions taken by the institution. This action has a typical duration of two years. This action cannot follow a previous SC action for the same Deficiency(s).
- SCV      This action indicates that a currently accredited program has one or more Deficiencies. The Deficiencies are such that an on-site review will be required to evaluate the remedial actions taken by the institution. This action has a typical duration of two years. This action cannot follow a previous SC action for the same Deficiency(s).
- NA      This action indicates that the program has Deficiencies such that the program is not in compliance with the applicable criteria. This action is usually taken only after a SCR or SCV review, or the review of a previously unaccredited program. Accreditation is not extended as a result of this action.

If this is a **new program**, indicate the date at which accreditation is to begin. Normally accreditation is retroactive for one year such that it applies to all students who graduated after October 1 of the year preceding the on-site review (see the “retroactive year” column in the Program Information section of the Request for Evaluation Form and section I.E.6 of the Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual).      **Initial Accreditation Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

## EXIT STATEMENT TO THE INSTITUTION

### INSTRUCTIONS (NOT to be read at exit meeting)

The sample exit statement that follows should be used as a template for the overall outline and formatting for a general review of baccalaureate level program, but the wording should represent the Program Evaluator's findings for the current visit relative to the applicable General Criteria, Program Criteria, and Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (APPM). For an interim review, please follow the outline and format found in E411- Sample IV Statement. For a master's level general review, please follow the outline and format found in E451 – Sample Masters Level Statement, based on the Master's Level Criteria.

The general outline for all statements is: 1) General Description of the Program, 2) Strengths (if applicable), 3) Shortcomings and 4) Observations.

1) **General Description of the Program** This normally includes information about the program's administrative location at the institution, its enrollment and faculty size, and number of recent graduates. For new programs, the General Description also includes information on the launch date of the program and the date of its initial graduates.

2) **Strengths** (if applicable) Each program strength should have three components: a) the observed facts that represent the strength, b) what makes it stand out above the norm, and c) what positive effect it has on the program.

3) **Shortcomings** These sections should be in order of 1) Deficiencies, 2) Weaknesses and 3) Concerns, and a section should exist only if one or more Criteria or APPM elements have that type of shortcoming. For a GR, include all shortcomings for one Criterion under the most stringent shortcoming. For example, if a program has a Weakness and a Concern in Criterion 3, then include the descriptions for both the Weakness and the Concern in the Weaknesses section, identified as Criterion 3. APPM elements that have different types of shortcomings should be cited separately in the appropriate shortcoming category. In describing specific deficiencies, weaknesses, or concerns, use the exact language from the criteria where possible. For an IV, the shortcomings should be listed at the level from the previous review (with any new shortcomings inserted into the appropriate section).

Please ensure that any shortcoming relates directly to the Criteria or APPM. Each shortcoming should have three components: a) the applicable part of the criterion, using the exact language from the Criteria or APPM where possible, b) the observed facts that are inconsistent or potentially inconsistent with the stated criterion or APPM element, and c) the negative impact on the program of the inconsistencies or potential inconsistencies. It is essential that all deficiencies and/or weaknesses identified on the Program Audit Form, which could lead to an action different than NGR, be discussed in this statement exactly as they are discussed in the Program Audit Form.

While there are no institutional shortcomings, to save time during the Exit Meeting, the Team Chair may read the citations for any of shortcomings common to all of the programs that were evaluated, first explaining that they were common to all programs. However, the shortcoming(s) will be cited in each program section in the Draft and Final Statements as applicable.

4) **Observations** **Observations** do not relate to findings relative to the Criteria or APPM. They may include suggestions based on the Program Evaluator's experience, and are provided in the interest of general program improvement. They must not appear prescriptive, and have no consequence relative to accreditation if ignored by the institution.

## PROGRAM EXIT STATEMENT

(TO BE READ AT EXIT MEETING – DO NOT LEAVE A COPY WITH THE INSTITUTION)

*Note: The header (first three lines with text) should be included in the copy given to the TC, but should not be read during the exit statement; i.e., start reading with the introduction paragraph*

### **Construction Engineering**

BS Program

Program Criteria for Construction Engineering and Similarly Named Engineering Programs

#### Introduction

The construction engineering BS program is offered by the Department of Civil, Construction, and Environmental Engineering. The program currently enrolls 279 full-time and 26 part-time students and is administered by five full-time tenured/tenure track faculty, eight term faculty (three full-time and five part-time), and four staff. The program awarded 74 bachelor's degrees in the 2017- 18 academic year.

#### Program Concerns

1. Criterion 2: Program Educational Objectives This criterion requires that there must be a documented, systematically utilized, and effective process, involving program constituencies, for the periodic review of these program educational objectives. The program identifies its constituencies as employers, alumni, students, and faculty. The program identifies an existing advisory committee, comprised of the constituencies, which reviews the program educational objectives. However, the program does not have a documented process that assures that these constituencies are represented on the advisory committee. Therefore, a potential exists that this criterion may not be satisfied in the future.
2. Criterion 5: Curriculum This criterion requires that the professional component include one-year of a combination of college level mathematics and basic sciences. The curriculum and required number of credits vary based on the selected area of emphasis within the program. The Heavy emphasis area requires only 32 math and science credits. The program has relied upon parsing a 400-level engineering course (ConE 422: Construction Cost Estimating and Cost Engineering) to provide the minimum number of math and science credits for the



heavy emphasis area. Upon review the topics are primarily engineering rather than math and science. The current curriculum does include at least three other courses that collectively ensure the math and science requirement for the Heavy emphasis area is met. However, if the content of these other courses changes to remove math and science coverage, the potential exists that the criterion may not be satisfied for students currently enrolled in the program.

#### Program Observations

1. The program would benefit in terms of continuity and potentially increased research integration from having more than one professor on staff.
2. As class size demands increase and changes in teaching methods drive more agile classroom configurations, aspects of the program (including course specific needs) would benefit by a critical evaluation of the current space and its limitations.