August 21, 2012

Grady Blount
Dean, College of Science, Engineering, & Agriculture
Texas A&M University-Commerce
P.O. Box 3011
Commerce, TX 75429

Dear Dr. Blount:

The Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET recently held its 2012 Summer Meeting to act on the program evaluations conducted during 2011-2012. 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 Texas A&M University - Commerce 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 2011-2012 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 2011-2012 Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (available at www.abet.org).
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 2011-2012 Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (available at www.abet.org).

Sincerely,

Susan E. Conry, Chair
Engineering Accreditation Commission

Enclosure: Summary of Accreditation Action
Final Statement

cc: Dan Jones, President
    Brent Donham, Department Head
    Catherine C. Dunn, Visit Team Chair
Accredit to September 30, 2018. A request to ABET by January 31, 2017 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, 2017. The reaccreditation evaluation will be a comprehensive general review.
Final Statement of Accreditation
to
Texas A & M University - Commerce
Commerce, Texas

2011-12 Accreditation Cycle

Leadership and Quality Assurance in Applied Science, Computing, Engineering, and Technology Education
Introduction & Discussion of Statement Construct

The Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET has evaluated the industrial engineering program of Texas A&M University-Commerce.

This statement is the final summary of the EAC evaluation, at the institutional and engineering-program levels. It includes information received during due process, including information submitted with the seven-day response. This statement consists of two parts: the first deals with the overall institution and its engineering operation, and the second deals with the individual engineering program. It is constructed in a format that allows the reader to discern both the original visit findings and subsequent progress made during due process.

A program’s accreditation action is based upon the findings summarized in this statement. Actions depend on the program’s range of compliance or non-compliance with the criteria. This range can be construed from the following terminology:

- **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 that does not relate directly to the accreditation action but is offered to assist the institution in its continuing efforts to improve its programs.

The Texas A&M University-Commerce enrolls approximately 11,400 students. About 89 percent come from the northeast region of Texas with a high fraction consisting of non-traditional students who have full-time or part-time jobs and are attempting to improve their career opportunities. Several others come from families in which they are the first to have access to college education. The institution is providing much needed educational opportunities and the university’s role seems to be well recognized by the Texas A&M system.

Four months before the EAC of ABET accreditation visit, the university restructured and formed the College of Science, Engineering, and Agriculture in which the Department of Engineering and Technology resides. A new dean assumed leadership in August of 2011. Under this department the university offers B.S. degrees in Industrial Engineering, Construction Engineering, and Technology Management, and a MS in Technology Management. The industrial engineering program is the only program seeking ABET accreditation; none of the other programs were evaluated. The department has 195 undergraduate students, 182 graduate students, and eight full-time faculty members.

The following units were reviewed and found to adequately support the engineering programs: physics, career services, registrar, and admissions.
Industrial Engineering
Program

Introduction

The industrial engineering program is housed in the Department of Engineering and Technology. In June 2011, the department became part of the newly-formed College of Science, Engineering and Agriculture. The program was started in fall 2002 and its initial ABET accreditation visit occurred in 2005. The program currently has approximately 109 full-time undergraduate students. The program awarded degrees to two students in the 2009-10 academic year and six students in the 2010-11 academic year.

Program Strengths

1. A high percentage of the program’s seniors plan to take the Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) Exam. This is laudable, as these students are not required to take statics, dynamics, strength of materials, thermodynamics, or circuits in their course of study. The students’ understanding of the significance of taking and passing the FE exam along with their dedication to prepare for the exam shows a strong commitment to professionalism.

Program Weakness

1. **Criterion 2. Program Educational Objectives**  Program educational objectives are defined in the engineering accreditation criteria as broad statements that describe what graduates are expected to attain within a few years of graduation. Many of the program objectives for the industrial engineering program describe skills the graduates should have acquired at the time of graduation and, therefore, reflect student outcomes rather than program educational objectives. Thus, the program lacks strength of compliance with this criterion.

   - **Due-process response:** The EAC acknowledges receipt of documentation indicating that the program revised its program educational objectives so that they are now statements describing attainments expected of graduates within a few years of graduation.

   - The weakness is resolved.
Program Concerns

1. **Criterion 4. Continuous Improvement** This criterion requires that a program regularly use appropriate, documented processes for assessing and evaluating the extent to which both the program educational objectives and the student outcomes are being attained. While it is evident that all of the student outcomes are being assessed, the evaluation of some of the assessment data appears to be inconsistent. Unless evaluation of the extent to which outcomes are attained is carried out on a consistent basis, future compliance with this criterion may be jeopardized. Further, the fact that one individual is primarily responsible for interpreting the data means that there is a potential that the program is at risk for future compliance with this criterion.

- **Due-process response:** The EAC acknowledges receipt of documentation indicating that the program is currently re-evaluating its assessment and evaluation the processes and plans on establishing a common assessment method across courses. While progress is being made, changes have not yet been systematically implemented to alleviate this concern.

- The concern is unresolved.

Program Observations

1. Course descriptions for sequenced courses appear to describe coverage of the two-course sequence and not for the individual courses of the sequence making it difficult for students to determine what is covered in each course.

2. Insight may be gained from examining the industrial engineering curricula at other institutions in the state to determine how those institutions are able to include coverage of basic engineering science topics.