



IEEE EAB Committee on Engineering Accreditation Activities (CEAA)

DRAFT Operations Manual

Draft Updated 1 March 2016

Sections in this Manual:

[Section 1: Introduction](#)

[Section 2: Nomination and Election of CEAA Chairperson](#)

[Section 3: Nomination and Election of At-Large CEAA Members](#)

[Section 4: Nomination and Endorsement of EAC of ABET Representatives and Alternates](#)

[Section 5: Orientation of New CEAA Members](#)

[Section 6: Program Evaluator Mentoring Process](#)

[Section 7: Program Evaluator Training Process](#)

[Section 8: Review of Visit Reports](#)

[Section 9 Personnel Issues](#)

Appendix A Report Review Form

Appendix B Grading Guidelines for Visit Reports

[Section 1: Introduction](#)

The IEEE is the world's largest professional association, with more than 395,000 members in more than 160 countries. The IEEE's Educational Activities Board, (EAB), coordinates the educational activities of education programs and participation in the accreditation of computer, engineering, and engineering technology programs for IEEE/ABET (Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, Inc.).

ABET is a federation of 30 engineering, professional and technical societies and is solely recognized by the U.S. Department of Education to accredit programs in engineering technology within the United States. The IEEE, is the largest of ABET's societies. The Computing Accreditation Commission (CAC) of ABET, Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET accredits engineering programs, and the Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission (ETAC) of ABET accredits engineering technology programs. IEEE is responsible for over 800 computing, engineering and engineering technology programs through ABET.

The IEEE EAB University Resources Committee (URC) is responsible for developing IEEE policies, procedures and positions with regard to accreditation of engineering and engineering technology accreditation. The URC coordinates the activities of the EAB Committee on Accreditation Activities (CEAA). The CEAA is responsible for IEEE's participation in the accreditation activities of the EAC of ABET and the CETAA is responsible for the IEEE's participation in the accreditation activities of the ETAC of ABET. The CEAA and CETAA carry out the selection, education, and assignment processes of qualified Program Evaluators (PEVs) for the IEEE EAB. Service as a PEV provides the opportunity for members of the profession to contribute to the achievement of high quality educational standards of engineering programs. These committees facilitate the accreditation process through their interaction with PEVs, department chairs, deans and others interested in accreditation.

This **CEAA Operations Manual** describes the principal activities and administrative processes of CEAA. It is intended to provide a guide for consistent application of practices and procedures by CEAA members. Continuous improvements will be made to this Operations Manual.

[Section 2: Nomination and Election of CEAA Chairperson](#)

Purpose

This describes the process for selection, evaluation, and recommendation for election of candidates for Chairperson of CEAA.

Objectives

The objectives of this process are to ensure that:

1. Qualified individuals are selected Chairperson of CEAA.
2. IEEE constituencies are fairly represented.
3. Diversity of membership is achieved and maintained.

Process Owner

This process is owned and maintained by the Chairperson of CEAA, who is responsible for its on-going implementation.

Process

1. A Nominating Committee is appointed by the CEAA Chairperson. Members of the committee may be chosen from the At-Large and Ex-Officio membership of CEAA. The committee consists of up to four members, one of which will serve as Chairperson. This committee is appointed no later than the CEAA meeting prior to the actual presentation of candidates to the CEAA membership and the election itself.
2. The Nominating Committee considers the following qualifications in the selection of potential candidates:
 - Leadership and contributions to engineering accreditation
 - Record as EAC PEV.
 - Knowledge of the academy and the ability to represent the academic community.
 - Demonstrated leadership abilities.
 - Knowledge of engineering practice and the ability to represent engineering practitioners.

- Knowledge of the engineering accreditation criteria.
 - Ability and willingness to devote time to perform required CEAA activities.
3. The Nominating Committee must identify at least two candidates for consideration. Candidates are selected with a goal of providing leadership for the CEAA while representing CEAA's academic and industry/government constituencies in a balanced manner. Each candidate shall indicate a willingness to serve and attest to their ability to devote time required to serve as Chairperson of CEAA.
 4. The Nominating Committee provides a one-page summary of qualifications for the position. For each candidate recommended for election, this summary should include the following information:
 - Academic background (degrees, dates, institutions).
 - Service to engineering accreditation
 - Service as IEEE PEV (institutions visited, program names, dates, evaluation performance data).
 - Evidence of leadership experience.
 - IEEE constituencies the candidate would well-represent.
 - For academic candidates, evidence of understanding of, and preferably experience in, engineering practice.
 - For industry/government nominees, evidence of understanding of the academy.
 5. The Chair of the Nominating Committee distributes the summary of qualifications to all voting members of the CEAA no later than one month prior to the meeting at which the election will be held.
 6. Prior to the election, any member of the CEAA has the opportunity to submit additional nominations for any pending vacancy among the At-Large membership of the CEAA. The candidacy of any other individual so nominated must be supported by a one-page summary of qualifications (as described in Item 4) which must be presented to all voting members of the CEAA one month prior to the election.
 7. The election is normally held at the winter meeting of the CEAA. Only candidates who have been nominated according to the prescribed process are considered for election.

The CEAA Chairperson serves a two-year term, which is not renewable. The term of membership begins at the next meeting following his or her election to the CEAA. The term expires following the CEAA winter meeting of the second year following election as CEAA Chairperson.

[Section 3: Nomination and Election of At-Large CEAA Members](#)

Purpose

This describes the process for selection, evaluation, and recommendation for election of candidates for at-large membership of CEAA.

Objectives

The objectives of this process are to ensure that:

- Qualified individuals are selected for At-Large CEAA membership.
- IEEE constituencies are fairly represented.

- Diversity of membership is achieved and maintained.

Process Owner

This process is owned and maintained by the Chairperson of CEAA, who is responsible for its on-going implementation.

Process

1. A Nominating Committee is appointed by the CEAA Chairperson. Members of the committee may be chosen from the At-Large and Ex-Officio membership of CEAA. The committee consists of up to four members, one of which will serve as Chairperson. (Two members of the committee are to be from the academic membership of CEAA and two members from the industry/government membership of CEAA.) This committee is appointed no later than the CEAA meeting prior to the actual presentation of candidates to the CEAA membership and the election itself.
2. The Nominating Committee considers the following qualifications in the selection of potential candidates:
 - Record as EAC PEV.
 - Knowledge of the academy and the ability to represent the academic community.
 - Demonstrated leadership abilities.
 - Knowledge of engineering practice and the ability to represent engineering practitioners.
 - Knowledge of the engineering accreditation criteria.
 - Ability and willingness to devote time to perform required CEAA activities.
3. The Nominating Committee identifies candidates for consideration. Candidates are selected with a goal of representing CEAA's academic and industry/government constituencies in a balanced manner and to achieve and maintain diversity within its membership.
4. The Nominating Committee provides a one-page summary of qualifications for the position. For each candidate recommended for election, this summary should include the following information:
 - Academic background (degrees, dates, institutions).
 - Service as IEEE PEV (institutions visited, program names, dates, evaluation performance data).
 - Evidence of leadership experience.
 - IEEE constituencies the candidate would well-represent.
 - For academic candidates, evidence of understanding of, and preferably experience in, engineering practice.
 - For industry/government nominees, evidence of understanding of the academy.
5. The Chair of the Nominating Committee distributes the summary of qualifications to all voting members of the CEAA no later than one month prior to the meeting at which the election will be held.
6. Prior to the election, any member of the CEAA has the opportunity to submit additional nominations for any pending vacancy among the At-Large membership of the CEAA. The candidacy of any other individual so nominated must be supported by a one-page summary of qualifications (as described in Item 4) which must be presented to all voting members of the CEAA one month prior to the election.
7. The election is normally held at the winter meeting of the CEAA. Only candidates who have been nominated according to the prescribed process are considered for election. The CEAA may choose to elect and prioritize alternate members who will be considered fully elected in the event that one or more of the those elected declines membership.

8. The final slate of elected candidates is forwarded to the EAB for confirmation.
9. At-Large members of the CEAA serve a five-year term, which is not renewable. The term of membership begins at the next meeting after the one at which the member is proposed for membership by the CEAA. The term expires in June of the fifth year following the year containing the CEAA meeting at which the member is proposed for membership. (For example: proposed at CEAA meeting of January 2000: term expires June 2005.)

Section 4: Nomination and Endorsement of EAC of ABET Representatives and Alternates

Purpose

This process describes the methodology that will be employed to select candidate(s) for designation as EAC (of ABET) Representatives from the IEEE and as *Ex-Officio* members of the CEAA and Alternate EAC Representatives, to evaluate the qualifications of the candidate(s), and the endorsement by ballot of those candidates to be recommended by the CEAA for designation to the EAB.

Objectives

The objectives of this process are to ensure that:

1. Qualified individuals are endorsed to serve as EAC Representatives from the IEEE.
2. IEEE constituencies are fairly represented.
3. Diversity of the EAC Delegation from the IEEE is achieved and maintained.

Process Owner

This process is owned and maintained by the Chairperson of the CEAA, who is responsible for its on-going implementation.

Process

1. A Nominating Committee is appointed by the CEAA Chairperson. Members of the committee may be chosen from the At-Large and Ex-Officio membership of the CEAA. The committee consists of up to four members, one of which will serve as Chairperson. This committee is appointed no later than the CEAA meeting prior to the actual presentation of candidates to the CEAA membership and the election itself.
2. The Nominating Committee considers the following qualifications in the selection of potential candidates:
 - Record as EAC PEV.
 - Prior service as member of the IEEE.
 - Demonstrated leadership abilities.
 - Knowledge of the academy and the ability to represent the academic community.
 - Knowledge of engineering practice and the ability to represent engineering practitioners.
 - Ability to devote time to perform required EAC activities.
3. The Nominating Committee identifies one or more candidates for consideration for each pending vacancy.
4. The Chairperson of the Nominating Committee notifies the potential candidate(s) for each vacancy to determine their interest in serving (as an EAC Representative.) Candidates who are unable to serve are dropped from further consideration in the current selection cycle.

5. Each Candidate is requested to provide a one-page summary of qualifications for the position. This summary should include the following information:
 - Academic background (degrees, dates, institutions).
 - Service as IEEE PEV (institutions visited, program names, dates).
 - Service as member of the IEEE and, as applicable, the CEAA or other accreditation-related body.
 - Evidence of leadership experience.
 - For academic candidates, evidence of understanding of, and preferably experience in, engineering practice.
 - For industry/government candidates, evidence of understanding of the academy.
 - A brief statement of special interest in serving on the EAC of ABET.
6. The Chair of the Nominating Committee distributes the summary of qualifications to all voting members of the CEAA no later than one month prior to the meeting at which endorsement of the candidates will take place.
7. Prior to the endorsement actions, any member of the CEAA has the opportunity to submit additional nominations for any pending vacancy within the EAC Delegation. The candidacy of any other individual so nominated must be supported by a one-page summary of qualifications (as described in Item 5) which must be presented to all voting members of the CEAA one month prior to the endorsement ballot.
8. The endorsement ballot is conducted at a meeting of the CEAA. Only candidates who have been nominated according to the prescribed process will be considered for endorsement. If more than one candidate is presented, the voting will be by secret ballot.
9. The name and qualifications of each endorsed candidate is forwarded to the EAB for final approval.
10. Members of the EAC Delegation nominally serve a five-year term, reconfirmed (by the EAB upon the recommendation of the CEAA and the URC of the EAB) each year beyond the first year. The term of service, including as an *Ex-Officio* member of the CEAA, begins following approval by the EAB at the start of the subsequent EAC accreditation cycle.

[Section 5: Orientation of New CEAA Members](#)

Purpose

This process describes the method that will be employed for orientation of new CEAA members.

Objectives

The process objectives are:

1. To ensure that all new CEAA Members are familiar with the goals, objectives, procedures and responsibilities of the CEAA.
2. To help new CEAA Members achieve the highest levels of productivity and quality of performance upon their initial appointment to the committee.

Process Owner

This process is owned and maintained by the Training Coordinator of the CEAA, who is responsible for its ongoing implementation.

Process (a flow diagram for the process is shown at the end of this Section)

Initial Familiarization. New Members should become familiar with the purposes and objectives of the CEAA. Toward this end, the CEAA Chair shall contact each new committee member as soon as possible after the member is elected. This contact shall be made within 30 days following the election. As part of this introductory contact, the role of the CEAA in the larger structure of accreditation activities, the structure and membership of the Committee, and its general operating procedures shall be described.

The new member should be directed to the CEAA web page (http://www.ieee.org/education_careers/education/accreditation/ceaa/DF_IEEE_MIG_MCT_55758) which provides information and resources aimed at familiarizing the new member with CEAA procedures and practices. The new member should be encouraged to contact the Chairman for any necessary clarification of the processes, or for other information relating to service on the CEAA.

New Member Mentoring. A mentor is assigned to each new CEAA member to facilitate the indoctrination process beginning with the ABET Face-To-Face training.. The mentor assignment will normally be the CEAA Mentor Coordinator.

Visit Report Review. New CEAA Members are assigned to review several visit reports submitted by IEEE PEVs. The review process is described in the CEAA Operating Process, Review of Visit Reports. The CEAA Mentor Coordinator reviews visit reports assigned to new members. The CEAA Mentor Coordinator interacts with the new members ensuring that they understand the visit report review process.

Selection of New Program Evaluators. CEAA Members are responsible for selecting new PEVs. This is done during the January meeting. Prior to the meeting, a set of new member applications and recommendations are compiled by the Educational Activities Department (EAD) Staff. This information is sent to each CEAA member in advance of the meeting along with instructions. New CEAA Members will participate in this process by reviewing qualifications of each applicant and developing a ranking of potential new members. Each new member should collaborate with the CEAA Mentoring Coordinator or his or her assigned mentor as necessary.

Other CEAA Processes. The new CEAA Member should become familiar with other areas of responsibility for the CEAA. For example, CEAA Members are responsible for such activities as developing new accreditation criteria, collaborating with other accreditation bodies, following accreditation activities and trends in the international community, evaluator training, and keeping current on accreditation activities of other professional societies and organizations. It is recommended that the new member actively read and communicate with others to keep current on accreditation issues. In addition, the new member should seek opportunities to participate in subcommittee work on the CEAA in order to contribute to the CEAA's mission.

[Section 6: Program Evaluator Mentoring Process](#)

Purpose

This process describes the method that will be employed for mentoring of PEVs.

Objectives

The process objectives are:

1. To ensure that all new PEVs are familiar with the goals, objectives, procedures and responsibilities of the CEAA.

2. To provide a consultant for assisting new PEVs who are undergoing their initial ABET training and are preparing for and conducting their first visit.
3. To provide support to all PEVs before, during, and after the visit as a means of answering questions relating to the accreditation process.
4. Provide feedback to CEAA on issues relating to training of evaluators or improvement of processes.

Process Owner

This process is owned and maintained by the Chair of the CEAA Mentoring Committee, who is responsible for its ongoing implementation. The process is as outlined below.

1. Initial Communications with new Program Evaluators. The Face-To-Face training mentor for a new PEV may also serve as the PEV's visit mentor, or a new one may be assigned as part of the overall CEAA PEV mentoring process. The mentor will contact the new PEV as soon as possible after his/her visit assignment. Initial contact will normally be made through e-mail. Correspondence to the new member will include the following items: (a) An introduction explaining the purpose of the Mentor Process. (b) A description of the major activities associated with the visit. (c) A reminder of program evaluator deliverables. This reminds the PEV of documentation that must be provided to his or her Team Chair, CEAA, and ABET prior to, during, and after the campus visit. (e) Characteristics of evaluator excellence. This helps the new Evaluator understand what is expected. A follow-up telephone contact may be made by the mentor to each new PEV within a short time after sending the e-mail. The purpose of the call is to ensure that the evaluator has received the e-mail information and to answer any questions that the evaluator may have. The mentor should explain the CEAA report review process and offer assistance to the evaluator.
2. Pre-visit Consultations with New Program Evaluators. During the visit preparation phase the CEAA mentor will act as a resource for answering questions and providing advice to the new PEV.
3. Mentoring of experienced Program Evaluators. Experienced PEVs are also assigned mentors. The mentor normally makes initial contact by e-mail following the process similar to that outlined in (1) above. Mentors provide PEVs with contacts for questions or issues that may arise prior to the visit and interact in post visit activities as necessary.
4. Process Feedback. At the January CEAA meeting the CEAA Mentor Coordinator shall report to the CEAA on any issues identified in the mentoring process that have potential for improving the accreditation process or the training of new PEVs. The Mentor Coordinator shall contact all mentors prior to the meeting in order to identify all issues and opportunities for improvement. The CEAA Mentor Coordinator collaborates with the CEAA Training Coordinator to ensure this information is incorporated into PEV training and is communicated back to PEVs in the next ABET visit cycle.

[Section 7: Program Evaluator Training Process](#)

Purpose

This process describes the method that will be employed for training of PEVs who may be assigned to evaluate engineering programs where IEEE has Lead Society or Cooperating Society responsibility for the program under evaluation.

Objectives

The process objectives are:

1. To ensure the competency of all new PEVs who may participate as members of an Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET visit team.
2. To ensure the continued competency of experienced PEVs who may be assigned to EAC visit teams.
3. To bring best training practices for PEVs to the process through liaison with other constituents.
4. To provide a means of continuous process improvement of the PEV training process.

Process Owner

This process is owned and maintained by the Chair of the CEAA Training Committee, who is responsible for its ongoing implementation.

Overview

Process Overview. The CEAA Training Process is carried out by the CEAA Training Committee. The training process is closely associated with the CEAA mentoring process as well as ABET Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) general criterion training for PEVs. While ABET has responsibility for general criteria training, CEAA must ensure proper administration and execution of the overall training process. CEAA is also responsible for ensuring that IEEE PEVs receive training on EAC program criterion (Criterion 9) where IEEE is responsible as either the Lead or Cooperating Society.

Organization and Staffing of the Training Committee. The CEAA Training Committee consists of at least three but not more than six members of CEAA. The Training Coordinator is appointed by the CEAA Chair in accordance with CEAA and IEEE practice and procedures. Members of the Training Committee are recommended by the CEAA Training Coordinator and approved by the CEAA Chair.

Responsibilities of the Training Committee. The CEAA Training Committee is responsible to the CEAA Chair for ensuring the competency of PEVs using the process defined in this document. With an aim at introducing best practices to the training process, the Training Committee chair will maintain liaison with staff and volunteers in ABET and other professional engineering societies who are engaged in EAC PEV Training.

Process

Training of new Program Evaluators. The CEAA Mentoring Coordinator will assign a CEAA mentor to each PEV trainee. The assigned mentor, in turn, will contact the new PEV trainee as soon as possible after his/her appointment. Initial contact will normally be made through e-mail. Correspondence to the trainee will include an explanation of the CEAA training process for EAC PEVs with a schedule of training events. Expectations based on ABET's PEV Competency Model for PEVs will be clearly communicated at this time. The training process includes the following elements:

- New PEVs will complete an on-line training program. The PEV Training Pre-Work is organized as six modules that provide increasing depth and detail about ABET accreditation: Overview, the Accreditation Process, the Role of the Program Evaluator, Assessment Basics, Applying the Criteria, and the Program Evaluator Appraisal Process. The trainee must complete required pre-work assignments as part of this exercise. These assignments will be reviewed by the trainee's mentor.
- Following successful completion of the Pre-Work training, the trainee will attend a Face to-Face training workshop. The PEV trainee will interact with other trainees where they will receive instruction on practical aspects of campus visits as well as ABET procedures and practices. The two-day face to face workshop simulates an actual campus visit where trainees make decisions and recommendations using realistic scenarios. Each PEV candidate will be evaluated by his/her peers. The candidate will also be evaluated by his/her Training Facilitator, who plays the role of

Team Chair, during the face-to-face training. ABET provides evaluation results for each PEV to CEAA's Training Committee, Mentoring Committee, and Program Evaluator Assignment Coordinator. If a PEV candidate does not achieve a satisfactory rating on his/her performance evaluation, they are informed by ABET and will not be assigned as an IEEE PEV.

- PEV candidates who have satisfactorily completed the Face-to-Face ABET training workshop must also complete EAC Program Criteria (Criterion 9) training prior to being assigned to a campus visit team. This final phase of the new PEV's training requires the evaluator to complete a set of case studies addressing practical situations relating to IEEE program criteria. This training utilizes web-based exercises that are linked to the PEV's CEAA Mentor. The discussion that follows completion of each case study reinforces the earlier training and provides an opportunity to answer any questions the PEV may have.
- At this time the PEV's CEAA Mentor must make a determination on final qualification status of the new PEV. The mentor is responsible for recommending to the CEAA Chair candidates who are fully qualified to participate on campus visit teams as IEEE PEVs. The chair will make final approval recommendations and ABET will notify the candidates.
- The mentor may continue to be a resource for the new PEV who is preparing for or conducting their first campus visit.

Training of Experienced Program Evaluators. The focus in training experienced PEVs is on maintaining the PEV's competencies and keeping the evaluator informed on issues and changes. Criterion, procedures or practices are subject to change from one year to another. Likewise, certain areas may need to be emphasized to ensure appropriate decision making by visit teams. These areas can be taken care through CEAA's mentoring process and by communicating through the yearly mentors' letter to IEEE PEVs who are assigned for the current visit cycle. While this process will ensure continued competency of the majority of IEEE PEVs, some special cases may occur. For example, a PEV who has not participated in a campus visit in several years or evaluators who receive low marks on their evaluations might require special training and mentoring. This should be handled on a case-by-case basis ensuring common sense and good judgment is applied to each case.

Remedial Action

PEVs are evaluated against the Program Evaluator Competency model by their team chairs, institutional representatives and their fellow PEVs. The six PEV competencies are:

- The PEV is technically current
- The PEV is an effective communicator
- The PEV is interpersonally skilled
- The PEV is team-oriented
- The PEV is professional
- The PEV is organized

In cases where a PEV's performance falls below expectations, the PEV is removed from the approved CEAA visitor list. In some cases, remedial action may be taken to reinstate a PEV's status as an approved visitor. This decision and appropriate remedial action will be decided by the CEAA Chair in conjunction with the CEAA Visit Assignment Coordinators and the CEAA Mentoring Coordinator.

Best Practices

The CEAA Training Coordinator should maintain liaison with colleagues involved with EAC PEV training in sister societies. It is strongly recommended that the Training Coordinator actively participate in ABET

training workshops, perhaps as a Training Facilitator. He/she should share ideas and innovations in training that are gained from these experiences.

Continuous Improvement

All aspects of the accreditation process must be subjected to the continuous improvement process. Training is no exception. The CEAA Training Committee should assess outcomes of PEV training on a regular basis. The frequency of evaluation should be not more than two years and should incorporate metrics that reflect performance of PEVs. While the CEAA training and mentoring processes are the focus of this effort, it is important to provide feedback and recommendations to the ABET training process as well.

[Section 8: Review of Visit Reports](#)

Purpose

This process describes the method that will be employed for the CEAA review of accreditation visit reports completed by IEEE PEVs.

Objectives

The objectives of this process are:

1. To ensure that ABET engineering accreditation standards and criteria are applied consistently to all accreditation visits for which IEEE provides the evaluator.
2. To permit timely CEAA participation in the ABET due process activities, through the IEEE Caucus.
3. To provide feedback to PEVs to help them improve their performance.
4. To provide feedback to the CEAA Training Coordinator to improve evaluator training.
5. To provide an early warning to the CEAA Chair and IEEE representatives to the EAC of those accreditation recommendations that may be inconsistent with the application of ABET accreditation criteria.
6. To identify PEVs whose performance is sufficiently superior as to warrant consideration for membership in the CEAA.
7. To identify PEVs whose performance is inferior and who require special consideration with respect to training and/or future visit assignments.
8. To provide public recognition of the efforts put forth by the PEVs.

Process Owner

This process is owned and maintained by the Chair of the CEAA Mentoring Committee, who is responsible for its on-going implementation.

Process

1. Appointment of Mentors. In accord with the Visit Assignment process, a mentor will be appointed by the (Visit Assignment) Mentor Coordinator for each PEV assigned to a program visit. The CEAA Mentor Coordinator is assigned to new PEVs (those who are assigned to their first visit). A listing of these assignments will be distributed to all members of the CEAA at the fall meeting of the CEAA, and updated as necessary during the visit cycle.

2. Pre-visit Correspondence with Evaluators. Also in accord with the Visit Assignment process, the (Program Evaluator Assignment Coordinator) assigned mentor shall correspond in the name of the CEAA Chair with each assigned PEV (1) reminding him or her of the deliverables to be provided to both ABET and CEAA that result from their visit; and (2) providing the PEV with names and contact information of the Chair of CEAA and their assigned CEAA mentor. The mentor shall correspond with the PEV prior to the visit, offering assistance with accreditation issues arising during the visit process and reminding the PEV of the reporting expectations, including deadlines.
3. Exit-Time Visit Report. Copies of the complete exit-time visit report submitted by the PEV to the Team Chair are to be sent immediately after the visit to the CEAA mentors and to the CEAA Chair. The evaluator shall also submit to the CEAA supplemental information (to the extent that it is not included in the visit report) that might be necessary in reviewing the visit report. If the visit report has not been received within 30 days of date of the visit, the assigned mentor shall request status of the report from the PEV.
4. Due Process Activities of Evaluator. ABET encourages the visited programs to remedy shortcomings at any time prior to the time that the EAC determines and adopts the accreditation action. While due-process communications from the program may be submitted for consideration at any time during the due-process period, there are two primary responses: the 14-day response, immediately following the visit and based on contents of the exit interview and the Program Audit Form and Explanation of Shortcomings; and a 30-day response based on the contents of the Preliminary Statement to the Institution. To the extent that the PEV is involved in the due process activities, the PEV shall promptly provide to the CEAA Chair and his or her mentor any substantive revisions to the exit-time visit report and other materials previously submitted to the CEAA. Substantive revisions specifically include any changes in the proposed statement to the institution, The Program Audit Form and Explanation of Shortcomings form, and the recommended accreditation action. Submission by email is preferred.
5. Post-visit Consultations. The CEAA mentors may consult directly with the PEV and indirectly through those CEAA members who are also IEEE representatives to the EAC with the Team Chair or with other EAC members and staff to clarify ambiguities in the exit-time visit report, its due-process revisions, the statement to the institution, and the recommended accreditation action. Any such consultation shall be fully coordinated with the CEAA Chair.
6. Review. Each mentor will compile a report review of the PEV's report and recommendations. The review report shall contain (1) the evaluator's name; (2) the CEAA mentor's name; (3) a very brief synopsis of the exit-time state of the program; (4) comments with respect to the quality of the exit-time visit report and suggestions for improvement; (5) comments with respect to any changes induced by any due process response and suggestions for improvement; (6) a discussion of the recommended accreditation action by the PEV indicating the reviewer's (mentor's) own recommendation; (7) a consultant-assigned grade on the quality of the visit report as amended by any changes induced by any due process response; and (8) comments to CEAA members regarding accreditation issues brought to light in the visit report.
7. The Report Review CEAA form in [Appendix A](#) shall be used by each mentor in making the visit report review. Grades for visit reports shall be assigned in accordance with the guidelines of [Appendix B](#).
8. Submission and Distribution of Visit Report Evaluations. Each reviewer will submit (by e-mail) each Visit Report Evaluation to the CEAA Mentoring Committee Chairperson within 7 days or as soon thereafter as practicable of receipt of the visit report from the PEV. The CEAA Chairperson will tabulate results of the review of all programs visited by IEEE evaluators. The tabulated information will be distributed to the membership of the CEAA for the purpose of (1) improving the CEAA mentoring and review processes, and (2) assisting the EAC to ensure the correct accreditation action is taken. Following deliberations on this information by the CEAA at its winter meeting, concerns with respect to specific programs shall be provided to the senior IEEE representative to the EAC to be used at his or her discretion in subsequent deliberations by the EAC.

9. Feedback to Program Evaluators. Suggestions for improvement, based on the Program Report Evaluation and the subsequent deliberations of the CEAA, shall be distributed to each PEV by the PEV's mentor.
10. Provision of Review Information to EAC. Information pertaining to due process responses gleaned by CEAA from its correspondence with PEVs may, at the sole discretion of the Chair of CEAA, be communicated with members of EAC. With respect to programs of previous concern to the CEAA and to other programs for which the recommended action was changed, the CEAA Chair shall provide the due process commentaries to the senior IEEE representative to the EAC to be used at his or her discretion in subsequent deliberations by the EAC.

Section 9 Handling of Personnel Issues

CEAA At-Large-Members

1. **Recognition of an issue based on non-attendance at CEAA meetings, non-performance of mentoring assignments or unprofessional behavior.**
2. **CEAA Chair makes initial decision based on personal observation or based on input from other IEEE members.**
3. **CEAA Chair confers with the CEAA Chair-Elect (or CEAA Past-Chair) and the CEAA Mentoring Coordinator to confirm that action is required.**
4. **CEAA Chair directs the IEEE Accreditation Administrator (AA) to not renew the individual at the end of the current 1-year term. The individual will remain as a member of the PEV pool unless otherwise indicated by the chair.**
5. **Any inquiries to CEAA or to IEEE AA are to be directed to the CEAA Chair for response as appropriate.**

IEEE PEV's Assigned by CEAA

1. **Issue is initiated by ABET and then routed through IEEE HQ to the IEEE CEAA Accreditation Administrator (AA). If an issue is uncovered through the CEAA mentoring process, then move directly to item 3 below.**
2. **The IEEE CEAA AA gives the name of the individual and a contact at ABET to the CEAA Chair.**
3. **CEAA Chair contacts the originator at ABET to understand the situation.**
If the situation can be handled through remediation, then the process listed below will be followed as indicated.
4. **CEAA Chair confers with the CEAA Chair-Elect (or CEAA Past Chair) and the CEAA Visit Assignment Coordinators. (Alternatively the Mentoring Chair)**
5. **CEAA Chair directs the CEAA Visit Assignment Coordinators to not assign the individual to a visit and to not renew the individual at the end of their current 5-year term.**
If remediation is appropriate, then no assignment is made until the retraining is complete and then the 5-year term will be completed as normal.
6. **Any inquiries to the CEAA Visit Assignment Coordinators or to the IEEE CEAA AA are to be handled with the following response:**

“Thank you for your inquiry regarding your assignment as an IEEE PEV. As you may know, we are unable to assign each PEV every year. If you have any questions regarding your PEV assignment, please contact the IEEE CEAA Chair... (name and email address).”

- 8. CEAA Chair to handle any inquiries as appropriate.**

[Appendix B](#)

Grading Guidelines for Visit Reports

Grades assigned to visit reports by CEAA reviewer/consultants require considerable judgment of the reviewer/consultant. Guidelines for assigning grades are listed in this appendix.

The grade to be assigned by each reviewer/consultant shall be a number in the range of 0 (lowest) to 5 (highest), unacceptable to outstanding, respectively, with a grade of 3 being "satisfactory". The following grade descriptors are associated with each grade level. Fractional grades (e.g. 3.7) can be assigned.

5 = outstanding in every regard. Among the very best

4 = very good, no significant shortcomings, findings and recommended action appear to be accurate

3 = good in most respects, some shortcomings and opportunities for improvement

2 = serious shortcomings, incomplete report, inconsistencies noted which required CEAA intervention

1 = unacceptable, many shortcomings, retraining required before another visit will be assigned

0 = no report submitted

Answers to the following questions may be of help in assigning grades:

- a. Is the recommended accreditation action consistent with the entirety of information contained in the visit report and other materials submitted for review? Note that this is a requirement for consistency only. The visit report may have critical information missing. If this requirement is satisfied, a grade of 3 or higher could be assigned depending upon report contents.
- b. Is the report sufficiently complete and is the recommended accreditation action supported by the statements contained therein? Included is a requirement for consistency and completeness. Additionally, the report will contain a logical flow of thought that affirms the decision making process that leads to the recommended accreditation action. A visit report satisfying these conditions could be assigned a grade of 4 or higher.
- c. Has ABET accreditation criteria been appropriately applied to the program visited? If current ABET accreditation criteria has not been used and the report is still usable by ABET, a grade as high as 4 could be assigned.
- d. Can ABET use the visit report as the basis for defending the recommended accreditation action? If ABET cannot use the visit report as the basis for defending the recommended accreditation action, it is clearly not satisfactory. A grade of 2 or less may be appropriate. If a visit report has not been provided, a grade of 0 would be warranted.
- e. Has all the information requested by CEAA been provided? CEAA is a review body and does request materials in addition to those required by the visit Team Chair. If some or all of materials requested by CEAA are missing and if the omission of these materials from those submitted to CEAA does not materially affect CEAA's ability to examine the program, a small penalty as large as 0.5 might be deducted from the grade as generated from the other components discussed herein.

[Return to Top of Document](#)