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 Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission (ETAC) 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 G. Jones

Lawrence Jones
President

Enclosure: Commission letter and attachments

415 North Charles Street Baltimore, MD 21201
+1.410.347.7700 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 Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission (ETAC) 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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

Sincerely,

Wilson Gautreaux

Wilson T. Gautreaux, Chair

Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission

Enclosure: Summary of Accreditation Action
Final Statement

cc: Daniel J. Bradley, President

Thomas Bartlett Quimby, Visit Team Chair

Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission

Summary of Accreditation Actions
for the
2015-2016 Accreditation Cycle

Indiana State University
Terre Haute, IN

Automotive Engineering Technology (B.S.)

Accredit to September 30, 2022. A request to ABET by January 31, 2021 will be required to initiate a reaccreditation evaluation visit. In preparation for the visit, a Self-Study Report must be submitted to ABET by July 01, 2021. The reaccreditation evaluation will be a comprehensive general review.

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

Packaging Engineering Technology (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.

Computer Engineering Technology (B.S.)

Mechanical Engineering Technology(Main Campus) (BS)

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.

Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission

Final Statement of Accreditation
to

Indiana State University

Terre Haute, IN

2015-2016 Accreditation Cycle

ABET

ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY ACCREDITATION COMMISSION

FINAL GENERAL REVIEW STATEMENT

on

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Terre Haute, Indiana

Dates of Visit:

October 4-6, 2015

The statement that follows consists of two parts: the first addresses the overall institution and its engineering technology operation, and the second addresses the individual engineering technology programs. Accreditation actions taken by ETAC of ABET will be based upon the findings summarized in this statement and will depend on the range of compliance or non-compliance with ABET criteria, policies, and procedures. The range can be construed from the following definitions for findings:

Strength: A program Strength is an exceptionally strong and effective practice or condition that stands above the norm and that has a positive effect on the program.

Deficiency: A Deficiency indicates that a criterion, policy, or procedure is not satisfied. Therefore, the program is not in compliance with the criterion, policy, or procedure.

Weakness: A Weakness indicates that a 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 criterion, policy, or procedure prior to the next evaluation.

Concern: A Concern indicates that a program currently satisfies a criterion, policy, or procedure; however, the potential exists for the situation to change such that the criterion, policy, or procedure may not be satisfied.

Observation: An Observation is a comment or suggestion which does not relate directly to the accreditation action but is offered to assist the institution in its continuing efforts to improve its programs.

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Terre Haute, Indiana

INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS AFFECTING

THE ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY UNIT

Introduction

The Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission (ETAC) of ABET has evaluated the following programs:

- Bachelor of Science in Automotive Engineering Technology;
- Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering Technology;
- Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering Technology; and
- Bachelor of Science in Packaging Engineering Technology.

of Indiana State University. The programs were evaluated using the 2015-16 *Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Technology Programs* and the 2015-16 *Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual.*

Indiana State University is a public institution located in Terre Haute, Indiana. The university serves approximately 13,600 students with a variety of undergraduate and graduate programs of study up through the doctorate. The institution is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission. The automotive, packaging, and mechanical engineering technology programs are housed in the Department of Applied Engineering and Technology Management in the College of Technology. The computer engineering technology program is housed in the Department of Electronics and Computer Engineering Technology in the College of Technology. The automotive

engineering technology and packaging engineering technology programs have been submitted for initial accreditation. The computer and mechanical engineering technology programs have been submitted for reaccreditation evaluation.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

AUTOMOTIVE ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Baccalaureate Degree

Introduction

The automotive engineering technology program prepares graduates for careers in product research, design and development, manufacturing, and technical sales in the original equipment and aftermarket industries. Graduates from the program are employed by original-equipment manufacturers such as Toyota, General Motors, Honda, Caterpillar, Cummins, Allison Transmission; aftermarket companies such as Jasper Engines and Competition Cams; service-oriented companies such as automotive dealerships and service facilities, GMAC Insurance, State Farm Insurance and Ally Auto; and retail companies such as O'Reilly Auto Parts, AutoZone, Advance, and NAPA. The program educational objectives are that graduates two to three years into their career should have the foundation to:

- Apply disciplinary reasoning, critical thinking, and hands-on skills to identify, analyze and solve problems;
- Communicate effectively in both oral and written form to articulate technical knowledge, ideas, and proposals;
- Consider professional, ethical and social responsibility of engineering technology practices;
- Perform effectively, think independently and work collaboratively in a team environment in a membership or leadership role; and
- Actively participate in professional development, including continuous self-improvement and lifelong learning.

The Program Criteria for Automotive Engineering Technology and Similarly Named Programs as published in the 2015-16 *Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Technology Programs* also were used to evaluate this program. Findings related to ABET criteria or policies and procedures are described below.

Program Weaknesses

1. Criteria: Criterion 2. Program Educational Objectives states "There must be 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." The program does have published program educational objectives. The program provided industry advisory committee meeting minutes indicating that the only meeting in the last six years that was documented was held in the month prior to the ABET team's site visit. The program provided information related to a curriculum coordination meeting with a local community college and a plan developed by the faculty to assess program educational objectives. Without periodic advisement from the program's constituents, the program's educational objectives may not stay relevant to the current needs of their constituents. It is required that the program demonstrate a documented, systematically utilized and effective process, involving all program constituents, for the periodic review of program educational objectives.

Due Process Response: The program provided a plan for involving the advisory committee more fully in the periodic (annual) review of the program educational objectives. The advisory committee will consist of representatives from all program constituencies. The revised process is being implemented in spring 2016.

Status after Due Process: This finding remains a Weakness until the program demonstrates a documented, systematically utilized and effective process, involving all program constituents, for the periodic review of program educational objectives.

Post 30-Day Due Process Response: The program provided minutes from an advisory committee meeting showing that representatives from all program constituencies participated in a review of the program educational objectives.

Status: This finding is reduced to a Concern until the program demonstrates a documented, systematically utilized and effective process, involving all program constituents, for the periodic review of program educational objectives.

2. Criteria: Criterion 5. Curriculum states "An advisory committee with representation from organizations being served by the program graduates must be utilized to periodically review the program's curriculum. The advisory committee must provide advisement on current and future aspects of the technical fields for which graduates are being prepared." The program provided information relating to a curriculum coordination meeting with a local community college, but it was not a review by organizations, including, industry, being served by program graduates. Without advisement on curriculum and current and future aspects of the technical field, it is possible that the curriculum will not meet the needs of graduates and their employers. The program is required to demonstrate scheduled and regular advisory committee reviews of the program's curriculum and advisement on current and future aspects of the field.

Due Process Response: The program provided a plan for its advisory committee to review the program's curriculum and provide advice on current and future aspects of the field. The advisory committee will consist of representatives from all program constituencies. The new process is being implemented in Spring 2016.

Status after Due Process: This finding remains a Weakness until the program demonstrates scheduled and regular advisory committee reviews of the program's curriculum and advisement on current and future aspects of the field.

Post 30-Day Due Process Response: The program has provided minutes from a meeting of the advisory committee documenting review of the program curriculum and the current and future aspects of the technical field of the program.

Status: This finding is reduced to Concern until the program demonstrates scheduled and regular advisory committee reviews of the program's curriculum and advisement on current and future aspects of the field.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

COMPUTER ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Baccalaureate Degree

Introduction

The computer engineering technology program prepares students for careers as technical professionals in an environment that requires a practical, problem-solving approach. The course work emphasizes hands-on skills with modern productivity tools (e.g. design, analysis, control, diagnostic, and project management tools). The program educational objectives are that graduates of the program will be able to demonstrate:

- Technical competency and technical proficiency by applying general and disciplinary reasoning and critical thinking to identify, analyze, and solve problems;
- Communication skills in both oral and written form to articulate technical knowledge, ideas, and proposals to peers, senior management, and other potentially diverse audiences;
- Managerial organizational skills, and increasing managerial skills at higher levels of management in their chosen field;
- Ethical, social, and professional responsibility through an awareness of the impact of professional, ethical, and social responsibility in the practice of engineering technology in the state of Indiana and in a diversified world;
- Teamwork mentality through the ability to function effectively and think independently in a multi-disciplinary team environment; and
- Lifelong learning by a continuing individual desire and commitment to remain technically current by engaging in continuous self-improvement and lifelong learning.

The Program Criteria for Computer Engineering Technology and Similarly Named Programs as published in the 2015-16 *Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Technology Programs* also were used to evaluate this program. Findings related to ABET criteria or policies and procedures are described below.

Program Weaknesses

1. Criteria: Criterion 2. Program Educational Objectives, states, "The program must have published program educational objectives that are consistent with the mission of the institution, the needs of the program's various constituencies, and these criteria. There must be 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." The program has published program educational objectives and the self-study documents a plan for the periodic review of program educational objectives by the advisory board and program faculty via a three-year review cycle. Advisory board meetings had been held in April of 2013, 2014 and 2015. However, the minutes of these meetings do not document review of program educational objectives. ECET Department meetings minutes were provided for meetings spanning March 2014 through April 2015. The minutes from these meetings do not document faculty review of program educational objectives. Additionally, interviews confirmed that while the program educational objectives three-year review cycle had been followed in prior years; the review process had not been followed for the past three years. Thus, a documented process exists but is not systematically utilized. Without periodic advisement from the program's constituents, the program's educational objectives may not stay relevant to the current needs of their constituents.

It is required that the program demonstrate a documented, systematically utilized and effective process, involving all program constituents, for the periodic review of program educational objectives.

Due Process Response: The program provided a plan for involving the advisory committee more fully in the periodic (annual) review of the program educational objectives. The advisory committee will consist of representatives from all program constituencies. The revised process is being implemented in spring 2016.

Status after Due Process: This finding remains a Weakness until the program demonstrates a documented, systematically utilized and effective process, involving all program constituents, for the periodic review of program educational objectives.

2. Criteria: Criterion 4. Continuous Improvement, states, "The program must 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. Other available information may also be used to assist in the continuous improvement of the program." The program has published student outcomes and the self-study documents a plan for assessing and evaluating the extent to which the student outcomes are attained using a three-year cycle. A process was described for using those evaluation data to determine actions to improve the program. The documented process includes the participation of the faculty, program coordinator, and the advisory board. Advisory board meetings were held in April of 2013, 2014 and 2015. Minutes for ECET Department meetings were provided for meetings spanning March 2014 through April 2015. The minutes from these meetings show no evidence that the three-year assessment and evaluation cycle was followed. Additionally, interviews confirmed that the three-year review cycle had not been followed, with

assessment data not collected, evaluated or improvement decisions made based on such processes for the last three years. Further, there was no evidence of data collection since the last ETAC visit. Thus, while an assessment, evaluation and improvement process plan exists, it has not operated for at least the last three years. Without regularly assessing and evaluating student attainment of student outcomes, the program will be unable to determine the level of achievement of all the outcomes. Thus the program is unable to determine appropriate continuous improvement actions and will be unable to determine if previous actions for improvement have been effective. The program must demonstrate that (1) it is using appropriate documented processes for assessing and evaluating the extent to which students are attaining all student outcomes, (2) the results of these evaluations are systematically used as input for the continuous improvement of the program, and (3) actions for improvement are implemented.

Due Process Response: The program provided a department-wide plan for assessing student outcomes. This assessment plan outlines a three-year cycle for assessing and evaluating student attainment of all student outcomes and implementation of actions for improvement designed to improve student attainment of outcomes.

Status after Due Process: This finding remains a Weakness until the program demonstrates that it is using appropriate documented processes for assessing and evaluating the extent to which students are attaining all student outcomes the results of these evaluations are systematically used as input for the continuous improvement of the program, and actions for improvement are implemented.

Program Concern

Criteria: Criterion 6, Faculty, states, "The faculty serving in the program must be of sufficient number to maintain continuity, stability, oversight, student interaction, and advising."

The 2013 Final Statement included a finding of a Concern related to the size of the faculty as several faculty members were nearing retirement. Since 2013, two new faculty members have been hired, but two faculty members have also left the program. There remains the possibility of more faculty retirements. Thus, if such attrition occurs and those faculty members are not replaced, the faculty serving in the program may not be sufficient to maintain continuity and stability of the program. This finding remains a Concern until the program demonstrates that its faculty is of sufficient number to maintain continuity, stability, oversight, student interaction, and advising.

Due Process Response: The program has started a search for a new tenure-track faculty position. It is expected that this position will be filled with the new faculty member in Fall 2016. The program has also requested a full-time instructor position to support lower-division classes.

Status after Due Process: This finding remains a Concern until the program demonstrates that its faculty is of sufficient number to maintain continuity, stability, oversight, student interaction, and advising.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Baccalaureate Degree

Introduction

The mechanical engineering technology program prepares graduates to enter careers in design, installation, manufacturing, testing, evaluation, technical sales, or maintenance of mechanical systems or processes. Graduates work for a wide variety of product designers/manufacturers principally in Indiana and Illinois. Caterpillar, Great Dane Trailers and Cummins are examples. The program educational objectives are that graduates two to three years into their career should have the foundation to:

- Apply disciplinary reasoning, critical thinking, and hands-on skills to identify, analyze and solve problems;
- Communicate effectively in both oral and written form to articulate technical knowledge, ideas, and proposals;
- Consider professional, ethical and social responsibility of engineering technology practices;
- Perform effectively, think independently and work collaboratively in a team environment in a membership or leadership role; and
- Actively participate in professional development, including continuous self-improvement and lifelong learning.

The Program Criteria for Mechanical Engineering Technology and Similarly Named Programs as published in the 2015-16 *Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Technology Programs*

also were used to evaluate this program. Findings related to ABET criteria or policies and procedures are described below.

Program Weaknesses

1. Criteria: Criterion 2. Program Educational Objectives, states, "The program must have published program educational objectives that are consistent with the mission of the institution, the needs of the program's various constituencies, and these criteria. There must be 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." The program does have published program educational objectives, approved by the program's industrial advisory committee in September 2015. Evidence indicates that the industrial advisory committee met in April 2013 and September 2015. The committee did not address program educational objectives in the 2013 meeting. There was no evidence other program constituents had reviewed the program educational objectives. Without the periodic review of the program educational objectives by all program constituents there is no assurance that program graduates are able to meet the needs of the program's various constituencies. The program is required to demonstrate a documented, systematically utilized, and effective process, involving all program constituents, for the periodic review of these program educational objectives.

Due Process Response: The program provided a plan for involving the advisory committee more fully in the periodic (annual) review of the program educational objectives. The advisory committee will consist of representatives from all program constituencies. The revised process is being implemented in spring 2016.

Status after Due Process: This finding remains a Weakness until the program demonstrates a documented, systematically utilized and effective process, involving all program constituents, for the periodic review of program educational objectives.

Post 30-Day Due Process Response: The program provided minutes from an advisory committee meeting showing representation from all the program constituencies and a review of the program educational objectives.

Status: This finding is reduced to a Concern until the program demonstrates a documented, systematically utilized and effective process, involving all program constituents, for the periodic review of program educational objectives.

2. Criteria: Criterion 4. Continuous Improvement, states, "The program must 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." The program has developed an assessment and evaluation plan with a limited number of direct and indirect measures for evaluation of student attainment of program student outcomes. Resulting information has been incorporated into the university-wide assessment reporting process and these reports have recommendations for program improvement. However, there was no documentation these recommendations had been implemented; thus there was little evidence that assessment and evaluation processes have led to program improvement. The program is not using the results of assessment and evaluation to determine appropriate continuous improvement actions and is unable to determine if any such actions for improvement are effective. The lack of consistent and documented use of the assessment plan to monitor the achievement of student outcomes with a record of the program changes jeopardizes program continuous improvement. The program must demonstrate its

documented processes for assessing and evaluating the extent to which students are attaining all student outcomes are systematically used as input for the continuous improvement of the program and that actions for improvement are implemented.

Due Process Response: The program provided a department-wide plan for assessing student outcomes. This assessment plan outlines a three-year cycle for assessing and evaluating student attainment of all student outcomes and implementation of actions for improvement designed to improve student attainment of outcomes.

Status after Due Process: This finding remains a Weakness until the program demonstrates it is using appropriate documented processes for assessing and evaluating the extent to which students are attaining all student outcomes; the results of these evaluations are systematically used as input for the continuous improvement of the program; and that actions for improvement are implemented.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

PACKAGING ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Baccalaureate Degree

Introduction

The packaging engineering technology program prepares graduates with technical and leadership skills necessary for packaging industry competitiveness and to enter careers in packaging process and systems design, operations, quality, continuous improvement, lean manufacturing, and sustainability. The program educational objectives are that graduates two to three years into their career should be able to:

- Apply disciplinary reasoning, critical thinking, and hands-on skills to identify, analyze and solve problems;
- Communicate effectively in both oral and written form to articulate technical knowledge, ideas, and proposals;
- Consider professional, ethical and social responsibility of engineering technology practices;
- Perform effectively, think independently and work collaboratively in a team environment in a membership or leadership role; and,
- Actively participate in professional development, including continuous self-improvement and lifelong learning.

There are no program-specific criteria for this discipline of study, so the program was evaluated using the General Criteria as published in the 2015-16 *Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Technology Programs*. Findings related to ABET criteria or policies and procedures are described below.

Program Weaknesses

1. Criteria: Criterion 2. Program Educational Objectives, states, "There must be 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." The program does have published program educational objectives. However, there is no evidence of a systematic process being utilized for the periodic review of the program educational objectives by program constituents, including the industrial advisory committee. Without periodic advisement from all program constituents, the program's educational objectives may not stay relevant to the current needs of their constituencies. It is required that the program demonstrate a documented, systematically utilized and effective process, involving all program constituents, for the periodic review of program educational objectives.

Due Process Response: The program provided a plan for involving the advisory committee more fully in the periodic (annual) review of the program educational objectives. The 'advisory committee will consist of representatives from all program constituencies. The revised process is being implemented in spring 2016.

Status after Due Process: This finding remains a Weakness until the program demonstrates a documented, systematically utilized and effective process, involving all program constituents, for the periodic review of program educational objectives.

Post 30-Day Due Process Response: The program provided minutes from an advisory committee meeting showing that representatives from all program constituencies participated in a review of the program educational objectives.

Status: This finding is reduced to a Concern until the program demonstrates a documented, systematically utilized and effective process, involving all program constituents, for the periodic review of program educational objectives.

2. Criteria: Criterion 4. Continuous Improvement, states, "The program must 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." The program specifies various direct and indirect assessments to measure attainment of program student outcomes. Resulting information has been incorporated into a university-wide assessment reporting process. However, specific data generated by assessment activities were not available. Student projects and related rubrics used in the assessment process were not available. Program outcomes assessment and evaluation reports have recommendations for program improvement. However, there was no documentation these recommendations had been implemented; thus there was little evidence that assessment and evaluation processes have led to program improvement. The lack of consistent and documented use of the assessment plan to monitor the achievement of student outcomes with a record of the program changes jeopardizes program continuous improvement. The program must demonstrate its documented processes for assessing and evaluating the extent to which students are attaining all student outcomes are systematically used as input for the continuous improvement of the program and that actions for improvement are implemented.

Due Process Response: The program provided a department-wide plan for assessing student outcomes. This assessment plan outlines a three-year cycle for assessing and evaluating student attainment of all student outcomes and the implementation of actions for improvement designed to improve student attainment of outcomes.

Status after Due Process: This finding remains a Weakness until the program demonstrates it is using appropriate documented processes for assessing and evaluating the extent to which students are attaining all student outcomes; the results of these evaluations are systematically used as input for the continuous improvement of the program; and that actions for improvement are implemented.