



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

January 06, 2009

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

Dear Dr. Abbaschian :

A Draft Statement presenting the findings of the recent evaluation by the Engineering Accreditation Commission of ABET is enclosed. Your institution is invited to submit a written response to this Draft Statement within thirty days following the receipt of this letter. Institutions are encouraged to submit their formal responses to the ABET Draft Statement electronically. Your response is particularly important if you believe any of the facts or observations presented in the Draft Statement are in error. Further, if the Draft Statement indicates that a program is considered to have weaknesses or deficiencies, you are encouraged to document any corrective actions that have been taken to remedy these shortcomings.

Please return the enclosed Acknowledgement of Receipt of Draft Statement to ABET Headquarters as quickly as possible. This form should indicate whether or not you intend to submit a written or electronic response to the enclosed Draft Statement.

Please limit any response to matters covered by the Draft Statement and affecting the potential accreditation of a program. If you agree with the assessment of the visiting team and wish to provide no response, please indicate this on the enclosed Acknowledgement of Receipt of Draft Statement.

It should be noted that a weakness or deficiency is considered to have been corrected only if the corrective action has been made effective during the academic year of the evaluation and is supported by official documentation. Where action has been initiated to correct a problem but has not yet taken full effect or where only indications of good intent are given, the effectiveness of the corrective action cannot always be presumed; in such cases, evaluation by the Commission at the time of the next evaluation may be required.

Your institution's response to the Draft Statement will be carefully reviewed by the Commission, and accreditation decisions will be determined by the Commission during its Summer Meeting in July. You should expect to receive official notification of accreditation actions together with the Final Statement during the period from mid-August to mid-September.

Neither the presence nor absence of a stated, projected accreditation action in any program discussion commits the Commission to a particular final action. The official accreditation action for each program is taken by vote of the entire Commission at its Summer Meeting following consideration of the team's findings along with the institution's response to the Draft Statement.

The Commission considers all Draft Statements to be unofficial documents distributed only for review and comment. The enclosed Draft Statement does not represent the final official views of the Commission; therefore, it should be handled confidentially. Please limit release of this document in whole or in part only to persons involved in the preparation of your response to the Commission.

Instructions for distribution of your response to the Draft Statements are enclosed. If you elect to provide a response, your response must be provided within 30 days to the addressees indicated in these instructions.

Sincerely,

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

John Rutherford, Chair
Engineering Accreditation Commission

Enclosure: Draft Statement
Acknowledgment of Receipt of Draft Statement
Instructions for Distribution of Response

cc: Kirk Schulz, Vice President for Research & Economic Development, Editor
Kenneth F. Cooper, Team Chair
Mitch Boretz, Technical Communications Specialist

ABET

Engineering Accreditation Commission

Instructions

for

Distribution of Response to Draft Statement

Please provide one copy of your response to each of the following addressees within 30 days:
(The 30 day Due Process response period starts with the signature date of the postal receipt card.)

Team Chair

Kenneth F. Cooper
3689 Inverness Way
Augusta GA 30907
kcooper14@comcast.net

Editor

Kirk Schulz
Vice President for Research & Economic
Development
Mississippi State University
617 Allen Hall
PO Box 6343
Mississippi State MS 39762
schulz@research.msstate.edu

ABET Office

Engineering Accreditation Commission
ABET, Inc.
111 Market Place, Suite 1050
Baltimore, MD 21202
Email: EAC@abet.org

Editor

Mary Leigh Wolfe
Professor, Biological Systems Engineering
Department
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State
University
(0303)
Blacksburg VA 24061
mlwolfe@vt.edu

**ABET, Inc.
ENGINEERING ACCREDITATION COMMISSION**

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA RIVERSIDE
Riverside, CA**

**DRAFT 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 a draft summary of the EAC interim evaluation. The first part covers the overall institution and its engineering operation; the second covers the computer and electrical engineering programs.

A program's accreditation action will be based upon the findings summarized in this statement. Actions will 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 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 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.