

CONFIDENTIAL EAC PROGRAM EVALUATOR REVIEW

American Society of Civil Engineers - Committee on Accreditation Operations

EVALUATOR:						<input type="checkbox"/>	Senior PEV				
INSTITUTION:											
PROGRAM:											
LEVEL:	<input type="checkbox"/> Baccalaureate			<input type="checkbox"/> Masters							
VISIT TYPE:	<input type="checkbox"/> General				<input type="checkbox"/> Interim						
QUALITY OF DISCUSSION ON PEV WORKSHEET		Inadequate 1		Marginal 2		Adequate 3		Good 4		Excellent 5	
Students											
Program Educational Objectives											
Student Outcomes											
Continuous Improvement											
Curriculum											
Faculty											
Facilities											
Institutional Support											
ASCE Program Criteria											
APPM											
PROPOSED STATEMENT TO THE INSTITUTION		Inadequate 1		Marginal 2		Good 3		Not Submitted			
ARE THESE FORMS COMPLETED SATISFACTORILY?											
		Yes No Not Submitted						Yes No Not Submitted			
PEV Report Form (E 351)					PEV Worksheet (E 341)						
Curriculum Analysis					Program Audit Form (E 301)						
Transcript Analyses											
CLARITY OF WRITING:		Good		Adequate		Minor Improvements Needed		Considerable Improvements Needed			
RECOMMENDED ACCREDITATION ACTION:		NGR	IR	RE	IV	VE	SC	SC-E	NA		
Is the above recommendation:											
<input type="checkbox"/>		Consistent with the report?									
<input type="checkbox"/>		Somewhat inconsistent with evidence presented?									
<input type="checkbox"/>		Inconsistent with evidence presented in the report?									
If the recommendation was for less than full term accreditation, did the statement to the institution clearly state what must be corrected?								Yes		No	
<i>see next page for additional comments</i>											

Additional comments on the quality of this report and/or program visited:

Thank you for your service to ASCE and to civil engineering education.

ASCE Program Evaluator Performance Evaluation Rubric

Review of PEV Worksheet (form 341)

	Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate	Good	Excellent
Quality of Discussion on PEV Worksheet	No comments in any worksheet comment boxes	Minimal comments (e.g. N/A, yes, no) in some of the comment boxes	Detailed comments provided for only topics identified as potential shortcomings	Detailed comments in all boxes relevant to all the criteria provided	All comment boxes filled with references to the SSR, criterion and tracking of status

Overall assessment of PEV worksheet: Inadequate Marginal Good

*To indicate E 341 is satisfactorily completed, the PEV must have received a rating of good or excellent on all elements listed under the section titled **Quality of Discussion on PEV Worksheet**

Review of Exit statement

	Inadequate	Marginal	Good
Format of the proposed statement to the institution	Lacking three-part construct	Contains three-part construct but statement lacks clarity and completeness	Uses three-part construct effectively with clear and complete explanation of the shortcoming
Consistency between statement and worksheet	Statement and worksheet content inconsistent	Statement minimally consistent with criterion and/or worksheet	Statement consistent with the worksheet
Quality of the proposed statement	Shortcoming statement not consistent with the criterion or level of findings; strengths are not strengths	Shortcoming statement not consistent with the level of findings; connection to evidence weak; implications to the program are not fully formed	Statement and evidence clearly support shortcoming level and provides a clear implication to the program

Overall assessment of exit statement: Inadequate Marginal Good