



415 North Charles Street Baltimore, MD 21201  
+1.410.347.7700 www.abet.org

August 31, 2016

Daniel J. Bradley  
President  
Indiana State University  
Office of the President  
Terre Haute, IN 47809

Dear Dr. Bradley :

I am pleased to transmit to you the findings of the Applied Science Accreditation Commission (ASAC) of ABET with respect to the evaluation conducted for Indiana State University during 2015-2016. Each of ABET's Commissions is fully authorized to take the actions described in the accompanying letter under the policies of the ABET Board of Directors.

We are pleased that your institution has elected to participate in this accreditation process. This process, which is conducted by approximately 2,000 ABET volunteers from the professional community, is designed to advance and assure the quality of professional education. We look forward to our continuing shared efforts toward this common goal.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Jones  
President

Enclosure: Commission letter and attachments



415 North Charles Street Baltimore, MD 21201  
+1.410.347.7700 [www.abet.org](http://www.abet.org)

August 31, 2016

Robert English  
Associate Dean  
Indiana State University  
College of Technology  
101 North Sixth Street  
Terre Haute, IN 47809

Dear Dr. English :

The Applied Science Accreditation Commission (ASAC) of ABET recently held its 2016 Summer Meeting to act on the program evaluations conducted during 2015-2016. Each evaluation was summarized in a report to the Commission and was considered by the full Commission before a vote was taken on the accreditation action. The results of the evaluation for Indiana State University are included in the enclosed Summary of Accreditation Actions. The Final Statement to your institution that discusses the findings on which each action was based is also enclosed.

The policy of ABET is to grant accreditation for a limited number of years, not to exceed six, in all cases. The period of accreditation is not an indication of program quality. Any restriction of the period of accreditation is based upon conditions indicating that compliance with the applicable accreditation criteria must be strengthened. Continuation of accreditation beyond the time specified requires a reevaluation of the program at the request of the institution as noted in the accreditation action. ABET policy prohibits public disclosure of the period for which a program is accredited. For further guidance concerning the public release of accreditation information, please refer to Section II.A. of the 2015-2016 Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (available at [www.abet.org](http://www.abet.org)).

A list of accredited programs is published annually by ABET. Information about ABET accredited programs at your institution will be listed in the forthcoming ABET Accreditation Yearbook and on the ABET web site ([www.abet.org](http://www.abet.org)).

It is the obligation of the officer responsible for ABET accredited programs at your institution to notify ABET of any significant changes in program title, personnel, curriculum, or other factors which could affect the accreditation status of a program during the period of accreditation stated in Section II.H. of the 2015-2016 Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (available at [www.abet.org](http://www.abet.org)).

ABET requires that each accredited program publicly state the program's educational objectives and student outcomes as well as publicly post annual student enrollment and graduation data as stated in Section II.A.6. of the Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (available at [www.abet.org](http://www.abet.org)).

ABET will examine all newly accredited programs' websites within the next two weeks to ensure compliance.

Please note that appeals are allowed only in the case of Not to Accredit actions. Also, such appeals may be based only on the conditions stated in Section II.L. of the 2015-2016 Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (available at [www.abet.org](http://www.abet.org)).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Neil Hutzler", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Neil Hutzler, Chair

Applied Science Accreditation Commission

Enclosure: Summary of Accreditation Action  
Final Statement

cc: Daniel J. Bradley, President  
Andrew Payne,  
Robert D. Soule, Visit Team Chair



8/31/2016

Applied Science Accreditation Commission

Summary of Accreditation Actions  
for the  
2015-2016 Accreditation Cycle

Indiana State University  
Terre Haute, IN

Safety Management (B.S.)

Accredit to September 30, 2018. A request to ABET by January 31, 2017 will be required to initiate a reaccreditation report evaluation. A report describing the actions taken to correct shortcomings identified in the attached final statement must be submitted to ABET by July 01, 2017. The reaccreditation evaluation will focus on these shortcomings. Please note that a visit is not required.

This is a newly accredited program. Please note that this accreditation action extends retroactively from October 01, 2014.



**ABET**

Applied Science Accreditation Commission

Final Statement of Accreditation  
to

**INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY**

Terre Haute, Indiana

2015-2016 Accreditation Cycle

ABET  
APPLIED SCIENCE ACCREDITATION COMMISSION

**INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY**  
Terre Haute, Indiana

FINAL STATEMENT  
Evaluation under the Applied Science Criteria  
and Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual 2015-2016  
Visit Dates: October 4 – 6, 2015

Introduction

The Applied Science Accreditation Commission (ASAC) of ABET has evaluated the Safety Management program at Indiana State University. The statement that follows consists of two parts: the first pertains to the overall institution and its applied science operations; the second addresses the safety management program. This final statement reflects any information provided by Indiana State University in its 7-day and due process responses.

ABET's accreditation action will be based upon the findings summarized in this statement. Actions will be dependent on the program's range of compliance or non-compliance with the ASAC/ABET criteria, including the general criteria, any applicable program criteria and provisions of the ABET Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual. This range can be construed from the following wording:

- **Deficiency:** A deficiency indicates that a criterion, policy or procedure is not satisfied. Therefore, the program is not in compliance with the cited criterion, policy or procedure, and immediate action is required.
- **Weakness:** A weakness indicates that the 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 cited criterion, policy or procedure prior to the next evaluation.

- **Concern:** A concern indicates that, while a criterion, policy or procedure is currently satisfied, the potential exists for this situation to change in the near future, such that the cited criterion, policy or procedure may no longer be satisfied. Therefore, positive action is required to ensure continued full compliance with the criteria.
- **Observation:** An observation is a comment or suggestion that does not relate directly to criteria, policies and procedures being used for evaluation but is offered to assist the institution in its continuing efforts to improve its programs.

What is now Indiana State University was established in 1865 as the Indiana State Normal School, with a core mission of preparing elementary and high school teachers. Following a succession of name changes, in recognition of expanding scopes of coverage, the institution was renamed Indiana State University (ISU) in 1965. ISU is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. ISU is recognized nationally for its substantial commitment to its academic approach to mutually beneficial and respectful community collaboration and its extensive outreach efforts and partnerships.

Indiana State University offers more than 100 major areas of study, notably in aviation, education, business, criminology, finance, insurance and risk management, music, nursing, athletic training, physical & occupational therapy, and construction technology. All offerings are designed to develop the abilities of students, including creative, quantitative, communication and critical thinking skills. The student demographic is diverse with approximately one in five students belonging to a minority. One of the fastest growing segments is the international student, currently approximately four percent of the student body.

**PROGRAM EVALUATION****SAFETY MANAGEMENT****Bachelor of Science Degree****Evaluation under ASAC Program Criteria for  
Safety and Similarly Named Applied Science Programs****Introduction**

The evaluation described in this report was conducted under the criteria established for all Applied Science programs and the Program Criteria for Safety and Similarly Named Programs, as published in the current ASAC criteria document. Provisions contained in the currently-applicable ABET Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual were also used in evaluation of this program. The definitions of shortcomings described earlier apply here, as well.

The Safety Management program at Indiana State University was initially approved in 1966. In the early 1970s, the program was revised extensively in efforts to satisfy the guidelines for preparation of safety professionals that were published by a joint action of the American Society of Safety Engineers (ASSE) and the Board of Certified Safety Professionals (BCSP). At that time, the program was housed in the Department of Health and Safety in the School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation. In 1988, the program was accredited by the ASSE, a designation that continued until 1997 at which time it was allowed to lapse. The name of the program was changed to Health, Safety and Environmental Health Sciences and the College was named Health and Human Performance. In 2004, the program was accredited by the National Association of Industrial Technology (NAIT) and in 2010 was reaccredited by NAIT, which had been restructured as the Association of Technology Management and Applied Engineering (ATMAE). In 2010, the program was moved into the Department of Built Environment in the College of Technology. Although the program maintains its ATMAE accreditation, it has requested evaluation for accreditation by the Applied Science Accreditation Commission of ABET.

The mission of the College of Technology is to provide exemplary undergraduate and graduate programs, to generate solutions and knowledge through research, and to serve the technology needs of the State, the nation, and the international community. The Safety Management program has prepared educational objectives and student outcomes that are consistent with the mission of

the College and has structured its curriculum and associated coursework to support that mission. The curriculum consists of a total of 120 credits: 18 credits in mathematics/statistics and lab science, 6 credits in management, 45 credits in foundation studies (the university requirement), 42 credits in safety management major courses, and 9 credits of elective courses. An active Industrial Advisory Board has been maintained to provide on-going input to the program so as to reflect the needs of its constituencies.

A total of 13 faculty (12.2 FTE) comprise the Department of Built Environment. Of these, the Safety Management program has three tenured faculty members (one professor and two associate professors), two 3-year instructors, and one recurring adjunct faculty position. An undergraduate coordinator for the program has been designated and assumed this responsibility in the Fall 2015. The program believes this level of staffing is sufficient to accommodate the current level of teaching, student-faculty interaction, service activities, professional development and communication with industrial partners.

Over the past five years, enrollment in the safety management program has risen steadily from 72 in 2010 to 113 in 2014. Over that period, approximately 20 students have graduated each year. Of significance, the makeup of the student population has changed over that period with approximately half of the students currently being international, including Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Qatar and South Korea.

#### Program Strengths

1. The program faculty is very well qualified and possess impressive backgrounds, both academic and real-world. Core faculty members have significant experience in teaching at the university level and continue to be very active within their profession, many receiving national recognition of their efforts.
2. The Industrial Advisory Board, composed of safety and health professionals from within a wide geographical area, includes representatives from oil and chemical companies, construction firms, power utilities, insurance companies and other employers. These individuals collectively provide an extremely valuable resource and their active contribution to continuing improvement of the program was acknowledged by all constituencies.

Program Deficiencies

No deficiencies are cited for this program.

Program Weaknesses

1. Criterion 2, Program Educational Objectives. This criterion requires that the program must have a “documented, systematically utilized, and effective process, involving program constituencies, for the periodic review of these program educational objectives that ensures they remain consistent with the institutional mission, the program’s constituents’ needs, and these criteria.” Discussions with program personnel and members of the Industrial Advisory Board revealed that not all constituencies have had an opportunity to provide input to the development of program educational objectives nor are they participants in the review of these program educational objectives. Until there is evidence that all constituencies are involved in the periodic review, there can be no assurance that the process is effective.

- 7-Day Response: None
- Due Process Response: The institution submitted a detailed discussion of their designation of all program constituencies including faculty, advisory board members, alumni, industry partners, potential employers, field experts and the Saudi Arabian Cultural Mission/ISU Global Engagement. Meetings among all constituencies are planned for January and March, 2016, with finalization of efforts by May, 2016.
- Status after Due Process: This weakness remains until evidence is submitted that documents the successful completion of these plans.
- Post 30-Day Due-Process Response: The program presented a detailed documentation of efforts associated with establishing additional, varied constituencies, now including faculty, advisory board, alumni, industry partners, potential employers, field experts and the Saudi Arabian Cultural Mission/ISU Global Engagement. Interactions with these constituents began shortly after the site visit and continued throughout the spring semester with formal documentation of the collective efforts in May, 2016. A complete list of

constituents was provided. The PEO review process, involving all constituencies, reportedly will be utilized each spring.

- Status after Post 30-Day Due-Process: This weakness has been resolved.
2. Criterion 3, Student Outcomes. This criterion requires that the program have “a documented and effective process for the periodic review and revision of student outcomes.” Review of program materials and interviews with program administrators and faculty indicated that, although a process was defined and in place, one full assessment cycle has not been completed. In addition, some constituencies, notably faculty, were not fully aware of the process and, as a result, not participating appropriately in the review and revision of student outcomes. Therefore, until all participants in the process are fully aware of, and actively engaged in, the process, it cannot be considered to be effective.
- 7-Day Response: None
  - Due Process Response: In the due process response, the institution reiterated its plans to complete the full cycle of assessment during Spring semester, 2016. Assessment reports have been a responsibility of faculty in the past, although their purpose in an overall assessment plan was not clear at the time of the site visit. These have become a more visible component of the periodic review process.
  - Status after Due Response: This weakness remains until documentation of completion of the assessment cycle is submitted.
  - Post 30 Day Due-Process Response: Documentation provided by the program showed that the department had completed the first full cycle of its outcomes assessment by the end of spring 2016 semester. Additionally, the program described more definitive assessment requirements for faculty, presented an assessment rubric and outlined a three-year assessment cycle, working collaboratively with the university’s assessment coordinator.
  - Status after Post 30 Day Due-Process Response: This weakness is resolved.

3. Criterion 4, Continuous Improvement. This criterion requires the program to “regularly use appropriate, documented processes for assessing and evaluating the extent to which the student outcomes are being attained. The results of these evaluations must be systematically utilized as input for the continuous improvement of the program.” Because of the weakness associated with the review and revision of student outcomes, previously discussed, there is insufficient input regarding the extent to which student outcomes are being achieved and completion of continuous improvement actions is not possible.

- 7-Day Response: None
- Due Process Response: The institution stated that completion of the assessment cycle will take place during Spring semester, 2016, and with that the results will be used to implement any necessary program modifications suggested by the assessment outcomes.
- Status after Due Process: This weakness remains until completion of the assessment cycle and implementation of any necessary program changes are documented.
- Post 30 Day Due-Process Response: The program provided evidence that the full assessment cycle had been completed during spring semester 2016. Plans were underway to implement program changes warranted by the assessment outcomes and a commitment was made to repeat the overall assessment process on a three-year cycle.
- Status after Post 30 Day Due-Process: This weakness remains until documentation is provided that the program changes necessitated by the assessment outcomes have been implemented.