August 29, 2018

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 2017-2018. 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,

Michael R. Lightner
President

Enclosure: Commission letter and attachments

Ronald Allen
Associate Dean
Indiana State University
650 Cherry Street
Terre Haute, IN 47809

Dear Dr. Allen :

The Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission (ETAC) of ABET recently held its 2018 Summer Meeting to act on the program evaluations conducted during 2017-2018. 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 2017-2018 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 2017-2018 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 2017-2018 Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (available at www.abet.org).

Sincerely,

Scott C. Dunning, Chair

Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission

Enclosure: Summary of Accreditation Action
                        Final Statement

cc: Daniel J. Bradley, President

         Randell W Peters, Professor and Chairperson

         Tim L Brower, Team Chair

Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission

Summary of Accreditation Actions
for the
2017-2018 Accreditation Cycle

Indiana State University
Terre Haute, IN

Computer Engineering Technology (B.S.)

Mechanical Engineering Technology (BS)

Packaging 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.

ABET

Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission

Final Statement of Accreditation
to

Indiana State University
Terre Haute, IN

2017-2018 Accreditation Cycle

ABET

ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY ACCREDITATION COMMISSION

FINAL INTERIM REPORT STATEMENT

on

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Terre Haute, Indiana

Date of Interim Report:
July 1, 2017

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 completed an evaluation review of the Progress Report submitted for the following programs:

- 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. This review was made to evaluate progress by the programs in addressing findings identified in the Final General Review Statement from ETAC of ABET dated August 31, 2016. The extent to which the previous findings have been resolved has been evaluated using the 2015-16 *Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Technology Programs* and the 2017-18 *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 level. 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 were initially accredited by ETAC of ABET in 2014 and have held continuous accreditation since that time. The computer and mechanical engineering technology programs were initially accredited by ETAC of ABET in 2011, 2008, respectively, and have held continuous accreditation since that time. These programs have been submitted for reaccreditation evaluation.

Due Process Response: The institution chose not to respond in due process.

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.   Previous Finding and 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 2016 Final General Review Statement reported that the program provided a plan for involving the advisory committee more fully in the periodic (annual) review of the program educational objectives. It was required that the program demonstrate a documented, systematically utilized and effective process, involving all program constituents, for the periodic review of program educational objectives.

Progress: The program provided department meeting minutes from March 30, 2017 where departmental members approved a process of evaluating the program educational objectives (PEOs). The process entailed a three-year cycle whereby PEOs are to be periodically reviewed by constituents. The Industrial Advisory Committee (IAC) met on March 31, 2017 and reviewed and discussed the PEOs and the student outcomes.

Status: This finding is resolved.

2.   Previous Finding and 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 2016 Final General Review Statement reported that the program provided a department-wide plan for assessing student outcomes.   It was required that the program demonstrate that it is using appropriate documented processes for assessing and evaluating the extent to which students are attaining all student outcomes, that the results of these evaluations are systematically used as input for the continuous improvement of the program and that actions for improvement are implemented. Progress: The program provided documented student learning outcomes (SLOs) approved by computer engineering technology faculty. A plan for the review and assessment of the SLOs was discussed and approved by the IAC.   Direct and indirect assessments of SLOs have been completed. Based on assessment results, a change in curriculum occurred.

Status: This finding is resolved.

Program Concern

        Previous Finding and 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 2016 Final General Review Statement reported that the program started a search for a new tenure-track faculty position and has also requested a full-time instructor position to support lower-division classes. It was suggested that the program demonstrates that its

faculty is of sufficient number to maintain continuity, stability, oversight, student interaction, and advising.

Progress: The program provided documentation that the Electronics and Computer Engineering Technology (ECET) department lost three faculty members in the fall of 2016. One new tenure track faculty member will join in the fall of 2017, one previous instructor was converted to tenure track and the previous dean of the college will be an ECET faculty member beginning in the summer of 2017. Two new part-time lecturers will continue. Two more tenure track positions for the 2017-18 academic year will be requested.

Status: 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. 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 Weakness

Previous Finding and 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 2016 Final General Review Statement reported that the program provided a department-wide plan for assessing student outcomes. This assessment plan outlined 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. It was required that the program demonstrate it is using appropriate documented processes for assessing and evaluating the extent to which students are attaining all student outcomes; that the results of these evaluations are systematically used as input for the continuous improvement of the program and that actions for improvement are implemented.

Progress: The program provided documented student learning outcomes (SLOs) that had been approved and published. Direct and indirect assessments of SLOs have been completed. Based on assessment results, a change in curriculum occurred.

Status: This finding is resolved.

Program Concern

Previous Finding and 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 2016 Final General Review Statement reported that the program provided a plan for involving the advisory committee more fully in the periodic (annual) review of the program educational objectives. Minutes from an advisory committee meeting showed representation from all the program constituencies and a review of the program educational objectives. It was suggested that the program demonstrate a documented, systematically utilized and effective process, involving all program constituents, for the periodic review of program educational objectives.

Progress: The program provided documentation showing a documented process involving all program constituents in reviewing and providing input to the PEOs. Meetings have occurred over the past two years.

Status: This finding is resolved.

<u>PROGRAM EVALUATION</u>

PACKAGING ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Baccalaureate Degree

<u>Introduction</u>

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 Weakness

Previous Finding and 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 2016 Final General Review Statement reported that the program provided a department-wide plan for assessing student outcomes. It was required that the program demonstrate 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 must systematically be used as input for the continuous improvement of the program and that any identified actions for improvement are implemented.

Progress: The program provided documented student learning outcomes (SLOs) that had been approved and published. Direct and indirect assessments of SLOs have been completed. Based on assessment results, a change in curriculum occurred.

Status: This finding is resolved.

Program Concern

Previous Finding and 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 2016 Final General Review Statement reported that the program provided a plan for involving the advisory committee more fully in the periodic (annual) review of the program

educational objectives. Minutes from an advisory committee meeting showed representation from all the program constituencies and a review of the program educational objectives had been performed. It was suggested that the program demonstrate a documented, systematically utilized and effective process, involving all program constituents, for the periodic review of program educational objectives.

Progress: The program provided documentation showing a documented process involving all program constituents in reviewing and providing input to the PEOs. Meetings have occurred over the past two years.

Status: This finding is resolved.