



ABET, Inc.
111 Market Place, Suite 1050
Baltimore, MD 21202
Phone: 410-347-7700
Fax: 410-625-2238
www.abet.org
accreditation@abet.org

Applied Science Accreditation Commission
Computing Accreditation Commission
Engineering Accreditation Commission
Technology Accreditation Commission

August 12, 2009

Reza Abbaschian
Dean, Bourns College of Engineering
University of California, Riverside
A342 Bourns Hall
Riverside CA 92521

Dear Dr. Abbaschian :

Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET recently held its 2009 Summer Meeting to act on the program evaluations conducted during 2008-2009. 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 University of California, Riverside 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.L. of the 2008-2009 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.

Please note that appeals are allowed only in the case of Not to Accredite actions. Also, such appeals may be based only on the conditions stated in Section II.G. of the 2008-2009 Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (available at www.abet.org).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Rutherford", written in a cursive style.

John Rutherford, Chair
Engineering Accreditation Commission

Enclosure: Summary of Accreditation Action
Final Statement

cc: Timothy P. White, President
Mitch Boretz, Technical Communications Specialist
Kenneth F. Cooper, Report Team Chair

ABET, Inc.

Engineering Accreditation Commission
Summary of Accreditation Actions
for the
2008-2009 Accreditation Cycle

**University of California, Riverside
Riverside, CA**

Computer Engineering (BS)

Electrical Engineering (BS)

Accredit to September 30, 2013. A request to ABET by January 31, 2012 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, 2012. The reaccreditation evaluation will be a comprehensive general review.

**ABET, Inc.
ENGINEERING ACCREDITATION COMMISSION**

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA RIVERSIDE
Riverside, CA**

**FINAL STATEMENT
Report submitted: 20 June 2008
Accreditation Cycle Criteria: 2006-2007**

Introduction

The Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET, Inc. has conducted an interim evaluation of the computer and electrical engineering programs of the University of California Riverside relative to shortcomings remaining after the 2006-07 general EAC review.

This statement is the final summary of the EAC interim evaluation. The first part of the statement covers the overall institution and its engineering operation; the second covers the computer and electrical engineering programs.

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 constructed 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 the program.

The University of California Riverside is a relatively new member of the University of California system. Its first engineering program was accredited in 1994.

**Computer Engineering
Program**Introduction

The computer engineering program, jointly administered by the Departments of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science and Engineering, has approximately 200 students.

Program Weaknesses

1. Criterion 2. Program Educational Objectives *Criterion 2 states, “ program educational objectives are broad statements that describe the career and professional accomplishments that the program is preparing graduates to achieve.” The previous review cited that the program’s objectives were not broad statements that describe the accomplishments of computer engineering graduates. In addition, it was not clear that the objectives were based on the needs of program constituents. At the conclusion of the review, a new set of educational objectives and a new process for involvement of constituents in refining/approving the objectives were being developed.*

The new program educational objectives cited in the interim report meet the definition of program educational objectives for criterion 2. The process for development and approval of the educational objectives involved the program constituents.

- The weakness is resolved.

2. Criterion 3. Program Outcomes and Assessment *Criterion 3 states, “There must be a process to produce these outcomes and an assessment process, with documented results, that demonstrates that these program outcomes are being measured and indicates the degree to which the outcomes are achieved. There must be evidence that the results of this assessment process are applied to the further development of the program.” The previous review noted that course objectives were defined for each course but they were not clearly related to program outcomes. The relationship between course content and grades to program*

outcomes was not clear and the process for program improvement based on assessment results was not evident.

The interim report describes the program's adoption of the outcomes assessment process that the electrical engineering program uses. The program outcomes addressed in each course and the instruments used to assess the level of achievement of the outcomes are specifically identified. The process for program improvement based on outcomes assessment data has been clearly identified and implemented. The report includes evidence of program changes made based on the assessment results. The multi-loop process for program improvement involving both short-term and long-term input on achievement of outcomes should be very effective.

- The weakness is resolved.

**Electrical Engineering
Program**

Introduction

The electrical engineering program is the oldest program in the college. The program has approximately 200 students.

Program Weakness

1. Criterion 2. Program Educational Objectives *Criterion 2 states that the program must have “a process based on the needs of the programs’ various constituencies in which the objectives are determined and periodically evaluated.” The previous review noted that while a process existed, it was not clear that the process was tied to feedback from the program’s defined constituents. While evaluation had been done, it was not clear that there was an ongoing process and that the results were used for program improvement, as required by this criterion. The program indicated that a new set of educational objectives was to be developed and a process for developing and refining program educational objectives that clearly involves the constituents defined.*

The new program educational objectives cited in the interim report meet the definition of program educational objectives for criterion 2. The process for development and approval of the educational objectives clearly involves the program constituents. The process for program improvement based on assessment of program objectives is clearly defined and has been implemented.

- The weakness is resolved.