November 9, 2016

Burns Hargis
President
Oklahoma State University
107 Whitehurst
Stillwater, OK 74078

Dear Dr. Hargis:

I am pleased to transmit to you the findings of the Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET with respect to the evaluation conducted for Oklahoma State University during 2015-2016. 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,

Lawrence Jones
President

Enclosure: Commission letter and attachments
November 9, 2016

Paul J. Tikalsky
Dean
Oklahoma State University
201 ATRC
Stillwater, OK 74078

Dear Dr. Tikalsky:

The Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET recently held its 2016 Summer Meeting to act on the program evaluations conducted during 2015-2016. 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 Oklahoma 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 2015-2016 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 2015-2016 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 2015-2016 Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (available at www.abet.org).

Sincerely,

Sarah A. Rajala, Chair
Engineering Accreditation Commission

Enclosure: Summary of Accreditation Action
Final Statement

cc: Burns Hargis, President
Randy Seitsinger, Associate Dean
Scott Teare, Visit Team Chair
Engineering Accreditation Commission
Summary of Accreditation Actions for the 2015-2016 Accreditation Cycle

Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK

Aerospace Engineering (BSAE)
Architectural Engineering (BARCHE)
Biosystems Engineering (BSBIOE)
Chemical Engineering (BSChE)
Civil Engineering (BSCE)
Computer Engineering (BSCompE)
Electrical Engineering (BSEE)
Industrial Engineering and Management (BSIEM)
Mechanical Engineering (BSME)

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.
Final Statement of Accreditation
to

Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK

2015-2016 Accreditation Cycle
Introduction & Discussion of Statement Construct

The Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET has evaluated the aerospace engineering, architectural engineering, biosystems engineering, chemical engineering, civil engineering, computer engineering, electrical engineering, industrial engineering and management, and mechanical engineering programs of Oklahoma State University.

This statement is the final summary of the EAC evaluation, at the institutional and engineering-program levels. It includes information received during due process, along with information submitted with the seven-day response. The statement that follows consists of two parts: the first addresses the institution and its overall engineering educational unit, and the second addresses the individual engineering programs. 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 review.
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 current accreditation action but is offered to assist the institution in its continuing efforts to improve its programs.

Oklahoma State University (OSU), founded in 1890 as the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, is a large comprehensive land-grant university with an enrollment of over 35,000 students on five campuses with about 70 percent on the Stillwater campus. Bachelor’s, master’s and doctoral degrees are offered. The undergraduate student enrollment is diverse, but comprised largely of in-state students, with 81 percent from Oklahoma, 16 percent from other states, and three percent from more than 120 different countries. Minorities constitute about 20 percent of the undergraduate student body. OSU has graduated more than 240,000 students since its inception.

The College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology (CEAT) was founded more than 125 years ago and has approximately 4,100 undergraduate students, with 3,043 enrolled in engineering programs. The college has 133 full-time faculty members who are active in the scholarship of both teaching and research. One program, mechanical engineering, is offered in two locations, Stillwater and Tulsa, but is administered by the same academic units and one faculty. The Tulsa campus, which was visited during this review, provides laboratory, multimedia, and distance-learning-capable teaching facilities.

The following units were reviewed and found to adequately support the engineering programs: mathematics, physics, chemistry, library, honor’s college, CEAT academic student services, registrar, and admissions.

Institutional Strength

1. The engineering programs have recognized the importance of helping students early in their college careers. The bridge program for incoming students in danger of not succeeding and the supplemental instruction in Calculus I are having a significant effect on improving student retention and enabling student progression to the second year.
Introduction

The aerospace engineering BSAE program is housed in the School of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. The program prepares students for careers in the aerospace industry and related fields. The program began as an aeronautical option to the mechanical engineering program and graduated its first class in 1928. The program was first accredited in 1960, and the name was officially changed to aerospace engineering in 2000. Topics of study include aerospace materials, structures, aerodynamics, propulsion, flight mechanics and stability and control. The program, which graduated 57 students during the previous academic year, currently has 96 undergraduate students and shares 18 faculty members, support staff and a number of instructional and research laboratories with the mechanical engineering program.

Program Strength

1. The program is doing an outstanding job in assessing and evaluating student outcomes, and then using those results to continuously improve the program.

Program Weakness

1. Criteria 2. Program Educational Objectives This criterion requires that the program 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. Program educational objectives are broad statements that describe what graduates are expected to attain within a few years of graduation. The program educational objectives published by the program are statements that describe what students are expected to know and be able to do at the time of graduation. Therefore, these statements do not meet the definition of program educational objectives. As a result, the program may not be adequately considering the desired post-graduate achievements of its graduates or representing the program accurately to its constituents. Therefore, strength of compliance with this criterion is lacking.

3
30-day due-process response: The EAC acknowledges receipt of documentation detailing a revised set of program educational objectives that were generated according to revised and documented procedures. The dates of completion of the various procedural steps were provided along with the date and location of publication of the revised program educational objectives. The revised program educational objectives contain broad statements that are focused on post-graduation attainments. The relationship between student outcomes and the program educational objectives was described.

The weakness is resolved.
Program Criteria for Architectural and Similarly Named Engineering Programs

Introduction

The architectural engineering BARCHE program is one of two programs housed in the School of Architecture. The program was originally established in 1909 and has been offered continuously since that time. In fall of 2015, 90 students are enrolled in the program; 12 students graduated in the 2014-15 academic year. Nineteen full-time faculty members are affiliated with the program: 14 are aligned with the school’s architecture program, four with the architectural engineering program, and one is serving in an administrative capacity. Four full-time clerical and technical staff members are supporting the program.

Program Concern

1. Criterion 6. Faculty This criterion requires that the faculty members are of sufficient number and have the competencies to cover all of the curricular areas of the program. This criterion also requires that there be sufficient faculty to accommodate adequate levels of student-faculty interaction, student advising and counseling, university service activities, professional development, and interactions with industrial and professional practitioners, as well as employers of students. The documentation provided indicates that only one faculty member is responsible for the instruction of all building mechanical systems courses and all electrical systems courses, and that only one faculty member is responsible for all of the management area courses. Additional information provided indicates that faculty members in other CEAT programs have expertise in these areas and could teach required courses, if needed. The program currently meets this criterion; however, this low number of faculty members in three out of the four required curricular areas makes it difficult for the faculty to accommodate adequate levels of student interaction, mentoring, and advising in these particular areas of architectural engineering. As such, a sudden or unforeseen change in the faculty members teaching in the program could jeopardize future compliance with this criterion.
• 30-day due-process response: The EAC acknowledges receipt of documentation detailing the current faculty members across the college who are qualified and available to provide instruction on building mechanical and electrical systems as well as management related courses. The documentation did not address the number of available faculty members in the department to provide interaction, mentoring and advising in these particular areas of the program.

• The concern remains unresolved.
Introduction

The biosystems engineering BSBIOE program is jointly administered by the College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology and by the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources. The first students graduated from the agricultural engineering program in 1924 and the program has gone through several name and emphasis changes through the years, becoming biosystems engineering in 1994. The program has three curricular options: biomechanical, bioprocessing and food processing, and environmental and natural resources. Currently 127 students are enrolled in the program and 34 students graduated in the previous academic year. The program is delivered by 22 faculty members, distributed as one instructor, two assistant professors, 11 associate professors, and eight full professors; with 16 of these professionals having teaching responsibilities. Eleven support staff personnel support the administrative, technological, and design requirements of the program; and two additional support personnel are responsible for the computer systems.

Program Strength

1. Students are immersed in the biosystems program from their first semester, and have the opportunity to build on their biosystems knowledge across all four years. This distinguishes the program and provides students with significant depth in their field by the time they graduate.

Program Weakness

1. Criterion 2. Program Educational Objectives This criterion states that 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. Program educational objectives are broad statements that describe what graduates are expected to attain within a few years of graduation. The program educational objectives published by the program are statements that describe what students are expected to know and be able to do at the time of
graduation. Therefore, these statements do not meet the definition of program educational objectives. As a result, the program may not be adequately considering the desired post-graduate achievements of its graduates or representing the program accurately to its constituents. Therefore, strength of compliance with this criterion is lacking.

- **30-day due-process response:** The EAC acknowledges receipt of documentation detailing a revised set of program educational objectives, which were generated according to the documented procedures. The dates of completion of the various procedural steps were included in the document and the online publication of the revised program educational objectives was reviewed. The revised program educational objectives contain broad statements that are focused on post-graduation attainments.

- The weakness is resolved.
Chemical Engineering
BSChE Program

Program Criteria for Chemical, Biochemical, Biomolecular and Similarly Named Engineering Programs

Introduction

The chemical engineering BSChE program was initiated in 1917 and had its first graduating class in 1921. The program has a general option, a biomedical/biochemical option, and a pre-medical option. The School of Chemical Engineering also offers M.S. and Ph.D. programs in chemical engineering, and a minor in petroleum engineering. Ten full-time faculty members deliver the program. Three additional faculty members in the school are part of the petroleum engineering program and do not teach courses in the chemical engineering BSChE program. The program currently has 450 full-time students and 25 part-time students. The program graduated 37 students in the 2014-15 academic year. Courses are taught in traditional classroom and laboratory venues.

Program Strength

1. The program has an active and successful AIChE student chapter, as evidenced by more than 16 years of receiving the Outstanding Student Chapter Award. The chapter has consistently placed high in the AIChE Student Design and ChemE Car competitions. These achievements display exemplary commitment to professionalism and performance from a large number of students and faculty members in the program.
Civil Engineering
BSCE Program

Program Criteria for Civil and Similarly Named Engineering Programs

Introduction

The civil engineering BSCE program is administered by the School of Civil and Environmental Engineering and has been accredited since 1936. The program has two options, civil engineering and environmental engineering, both leading to a Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering degree. The program currently has 262 full-time students and 11 part-time students. The program produced 43 graduates in the 2014-15 academic year. The program is delivered by 17 full-time tenure-track or tenured faculty members, including five professors, five associate professors, and seven assistant professors.

Program Concern

1. Criterion 4. Continuous Improvement  This criterion requires that the program regularly use appropriate, documented processes for assessing and evaluating the extent to which the student outcomes are being attained and the results of these evaluations must be systematically utilized as input for the continuous improvement of the program. The Fundamentals of Engineering Exam results, which are used for assessing certain outcomes, were only available for the past three years. Currently, sufficient assessment results from other sources support that the criterion is being satisfied. However, without consistent gathering of data, the potential exists for the situation to change such that the criterion may not be satisfied in the future.

- 30-day due-process response: The EAC acknowledges receipt of documentation describing the program's plans and efforts to-date to improve the gathering and use of data from the Fundamentals of Engineering Exam in the assessment process. Full implementation of these plans is still in progress.

- The concern remains unresolved.
Introduction

The computer engineering BSCompE program is housed in the School of Electrical and Computer Engineering. The program was established in 2008. Currently the program has 145 undergraduate students, and 14 students graduated last year. There are 23 tenured and tenure-track faculty members, and one visiting faculty member in the school, which serve both the computer engineering and electrical engineering programs. Approximately 635 undergraduate and graduate students are enrolled in the school across both of these programs. The school has three full-time administrative staff members, one full-time technician, and a part-time general staff member.

Program Weakness

1. **Criterion 2. Program Educational Objectives** The criterion states that 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. Program educational objectives are broad statements that describe what graduates are expected to attain within a few years of graduation. The program educational objectives published by the program are statements that describe what students are expected to know and be able to do at the time of graduation. Therefore, these statements do not meet the definition of program educational objectives. As a result, the program may not be adequately considering the desired post-graduate achievements of its graduates or representing the program accurately to its constituents. Therefore, strength of compliance with this criterion is lacking.

- **30-day due-process response:** The EAC acknowledges receipt of documentation detailing a revised set of program educational objectives that were generated according to the documented procedures. The dates of completion of the various procedural steps were provided along with the date and location of publication of the revised program educational
objectives. The revised program educational objectives contain broad statements that are focused on post-graduation attainments.

- The weakness is resolved.

Program Concerns

1. **Criterion 6. Faculty**  This criterion states that the program must demonstrate that the faculty members are of sufficient number and have the competencies to cover all of the curricular areas of the program. There must be sufficient faculty to accommodate adequate levels of student-faculty interaction, student advising and counseling, university service activities, professional development, and interactions with industrial and professional practitioners, as well as employers of students. The program faculty must have appropriate qualifications and must have and demonstrate sufficient authority to ensure the proper guidance of the program and to develop and implement processes for the evaluation, assessment, and continuing improvement of the program. The school has 24 faculty members; most of them are primarily specialized towards electrical engineering. Only three faculty members are designated as purely computer engineering faculty. The program is heavily dependent on the faculty of electrical engineering. Some of the key areas of the program, such as algorithms, networks and databases, are understaffed. Although the school has begun a search for a faculty position in computer engineering, currently the program has limited ability to offer a variety of upper division elective courses. Lack of access to faculty members who specialize in computer engineering has the potential to impact the adequacy of elective course offerings and sufficient student-faculty interactions. Thus, future compliance with this criterion may be jeopardized.

- **30-day due-process response:** The EAC acknowledges receipt of a document identifying the faculty members from other programs who are available to teach computer engineering courses. The document confirms the current search for an assistant professor. A tenure-track faculty member from the electrical engineering technology program has been appointed as an adjunct faculty member for the computer engineering program. Additionally, a faculty member within the department has been formally reassigned from primary association with electrical engineering to computer engineering. An offer has been extended to a candidate to teach digital signal processing courses, who is also capable of
teaching computer engineering courses. The program is making a good effort to improve the number of faculty members directly associated with the computer engineering program and it is anticipated that when the hiring plans are completely implemented the program will have a sufficient number of faculty members to deliver all key program areas.

- The concern remains unresolved.

2. **Criterion 7. Facilities** This criterion requires that a program have classrooms, offices, laboratories, and associated equipment that are adequate to support attainment of the student outcomes and to provide an atmosphere conducive to learning. Modern tools, equipment, computing resources, and laboratories appropriate to the program must be available, accessible, and systematically maintained and upgraded to enable students to attain the student outcomes and to support program needs. Although the laboratory infrastructure currently is appropriate to the curriculum, no systematic plan to upgrade the specialized hardware, software tools, and laboratories associated with computer engineering exists. Thus, compliance with this criterion may be jeopardized if the specialized hardware, software, and laboratories fail to meet students’ learning needs in the future.

- **30-day due-process response:** The EAC acknowledges receipt of a document detailing the plans to improve the infrastructure and facilities within the college that will impact the program. Although the development of a new laboratory plan is getting underway, a systematic plan to upgrade specialized hardware, tools and laboratories has not been presented beyond the identification of potential funding sources.

- The concern remains unresolved.
Program Criteria for Electrical, Computer, Communications, Telecommunication(s) and Similarly Named Engineering Programs

Introduction

The electrical engineering BSEE program is housed in the School of Electrical and Computer Engineering. The program was initially established in 1909 and was first accredited in 1936. Currently the program has 256 students enrolled and 43 students graduated in the previous academic year. There are 24 full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the school catering to the needs of the 635 undergraduate and graduate students in both the electrical and computer engineering programs. The school has three full-time administrative staff members, a full-time technician, and a part-time general staff member.

Program Weaknesses

1. **Criterion 2. Program Educational Objectives** This criterion states that 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. Program educational objectives are broad statements that describe what graduates are expected to attain within a few years of graduation. The program educational objectives published by the program are statements that describe what students are expected to know and be able to do at the time of graduation. Therefore, these statements do not meet the definition of program educational objectives. As a result, the program may not be adequately considering the desired post-graduate achievements of its graduates or representing the program accurately to its constituents. Therefore, strength of compliance with this criterion is lacking.

- **30-day due-process response:** The EAC acknowledges receipt of documentation detailing a revised set of program educational objectives that were generated according to the documented procedures. The dates of completion of the various procedural steps were provided along with the date and location of publication of the revised program educational
objectives. The revised program educational objectives contain broad statements that are focused on post-graduation attainments.

- The weakness is resolved.

2. **Criterion 6. Faculty** This criterion requires that the faculty must be sufficient to accommodate adequate levels of student-faculty interaction, student advising and counseling, university service activities, professional development, and interactions with industrial and professional practitioners, as well as employers of students. Discussions with alumni revealed that they had past difficulties in accessing faculty for advising, and current students reported that they have difficulties in accessing faculty for advising in the areas of electronics, communications and solid state, as well as in the other technical areas. Thus, it appears that insufficient student-faculty interaction is available and students find it difficult to obtain technical advising in a timely manner and over a range of topics. The program lacks strength of compliance with this criterion.

- **30-day due-process response:** The EAC acknowledges receipt of documentation acknowledging the limited access students have had in accessing and interacting with faculty members. The program describes a policy change that has been implemented to provide posted office hours in which faculty members will be accessible to students for at least three hours per week, along with a mechanism to set up non-office-hour appointments. Additional resources have been added to provide monthly presentations by the faculty on technical fields of interest for students, as well as pizza nights each semester to provide information and advice on curriculum and career options. Approval has been made to hire a clinical assistant professor who will focus 35 percent of his or her time on student advising. These changes provide significant improvements in student-faculty interactions and advising.

- The weakness is resolved.

**Program Concern**

1. **Criterion 7. Facilities** This criterion requires that classrooms, offices, laboratories, and associated equipment be adequate to support attainment of the student outcomes and to provide
an atmosphere conducive to learning. Modern tools, equipment, computing resources, and laboratories appropriate to the program must be available, accessible, and systematically maintained and upgraded to enable students to attain the student outcomes and to support program needs. Currently, sufficient laboratory infrastructure is available for the students. However, recent increases in student enrollment will place a corresponding increase in demand on the laboratory facilities. Enrollment growth is expected to continue at the rate of approximately eight percent per year. Additionally, upgrades in the laboratory equipment for the computer engineering program may compete for resources in the School of Electrical and Computer Engineering. A long-range plan appears to be lacking for the program to provide laboratories that are maintained and upgraded to support program needs. Although the criterion is currently satisfied, a potential exists that future compliance with the criterion may be jeopardized.

- **30-day due-process response:** The EAC acknowledges receipt of documentation detailing the plans to improve the infrastructure and facilities within the college that will impact the program. Although the development of a new laboratory plan is getting underway, a systematic plan for upgrades and maintenance has not been presented beyond the identification of potential funding sources.

- The concern remains unresolved.
Industrial Engineering and Management
BSIEM Program

Program Criteria for Industrial and Similarly Named Engineering Programs

Introduction

The industrial engineering and management BSIEM program was originally established in 1925 as industrial engineering. In 1950 the name was changed to industrial engineering and management to enrich the program and better prepare students to take on leadership and managerial rolls. Approximately 130 students are currently enrolled in the undergraduate program; 24 degrees were awarded in 2014. The program is delivered by 15 faculty members who are dedicated to the program.

Program Concern

1. Criterion 5. Curriculum This criterion states that the professional component must include one and one-half years of engineering topics, consisting of engineering sciences and engineering design appropriate to the student's field of study. While the program, as defined, goes beyond the minimum requirements for engineering topics and all student transcripts reviewed showed sufficient coverage, several transcripts showed substitution of business courses for courses that were identified as having engineering content. The potential exists that curricular modifications could be made in the future that create a situation in which students allowed to make business-course substitutions for engineering courses might not receive the engineering content required, thus jeopardizing continued compliance with this criterion.

- 30-day due-process response: The EAC acknowledges receipt of documentation that includes a revised Table 5-1 showing that the current curriculum includes 48 credit hours of engineering topics even if the two required engineering management-oriented courses and a controlled elective are all substituted with business courses. However, the response did not address the policy of allowing these substitutions within the required curriculum.

- The concern is unresolved.
Introduction

The mechanical engineering BSME program is housed in the School of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. The program is a traditional one that prepares its undergraduates for careers in the thermal and mechanical systems areas. It began in 1898 in Stillwater, OK, from where it is still administered. In 2000, a second site was opened in Tulsa, OK. Currently, both sites offer a complete array of courses to allow for students to graduate from either location. In addition to the traditional program, a pre-medical option is available to students. Furthermore, overlap with the aerospace engineering program allows for many students to double-major in the two disciplines. The program currently has approximately 975 students, and graduates about 140 students each year. The program has 22 full-time faculty members and two part-time faculty members.

Program Strength

1. The program is successfully offered at two locations: Stillwater and Tulsa. The faculty ably teaches courses at both locations, allowing many non-traditional students to complete their degree in an evening setting in Tulsa, which is close to their homes and jobs. The attention given to both locations and the coordination employed between locations can serve as a model for other programs considering offering programs in multiple locations.

Program Weakness

1. Criterion 2. Program Educational Objectives This criterion states that 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. Program educational objectives are broad statements that describe what graduates are expected to attain within a few years of graduation. The program educational objectives published by the program are statements that describe what students are expected to know and be able to do at the time of graduation. Therefore, these statements do not meet the definition of program educational objectives. As a result, the program may not be adequately considering the desired post-
graduate achievements of its graduates or representing the program accurately to constituents. Therefore, strength of compliance with this criterion is lacking.

- **30-day due-process response**: The EAC acknowledges receipt of documentation detailing a revised set of program educational objectives that were generated according to the revised and documented procedures. The dates of completion of the various procedural steps were provided along with the date and location of publication of the revised program educational objectives. The revised program educational objectives contain broad statements that are focused on post-graduation attainments. The relationship between student outcomes and the program educational objectives was described.

- The weakness is resolved.