

The People at the Heart of ABET Accreditation

2009 Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2008-2009






Table of Contents



ABET at a Glance Page 2

The People of ABET Page 6

Executive Letter Page 7

A Legacy of Leadership. Page 8

Q&A with Dr. Michael Milligan Page 9

The People at the Heart of ABET Accreditation. Page 12

Highlights of the Year Page 16

ABET Accreditation Council. Page 19

ASAC Commission Page 21

CAC Commission. Page 23

EAC Commission Page 25

TAC Commission Page 27

Industry Advisory Council Page 29

International Activities Council Page 31

Financial Highlights Page 33

Notes to Financial Statements. Page 36

Statistics. Page 38

ABET Board of Directors. Page 46

Team Chairs Page 47

2008-2009 Program Evaluators Page 49

ABET Professional Staff. Page 57

Fellows of ABET. Page 58

Linton E. Grinter Award Page 59

President's Awards for Diversity Page 60

Who's Who on Our Covers. Page 61

ABET at a Glance



ABET is...

- The global gold standard in professional technical education accreditation.
- The recognized accreditor for applied science, computing, engineering, and technology programs.
- A federation of 30 professional technical societies that represent “the professions.” (See page 3.)
- A 501(c) 3 nonprofit staffed by 34 full- and part-time employees and over 1,500 volunteers.



ABET's Vision

ABET will provide world leadership in assuring quality and in stimulating innovation in applied science, computing, engineering, and technology education.

ABET's Mission

ABET serves the public through the promotion and advancement of education in applied science, computing, engineering, and technology. ABET will:

- Accredit educational programs.
- Promote quality and innovation in education.
- Consult and assist in the development and advancement of education worldwide in a financially self-sustaining manner.
- Communicate with our constituencies and the public regarding activities and accomplishments.
- Anticipate and prepare for the changing environment and the future needs of constituencies.
- Manage the operations and resources to be effective and fiscally responsible.

ABET's Impact:

85,000 students graduate from ABET-accredited programs each year.

ABET's Scope of Services:

- Accredits programs—not institutions, faculty, curricula, or degrees—to ensure they are relevant, sufficient, and technically strong.
- Includes associate-, bachelor-, and master-level programs.
- Is a peer-review accreditor, meaning that all accreditation visits, decisions, and actions are accomplished by members of the profession working for one of the four ABET Commissions: applied science, computing, engineering, and technology.
- Offers workshops, conferences, and educational programming to institutions to help them understand the accreditation process and how to improve the quality of their programs.


ABET at a Glance, continued

ABET Accredits Nearly 3,000 Programs Worldwide

Discipline	Began Accrediting	No. of Programs	No. of Institutions	Top Three Program Areas by Level
Applied Science	1983	66	56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial Hygiene – MS • Surveying & Geomatics – BS • Safety – BS
Computing	1985 ¹	323	263	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computer Science – BS • Information Systems – BS • Information Technology – BS
Engineering	1936	1933	397	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electrical Engineering – BS • Mechanical Engineering – BS • Civil Engineering – BS
Technology	1946	651	230	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electrical Technology – BS • Electrical Technology – AS • Mechanical Technology – BS
Total		2961	616	

¹ ABET accredited computing programs from 1972-1985 and 2001 to present (CSAB accredited from 1986-2000).

100 Percent of the Accreditation Decisions Are Made by ABET Volunteers



ABET at a Glance, continued

What ABET's Eight Criteria Cover

When an institution wants its program evaluated by ABET, for the first time or for reaccreditation, it completes a document called a Self Study, which asks for information in the following eight criteria. The Self Study may also require additional information that is specific to the program, but these eight categories form the core of the ABET accreditation system.

Students	Are they evaluated, advised, and monitored for success
Program Educational Objectives	What are the professional accomplishments graduates are expected to achieve five years after graduation
Program Outcomes	What are students expected to know and be able to do upon graduating
Continuous Improvement	How are institutions improving the quality of the academic program to aid the student
Curriculum	Is it appropriate and relevant to the program of study
Faculty	Are they sufficient in number and competent to cover all curricular areas
Facilities	Are the classrooms, laboratories, and equipment sufficient
Support	Does the institution support the program

A By-the-Numbers Look at Institutions with ABET-Accredited Programs

85,000	Number of students who graduate each year from ABET-accredited programs globally
616	Number of institutions with ABET-accredited programs
100%	Percent of the decisions to accredit programs that are voluntary
36%	Of the institutions have chosen to accredit programs beyond engineering
32%	Of the institutions have no accredited engineering programs
24	Most ABET-accredited programs at one institution
9%	Percent of institutions that have programs evaluated by three or four Commissions



ABET at a Glance, continued

ABET's Member Societies

ABET is a federation of 30 professional and technical societies, which own and operate the organization. Each society has curricular responsibilities. Some societies have primary responsibility for a particular curricular area and are designated by the ABET Board as Lead Society. Other societies assist Lead Societies in their curricular responsibilities and are referred to as Cooperating Societies.

American Academy of Environmental Engineers

(AAEE) — www.aaee.net
■ Environmental

American Congress on Surveying and Mapping

(ACSM) — www.acsm.net
■ Geomatics
■ Surveying

American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics

(AIAA) — www.aiaa.org
■ Aeronautical
■ Aerospace

American Institute of Chemical Engineers (AIChE)

— www.aiche.org
■ Chemical

American Industrial Hygiene Association (AIHA)

— www.aiha.org
■ Environmental, Health, and Safety
■ Industrial Hygiene

American Nuclear Society

(ANS) — www.new.ans.org
■ Nuclear
■ Radiological

American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers (ASABE)

— www.asabe.org
■ Agricultural
■ Biological

American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE)

— www.asce.org
■ Architectural
■ Civil
■ Construction

American Society for Engineering Education

(ASEE) — www.asee.org
■ Engineering Physics
■ Engineering Science
■ General Engineering

American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers

(ASHRAE) — www.ashrae.org
■ Air Conditioning

American Society of Mechanical Engineers

(ASME) — www.asme.org
■ Drafting and Design (Mechanical)
■ Engineering Mechanics
■ Mechanical
■ Systems

American Society of Safety Engineers (ASSE)

— www.asse.org
■ Environmental, Health, and Safety
■ Safety

Biomedical Engineering Society (BMES)

— www.bmes.org
■ Bioengineering/
Biomedical

CSAB

— www.csab.org
■ Computer Science
■ Information Systems
■ Information Technology
■ Software

Health Physics Society

(HPS) — www.hps.org
■ Health Physics

IEEE

— www.ieee.org
■ Computer
■ Electrical/Electronics
■ Electromechanical
■ Information Engineering Technology
■ Systems
■ Telecommunications

Institute of Industrial Engineers

(IIE) — www.iienet2.org
■ Engineering Management
■ Industrial
■ Industrial Management
■ Quality Management Systems

International Council on Systems Engineering

(INCOSE) — www.incose.org
■ Systems

International Society of Automation

(ISA) — www.isa.org
■ Instrumentation and Control Systems
■ Systems

National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying

(NCEES) — www.ncees.org
■ Engineering and surveying licensure

National Institute of Ceramic Engineers

(NICE) — www.ceramics.org
■ Ceramic

National Society of Professional Engineers

(NSPE) — www.nspe.org
■ Licensed Engineers

SAE International

(SAE) — www.sae.org
■ Automotive
■ Systems

Society of Fire Protection Engineers

(SFPE) — www.sfpe.org
■ Fire Protection

Society of Manufacturing Engineers (SME)

— www.sme.org
■ Manufacturing

Society for Mining, Metallurgy, and Exploration

(SME-AIME) — www.smenet.org
■ Geological
■ Mining

Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers

(SNAME) — www.sname.org
■ Marine
■ Naval Architecture
■ Ocean

Society of Petroleum Engineers

(SPE) — www.spe.org
■ Petroleum

The Minerals, Metals, and Materials Society


(TMS) — www.tms.org
■ Materials
■ Metallurgical

Associate Member Society

Materials Research Society

(MRS) — www.mrs.org
■ Materials Research


People have been the heart of ABET accreditation since its earliest inking a century ago



In 1908, the American Institute of Chemical Engineers (AIChE) was founded and decided that it needed a unique body of knowledge to properly educate chemical engineers. A committee of prominent professionals deliberated for years on the curricular structure, with consensus coming finally in 1922. A select committee was soon developed, comprised equally of academe and industry. The members' roles were to evaluate programs against the criteria the professions judged critical to the success of new graduates and to publicize a list of institutions with those programs.



A similar, simultaneous effort was well underway by notable members of six other engineering societies. Led by the American Society of Engineering Education's (ASEE) predecessor, the goal was program quality assurance. In 1932, the leadership of the seven influential societies launched the Engineers' Council for Professional Development, ABET's precursor.



While much has changed since ABET's beginnings 77 years ago, one aspect remains indisputably the same. It has always been about the people.

The **30 professional and technical societies** that ensure continued professional excellence through ABET.

The **ABET volunteers** who are involved in every facet of the accreditation process.

The **students and parents** who look to ABET for a quality education.

The **institutions** that add value to their programs by choosing ABET accreditation.

The **faculty and administrators** who impart the ever-evolving body of knowledge to the next generation of technical professionals.

Industry partners who require their employees to possess an arsenal of technical and professional skills to succeed in today's workplace.

The **international education community** that partners with ABET to ensure the mobility of technical professionals as market forces demand.

And **ABET's professional staff**, who rise to every challenge that's presented.

Thanks to all of you, ABET is the global gold standard of technical education accreditation.

It is an understatement to say 2009 was a year for reflection, reevaluation, and regeneration.



The global economic crisis and its impact has been a wake-up call of historic proportions. If we are lifelong learners, we use such teachable moments to our advantage—to redefine what is most important, to sharpen our focus, and to rethink our priorities for the future.

What's Most Important: Our People

Clearly, what has always been most important at ABET has been the people. We have a long heritage of attracting the brightest, most committed volunteers who give generously of their time and talents to improve technical education. This report also honors the ABET professional staff. People envision a large workforce that supports our worldwide accreditation process, so they are surprised to learn ABET employs only 34 full- and part-time staffers. That was particularly true for the 2008-2009 cycle, as ABET was able to accomplish a record-breaking 894 program evaluations thanks to the dedication and determination of both its volunteers and staff.

A Change in Leadership

In 2009, ABET welcomed only its third Executive Director in our 77-year history, (see pages 9). His successor secured, George D. Peterson, Ph.D., P.E., retired from ABET following a decade as a committed volunteer, 15 years as Executive Director, and nearly two years as its Managing Director for International Development. George shepherded ABET through a period of tremendous change (page 8). The legacy of his leadership has benefitted technical professions worldwide and instilled the principles of continuous quality improvement for which ABET is now well known.

Enhancing the Value of Your Investment in ABET



From all sectors of our world—the policymakers, legislators, employers, educators, the media — we hear about the tremendous need for more qualified students in science, engineering, and technology. What we can be extremely proud about each and every day is that we are working to turn that tide. If we partner in the effort to inspire students to follow the professions through ABET program accreditation, it is possible. Only by doing so do you realize the full value of your investment in accreditation and we assume a leadership role in the STEM professions' renaissance.

We thank you for your commitment to technical education and ABET accreditation.

Joseph L. Sussman, Ph.D.
President

Michael K. J. Milligan, Ph.D., P. E.
Executive Director

A Legacy of Leadership



George D. Peterson, Ph.D., P.E.

Executive Director Emeritus
Managing Director for International Development
2009 Linton E. Grinter Distinguished Service Award Recipient



In 1993, Dr. George D. Peterson became ABET's Executive Director, only the second person to hold that position. More than 15 years later, as we reflect on his accomplishments, there's no doubt that his tenure will be remembered as among the most pivotal periods in ABET's 77-year history.

Establishing the Gold Standard

Dr. Peterson shepherded ABET through tremendous changes. He instilled an enduring belief in the value of continuous quality improvement and adopted outcomes-based criteria while promoting its benefits to accreditation agencies worldwide. He was the driving force behind integrating the computer science programs into ABET's purview. Internationally, Dr. Peterson has been pivotal to ABET achieving the worldwide recognition as "The Gold Standard." He furthered several mutual recognition agreements, including the Washington, Sydney, Dublin, and Seoul Accords. In addition, Dr. Peterson initiated 14 memoranda of understanding with accrediting agencies, helping improve the quality of accrediting systems throughout the world.

Before becoming ABET's Executive Director, Dr. Peterson was a devoted ABET volunteer, moving from Program Evaluator to Commissioner to Engineering Accreditation Commission Chair. He served on all manner of councils and committees, from the IEEE Educational Activities Board to ABET criteria committees. The sum of his experiences prepared him well for the leadership position he enjoyed and performed so adeptly.

Achievements and Accolades

Dr. Peterson's time with ABET capped an eminent career in educational leadership. He spent considerable time with the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Air Force Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and Morgan State University. He served 23 years in the U.S. Air Force and retired with the rank of Lieutenant Colonel. Dr. Peterson earned a B.S. from North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University, an M.S. from the Air Force Institute of Technology, and a Ph.D. from the University of Illinois — all in electrical engineering.

In October of 2009, Dr. Peterson was awarded ABET's most prestigious honor: the Linton E. Grinter Distinguished Service Award. (See page 59.) This was preceded by a multitude of accolades, among them the IEEE Education Society Achievement Award, an honorary doctor of humanities from the North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University, the University of Illinois Electrical and Computer Engineering Alumni Association Distinguished Alumnus Award, and four Fellows — from ABET, IEEE, the IEE of the United Kingdom, and the Institution of Engineers of Ireland.

Thank you George for your dedicated service to ABET; you will be missed. Goodbye and Godspeed.

Q&A with ABET's New Executive Director Michael K. J. Milligan, Ph.D., P.E.



On June 1, 2009, Dr. Michael Milligan was named ABET's third Executive Director. He brings to ABET a broad expertise in business, government, and academe. During his 24-year career with the U.S. Air Force, Dr. Milligan managed international research portfolios, engaging scientists and engineers in more than 30 countries. Other responsibilities included program manager, lead engineer, and test manager on several cutting-edge technology projects.

At the U.S. Air Force Academy, Dr. Milligan directed and taught advanced electrical and computer engineering courses. He served as a senior member of the accreditation team that prepared for the ABET visit. For five years before joining ABET, he volunteered as a Program Evaluator (PEV) for IEEE.

Dr. Milligan earned a Ph.D. from The University of Texas at Austin, an M.S.E. from the University of Massachusetts at Lowell, and a B.S. from Michigan State University—all in electrical engineering. He also earned an M.B.A. from Western New England College.

He is a senior member of ABET's largest society, the IEEE; a member of Tau Beta Pi, the Engineering Honor Society; and is a registered professional engineer in Colorado and Maryland.

Q. What was most attractive about the opportunity to lead ABET?

After serving as a PEV, it became apparent to me how much of a direct impact ABET has on improving the value of the “educational experience” for so many students. ABET is in a unique position to shape and influence the quality of education globally. The opportunities have no bounds—this is an exciting opportunity for me.

Q. You volunteered as an ABET Program Evaluator for five years before becoming ABET's Executive Director. Why was that important to you?

Being a part of the ABET team that directly evaluated academic programs gave me great insight and appreciation into how other institutions build their programs and view accreditation. On a personal level, I found it satisfying to influence programs in such a positive way—we made the programs better for the students. From these experiences, I learned the importance of accreditation, and how it helps ensure students have the best educational experience possible.

Q. You also taught electrical and computer engineering courses at the U.S. Air Force Academy. How did that shape your view of professional technical education?

While the Deputy Department Head, I participated in the first accreditation of a new computer engineering program. It was then I realized the importance of accreditation and of the careful assessment of student achievement from the academic perspective.

Our continuous quality improvement process focused our efforts on the needs of our constituents—in this case, cadets—as well as those Air Force units receiving graduates from our programs. I felt we had a strong, efficient, systematic process that met the needs of our customers and promoted continued quality in a deliberate way, yet allowed us the flexibility to introduce new and innovative teaching methods and techniques.

Q. Since accepting the position of Executive Director in June 2009, you have been on the road almost nonstop, meeting ABET constituents. Why has that been so important to you?

You cannot successfully lead an organization unless you understand its constituents. At ABET, they fall into five major groups: students and parents, professional societies, academe, industry, and the public. Each has a



Q&A, continued

unique view of ABET, the value of accreditation, our process, and the issues most important to them. Like any healthy organization, establishing strong relationships is vital, and I've worked hard over the past year to do just that.

Q. What have you learned from the ABET societies?

First, they are different in many ways. Some are quite large, with over 100,000 individual members and 100-plus ABET programs. Some are small, with a few thousand members and less than 10 programs. How ABET supports and interacts with them varies: the large societies have dedicated staff and volunteers associated with accreditation and educational activities, while the smaller societies don't have such structures.

Societies with long ABET membership histories are more "established" in terms of the academic programs they sponsor. Newer societies need ABET to help them expand and grow their base of programs. Another difference is membership: some are predominately academe, while others have a larger industry base—each drives their specific interests as well as what they want from ABET. The societies also differ widely on their international presence. While some societies have significant membership internationally, many want a stronger presence overseas, and they see ABET's international growth as helpful to them.

Q. What do you think the societies most want from ABET?

Better communications, stronger relationships, and fiscal accountability. To develop stronger relationships, especially between the full-time staff organizations, I created a full-time member relations position to focus entirely on serving our Member Societies. I think this will have a tremendous impact on improving communications. Several societies also want us to contain membership costs as much as possible. We're trusted stewards of the societies' membership dues, and we're proactive in managing our budget and expenditures in a responsible way, to ensure we gain the most from our resources.

The fundamental concept that was reinforced during my visits is that we all share a common goal: to ensure only qualified graduates enter our respective "professions."

Q. What have you learned from institutions with ABET-accredited programs?

ABET's academic constituents have been insightful. Almost everyone I've spoken with appreciates the value of accreditation and continuous quality improvement. Some have issues with the process, and its consistent application, which has led to frustration. There are three primary areas that need to be addressed: consistency of the quality of evaluations (and evaluators), consistency of criteria, and a better understanding of proper assessment techniques.

We do a lot of faculty and administrator training, which helps with the assessment part, but we need to do more. Many don't understand the most efficient methods for assessing the quality of their programs. Many collect far too much data, and don't analyze it properly. As a result, institutions dedicate far more resources to assessment and accreditation than necessary.

With respect to consistency in evaluations, each year, more than 1,500 volunteers carry out our mission, so we're bound to have differences on how some PEVs do their jobs. Although we do a great job training our new evaluators, we need to provide centralized, refresher training to ensure our experienced PEVs are up-to-date on the latest information. That is coming in 2010. I'd like ABET to offer refresher training to all PEVs on a regular basis, to ensure they're all working from the same set of instructions.

Q. Is that what Harmonized Criteria is about?

That is designed to address the consistency of criteria. We're moving towards "harmonized" criteria across all four Commissions, which will help all of us—institutions, volunteers, and ABET staff—by making the criteria clear and easier to understand. Differences in Commission-specific criteria will be removed and replaced by a set of criteria that can be applied across all our areas.

There will still be a couple of specific criteria that will only be applied to individual programs (i.e., electrical engineering technology, industrial hygiene, computer science, chemical engineering, surveying technology, etc.) since each have unique aspects to their programs. We then intend to "freeze" the criteria for a length of time, to allow programs to assess performance against a stable set of criteria.

Q: You talk about the value of ABET accreditation. What does that mean exactly?

The value of accreditation is really at the heart of what we do. It's broad and best viewed by the respective constituents. To students and parents, understanding the value of accreditation allows them to select quality academic programs. It also shows that the institution is committed to continuously improving the educational experience for the student.

Accreditation is all about ensuring quality, so it's important to students, and their parents, that there is some type of "third-party" verification of a program's quality. ABET accreditation is often required as a prerequisite for eligibility for federal student loans, grants, and scholarships. Many employers, including the federal government, often require graduation from ABET-accredited programs to be eligible for employment. Many forms of professional licensure and board certification also require graduation from ABET-accredited programs, so you can see the value to students is great.



Q&A, continued

Q. What is the value of ABET accreditation to colleges and universities?

From an institutional view, accreditation provides a level of recognition by the profession that they are preparing students well. It encourages the implementation of “best practices” in education through continuous quality improvement. It also demonstrates to the general public that the institution is serious about improving quality.

Q. What does it mean to the societies?

It’s clear that “the profession” clearly values and benefits from accreditation. As I mentioned earlier, many corporations and government organizations require graduates who come from ABET-accredited programs. This is important to them because they know that certain educational requirements are met in those programs, and accreditation helps them recruit only qualified candidates. Since industry is such an integral partner with ABET, it allows them some opportunity to help guide the educational process as industry and technology advance.

Q. You’ve often said that there is a public benefit to ABET accreditation. Please explain.

So many, if not all, of the programs ABET accredits provide individuals that go on to work in industries, or develop technologies, that directly impact the safety of the public. Again, accreditation helps ensure a level of quality and assurance that students receive a certain “educational experience” necessary to become professionals in their respective fields. I also include the general taxpayer into this group. Certainly our tax dollars go toward supporting a wide range of research and development activities, educational opportunities, etc., at various institutions. Accreditation helps identify quality programs for investment of public funds.

Q. You’ve cited four priorities for your second year as Executive Director. The first is creating a constituent-focused organization. What does that mean to you?

ABET’s value lies in our ability to provide exceptional service, so we need to do a better job in several areas: strengthening our communications, clarifying the value of accreditation, and building strong relationships. That’s one of the reasons I’ve been out visiting with so many groups—I need to understand from them how to make us more effective partners. We all share a common goal: quality in technical education and ensuring graduates are prepared to enter the profession. We all need to work together to make this happen.

Q. Improving quality is the second goal. How do you plan to do that?

We owe it to our academic partners to provide the highest quality evaluations possible. Although we’ve done a great job in the past, we have areas for improvement. One of the primary concerns for me is ensuring that each PEV possesses a consistent level of quality. We’ve really improved our process over the past few years in selecting and training new PEVs, but we need to pay attention to our existing, more experienced evaluators.

Within the next few months, ABET will launch common refresher training for our more experienced PEVs. The intent is to maintain their currency about ABET policies and procedures while guaranteeing that all PEVs have a universal understanding of “best” accreditation practices—and that they apply and interpret program criteria consistently.

Q. The third goal is “help promote innovation in technical education.” How can ABET impact innovation in this way?

One of the primary goals of outcomes-based criteria is to stimulate innovation in education. It’s become apparent that while some institutions have embraced innovation in improving their programs, other faculty and administrators are reluctant to do so. They fear changing their programs may negatively impact their accreditation status (or future status).

With the educational landscape transforming rapidly (globalization, entrepreneurship, distance learning, etc.), it is clear that the pedagogy for educating the next generation of students will change profoundly. ABET fully supports innovation in technical education, but we need to do a much better job of promoting this concept. As leaders in ensuring the quality of our students’ educational experiences, it’s our responsibility to remove any real or perceived barriers and to work with our academic partners to encourage new teaching methods, novel curricula, etc.

We must also make certain there are no negative consequences associated with accreditation status for those programs that are eager to implement well-designed, innovative improvements.

Q. The fourth and final goal is to refine ABET’s international strategy.

Our competitive global economy demands that only qualified graduates enter our respective professions. Global accreditation of applied science, computing, engineering, and technology education is critical in achieving this goal. Worldwide demand for ABET accreditation has grown so rapidly that we haven’t been able to develop a thorough strategic or operational plan to support our international activities. This complex task will take time, but we are committed to implementing a clear, actionable strategy that directs our future international operations.

The People at the Heart of ABET Accreditation



Our Students

Peggy Liska, Texas A&M University, Senior, B.S. Electronics Engineering Technology

“When I first started looking for a highly ranked engineering college, I was overwhelmed by the number of ranking systems. To narrow down the schools, I eliminated those that were not ABET-accredited. This ensured that those I was considering were recognized for their technical credibility. I selected the Engineering Technology (ET) program at Texas A&M. I’m particularly impressed with the partnership that they’ve formed with industry representatives. The ET program receives valuable input as to where the electronics engineering profession is going, while the companies learn about the university’s innovative research and capstone design projects.”



Curtis Fitzgerald, University of Houston – Clear Lake, Graduate, B.S. Environmental Science

“My program was going through the accreditation process, so my professors discussed in great detail the importance of an accredited Industrial Hygiene and Safety program and the benefits to students of graduating from an accredited program. They explained the criteria and asked students to become actively involved in the process. A group of us started a student organization called the Society of Industrial Hygienists and Safety Professionals, which introduced prospective students to the fields, and promoted networking and job spotting. I was the first student president to sit on the board for a local chapter nationwide. Going through the stringent process of becoming an ABET-accredited program definitely changed my view of the institution I will select for my master’s degree.”



Allison Guettner, University of Texas at San Antonio, Graduate, B.S. Civil Engineering

“I’m not sure if I knew much about ABET when choosing an undergraduate institution, but I do want to be sure that the graduate school I attend is ABET-accredited. The ABET-accredited Civil Engineering Program at UTSA is fairly young compared to most universities, but it is constantly growing and improving. I saw vast changes take place over the four years that I spent there. It is still small enough to learn on a personal level, but also large enough to be a strong competitor and present its students with great opportunities. I know that I have gotten a quality education that I can now rely and build on.”



Timothy Brandsma, Texas State University at San Marcos, Graduate, B.S. Computer Science

“This past year, I had the incredible opportunity to represent Texas State University’s Computer Science Department at the 2009 ABET Annual Conference—the first time ABET held a student panel. I was thrilled to be the voice of both my department and my university. I think it is highly beneficial to bring in the students ABET represents to provide feedback on their experiences and to share ways the program can be improved to provide the best programs for both future and current students. Right now, I am starting my career at USAA, a company that seeks to be the provider of choice for the financial needs of the military community and their families. In the future, I hope to pursue my master’s degree in computer science.”



From top to bottom:
Peggy Liska, Curtis Fitzgerald,
Allison Guettner, and Timothy
Brandsma

The People at the Heart of ABET Accreditation, continued



Our Member Society Volunteers

Robert A. Herrick, Ph.D., P.E., President, Herrick Engineering, Inc.
ABET Board Member, Society: AIHA

“I began volunteering with ABET nearly 28 years ago and I’ve had 17 different positions since that time. What keeps me engaged is that I truly believe in the continuous improvement of higher-level education. It also helps that the people who share this passion are a pretty cool bunch of folks to hang around with. ABET has met a need of mine to be involved in an organization with a purpose I believe in. I have been an active part of the transition from prescriptive to outcomes-based criteria. It has not been easy, but I believe it’s worth the work. Plus, teaming with like-minded people has led to many personal relationships that I value highly.”



A. Joseph Turner, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus of Computer Science, Clemson University
ABET Commissioner, Society: CSAB

“As with many experiences, what you get out of being an ABET volunteer depends on what you put into it. The potential for satisfaction and rewarding experiences is very high. The opportunity to work with so many truly outstanding people is a reward in itself. It has been an honor for me to work with many such people, both within ABET and in CSAB before that. I have been an ABET volunteer since 1985. My advice to a new volunteer would be to take the responsibility of a role in determining accreditation actions on academic programs very seriously—prepare thoroughly and work collegially with respect for the knowledge and opinions of others.”



Wayne Bergstrom, Ph.D., P.E., Principal Engineer – Technical Specialist, Bechtel Power Corporation
ABET Team Chair and EAC Commissioner, Society: ASCE

“Meeting students and faculty has been a very enjoyable part of being an ABET volunteer. I also value the relationships I have formed with many colleagues in various engineering disciplines who are serving our profession through ABET. However, the most personally rewarding aspect for me has been the opportunity to visit many strong engineering programs and provide them constructive feedback. Since my first observer visit in 1993, I’ve been on ten Program Evaluator visits and conducted ten Team Chair reviews, and have also served as an EAC Criteria Committee member for several years. Serving as an ABET volunteer is a fulfilling experience, and all one needs to participate is detailed study of the Accreditation Criteria and the ABET Policies and Procedures Manual...and an open mind.”



Diane Chong, Ph.D., Vice President – Engineering, Operations & Technology, The Boeing Company
ABET Program Evaluator, Society: SME

“It is exciting to be part of an organization that helps set the standards for education globally. I enjoy seeing the different programs and how they meet these requirements. I enjoy seeing the students and the faculty, and their enthusiasm. It is also great to build a network of industry and academic experts. I learn a lot from the people about current trends in education, and feel that I am making a valuable contribution to maintaining the quality of education. I cannot think of an organization that has more importance than ABET in helping us maintain and grow a world-class engineering and technical workforce. The sense of excellence that all the volunteers and staff bring to the process is outstanding. It makes me proud to be part of this.”



From top to bottom:
Robert A. Herrick, Ph.D.; A.
Joseph Turner, Ph.D.; Wayne
Bergstrom, Ph.D.; and Diane
Chong, Ph.D.

The People at the Heart of ABET Accreditation, continued



Our Institutions

Raman Menon Unnikrishnan, Ph.D., Dean, College of Engineering and Computer Science, California State University – Fullerton

“The challenge in accreditation starts with people: having good people who have the objectivity, training, vision, commitment, tenacity, professional stature and, above all, the time to volunteer. To ensure that the accreditation criteria are consistent with contemporary technical needs and thoughts is also a challenge for both ABET and the institution it is visiting. Another important issue is how ABET evaluates programs and suggests areas of improvement to the programs. Programs, however, are part of a university, with their own independent and sometimes contradictory requirements and idiosyncrasies, so meeting ABET requirements is a balancing act between what is needed professionally and what is achievable locally.”



Renata S. Engel, Ph.D., Associate Dean for Academic Programs, College of Engineering, The Pennsylvania State University

“My approach to program assessment has been shaped by and benefited from discussions with my colleagues in the College of Engineering and throughout Penn State, members of external networks, and professional and volunteer members of ABET. I appreciate the perspectives each brings to the table and want to share one of the viewpoints that has shaped my understanding of how assessment relates to accreditation. At a Penn State workshop a number of years ago, Professor J.F. Volkwein, known for his work in higher education on assessment and policy, described the process using a pictorial of Janus, the mythological god with two faces sometimes placed in doorways. With that image he made the point that the process is akin to simultaneously looking inward at what you have done in order to improve, and looking outward, i.e., the external face, as a way of demonstrating the effectiveness to others.”



Mary Marchegiano, Chairperson, Department of Electronics/Electrical Engineering Technology, Delaware Technical & Community College

“Preparing for an accreditation visit is similar to working on an in-depth review of your program. Although difficult to prepare, the results provide valuable insight into the strengths and weaknesses of the program. The criteria that ABET uses for the accreditation process does not make your program fit into a particular mold. It provides an understanding of how your program compares with other similar programs nationally while maintaining the uniqueness of the program to meet the needs of students and local industry. Preparing for an ABET visit is a time-consuming and tedious task, no matter how organized you are. It takes time to decide what documentation you need to provide and to organize your display to highlight your program. If organized correctly, the documentation provides a wealth of information to the accreditation team.”



James H. Johnson, Jr., Ph. D., Professor and Dean Emeritus, College of Engineering, Architecture and Computer Sciences, Howard University

“During my 14-year tenure as dean, I had the responsibility for programs receiving accreditation from ABET—EAC and CAC. My philosophy has always been to allow each program to be the driver for improvements in their programs. The dean’s office assumed the responsibility for college-wide initiatives (e.g. leadership training), ensured programs were consistent with university-wide requirements, and provided a key person to monitor progress on preparation of accreditation materials and to serve as a mock reviewer. Department chairs were encouraged to—and did—share practices with each other. All attended ABET workshops and other workshops dealing with accreditation and undergraduate programmatic issues. The aim: to build a team of persons who would interact in a way that would produce results greater than any one of them would have generated alone.”



From top to bottom:
Raman Menon Unnikrishnan,
Ph.D.; Renata S. Engel, Ph.D.;
Mary Marchegiano; and James
H. Johnson, Jr., Ph.D.

The People at the Heart of ABET Accreditation, continued

Our Industry Partners

Michael B. Gwyn, P.E., VP & Managing Director – Atlantic Region, Benham Constructors, LLC

“I have had the opportunity to participate as an observer on an accreditation visit and have been exposed to evaluator training, so I have a very good understanding of the quality that goes into the accreditation process. That knowledge has increased my appreciation for ABET accreditation and gives me additional assurance that I can rely on a certain minimum quality of graduate from an ABET-accredited program. We would never consider another option. At the end of the day, industry is the primary beneficiary of ABET’s “product,” so it is appropriate for industry (whether it be private or public sector) to assist ABET in achieving its mission.”



Gina L. Hutchins, Corporate Industrial Engineering Training & Development Director, United Parcel Service (UPS)

“My rationale for becoming involved with ABET? It’s critical that industry have a voice in the development of new engineering programs and curriculum content to ensure that the future employees who are graduating from these institutions are qualified to address the business challenges of the near future. ABET provides an assurance that there is standardization and consistency in the engineering curriculum. This is so important to a company like UPS, which is one of the largest employers of industrial engineers globally. In the future, I’d like to see: ABET societies become more diverse from an industry, gender and ethnic perspective; an increase in international involvement and engagement; and improvements in the K-12 STEM disciplines.”



James C. Dalton, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chief of Engineering and Construction

“The Army Corps of Engineers has substantial work in many overseas countries. We expect and require that entry-level graduate engineers and students bring a consistent level of core competence to the job. We believe it essential to help establish the standard for the engineering profession and ABET accreditation offers an excellent way to help influence the quality of education and training. Not only has technology moved us to be more global in our thinking and expand our use of worldwide resources, but the state of world affairs and conflicts means that the U.S. and other countries will have to depend on each other more and more. ABET can help level the playing field for many professions by establishing standards recognized and accepted worldwide.”



Paul B. Kalafos, Jr., Vice President, International Infrastructure Systems, Northrop Grumman Corporation

“Northrop Grumman counts heavily on engineering resources from ABET-accredited universities to ensure quality educational programs. In the next five years, we’d like to see an increased emphasis on software and systems engineering programs since more hardware is becoming a commodity and the value discriminator is increasingly in the software. Additionally, we do more projects abroad in conjunction with foreign partners and governments, which will require us to use local engineering staff. We would like to see an increased focus on international accreditation to ensure consistency across our entire workforce. In 10 years, we’d like to see a standard program globally. There is concern about maintaining engineering relevance in the U.S. given the numbers of engineering folks in the world (China and India in particular). It is clear that we cannot keep up from a pure numbers standpoint, so we need to find a way to distinguish ourselves at a different level.”



From top to bottom: Michael B. Gwyn, P.E.; Gina L. Hutchins; James C. Dalton; and Paul B. Kalafos



Highlights of the Year



ABET: The Leader in Technical Education Accreditation

Annual Graduates from ABET Programs: 85,000

This year, ABET took steps to quantify accreditation's impact, and the results surprised even us! Based on reports from our 600+ institutions, we can now say that approximately 85,000 students graduate from ABET-accredited programs each year. That makes us among the most influential accreditors today.



The Value of Our Volunteers: \$4.2 Million

For the first time, ABET assessed a value for the time and talent that its volunteer Commissioners and Program Evaluators provide. Recorded on its statement of activities, ABET quantified the in-kind contribution of its volunteers at more than \$4.2 million. The size of the figure reinforces what ABET has always known: our volunteers are our most valuable asset!



ABET Headquarters Staff

ABET Sets New Record for Evaluations

In 2009, ABET completed a staggering 894 evaluations—the highest number ever in a single accreditation cycle! This high number of evaluations is due to both a large number of new programs and to the “cyclical effect” of the normal fluctuations in the review cycle. A tremendous thanks goes to our dedicated volunteers—and to our headquarters staff—who made all of this possible.

SFPE Joins the ABET Federation of Societies

The Society of Fire Protection Engineers (SFPE), the professional society representing those practicing in the field of fire protection engineering, joined ABET in 2009. Established in 1950 and incorporated as an independent organization in 1971, SFPE has approximately 4,500 members in the U.S. and abroad, as well as 57 regional chapters. The organization's stated purpose is to advance the science and practice of fire protection engineering and its allied fields, to maintain a high ethical standard among its members, and to foster fire protection engineering education.





Highlights of the Year, continued

PAVE Project Concludes

The Partnership to Advance Volunteer Excellence, or PAVE, finally came to its conclusion. This two-year initiative among ABET and its Member Societies realized the improved processes and procedures related to volunteer recruitment, selection, training, and performance appraisal. Recent achievements include revising the minimum qualifications to serve as a Program Evaluator, adding society-specific portions to the online application, and completing the *Recruitment and Selection Guide for ABET Member Societies*. In addition, qualifications for volunteers being considered for non-U.S. evaluation visits, a volunteer training facilitator competency model, and the framework for program evaluator remediation and refresher training have been developed.



ABET Receives Positive Response About Training Sessions


Faculty from accredited programs continued to respond favorably to ABET training that supports their efforts to assess continuous improvement of student learning. The Faculty Workshop on Sustainable Assessment Processes continued to draw strong attendance, with more than 300 attendees over five sessions. The Institute for the Development of Excellence in Assessment Leadership, or IDEAL, is a 4½-day professional development opportunity for those responsible for leading their faculty in program assessment planning that continues to draw overwhelmingly positive reviews. In 2009, there were two sessions of IDEAL, providing approximately 90 participants with the fundamentals of assessment principles, facilitation skills, and change management.



ABET Renames Diversity Award to Honor Dr. Claire Felbinger

The ABET Board of Directors renamed its President's Award for Diversity to honor one of its late Public Members, Dr. Claire Felbinger. The former chair of the Master of Public Administration program at American University, Dr. Felbinger served on the ABET Board from 1998 to 2004. Under her leadership, the Public Member Committee was the first to bring ABET's diversity issue formally to the attention of the Board and was a key impetus for many of the diversity initiatives ABET has carried out during the past decade. These include issuing a formal policy statement on diversity, collecting and publishing diversity statistics on our volunteer pool, and creating an award for individuals, institutions, and organizations that achieve or facilitate diversity in the technological segments of our society. This honor will now be known as the Claire L. Felbinger Award for Diversity.

ABET: The Global Gold Standard



ABET Signs Seoul Accord on Computing Accreditation

ABET was a founding member of the Seoul Accord, a mutual recognition agreement among organizations that accredit baccalaureate-level computing and IT-related programs. This agreement aims to facilitate the improvement of computing education worldwide by establishing desired attributes for computing graduates and by sharing best practices in computing education. Also, it contributes to greater mobility for computing professions, as signatories agree to recommend that graduates from recognized programs be afforded the same rights and privileges as those graduates in the home country. The Seoul Accord was modeled on the Washington Accord, an agreement among engineering accrediting organizations that ABET also helped to establish.



In addition to ABET, there are seven signatories to the accord: the Australian Computer Society, the Canadian Information Processing Society, the Hong Kong Institution of Engineers, the Japan Accreditation Board for Engineering Education, the Accreditation Board for Engineering Education in Korea, the Institution of Engineering Education Chinese Taipei, and the British Computer Society.

Highlights of the Year, continued

Technology Accreditors Admit ABET to Sydney Accord

In 2009, ABET achieved full signatory status in the Sydney Accord, an agreement among quality assurance organizations that evaluate baccalaureate-level technology programs. The accord acknowledges the substantial equivalency among recognized programs that prepare students to practice as technologists. In addition, it recommends that signatory countries recognize graduates of accredited baccalaureate technology programs in other signatory countries as having met the academic requirements for entry-level practice as an engineering technologist.

Besides ABET, the signatory organizations are Engineers Australia, the Canadian Council of Technicians and Technologists, the Hong Kong Institution of Engineers, Engineers Ireland, the Institution of Professional Engineers NZ, the Engineering Council of South Africa, and the Engineering Council UK.

ABET: An Advocate for Efficiency and Financial Stewardship

Criteria Harmonization to Improve Efficiency and Reduce Confusion

ABET launched a major effort to reduce the growing confusion among institutions experiencing accreditation visits that involve more than one Commission. Known as “Criteria Harmonization,” the effort aligns the accreditation criteria across the four Commissions and uses common wording where the intent is the same. Harmonization strives for a more consistent presentation and understanding of the criteria, but it does not force commonality where differences are necessary and intentional. Successful harmonization will bring much-needed efficiencies, such as reducing the need for commission-specific training and duplicate forms, and helping the ABET headquarters staff streamline the accreditation processes.

ABET received more than 800 comments throughout the 18-month comment period. Pending ABET Board approval, the harmonized criteria will go into effect beginning with the 2011-2012 accreditation cycle.

Careful Cost Control Helps Grow Reserves to 15 Percent

A strong focus on controlling costs has enabled ABET to grow its reserves to 15 percent of annual operating expenses. The successful strategies employed include upgrading the accounting system, implementing an enhanced expense reporting system, renegotiating contracts with key vendors, mandating preapproved purchase orders for all procurements, and instituting a new time reporting system to improve cost tracking.

Accreditation Request for Evaluation Now Online

ABET rolled out an online Request for Evaluation process, which enabled institutions with programs that currently hold ABET accreditation to submit their requests for their reaccreditation visits electronically. This improvement will save time and labor, both for institutions and for the ABET staff.

Online Expense Report System Successfully Piloted

Each year, more than 1,000 volunteers submit expense reports to ABET following campus visits. The result—a large number of reimbursement requests flooding a small staff over a short time period. Responding to volunteers’ concerns regarding timely turnaround, ABET successfully piloted an online expense report system in 2009. Selected volunteers and staff members submitted their expenses electronically, greatly reducing the time and labor required to issue the reimbursements. About the online expense report system, ABET CFO Lance Hoboy says, “This is just one of many IT initiatives that we will be implementing over the next several months to improve the volunteer experience, streamline the accreditation process, and reduce overall costs to the accredited programs, ABET, and its Member Societies.”



ABET Accreditation Council

The ABET Accreditation Council exists to improve the accreditation process, with emphasis on sharing best practices and achieving appropriate consistency across the four ABET Commissions. The work encompasses policies, processes, procedures, and criteria.

The Accreditation Council is made up of the leadership of the four ABET Commissions plus the Chair of the International Activities Council. Specifically, membership includes: the Chair, Chair-Elect, and Past Chair of each ABET Commission.



Accreditation Council Chair

Lawrence G. Jones
Software Engineering Institute
Carnegie Mellon University

Applied Science Accreditation Commission

Chair

J. Turner Hughey
Chromcraft Corporation

Chair-Elect

Charles W. McGlothlin, Jr.
Oakland University

Past Chair

Ralph J. Hodek
Michigan Technological University

Computing Accreditation Commission

Chair

Gayle J. Yaverbaum
The Pennsylvania State University

Chair-Elect

David P. Kelly
Battelle

Past Chair

Stuart H. Zweben
The Ohio State University

Engineering Accreditation Commission

Chair

John W. Rutherford
The Boeing Company

Chair-Elect

Douglas R. Bowman
Lockheed Martin

Past Chair

Mary Leigh Wolfe
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Technology Accreditation Commission

Chair

Mohammad A. Zahraee
Purdue University Calumet

Chair-Elect

Kevin D. Taylor
Purdue University

Past Chair

Michael A. Robinson
Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory

International Activities Council Chair

Phillip E. Borrowman
Hanson Professional Services, Inc.



ABET Accreditation Council: Year in Review

Criteria Harmonization

This year, the Council continued its major initiative on Criteria Harmonization, an effort to use common criteria wording across the four ABET Commissions where the intended meaning is the same. However, harmonization is NOT about forcing commonality where differences are necessary and intentional.

In fall 2008, the ABET Board of Directors approved the four Commissions' harmonized criteria for a two-year review and comment period. The Council used a proactive email campaign to solicit feedback about the criteria via an online survey. The Cross-Commission Criteria Harmonization Committee incorporated the feedback, which was overwhelmingly positive, into an improved set of criteria that the four Commissions approved in July 2009.

Training

Last year, the ABET Board of Directors established the Accreditation Council Training Committee, which consists of a chair, the training committee chairs from the four Commissions, and four at-large representatives from Member Societies. The Training Committee continued its fine work on common PEV training as it laid the groundwork for broader sharing of training across Commissions. All new PEVs are now trained using this common training.

Alternate Delivery



Increasingly, programs are using non-traditional delivery methods, e.g., online courses and distributed instruction. To support an ABET Board initiative and with the Computing Accreditation Commission (CAC) taking the lead, the Council supported a fact-finding investigation in collaboration with a national online university. The purpose was to gain "bottom-up" insight into such programs' issues and how they would affect the accreditation process. The investigation's results will inform all Commissions about any procedural and criteria-related aspects related to alternate delivery methods, as well as inform the Board about issues that could impact policy.

Other Initiatives

In the spirit of the Criteria Harmonization effort, the Council continued work to increase uniformity of policies, processes, and documents across the Commissions. These efforts include the following:

- **Forms harmonization:** The Council is developing a harmonized institutional self-study for use in the 2011 visits and is aligning other accreditation documents and training materials to support institutions and visiting teams.
- **Program naming:** The Council is working hard on an appropriate policy to address program naming. This is a complicated issue that juxtaposes properly representing program content to the public with institutional prerogatives and restrictions. It is further complicated by ABET's increasing role in non-U.S. accreditation, bringing in not only literal but also cultural translation issues.
- **Training for new Executive Committee members:** This session acquaints all Commissions' new Executive Committee members with their duties and initiates the cross-Commission relationships that further this Council's work.
- **Training on joint and simultaneous visits for team chairs:** This training enables evaluation teams to work together more efficiently before, during, and after visits that involve multiple Commissions. A simultaneous visit is one when evaluation teams from two or more Commissions visit an institution at the same time. A joint visit occurs when an institution has one or more programs requiring evaluation by two or more Commissions.

Applied Science Accreditation Commission (ASAC)



The Applied Science Accreditation Commission (ASAC) is responsible for conducting accreditation evaluations and making decisions on applied science programs based on the policies and criteria that have been approved by the ABET Board. ASAC makes the final decisions on accreditation actions, except for appeals, which the ABET Board decides. ASAC also recommends policies and the Rules of Procedure to the Board.

Officers

Chair

J. Turner Hughey
Chromcraft Corporation

Chair-Elect

Charles W. McGlothlin, Jr.
Oakland University

Past Chair

Ralph J. Hodek
Michigan Technological University

Vice Chair-Operations

Carol Boraiko
Middle Tennessee State University

Members-at-Large

Richard R. Brey
Idaho State University

Bret M. Clausen
CH2M Hill Constructors, Inc.

John J. Segna
American Society of Civil Engineers

Board Liaison Representative

Edwin G. Wiggins
Webb Institute

Commission Members

Public Commissioner

Linda Biemer
State University of New York at
Binghamton/Retired

AAEE

Frank E. Stratton

ACSM

Joseph V. Paiva
Spatial Data Research, Inc.

Khagendra Thapa

Ferris State University

AIHA

George R. Osborne
Southeastern Environmental
Products, Inc.

Phillip L. Williams

University of Georgia

ANS

James S. Tulenko
University of Florida

ASCE

Douglas M. Mace
Mace Consulting Engineers, PC

ASSE

Christopher A. Janicak
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

James Ramsay
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical
University

HPS

Mark Rudin
Boise State University

IIE

Dennis B. Webster
Louisiana State University

NCEES

Rita Marie Lumos
City of Las Vegas

SME

Venkataswamy Raju
State University of New York
at Farmingdale



ASAC: Year in Review



ASAC members, especially the Executive Committee members, supported the efforts to harmonize the criteria and forms used across all four accreditation Commissions. This included evaluating comments from surveys and the public comment period, and sharing these findings with the other Commissions. Harmonization efforts continue for general criteria, common forms, and self-study documents.

Value of Accreditation

During the fall meeting of the ABET Board of Directors, ASAC presented a motion calling for increased awareness and appreciation of the value that accreditation brings to programs and employers. This issue is particularly important for disciplines that reside within ASAC but do not require certification or licensure for practice. ASAC recommended that ABET identify incentives for academic programs to pursue accreditation, increase awareness about accreditation among relevant professional societies, introduce employers to peer-reviewed accreditation and its value as a qualification for college graduates, and expand the current accreditation outreach campaign to educational, employment, and public sectors. The Board accepted the motion and instructed the ABET staff to begin addressing this issue.

Process Improvements Made

ABET headquarters used weekly tracking statements to keep reports from ASAC evaluation visits moving through the editing process. This effort markedly improved the time to complete draft statements and return them to the institutions, compared to recent years.

ASAC continued to use a “consent agenda” to facilitate the review processes during the Summer Commission Meeting. This allowed the Commission to forego discussions about programs that received positive actions and to dedicate considerable time to evaluating programs and reports that required more detailed consideration.

Effort to Add New Disciplines

In addition, ASAC continued an initiative that encouraged current Commissioners to use grassroots efforts to add new disciplines to the Commission. ABET staff assisted as well, identifying societies that may bring more programs into ASAC.



Computing Accreditation Commission (CAC)

The Computing Accreditation Commission (CAC) is responsible for conducting accreditation evaluations and making decisions on computing programs based on the policies and criteria that have been approved by the ABET Board. The CAC makes the final decisions on accreditation actions, except for appeals, which the ABET Board decides. The CAC also recommends policies and the Rules of Procedure to the Board.

Officers

Chair

Gayle J. Yaverbaum
The Pennsylvania State University

Chair-Elect

David P. Kelly
Battelle

Past Chair

Stuart H. Zweben
Ohio State University

Vice Chair-Operations

Allen Parrish
University of Alabama

Lillian Cassel
Villanova University

Kai H. Chang
Auburn University

David Allen Cook
Aegis Technologies Group, Inc.

David W. Cordes
University of Alabama

Roy Daigle
University of South Alabama

Venu Gopal Dasigi
Southern Polytechnic State University

William John Dixon
Ernst & Young, LLP

Ronald P. Doyle
IBM Corporation

David L. Feinstein
University of South Alabama

David S. Gibson
U.S. Air Force Academy

Teofilo F. Gonzalez
University of California, Santa Barbara

Raymond Greenlaw
Armstrong Atlantic State University

C. Richard G. Helps
Brigham Young University

Thomas B. Horton
University of Virginia

Carolyn M. Jacobson
Marymount University

George Kasper
Virginia Commonwealth University

Nancy Kinnersley
University of Kansas

Paul M. Leidig
Grand Valley State University

Jim Leone
Rochester Institute of Technology

Lois Mansfield
Raytheon Systems

Kenneth E. Martin
University of North Florida

Manton Matthews
University of South Carolina

Gerald Ulrich Merkel
University of North Florida

Dan Nash
Raytheon Company

Keith Bennett Olson
Utah Valley State College

Andrew T. Phillips
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire

George Pothering
College of Charleston

Anne-Louise Radimsky
California State University,
Sacramento

Harry L. Reif
James Madison University

John L. Schnase
NASA Goddard Space Flight Center

Dennis D. Schweitzer
U.S. Air Force Academy

James A. Smith
NASA Goddard Space Flight Center

Edward J. Sobiesk
U.S. Military Academy

Judith L. Solano
University of North Florida

Pradip Srimani
Clemson University

Stan Thomas
Wake Forest University

John Carroll Turchek
Robert Morris University

Members-at-Large

Della T. Bonnette
University of Louisiana at Lafayette

Lynn R. Carter
Carnegie Mellon University Qatar

Harold Grossman
Clemson University

Barbara Price
Georgia Southern University

A. Joseph Turner
Clemson University/Retired

Board Liaison Representative

Susan O. Schall
Consultant

Commission Members

Public Commissioner


David E. Herrington
Prairie View A&M University/Retired

CSAB

James H. Aylor
University of Virginia

Jean R. S. Blair
U.S. Military Academy

Curtis A. Carver
U.S. Military Academy





CAC: Year in Review

For the 2008-2009 evaluation cycle, the Computing Accreditation Commission (CAC) evaluated 102 programs, including 16 new programs, at 81 institutions. The CAC continued a relatively new practice whereby the Consistency Committee received all reports prior to the Commission meetings and recommended changes to maintain consistent decisions across all programs reviewed.

CAC and CSAB, Inc., continue to coordinate the work of key committees, notably the joint CAC/CSAB Criteria Committee. The excellent communication among the Accreditation Council's Cross-Commission Harmonization Committee, CAC, and CSAB is contributing to the success of the harmonization activities, and a similar working relationship with the respect to training continues to work well.

Significant Achievements

Other significant achievements for the 2008-2009 accreditation cycle include:

- Members of the Documents Committee, chaired by Harold Grossman, participated on the Accreditation Council Task Force that is producing a harmonized self-study.
- The Ad Hoc Task Force on Alternative Delivery Accreditation, chaired by Barbara Price, was charged with identifying accreditation criteria and evaluation procedures that impede conducting accreditation evaluations of programs delivered via alternative or non-traditional means. Based on an in-depth criteria analysis and interactions with institutions that offer computing programs online, it was determined there is no need to alter current and proposed criteria to evaluate such a program.
- Gayle Yaverbaum and David Kelly were members of a new Accreditation Council Philosophy Task Force that is harmonizing the manner in which Commissions interpret and analyze the accreditation criteria, and they will participate on this task force through the next accreditation cycle.
- An ongoing cause for concern for CAC is naming issues for programs, and Past Chair Stu Zweben led discussions about how the global diversity in names is compounding this fact.

Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC)



The Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) is responsible for conducting accreditation evaluations and making decisions on engineering programs based on the policies and criteria that have been approved by the ABET Board. The EAC makes the final decisions on accreditation actions, except for appeals, which the ABET Board decides. The EAC also recommends policies and the Rules of Procedure to the Board.

Officers

Chair

John W. Rutherford
The Boeing Company

Chair-Elect

Douglas R. Bowman
Lockheed Martin

Past Chair

Mary Leigh Wolfe
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and
State University

Vice Chair-Operations

Peter J. Carrato
Bechtel Corporation

Members-at-Large

David B. Beasley
North Carolina State
University at Raleigh

Richard L. Brandon
Premier, Inc.

Susan E. Conry
Clarkson University

Kirk Schulz
Mississippi State University

Bruce Vaughn Smith
Rockwell Collins, Inc.

David L. Soldan
Kansas State University

Board Liaison Representative

Paul N. Hale, Jr.
Louisiana Tech University

Commission Members

Public Commissioner

Herbert H. Richtol
National Science Foundation

AAEE

Paul L. Bishop
University of Cincinnati

John H. Koon
Malcolm Pirnie, Inc.

ACSM

David Wylie Gibson
University of Florida

AIAA

Brett L. Anderson
The Boeing Company

David S. Dolling
The University of Texas at Austin

AIChE

Laura Jean Dietsche
Dow Chemical Company

Thomas F. Edgar
The University of Texas at Austin

Carl E. Locke, Jr.
University of Kansas

Joseph A. Shaeiwitz
West Virginia University

ANS

Andrew Klein
Idaho National Laboratory

Paul J. Turinsky
North Carolina State
University at Raleigh

ASABE

Ann L. Kenimer
Texas A&M University

David R. Thompson
Oklahoma State University

ASCE

Wayne R. Bergstrom
Bechtel Power Corporation

William L. Coulbourne
USR Corporation

Robert P. Elliott
University of Arkansas

Muthusamy Krishnamurthy
Hydro Modeling, Inc.

Gayle F. Mitchell
Ohio University

J. Phillip Smith
Chevron

ASEE

Joan P. Gosink
Colorado School of Mines

Sarah A. Rajala
Mississippi State University

Raman M. Unnikrishnan
California State University, Fullerton

ASHRAE

Robert Rudolph Bittle
Texas Christian University

ASME

Eugene Francis Brown
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and
State University

Pamela A. Eibeck
Texas Tech University

Gary L. Kinzel
The Ohio State University

Gina J. Lee-Glauser
Syracuse University

Darrell W. Pepper
University of Nevada Las Vegas

Patrick Benedict Usoro
General Motors Research and
Development Center

William J. Wepfer
Georgia Institute of Technology

BMES

John Denis Enderle
University of Connecticut

Cedric Frank Walker
Tulane University

CSAB

Donald Joseph Bagert
Southeast Missouri State University

IEEE

Kenneth F. Cooper
Westinghouse Savannah River
Company

Joanne Bechta Dugan
University of Virginia

Joseph L.A. Hughes
Georgia Institute of Technology

Larry D. Kendrick
Caterpillar, Inc.

Franc E. Noel
IBM/Retired

John A. Orr
Worcester Polytechnic Institute

Samuel G. White, Jr.
Indiana University-Purdue University
Indianapolis

IIIE

R. Allen Miller
The Ohio State University

Deborah E. Puckett
Consultant

Mickey Randall Wilhelm
University of Louisville

NCEES

James T. McCarter
H2L Consulting Engineers

NICE

Elizabeth Ann Judson
Verco Materials

NSPE

Benjamin S. Kelley
Baylor University

SAE

Daniel J. Weinacht
ARES Corporation

SME

Steve Coe
The Boeing Company

Winston Erevelles
Robert Morris University

SME-AIME

Jeffrey R. Keaton
MACTEC

Richard J. Sweigard
University of Kentucky

SNAME

Michael Fleahman
The Louis Berger Group, Inc.

SPE

Ali Ghalambor
University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TMS

Gillian Mary Bond
New Mexico Institute of Mining &
Technology

Jeffrey Fergus
Auburn University



Basis for Accreditation Actions

The Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) bases its actions on the degree of a program's compliance with the Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Programs. Furthermore, the EAC utilizes processes and procedures for evaluation of engineering programs as detailed in the Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual. The final decision on program accreditation resides within the EAC.

Analysis of Accreditation Actions and Trends

Criterion 2 (Program Educational Objectives) and Criterion 3 (Program Outcomes) continue to be the areas in which there are the most shortcomings (deficiencies, weaknesses, and concerns). Common shortcomings related to these two criteria included the following:

- Inadequate evidence that the process in which the objectives are determined and periodically evaluated is based on the needs of constituencies (Criterion 2).
- Confusion between the definition of program educational objectives (Criterion 2) and program outcomes (Criterion 3).
- Inadequate evidence that programs are using the results of evaluating objectives (Criterion 2) and/or assessing outcomes (Criterion 3) for improvement.
- Inadequate evidence demonstrating achievement of objectives (Criterion 2) or outcomes (Criterion 3).

Process Improvement

Last year, the EAC piloted panels to increase opportunities for Commissioners to discuss individual statements, ensure that the Commission was applying the correct accreditation actions for programs, and assure the engineering education stakeholder community that accreditation actions are determined through a credible process. The EAC adopted the process this year, as this new approach improved the review process' rigor, the Commission accreditation actions' quality, and learning opportunities through the panels' open discussions.

The second area of improvement occurred in the area of Commissioner training. Training has been refined to focus on areas that Commissioners misunderstand or find confusing.

New Commissioners are provided two teleconference training sessions, which then allows time for clarification of specific issues once they arrive for the Summer Commission Meeting training. Basic information has been included in a new reference titled "Team Chair Handbook," rather than the traditional plethora of PowerPoint slides. This way, training can focus on writing statements and interpreting areas in the criteria that have been identified as problematic from the editor chain.

Finally, the EAC identified and began leading an initiative through the Accreditation Council to develop a "harmonized philosophy" in applying the criteria across Commissions. This is an ongoing project.

Other Achievements

EAC intended to develop and disseminate a position articulating to professional societies that interpretation of the General Criteria for Accreditation is the sole purview of the Commission. In trying to help with consistency, some individual societies were communicating inaccurate interpretation of the criteria to their members who serve as Program Evaluators. EAC referred this goal to the Accreditation Council, as this occurrence is common across Commissions.

In addition, EAC actively encouraged professional societies and academe constituents to provide feedback about the Harmonized Criteria during the public comment phase. A comprehensive online survey was developed and sent out to collect these responses about harmonization, which were generally positive.

Technology Accreditation Commission (TAC)

The Technology Accreditation Commission (TAC) is responsible for conducting accreditation evaluations and making decisions on technology programs based on the policies and criteria that have been approved by the ABET Board. TAC makes the final decisions on accreditation actions, except for appeals, which the ABET Board decides. TAC also recommends policies and the Rules of Procedure to the Board.

Officers

Chair

Mohammad A. Zahraee
Purdue University Calumet

Chair-Elect

Kevin D. Taylor
Purdue University

Past Chair

Michael A. Robinson
Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory

Vice Chair-Operations

Carol Richardson
Rochester Institute of Technology

Members-at-Large

Amitabha Bandyopadhyay
State University of New York at Farmingdale

Warren R. Hill
Weber State University

Eric W. Tappert
Tappert Engineering

Board Liaison Representative

Robert A. Herrick
Herrick Engineering, Inc.

Commission Members

Public Commissioner

Patricia A. Ladewig
Regis University

AAEE

Otis J. Sproul
University of New Hampshire

ACSM

Sonya Cooper
New Mexico State University

AIAA

Swami N. Karunamoorthy
Saint Louis University

AICHe

Wilson T. Gautreaux

ANS

Kent W. Hamlin
Institute of Nuclear Power Operations

ASCE

Nirmal Kumar Das
Georgia Southern University

Subal K. Sarkar

Jean S. Uhl

Georgia Southern University

ASEE

John A. Stratton
Rochester Institute of Technology

ASHRAE

Paul H. Ricketts
New Mexico State University

ASME

Christine L. Corum
Purdue University

Scott Danielson
Arizona State University

Thomas R. Jurczak
General Cable

Steven E. Wendel
Sinclair Community College

BMES

Ronald Howard Rockland
New Jersey Institute of Technology

IEEE

Scott C. Dunning
University of Maine

Adrienne Marie Hendrickson
University of Virginia

James Allen Lookadoo

Martin Reed
IBM

John J. Sammarco
National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health

Timothy L. Skvarenina
Purdue University

IIE

Balachandran Swaminathan
University of Wisconsin-Platteville

Kirk Lindstrom
Questar Corporation

NSPE

C. Wayne Unsell
Bowling Green State University

SAE

Fred Z. Sitkins
Western Michigan University

SME

Niaz Latif
Purdue University

Carl R. Williams
The University of Memphis

SME-AIME

Susan B. Patton
Montana Tech of the University of Montana

SNAME

Paul C. Jackson
California Maritime Academy



TAC: Year in Review

Programs for Institutions and Faculty

In addition to the annual Commission Summit and Best Assessment Processes Symposium activities, TAC invited institutional representatives to attend an orientation session held in conjunction with the Summer Commission Meeting. This event provided attendees who were about to participate in their first general review under the outcomes-based criteria with guidance about institutional preparation for those visits. In response to interests that constituents expressed at previous workshops, this session was fully interactive, with many opportunities for small group breakouts.

Analysis of Accreditation Actions and Trends

All programs reviewed this year received positive accreditation actions by the Commission. A contributing factor seems to be the maturity level that institutions are achieving in having assessment and continuous improvement as part of their educational culture. This was the fifth cycle in which all general reviews were conducted using outcomes-based criteria, and most of the shortcomings continue to be related to continuous improvement plans and the assessment of objectives and outcomes. Another contributing factor is the institutions' responsiveness, which resulted in many findings being resolved or reduced in level during due process. The number of Interim Report actions continues to substantially outpace the number of Interim Visit actions, as has been the case since introducing outcomes-based criteria.


Going Global

In fall 2008, TAC conducted evaluation visits at non-U.S. institutions – three programs at two institutions in two countries – for the first time. The number of institutions to be visited in 2009 increased to four, with 12 programs in three countries: Kuwait, Peru, and Saudi Arabia.


TAC Committee Activities

- Over the course of the year, the TAC Executive Committee considered policy issues, internal procedures, relationships with other ABET Commissions, criteria interpretations, volunteer training, accreditation visits in foreign countries, and accreditation process improvements. The Executive Committee members also served as team chairs for accreditation visits and as editors for accreditation statements.
- The Operations Committee coordinated and monitored the year's workload of evaluation visits and report actions. Major tasks included assigning or reassigning team chairs, editors/panelists, and reviewers for the current cycle; drafting such assignments for the next cycle; ensuring that visiting teams were appropriate for the programs being evaluated; and monitoring each accreditation visit's progress.
- The Criteria Committee continued to develop harmonized criteria with the other three Commissions, and Committee Co-Chair Mike Robinson chaired the Cross-Commission Harmonized Criteria Committee, established by the Accreditation Council. The TAC Criteria Committee also finalized the distinct outcomes for associate programs versus baccalaureate programs, similar to the distinctions that ASAC uses, to bring the associate program outcomes more in line with those required for the Dublin Accord. In addition, the committee started working with the Society of Fire Protection Engineers to develop new program criteria for technology programs.
- The Documents Committee amended several TAC forms to align them with the criteria and to bring them more in line with those of the other three Commissions.
- The Training Committee revised all TAC-specific training materials to not only reflect the criteria, but also to incorporate trainee and facilitator comments. Team chairs who were leading their first or second visits spearheaded the effort to extensively revise the new Commissioner training presentation so that it better addresses the novice team chairs' needs. Also, training for all Commissions was offered in a new format that focused on the details of writing a "good" statement.

Industry Advisory Council (IAC)



The Industry Advisory Council (IAC) provides ABET with industries' perspectives on accreditation for applied science, computing, engineering, and technology education as well as on matters affecting the relevant professions and proposed ABET programs and policies. The IAC develops methods to stimulate the involvement of industry in ABET through board participation, membership on the Accreditation Commissions, and other volunteer positions. It is comprised of 13 representatives of industries, the current ABET President, the President-Elect, and Executive Director.



Chair

Michael B. Gwynn, P. E.
Benham Constructors, LLC

Members

Ray Almgren
National Instruments

John K. Amdall
Caterpillar, Inc.

Patrick Rivera Antony
Terex Corporation

Kenneth R. Baker
Eli Lilly & Company/Retired

Dwight A. Beranek
Michael Baker, Jr., Inc.

Charles R. Craig
Corning Incorporated

James C. Dalton
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Kim Miller Dunn
Emerson Process Management

Gina L. Hutchins
United Parcel Service

Paul B. Kalafos, Jr.
Northrop Grumman Corporation

Scott C. Petrak
Bayer Corporate & Business
Services, LLC

Susan M. Sinclair
Hershey Foods Corporation

Ray Steen
General Dynamics Armament and
Technical Products

IAC: Year in Review



International Accreditation

The IAC continues to review, and is encouraged by, ABET's progress in international accreditation. The number of international schools seeking accreditation has significantly increased over the past few years. The IAC recommended that all participants in the accreditation process maintain a complete commitment to continue the momentum.

Because members of the IAC have significant international experience, they understand that security and related logistics are serious considerations for international activities. The IAC member companies continue to offer assistance to ABET on international security matters in the form of information regarding prospective countries, process sharing, and benchmarking.

The IAC envisions a possible regional management and oversight component to ABET's international accreditation at some future date. This could impact recruitment of PEVs and may call for a modification of PEV training.

Community College Articulation

The IAC supports activities that increase the flow of qualified graduates in applied sciences, computing, engineering, and technology, and believes that four-year programs may produce more graduates by using community colleges as "feeder" programs. The IAC recommends that ABET coordinate with relevant and related entities on the topic of improving articulation from community colleges into four-year programs nationally.

ABET's Role in Improving Quantity

As noted in discussions on other topics, the IAC supports any ABET activity that increases the potential number of qualified graduates in the technical professions, and sees this as consistent with the ABET mission statement and strategies ("ABET serves the public through the promotion and advancement of education in applied science, computing, engineering, and technology"). The IAC believes the volume of graduates from ABET-accredited programs can be increased with additional emphasis and promotion of accreditation through ABET constituents.

Evaluators and Recruiting

The IAC believes additional emphasis should be applied to recruiting industry evaluators. Some concepts for consideration include:

- Target top companies (by industry) for support.
- Use industry publications to recruit.

- Include statements from the IAC in the recruiting information (i.e., use the industry-to-industry approach to recruit).
- Continuing Education Units (CEU) or Professional Development Hours (PDH) should be offered for completing training and for participating in visits.

ABET Foundation

The IAC has no comment on the formation of the Foundation at this time other than to assure that any and all conflicts or potential conflicts of interest are cleared.

ABET Financial Management

The IAC is encouraged by ABET's improved financial situation. The IAC recommends that ABET continue to focus on building a stronger reserve base within and up to appropriate legal guidelines.

IAC Development and Sustainability

Significant progress has been made in recruiting new members and in creating greater diversity within the group individually, and across industries. However, recruiting new members continues to be a priority for the long-term health of the IAC. The IAC would like to add five new members during the next year, focusing on those industries aligned with ABET that are not currently represented.

IAC Engagement

The IAC continues to actively support ABET operational activities. Members have participated as observers to both program evaluation visits on campuses as well as attending training sessions for new PEVs. In addition, the IAC also plans several new initiatives. The first is sponsorship of an IAC panel discussion at each ABET annual meeting on a topic of interest to ABET. This was implemented at the 2009 meeting and will continue in subsequent years. The IAC also looks forward to interacting with the Academic Advisory Council that is being developed as a formal interface between ABET and the academic community.

The IAC suggested developing a wide industry network of past IAC members that would facilitate continued communications between the IAC and allow for broader industry involvement. It was suggested that this group might be called the "Friends of the IAC." This broader network would offer the opportunity to recruit new IAC members as well as to recruit a forum for IAC members to rotate through upon completion of their time on the Council. This would allow for continued engagement of previous IAC members who strongly support the ABET mission.



International Activities Council (INTAC)



The International Activities Council, or INTAC, creates and recommends for Board approval policies and procedures regarding ABET's international activities.

Chair

Phillip E. Borrowman
Hanson Professional Services, Inc.

Patricia D. Daniels
Seattle University

Wolter J. Fabrycky
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Members

Sylvia L. Alexander
Michigan Department of Transportation

Donald Ray Gillum
Texas State Technical College

John K. Amdall
Caterpillar, Inc.

Lawrence Jones
Carnegie Mellon University Software Engineering Institute

Kenneth R. Baker
Retired, Eli Lilly & Company

Paul Kalafos, II
Northrop Grumman Corporation

Henry R. Bauer
University of Wyoming

Roger M. Zimmerman
Engineering Analyses, LLC



Gilbert J. Brown
University of Massachusetts Lowell



INTAC: Year in Review

Substantial Equivalency Recognition

In 2005, the ABET Board voted to phase out substantial equivalency evaluations and to allow programs outside of the U.S. to become eligible for accreditation. INTAC reviewed the dates when substantial equivalency recognition will expire and is working with the 17 programs in 10 countries that still hold this recognition. The Commissions reviewed the majority of these programs. Additionally, INTAC reviewed the Interim Reports from two non-U.S. programs and extended their substantial equivalency recognition through 2012, when the last of such recognitions will expire.

Recommendations on Training

INTAC has suggested that, as a condition for accepting an evaluation assignment for a program outside of the U.S., the Commissions require team chairs and program evaluators to take the international training that INTAC previously offered or to complete the non-U.S. training module and, especially, its Checks for Understanding.

In addition, INTAC recommended that the Accreditation Council Training Committee require volunteers to retake the non-U.S. training module and Checks for Understanding during the refresher training cycle. Lessons learned and team chair comments will provide the material needed to update the module periodically.

Accreditation

If all requests for evaluations are completed during the 2009-2010 cycle, ABET will conduct the largest number of non-U.S. evaluation visits ever undertaken. INTAC encouraged the Commissions to do a close review of submitted materials, as these will help to determine the accuracy of program names and each program's readiness to undergo an accreditation evaluation.

Memorandum of Understanding

ABET met with the Greater Caribbean Regional Engineering Accreditation System (GCREAS) and is negotiating a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with this organization. A MOU is an agreement that guides the collaboration as ABET assists a peer-quality assurance agency during its developmental period, but the agreement does not extend to the recognition of programs or graduates. ABET currently has 14 Memoranda of Understanding, and INTAC anticipates that an MOU with GCREAS will be brought to the ABET Board for approval in the near future.

Mutual Recognition Agreements

ABET successfully completed its periodic review by the Washington Accord, and recognition of graduates from EAC-accredited programs in the U.S. will continue through 2015.

This year, ABET became a signatory to the Sydney Accord, a Mutual Recognition Agreement (MRA) that addresses the mobility of engineering technologists. The accord recognizes that baccalaureate-level technology programs accredited by the participating bodies are substantially equivalent and recommends that signatory countries recognize the graduates of accredited programs in other countries as having met the academic requirements for entry-level practice as engineering technologists. The accord will recognize TAC-accredited programs at the bachelor's level through 2015.

Issues Requiring Further Discussion

INTAC recognizes that there are other issues that require in-depth discussion. The council will recommend to the ABET Board that a face-to-face meeting with a small subcommittee is needed to address the following matters:

- MRAs that have value for ABET because they allow the organization to influence the future roles and use of worldwide accords.
- Non-U.S.-based volunteers, particularly their qualifications, financial impact, training, and use for domestic evaluations.
- The ABET Foundation's assistance to accreditation agencies, institutions, and programs with potential for future accreditation activity.




Financial Highlights



Independent Auditors' Report

We have audited the accompanying statement of financial position of Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, Inc., (ABET) (a nonprofit organization) as of September 30, 2009, and the related statements of activities and cash flows for the year then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of ABET's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit.



We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, Inc., as of September 30, 2009, and the changes in its net assets and its cash flows for the year then ended in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

As described in Note 2 to the financial statements, ABET corrected its method of accounting for temporarily restricted contributions from reporting them as liabilities to reporting them as temporarily restricted support and net assets; corrected its method of accounting for in-kind services from not reporting such services to reporting them as support and expenses at fair value; and corrected its method of accounting for travel expense reimbursements from reporting them as expenses and subsequent revenues to reporting them as receivables.

Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming an opinion on the basic financial statements taken as a whole. The information in the supplementary schedule of expenses without indirect expense allocation is presented for purposes of additional analysis and is not a required part of the basic financial statements. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements and, in our opinion, is fairly stated in all material respects in relation to the basic financial statements taken as a whole.

Councilor, Buchanan & Mitchell, P.C.

February 18, 2010

Financial Highlights, continued

See accompanying Notes to Financial Statements

Statement of Activities

SUPPORT AND REVENUES

Accreditation Fees	\$ 6,068,972
In-Kind Contributions	4,216,030
Assessments - Member Societies	1,282,229
Professional Service Revenues	502,043
Science Screen Report Contributions	322,815
Government Grants	61,492
Investment Income	53,775
Other Revenue	2,344
Executive Meeting Revenues	<u>1,865</u>
Total Support and Revenues	<u>12,511,565</u>

EXPENSES

Accreditation	\$ 7,100,364
Professional Services	908,250
Governance	863,597
Special Projects	28,445
Planning and Operations	<u>2,433,647</u>
Total Expenses	<u>11,334,303</u>
Increase (Decrease) in Net Assets	<u>1,177,262</u>
Net Assets, Beginning of Year as Originally Stated	790,126
Adjustment for Correction of Accounting Principle	<u>(22,725)</u>
Net Assets, Beginning of Year as Adjusted	<u>767,401</u>
Net Assets, End of Year	<u>\$ 1,944,663</u>

Statement of Financial Position

ASSETS

Current Assets

Cash Equivalents	\$ 1,286,529
Investments	3,027,737
Accounts Receivable, Less Allowance for Doubtful Accounts of \$169,945	485,322
Prepaid Expenses and Other Current Assets	<u>361,452</u>
Total Current Assets	<u>5,161,040</u>

Property and Equipment

Information Management Systems	705,021
Equipment	522,617
Furniture and Fixtures	160,680
Computer Software	115,883
Equipment Under Capital Lease, Before Accumulated Amortization of \$16,843	88,424
Leasehold Improvements	<u>79,798</u>
	1,672,423
Less Accumulated Depreciation and Amortization	<u>(897,767)</u>
Net Property and Equipment	<u>774,656</u>
Total Assets	<u>\$ 5,935,696</u>

Because this is the first year of a new auditor, only one year of financial data is presented.

Financial Highlights, continued

See accompanying Notes to Financial Statements

Statement of Financial Position, continued

LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS

Current Liabilities

Accrued Expenses and Other Current Liabilities	\$ 741,412
Capital Lease Payable - Current Portion	11,795
Deferred Revenues	<u>2,968,974</u>
Total Current Liabilities	<u>3,722,181</u>

Long-Term Liabilities

Capital Lease Payable - Net of Current Portion	65,623
Deferred Rent Payable	<u>203,229</u>
Total Long-Term Liabilities	<u>268,852</u>

Net Assets

Unrestricted	1,923,373
Temporarily Restricted	<u>21,290</u>
Total Net Assets	<u>1,944,663</u>

Total Liabilities and Net Assets

\$ 5,935,696

Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, Inc.

STATEMENT OF CASH FLOWS FOR THE YEAR ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 2009

Cash Flows from Operating Activities

Increase in Net Assets	\$ 1,177,262
Adjustments to Reconcile Increase in Net Assets to Net Cash Provided by Operating Activities	
Depreciation and Amortization	138,555
Deferred Rent	(19,737)
Allowance For Doubtful Accounts	134,945
(Increase) Decrease in Assets	
Accounts Receivable	(193,730)
Prepaid Expenses and Other Current Assets	(259,338)
Increase (Decrease) in Liabilities	
Accrued Expenses and Other Current Liabilities	282,035
Deferred Revenues	<u>(466,753)</u>
Net Cash Provided by Operating Activities	<u>793,239</u>

Cash Flows from Investing Activities

Purchases of Property and Equipment	(125,627)
Maturities of Investments	5,860,213
Purchases of Investments	<u>(6,419,920)</u>
Net Cash Used in Investing Activities	<u>(685,334)</u>

Cash Flows from Financing Activities

Capital Lease Payments	<u>(8,583)</u>
Net Increase in Cash Equivalents	99,322
Cash Equivalents, Beginning of Year	<u>1,187,207</u>
Cash Equivalents, End of Year	<u>\$ 1,286,529</u>

Supplementary Disclosure of Cash Flow Information

Cash Paid During the Year for Interest	\$ 11,933
----------------------------------------	-----------

Because this is the first year of a new auditor, only one year of financial data is presented.



Notes to Financial Statements

1. ORGANIZATION

Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, Inc., (ABET) is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization organized in 1932 and incorporated in 1963. ABET accredits applied science, computing, engineering, and technology programs at colleges and universities throughout the United States as well as internationally. ABET also conducts faculty improvement workshops. The organization is supported primarily by accreditation fees, contributed accreditation services, and membership assessments.

2. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

Use of Estimates

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America (US GAAP) requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities, and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

Cash Equivalents

ABET considers all highly liquid investments with an initial maturity of three months or less when purchased to be cash equivalents.

Investments

Investments in certificates of deposit are reported at fair value in the statement of financial position.

Accounts Receivable

Accounts receivable are reported at their outstanding balances reduced by an allowance for doubtful accounts, if necessary.

Management periodically evaluates the adequacy of the allowance for doubtful accounts by considering ABET's past receivables loss experience, known and inherent risks in the accounts receivable population, adverse situations that may affect a client's ability to pay, and current economic conditions.

The allowance for doubtful accounts is increased by charges to bad debts expense and decreased by charges off of the accounts receivable balances. Accounts receivable are considered past due and charged off based on management's determination that they are uncollectible.

Property and Equipment

Property and equipment are stated at cost. Depreciation is provided over the estimated useful lives of the assets on a straight-line basis. Acquisitions of property and equipment in excess of \$1,000 are capitalized. Amortization of equipment purchased through capital leases has been included in depreciation expense.

Temporarily Restricted Net Assets

During the year ended September 30, 2009, ABET received \$322,815 in contributions restricted for the Science Screen Report program. Additionally, net assets of \$301,525 related to the Science Screen Report contributions were released from donor restrictions by satisfying the restrictions specified by the donors. Temporarily restricted net assets at September 30, 2009, was \$21,290.

Revenue, Support, and Expense Recognition

The financial statements of ABET have been prepared on an accrual basis. Revenue from membership assessments is recognized over the period to which the assessments relate, and revenue from fees is recognized when the related services are performed. Accreditation-visit revenue is recognized when ABET releases its final reports.

Unless specifically restricted by the donor or the grantor, all contributions and grants are considered to be available for unrestricted use. Unrestricted contributions received for ABET's programs are recognized as support when received.

Income Taxes

ABET is a tax-exempt organization operated for charitable and educational purposes under the provisions of Section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Corrections of Accounting Principles

ABET corrected its accounting method for recognizing Science Screen Report support and expense. Effective October 1, 2008, ABET recorded incoming funds as temporarily restricted support and disbursements as expenses. US GAAP require contributions that have temporary, donor-imposed restrictions to be accounted for as temporarily restricted contributions and related expenses. Prior to October 1, 2008, these funds were accounted for as liabilities using an agency-beneficiary method. The cumulative effect on prior years of the correction of accounting method was charged to October 1, 2008, net assets. The effect of this change was to decrease unrestricted net assets by \$22,725 to \$767,401.

During the year ended September 30, 2009, ABET corrected its accounting method for recording the fair value of in-kind services. US GAAP require the fair value of donated services to be recognized in the financial statements when the services require specialized skills, are provided by entities or persons possessing those skills, and would be purchased if they were not donated. Prior to October 1, 2008, ABET did not record the fair value of the accreditation services provided by volunteer commissioners and evaluators as in-kind support or expenses. There is no cumulative effect on prior years because the support and expenses offset each other. Additionally, there was no effect on net assets at September 30, 2009.

ABET also corrected its accounting method for travel reimbursements related to international accreditation visits. US GAAP require that accounts receivable be reported for travel reimbursements from other entities. Effective October 1, 2008, ABET recorded international travel charges as receivables from the institutions being accredited. Prior to October 1, 2008, international travel costs were expensed and the reimbursements were recognized as revenue. There is no cumulative effect on prior years because the revenues and expenses were recognized as offsetting amounts. Additionally, there was no effect on net assets at September 30, 2009.

3. CONCENTRATION OF CREDIT RISK

ABET maintains its cash equivalents in money market funds in an investment brokerage account. Although balances of \$1,446,310 as of September 30, 2009, were not insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, they were fully insured by the Securities Investor Protection Corporation and through a supplemental insurance policy underwritten by Lloyds of London.

Notes to Financial Statements, continued

4. INVESTMENTS AND FAIR VALUE MEASUREMENTS

ABET's investments and cash equivalents constitute its only assets or liabilities measured at fair value on a recurring basis as of September 30, 2009. These investments and cash equivalents, and their fair value measurements, are summarized below.

	Fair Value Measurements at Reporting Date Using		
	Fair Value	Quoted Prices in Active Markets for Identical Assets (Level 1)	Significant Observable Inputs (Level 2) Other
Certificates of Deposit	\$ 3,027,737	\$ -	\$ 3,027,737
Money Market Funds	1,446,310	1,446,310	-

Financial assets measured using Level 1 inputs are based on unadjusted quoted market prices in active markets for identical assets.

Level 2 inputs include quoted prices for similar assets in active markets, quoted prices for identical or similar assets in markets that are not active, inputs other than quoted prices that are observable, and inputs derived from observable market data.

Level 3 inputs are obtained from the entity's own assumptions.

None of the Organization's financial assets are valued using Level 3 inputs.

Investment income of \$53,775 consists of interest earned.

5. CAPITAL LEASE OBLIGATION

ABET is obligated under a capital lease arrangement for office equipment. The following is a summary of the minimum rental commitment of the long-term lease over the remaining years:

For the Year Ending September 30,	
2010	\$ 21,816
2011	21,816
2012	21,816
2013	21,816
2014	21,990
Total Minimum Lease Payments	109,254
Less Amount Representing Interest	(31,836)
Present Value of Minimum Lease Payments	\$ 77,418

Interest expense for the year ended September 30, 2009, was \$11,933.

6. CONTRIBUTED SERVICES

ABET records in-kind contributions for accreditation services rendered by the volunteer Commissioners and Program Evaluators. Contributed services are recognized at fair value if the services received (a) create or enhance long-lived assets or (b) require specialized skills, are provided by individuals possessing those skills, and would typically need to be purchased if not provided by donation. During the year ended September 30, 2009, ABET recorded \$4,216,030 in in-kind contributions support and accreditation expense in the statement of activities. All contributed services received were recognized as support during the year ended September 30, 2009.

7. RETIREMENT PLAN

ABET has a retirement plan open to all employees. Under the Plan, ABET makes contributions to TIAA/CREF. Contributions to the Plan are at the discretion of management each year and amounted to \$124,468 for the year ended September 30, 2009.

8. OPERATING LEASE OBLIGATION

ABET leases its office space under a non-cancellable operating lease that expires in September 2014. The lease includes an escalation clause for rental increases every 12 months. Future minimum rentals are as follows:

For the Year Ending September 30,	
2010	\$ 315,655
2011	322,570
2012	329,641
2013	336,872
2014	344,267
	<u>\$ 1,649,005</u>

Rental expense, which includes maintenance and utilities, amounted to \$372,440 for the year ended September 30, 2009.

9. FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF EXPENSES

The following is the breakdown of expenses by functional classification:

Program Services		
Accreditation	\$ 8,998,025	
Professional Services	502,043	
Governance	1,431,775	
Special Projects	47,160	
Total Program Services		\$ 10,979,003
Management and General		
Planning and Operations		355,300
Total Expenses		<u>\$ 11,334,303</u>

Professional services and planning and operations expenses in excess of revenues are allocated to accreditation, governance, and special projects expenses in proportion to their shares of direct expenses to total expenses.

10. SUBSEQUENT EVENTS

ABET has evaluated subsequent events through February 18, 2010, the date on which the financial statements were available to be issued.

Statistics

Part A: 2008-2009 Cycle Data







Evaluations Conducted (Number of Programs)

	ASAC	CAC	EAC	TAC	Total
General Review	13	60	419	124	616
Interim Report	5	27	100	87	219
Interim Visit	1	9	19	8	37
	19	96	538	219	872

Acronym Key

- GR General Review
- IR Interim Review
- IV Interim Visit
- NA Not to Accredit
- NGR Next General Review
- SC Show Cause

Results of Evaluations Conducted by Commission



Statistics

Part A: 2008-2009 Cycle Data

Programs Visited by Curricular Area*

	ASAC		CAC	EAC		TAC		TOTAL
	Bachelor	Master	Bachelor	Bachelor	Master	Associate	Bachelor	
Aeronautical	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Aerospace	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	14
Agricultural	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	6
Air Conditioning	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Architectural	0	0	0	7	0	3	1	11
Bioengineering and Biomedical	0	0	0	17	1	0	4	22
Biological	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Ceramic	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Chemical	0	0	0	38	0	1	1	40
Civil	0	0	0	57	0	10	4	71
Computer	0	0	0	52	0	4	8	64
Computer Science	0	0	52	0	0	0	0	52
Construction	0	0	0	3	0	2	3	8
Drafting and Design (Mechanical)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Electrical	0	0	0	70	0	19	17	106
Electromechanical	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
Engineering Management	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Engineering Mechanics	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Engineering, Engineering Physics, and Engineering Science	0	0	0	8	0	4	10	22
Environmental	0	0	0	18	3	1	0	22
Environmental, Health, and Safety	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
General Criteria Only	0	0	0	5	0	2	3	10
Geological	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Health Physics	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
Industrial	0	0	0	24	0	0	3	27
Industrial Hygiene	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	6
Information Systems	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	8
Information Technology	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	9
Instrumentation and Control Systems	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Manufacturing	0	0	0	6	0	1	5	12
Marine	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Materials	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	9
Mechanical	0	0	0	76	0	13	11	100
Metallurgical	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Mining	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	5
Naval Architecture and Marine	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Nuclear and Radiological	0	0	0	6	0	0	1	7
Ocean	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Petroleum	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Safety	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Software	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4
Surveying and Geomatics	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Systems	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Telecommunications	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
TOTAL	9	5	69	443	4	65	79	674

*Individual programs may embrace more than one curricular area, and thus may be counted more than once in this table. Visits are not conducted for Interim Visits.




Statistics


Part A: 2008-2009 Cycle Data

Actions for General Reviews

	ASAC		CAC		EAC		TAC		All	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
NGR	9	69.2%	26	43.3%	320	76.4%	71	57.3%	426	69.1%
IR	4	30.8%	30	50.0%	96	22.9%	49	39.5%	179	29.1%
IV	0	0.0%	4	6.7%	2	0.5%	2	1.6%	8	1.3%
SC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	1.6%	2	0.3%
NA	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	1	0.2%



Actions for General Reviews Across All Commissions, 2008-2009



Acronym Key

- GR General Review
- IR Interim Review
- IV Interim Visit
- NA Not to Accredite
- NGR Next General Review
- SC Show Cause

Statistics

Part A: Programs Accredited as of 10/1/09

Programs Accredited by Curricular Area*

	ASAC			CAC	EAC		TAC		TOTAL
	Associate	Bachelor	Master		Bachelor	Master	Associate	Bachelor	
Aeronautical	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
Aerospace	0	0	0	0	67	3	0	0	70
Agricultural	0	0	0	0	43	0	0	0	43
Air Conditioning	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3
Architectural	0	0	0	0	17	1	16	8	42
Automotive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Bioengineering and Biomedical	0	0	0	0	67	1	3	9	80
Biological	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	10
Ceramic	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4
Chemical	0	0	0	0	171	1	1	1	174
Civil	0	0	0	0	235	1	40	26	302
Computer	0	0	0	0	223	3	24	50	300
Computer Science	0	0	0	271	0	0	0	0	271
Construction	0	0	0	0	9	0	6	23	38
Drafting and Design (General)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3
Drafting and Design (Mechanical)	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	9
Electrical	0	0	0	0	320	4	101	113	538
Electromechanical	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	10
Engineering	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	19	24
Engineering Management	0	0	0	0	11	1	0	0	12
Engineering Mechanics	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	6
Engineering, Engineering Physics & Engineering Science	0	0	0	0	70	0	0	0	70
Environmental	0	0	0	0	58	8	4	0	70
Environmental, Health, and Safety	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Fire Protection	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	3
General Criteria Only	0	1	0	2	25	3	13	13	57
Geological	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	16
Health Physics	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	8
Industrial	0	0	0	0	101	1	6	9	117
Industrial Hygiene	0	7	33	0	0	0	0	0	40
Information Systems	0	0	0	38	0	0	0	0	38
Information Technology	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	15
Instrumentation and Control Systems	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4
Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	22	1	9	28	60
Marine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Materials	0	0	0	0	63	0	0	0	63
Mechanical	0	0	0	0	304	2	62	66	434
Metallurgical	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	9
Mining	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	14
Naval Architecture and Marine	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	11
Nuclear and Radiological	0	0	0	0	22	1	2	2	27
Ocean	0	0	0	0	7	1	0	0	8
Optics	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Petroleum	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	18
Safety	1	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	12
Software	0	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	19
Surveying and Geomatics	0	10	0	0	6	0	7	5	28
Systems	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	12
Telecommunications	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	7
TOTAL	1	32	41	326	1964	32	319	398	3113


*Individual programs may embrace more than one curricular area, and thus may be counted more than once in this table.




Statistics

Part A: 2008-2009 Cycle Data

Accredited Programs by Commission




Institutions by Commission



*Note: last year's number for CAC was incorrect.

10 Largest Curricular Areas by Number of Accredited Programs



Statistics


Part B: Accreditation Trend

Number of Accredited Programs and Institutions Having Accredited Programs, 1999-2009**

	ASAC		CAC		EAC		TAC		All	
	Pgms	Insts	Pgms	Insts	Pgms	Insts	Pgms	Insts	Pgms	Insts
1999	59	46	167	161	1626	338	695	237	2539	559
2000	62	48	177	169	1664	343	685	238	2580	567
2001	71	53	190	179	1699	348	689	236	2641	570
2002	70	52	205	187	1729	351	685	230	2680	569
2003	73	54	231	199	1763	359	693	229	2749	580
2004	74	56	254	218	1809	368	696	232	2823	591
2005	71	54	281	235	1830	372	701	235	2872	597
2006	75	57	309	254	1892	383	696	237	2961	615
2007	77	58	324	264	1963	397	687	239	3040	629
2008	73	56	324	263	1946	397	666	230	2997	621
2009	66	56	323	263	1933	397	651	230	2961	616

*Individual programs may embrace more than one curricular area and, thus, the totals may be lower than the sums of the commissions.

**Data above may differ from that reported in previous versions of this publication as a result of retroactive accreditation. Retroactive accreditation occurs when a commission extends accreditation to encompass the academic year prior to the one in which a program's onsite review was conducted. Retroactive accreditation may be applied to cover a new program's early graduates, whose work is usually evaluated during the initial accreditation visit.



Statistics

Part B: Accreditation Trend


Actions for General Reviews, 1999-2009* [percentages]

NA	ASAC					CAC*				
	NGR	IR	IV	SC	NA	NGR	IR	IV	SC	NA
1999	50%	25%	25%	0%	0%	40%	26%	20%	14%	0%
2000	17%	83%	0%	0%	0%	46%	29%	11%	7%	7%
2001	43%	57%	0%	0%	0%	41%	27%	24%	2%	5%
2002	86%	14%	0%	0%	0%	49%	27%	16%	5%	3%
2003	80%	0%	20%	0%	0%	62%	10%	14%	10%	3%
2004	50%	43%	7%	0%	0%	40%	40%	8%	8%	4%
2005	46%	31%	23%	0%	0%	40%	46%	10%	2%	2%
2006	10%	90%	0%	0%	0%	56%	32%	12%	0%	0%
2007	33%	56%	0%	11%	0%	48%	39%	11%	2%	0%
2008	62%	38%	0%	0%	0%	47%	37%	15%	1%	0%
2009	69%	31%	0%	0%	0%	43%	50%	7%	0%	0%


	EAC					TAC				
	NGR	IR	IV	SC	NA	NGR	IR	IV	SC	NA
1999	78%	11%	8%	3%	1%	59%	34%	6%	0%	0%
2000	66%	22%	11%	1%	1%	49%	38%	12%	1%	0%
2001	72%	13%	14%	1%	1%	31%	38%	5%	0%	0%
2002	68%	21%	11%	1%	0%	42%	52%	7%	0%	0%
2003	77%	17%	5%	1%	0%	52%	47%	0%	1%	0%
2004	71%	20%	7%	1%	1%	26%	65%	9%	0%	0%
2005	72%	22%	5%	1%	0.40%	57%	32%	10%	0%	1%
2006	65%	26%	9%	0%	0%	52%	42%	6%	0%	0%
2007	65%	30%	5%	0%	0%	51%	43%	3%	1%	1%
2008	67%	32%	1%	0%	0%	37%	49%	0%	14%	0%
2009	76%	23%	1%	0%	0%	57%	39%	2%	2%	0%

*CSAC/CSAB actions are shown as the ABET equivalents for 1999-2001: NGR (6V), IR (6VR), IV (3V), SC, and NA.


NGR Actions for General Reviews



IV Actions for General Reviews



5 Largest Curricular Increases in Number of Accredited Programs by Curricular Area, 1999-2009






Statistics

Part C: Volunteer Pool Characteristics*

Raising Awareness about Volunteer Diversity


In 2009, ABET conducted the first assessment of its Member Societies' volunteer diversity, with each ABET Society receiving a report based on data provided by their volunteers. The reports were provided to raise awareness, improve ABET's volunteer pool diversity, and encourage support for ABET's diversity policy, which states: "Our professions benefit from the creativity and constructive improvements best informed and achieved by persons with varied perspectives, experiences, and talents who work toward shared goals."

Gender Diversity of ABET Volunteers




In the U.S., ABET's volunteer group's gender diversity reflects that of the technical professions as a whole. According to The National Council for Research on Women, roughly 20 percent of careers in the technical professions are held by women.

Professional Diversity of ABET Volunteers



Nearly two out of every three ABET volunteers come from an academic background, which is why ABET is working with its Societies to attract more industry and government volunteers.

Ethnic Diversity of ABET Volunteers



In the U.S., ethnic groups are underrepresented in the technical professions. ABET is connecting with associations representing such groups to increase their presence in its volunteer team and the professions.

ABET Board of Directors



ABET is a federation of 30 professional and technical societies; the Board of Directors is its governing body. The Board consists of officers, representatives of the Member Societies, and representatives of the public, who are called Public Directors. The primary responsibilities of the Board of Directors are to set policy and approve accreditation criteria.

Officers

President

Joseph L. Sussman
Deloitte Consulting, LLP

Past President

L. S. Skip Fletcher
Texas A&M University/Retired

President-Elect

David K. Holger
Iowa State University

Secretary

Phillip E. Borrowman
Hanson Professional Services, Inc.

Treasurer

Daniel J. Bradley
Indiana State University

Directors

Public Directors

Sylvia L. Alexander
Michigan Department of
Transportation

Peter J. Haas
San Jose State University

Margaret I. Keller
Organizational Success

Barbara Martin
Montana Department of
Transportation

Amy O'Leary
Virginia Transportation
Research Council

AAEE

David A. Vaccari
Stevens Institute of Technology

ACSM

James R. Plasker
American Society for Photogram-
metry and Remote Sensing

AIAA

John E. LaGraff
Syracuse University

AIChE

Jeffrey J. Siirola
Eastman Chemical Company

Larry A. Kaye
Exxon Mobil Research and
Engineering Company/Retired

AIHA

Robert A. Herrick
Herrick Engineering, Inc.

ANS

Gilbert J. Brown
University of Massachusetts Lowell

ASABE

Lalit R. Verma
University of Arkansas

ASCE

Larry J. Feeser
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

Paul C. Taylor
Metropolitan Transportation
Authority

Beverly W. Withiam
University of Pittsburgh at
Johnstown

ASEE

Karan Watson
Texas A&M University

ASHRAE

David B. Meredith
The Pennsylvania State University
Fayette

ASME

Bassem F. Armaly
Missouri University of Science and
Technology

Franklin T. Dodge
Southwest Research Institute

Frank A. Gourley, Jr.
West Virginia University Institute of
Technology/Retired

ASSE

Paul G. Specht
Millersville University of
Pennsylvania

BMES

Paul N. Hale, Jr.
Louisiana Tech University

CSAB

Lawrence G. Jones
Software Engineering Institute
Carnegie Mellon University

Murali R. Varanasi
The University of North Texas

Patrick J. Walsh
IBM Global Services

HPS

John W. Poston, Sr.
Texas A&M University

IEEE

Bruce A. Eisenstein
Drexel University

Moshe Kam
Drexel University

Michael R. Lightner
University of Colorado at Boulder

IIE

K. Jamie Rogers
The University of Texas at Arlington

Warren H. Thomas
The State University of New York
at Buffalo

INCOSE

Wolter J. Fabrycky
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and
State University

ISA

Donald R. Gillum
Texas State Technical College

NCEES

Monte L. Phillips
University of North Dakota/Retired

NICE

Harrie J. Stevens
Alfred University

NSPE

Craig N. Musselman
CMA Engineers

SAE

Kenneth Rennels
Indiana University-Purdue
University Indianapolis

SFPE

John W. McCormick

SME

Hulas H. King
Siemens PLM Software

SME-AIME

Arden D. Davis
South Dakota School of Mines &
Technology

SNAME

Wayne L. Neu
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and
State University

SPE

Ronald L. Hinn, Jr.
Occidental Oil & Gas

TMS


Joseph F. Thomas, Jr.
Wright State University

Associate Member Society Representative

MRS

Steven M. Yalisove
University of Michigan

2008-2009 Team Chairs



Team Chairs have demonstrated technical competency and applied knowledge of accreditation criteria, policies, and procedures. They are experienced Program Evaluators, capable of leading the campus visit, and interacting with diplomacy and tact with the institutions. They ensure that all the required documents, forms, and statements are completed in a timely manner. The Team Chairs are selected by the four ABET Commissions to lead the campus visits, so they are listed alphabetically, not by society. Note: Every ABET Commissioner is a Team Chair, but not every Team Chair is a Commissioner.


Brett L. Anderson The Boeing Company	Lynn R. Carter Carnegie Mellon University Qatar	William J. Dixon Ernst & Young, LLP	Joan P. Gosink Colorado School of Mines
James H. Aylor University of Virginia	Curtis A. Carver University System of Georgia	David S. Dolling The University of Texas at Austin	Raymond Greenlaw Armstrong Atlantic State University
Donald J. Bagert Southeast Missouri State University	Lillian Cassel Villanova University	Ronald P. Doyle IBM	Harold Grossman Clemson University
Gordon (Don) L. Bailes East Tennessee State University	Kai H. Chang Auburn University	Joanne B. Dugan University of Virginia	Kent W. Hamlin KWH Associates, LLC
Swaminathan Balachandran University of Wisconsin - Platteville	Bret M. Clausen CH2M Hill Constructors	Scott C. Dunning University of Maine	Frank E. Hart Bluefield State College
Amitabha Bandyopadhyay State University of New York at Farmingdale	Steve Coe The Boeing Company	Thomas F. Edgar The University of Texas at Austin	Stephen T. Hedetniemi Clemson University
Henry R. Bauer, III	David A. Cook Stephen F. Austin State University	Pamela A. Eibeck Texas Tech University	C. Richard G. Helps Brigham Young University
David B. Beasley Arkansas State University	Kenneth F. Cooper Westinghouse Savannah River Company	Robert P. Elliott University of Arkansas	Adrienne M. Hendrickson University of Virginia
Wayne R. Bergstrom Bechtel Power Corporation	Sonya Cooper New Mexico State University	John D. Enderle University of Connecticut	Warren R. Hill Weber State University
Paul L. Bishop National Science Foundation	David W. Cordes University of Alabama	Winston F. Erevelles St. Mary's University	Thomas B. Horton University of Virginia
Robert R. Bittle Texas Christian University	Christine L. Corum Purdue University	David L. Feinstein University of South Alabama	Joseph L. Hughes Georgia Institute of Technology
Jean R. Blair U.S. Military Academy	William L. Coulbourne URS Corporation	Jeffrey W. Fergus Auburn University	Paul C. Jackson California Maritime Academy
Gillian M. Bond New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology	Patricia D. Daniels Seattle University	Michael Fleahman The Louis Berger Group, Inc.	Gerald S. Jakubowski Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology
Della T. Bonnette University of Louisiana at Lafayette	Scott Danielson Arizona State University	William Garrard University of Minnesota	Christopher A. Janicak Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Douglas R. Bowman Lockheed Martin	Ronald P. Danner The Pennsylvania State University	Wilson T. Gautreaux Rayonier, Inc.	Elizabeth A. Judson University Industry Demonstration Partnership
Richard L. Brandon Premier, Inc.	Nirmal K. Das Georgia Southern University	Ali Ghalambor University of Louisiana at Lafayette	Thomas R. Jurczak General Cable
Eugene F. Brown Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	Venu G. Dasigi Southern Polytechnic State University	David S. Gibson U.S. Air Force Academy	Swami N. Karunamoorthy Saint Louis University
Peter J. Carrato Bechtel Power Corporation	Laura Dietsche Dow Chemical Company	David W. Gibson University of Florida	George M. Kasper Virginia Commonwealth University
		Teofilo F. Gonzalez University of California, Santa Barbara	

2008-2009 Team Chairs, continued



Jeffrey R. Keaton MACTEC	Gayle F. Mitchell Ohio University	John J. Sammarco National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health	John C. Turchek Robert Morris University
Benjamin S. Kelley Baylor University	Dan Nash Raytheon Company	Subal K. Sarkar Wang Engineering	Paul J. Turinsky North Carolina State University at Raleigh
David P. Kelly Battelle	Franc E. Noel IBM/Retired	John L. Schnase Goddard Space Flight Center	A. Joseph Turner Clemson University/Retired
Larry E. Kendrick Mathworks	Keith B. Olson Utah Valley State College	Kirk Schulz Kansas State University	Jean S. Uhl Georgia Southern University
Ann L. Kenimer Texas A&M University	John A. Orr Worcester Polytechnic Institute	Dennis D. Schweitzer U.S. Air Force Academy	Raman M. Unnikrishnan California State University, Fullerton
Nancy Kinnersley University of Kansas	George R. Osborne McCart Group	John J. Segna American Society of Civil Engineers	C. Wayne Unsell Bowling Green State University
Gary L. Kinzel The Ohio State University	Allen Parrish University of Alabama	Joseph A. Shaeiwitz West Virginia University	Patrick B. Usoro General Motors Research and Development Center
Andrew Klein Oregon State University	Susan B. Patton Montana Tech of the University of Montana	Fred Z. Sitkins Western Michigan University	Chester J. Van Tyne Colorado School of Mines
John H. Koon John H. Koon & Associates	Darrell W. Pepper University of Nevada, Las Vegas	Gary L. Skaggs Agapito Associates, Inc.	Cedric F. Walker Tulane University
Muthusamy Krishnamurthy Hydro Modeling, Inc.	Andrew T. Phillips U.S. Naval Academy	Timothy L. Skvarenina Purdue University	Richard C. Warder, Jr. University of Memphis
Niaz Latif Purdue University Calumet	George Pothering College of Charleston	James A. Smith Goddard Space Flight Center	Dennis B. Webster
Gina J. Lee-Glauser Syracuse University	Deborah E. Puckett Southern Nuclear Company	J. Phillip Smith	Daniel J. Weinacht ARES Corporation
Paul M. Leidig Grand Valley State University	Anne-Louise Radimsky California State University, Sacramento	Edward J. Sobiesk U.S. Military Academy	Steven E. Wendel Sinclair Community College
Jim Leone Rochester Institute of Technology	Sarah A. Rajala Mississippi State University	Judith L. Solano University of North Florida	William J. Wepfer Georgia Institute of Technology
Kirk Lindstrom Questar Corporation	Venkitaswamy Raju State University of New York at Farmingdale	David L. Soldan Kansas State University	Samuel G. White Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
Carl E. Locke University of Kansas	Martin A. Reed IBM	Otis J. Sproul University of New Hampshire	Mickey R. Wilhelm University of Louisville
James A. Lookadoo Pittsburg State University	Harry L. Reif James Madison University	Pradip Srimani Clemson University	Carl R. Williams University of Memphis
Rita M. Lumos	Carol Richardson Rochester Institute of Technology	John A. Stratton Rochester Institute of Technology	Phillip L. Williams University of Georgia
Lois Mansfield Raytheon Systems	Paul H. Ricketts Bath Engineering	Richard J. Sweigard University of Kentucky	Mary Leigh Wolfe Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Kenneth Martin University of North Florida	Michael A. Robinson Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory	Eric W. Tappert Tappert Engineering	Frank H. Young Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology
Manton Matthews University of South Carolina	Ronald H. Rockland New Jersey Institute of Technology	Kevin D. Taylor Purdue University	Stuart H. Zweben The Ohio State University
James T. McCarter H2L Consulting Engineers	Mark Rudin Boise State University	Khagendra Thapa Ferris State University	
Gerald U. Merkel University of North Florida		Stan Thomas Wake Forest University	
R. A. Miller The Ohio State University		David R. Thompson Oklahoma State University	

2008-2009 Program Evaluators



Program Evaluators are the backbone of the ABET accreditation process. They visit college and university campuses and evaluate the programs seeking accreditation. To become a Program Evaluator, a person must meet certain qualifications, such as demonstrated interest in improving education, membership in one of the ABET Societies, and possessing a degree appropriate to the field, to name but a few. Once accepted as a volunteer, these individuals must undergo an extensive training process before becoming an ABET Program Evaluator. We owe each Program Evaluator many thanks.

AAEE C. Robert Baillod	ACSM Ralph W. Goodson	Valana L. Wells Arizona State University	Myung S. Jhon Carnegie Mellon University
David A. Chin University of Miami	David L. Ingram Ingram-Hagen & Company, PLC	AICHe Joseph S. Alford	Harry N. Knickle
Seward G. Gilbert, Jr. Engineering Perfection, PLLC	Kelly Olin California State Lands Commission	Sue Ann B. Allen Georgia Institute of Technology	Steven LeBlanc University of Toledo
Stephen P. Graef	Rebecca Y. Popek Spaceco, Inc.	R. M. Bricka Mississippi State University	Randy S. Lewis Brigham Young University
Jeffrey H. Greenfield Florida International University	AIAA Aaron R. Byerley U.S. Air Force Academy	Daina M. Briedis Michigan State University	Douglas K. Ludlow Missouri University of Science and Technology
James R. Hunt University of California	Merlin Dorfman	Janet M. Callahan Boise State University	Stephen S. Melsheimer Clemson University
Neil Hutzler Michigan Technological University	William Garrard University of Minnesota	David T. Camp Dow Chemical Company	Michael E. Mullins Michigan Technological University
Jason Lynch U.S. Military Academy	Mark N. Glauser Syracuse University	Ronald P. Danner The Pennsylvania State University	Kimberly L. Ogden University of Arizona
Joseph F. Malina, Jr. The University of Texas at Austin	Walter E. Haisler Texas A&M University	Jeffrey J. Derby University of Minnesota	Gary K. Patterson Missouri University of Science and Technology
Prahlad N. Murthy Wilkes University	Awatef Hamed University of Cincinnati	David DiBasio Worcester Polytechnic Institute	Thomas Peterson University of Arizona
Ronald D. Neufeld University of Pittsburgh	Osama A. Kandil Old Dominion University	Joshua S. Dranoff Northwestern University	Bruce E. Poling University of Toledo
Debra R. Reinhart University of Central Florida	Swami N. Karunamoorthy Saint Louis University	John G. Ekerdt The University of Texas at Austin	Michael E. Prudich Ohio University
John J. Segna American Society of Civil Engineers	Dolores S. Krausche Florida Center for Engineering Education	Bill B. Elmore Mississippi State University	Edward M. Rosen EMR Technology Group
Stephen P. Shelton Dowbiggin Partners, LLC	John E. LaGraff Syracuse University	Gary L. Foutch Oklahoma State University	Tony E. Saliba University of Dayton
David A. Vaccari Stevens Institute of Technology	Perry H. Leo University of Minnesota, Twin Cities	Clifford E. George	Kendree J. Sampson Ohio University
Mark J. Vanarelli, P.E. Colorado School of Mines	Dennis K. McLaughlin The Pennsylvania State University	Eric A. Grulke University of Kentucky	Mayis Seapan DuPont Central Research & Development
Yuefeng Xie The Pennsylvania State University Harrisburg	Han V. Nguyen The Boeing Company	Thomas R. Hanley Auburn University	W. Leigh Short Alternative Environmental Strategies, LLC
	Thomas J. Rudolphi Iowa State University	Roland H. Heck University of Delaware	
	Richard C. Warder, Jr. University of Memphis	James J. Hurny Rochester Institute of Technology	Todd G. Smith The Shaw Group

2008-2009 Program Evaluators, continued



Javad Tavakoli
Lafayette College

Reginald P. Tomkins
New Jersey Institute of Technology

Robert C. Weaver
International Matex Tank Terminals

Eileen Webb
Streamline Consulting

G. P. Willhite
University of Kansas

Andrew J. Wilson
URS Corporation - Abu Dhabi

AIHA

Lisa M. Brosseau
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

Alice Greife
University of Central Missouri

Randal J. Keller
Murray State University

J. T. Nalbone
The University of Texas at Tyler

William Pependorf
Utah State University

Barkev Siroonian
Siroonian Associates

Neil J. Zimmerman
Purdue University

ANS

Richard P. Coe
Excelsior College

David Dooley
CH2M Hill

Larry R. Foulke
University of Pittsburgh

Kent W. Hamlin
KWH Associates, LLC

Jane A. LeClair
Excelsior College

Stanley H. Levinson
AREVA NP, Inc.

Mathew M. Panicker
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission

James S. Tulenko
University of Florida

ASABE

Ronald L. Elliott
Oklahoma State University

Scott A. Hale
North Carolina State University at
Raleigh

Sonia M. Jacobsen
U.S. Department of Agriculture

Van C. Kelley
South Dakota State University

Jim Lindley
Indiana Department of
Environmental Management

Peter A. Livingston
Bosque Engineering

Sue E. Nokes
University of Kentucky

John F. Ourada
U.S. Department of Agriculture

ASCE

Farshad Amini
Jackson State University

Sia Ardekani
The University of Texas at Arlington

Daryl R. Armentrout
Tennessee Valley Authority

Abdeljelil Belarbi
Missouri University of Science and
Technology

David Binning
AEM Corporation

Michael S. Bronzini
George Mason University

Ciro Capano
State University of New York at
Farmingdale

Lizette Chevalier
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale

David A. Chin
University of Miami

Ricky C. Clifft
Arkansas State University

Elliot Colchamiro
City College of the City University
of New York

Marvin E. Criswell
Colorado State University

Norman D. Dennis
University of Arkansas

David P. Devine
Commonwealth Engineers

Roger O. Dickey
Southern Methodist University

Keith S. Dunbar
K.S. Dunbar & Associates, Inc.

William W. Edgerton
Jacobs Associates

William H. Espey, Jr.
Espey Consultants, Inc.

Allen C. Estes
California Polytechnic State
University

Lorraine Fleming
Howard University

Maury Fortney
Walla Walla Community College

Seward G. Gilbert, Jr.
Engineering Perfection, PLLC

Michael J. Hagenberger
Valparaiso University

Terry D. Hand
U.S. Military Academy

Frank E. Hart
Bluefield State College

Mohamed Hegab
California State University,
Northridge

William H. Highter
University of Massachusetts
Amherst

Peter W. Hoadley
Virginia Military Institute

Ralph J. Hodek
Michigan Technological University

Thomas Horsch

David W. Hubly
University of Colorado Denver

E. S. Huff
Portland Community College

Prasad Inmula
Federal Emergency Management
Agency

Thomas K. Jewell
Union College

David W. Johnston
North Carolina State University at
Raleigh

Edward H. Kalajian
Florida Institute of Technology

Sylvester A. Kalevela
Colorado State University – Pueblo

Nathan M. Kathir
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Mike G. Katona

Robert D. Kersten

Jai B. Kim
Bucknell University

Reed N. Knowles
Owens Community College

James L. Kohout
Iowa Western Community College

B. K. Lall
Portland State University

Debra Larson
Northern Arizona University

Martin E. Lipinski

Richard W. Lyles
Michigan State University

Douglas M. Mace
Mace Consulting Services, Inc.

Joseph F. Malina, Jr.
The University of Texas at Austin

John J. McDonough
University of Maine

Robert J. Mimiaga
Harris & Associates

Paul F. Mlakar
U.S. Army Engineer Research and
Development Center

Thomas E. Mulinazzi
University of Kansas

W. G. Mullen, Jr.
Virginia Military Institute

James M. Nau
North Carolina State University
at Raleigh

Robert J. O'Neill
Florida Gulf Coast University

David V. Owsley
Larkin Group NM, Inc.

Donald Phelps

Bobby E. Price
NSPE

Thomas B. Quimby
University of Alaska Anchorage

2008-2009 Program Evaluators, continued



Herbert M. Raybourn Reedy Creek Improvement District	Walter Boles Middle Tennessee State University	Saleh M. Sbenaty Middle Tennessee State University	Scott A. Clary Florida Institute of Technology
Ronald L. Sack Washington State University	Richard Bova DeVry Institute of Technology, Long Island City	James R. Sherrard Three Rivers Community College	Robert J. Comparin Emerson Climate Technologies
Joseph E. Saliba University of Dayton	Walter W. Buchanan Texas A&M University	John A. Weese Texas A&M University	Melvin R. Corley Louisiana Tech University
James R. Schaaf Schaaf & Wheeler	Hector R. Carrasco Colorado State University - Pueblo	Andrew J. Wilson URS Corporation – Abu Dhabi	William J. Craft North Carolina A&T State University
Stephen P. Shelton Dowbiggin Partners, LLC	Frank M. Croft The Ohio State University	ASHRAE William J. Hutzal Purdue University	Raju S. Dandu Kansas State University – Salina
Roger E. Snyder National Nuclear Security Administration	Fred Denny McNeese State University	ASME Nicholas J. Altiero Tulane University	Mohammad M. Dehghani Johns Hopkins University
Sheryl A. Sorby Michigan Technological University	Andy Drake Weber State University	Mahesh C. Aggarwal Gannon University	Ashley Emery University of Washington
Ellen W. Stevens Oklahoma State University	Maury Fortney Walla Walla Community College	Mehdi Ahmadian Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	Thomas C. Esselman Harvard University
Brian J. Swenty University of Evansville	Robert English New Jersey Institute of Technology	Forrest E. Ames University of North Dakota	Bakhtier Farouk Drexel University
Kamal S. Tawfiq Florida A&M University	Jane Fraser Colorado State University – Pueblo	Nagamangala K. Anand Texas A&M University	Ismail Fidan Tennessee Technological University
Robert W. Thompson CTL/Thompson	Venancio L. Fuentes County College of Morris	Albert A. Arthur	David P. Fleming
Houssam A. Toutanji University of Alabama at Huntsville	Matthew J. Goeckner The University of Texas at Dallas	Kenneth S. Ball Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	Linda Franzoni Duke University
Christian O. Unanwa California Department of Transportation	James A. Harbach U.S. Merchant Marine Academy	Oscar Barton, Jr. U.S. Naval Academy	Karen Fujikawa Structural Integrity Associates, Inc.
Albert C. Wahle Sinclair Community College	Ray M. Haynes DaVinci Charter High School	David I. Bigio University of Maryland College Park	John Gardner Boise State University
Clarence E. Waters University of Nebraska – Lincoln	James J. Hurny Rochester Institute of Technology	Daisie Boettner U.S. Military Academy	Lynnane E. George Colorado Technical University
John A. Wiggins New Jersey Institute of Technology	Stanley L. Love Softtek	Farhad Boeshaghi Florida A&M University	Hakan Gurocak Washington State University
Nur Yazdani The University of Texas at Arlington	James McNeil Colorado School of Mines	Cynthia Bracht Marvin Windows & Doors	Christine E. Hailey Utah State University
Timothy W. Zeigler Southern Polytechnic State University	Reza A. Mirshams The University of North Texas	M. Patricia Brackin Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology	David S. Hansen U.S. Air Force
ASEE Nicholas J. Altiero Tulane University	Bahman S. Motlagh University of Central Florida	Rebecca M. Brannon University of Utah	Edwin A. Harvego Idaho National Laboratory
Sohail Anwar The Pennsylvania State University Altoona	Mark Nowack Schafer Corporation	Tim L. Brower University of Colorado at Boulder	Mohamed Samir Hefzy University of Toledo
Ronald E. Barr The University of Texas at Austin	Teri Reed-Rhoads Purdue University	Lawrence M. Butkus U.S. Air Force	John I. Hochstein University of Memphis
Theodore A. Bickart Colorado School of Mines	James R. Rowland University of Kansas	Cordelia K. Chandler AREVA NP, Inc.	Mohammad H. Hosni Kansas State University
	Michael B. Santos University of Oklahoma		William E. Howard East Carolina University
			Diane M. Jakobs Rheem Manufacturing Company

2008-2009 Program Evaluators, continued



David H. Johnson
The Pennsylvania State University
Erie, The Behrend College

Syed P. Kalim
Wilkes University

Lorraine A. Kapka
Sinclair Community College

Amir Karimi
The University of Texas at San
Antonio

Mary Kasarda
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and
State University

Richard F. Keltie
North Carolina State University at
Raleigh

George Kent
Northeastern University

Charles W. Knisely
Bucknell University

Gregory J. Kowalski
Northeastern University

Timothy W. Lancey
California State University, Fullerton

Pierre M. Larochele
Florida Institute of Technology

Cesar Levy
Florida International University –
Modesto Maidique Campus

Thomas F. Lukach

Annette M. Lynch
Woodward Governor Company

Stacy T. Malecki
UTC Pratt & Whitney

Joseph L. Meick
Mark Rite Lines Equipment
Company

Robert A. Merrill
Rochester Institute of Technology

Swaminadham Midturi
University of Arkansas at Little Rock

Michele Miller
Michigan Technological University

Archer S. Mitchell, Jr.
Northrop Grumman Corporation

Kenneth D. Moore
GE Energy

Andrew J. Moskalik
Environmental Protection Agency

Joseph C. Musto
Milwaukee School of Engineering

Dennis O'Neal
Texas A&M University

Bipin Pai
Purdue University Calumet

Ronald C. Pare
University of Houston

Johne M. Parker
University of Kentucky

Steven G. Penoncello
University of Idaho

James P. Penrod
University of Dayton

Mark Petrie
TriAxis Engineering, Inc.

Katherine Prestridge
Los Alamos National Laboratory

Charles L. Proctor
Proctor Engineering, Research &
Consulting, Inc.

Jay Raja
University of North Carolina at
Charlotte

James W. Ramsey
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

Joseph J. Rencis
University of Arkansas

Keyanoush Sadeghipour
Temple University

Chittaranjan Sahay
University of Hartford

Anil Saigal
Tufts University

Muthukrishnan Sathyamoorthy
The University of Texas at Tyler

Jerzy T. Sawicki
Cleveland State University

George Schanzenbach
The Pennsylvania State University

Daniel J. Segalman
Sandia National Laboratories

Cecil J. Shorte
Booz Allen Hamilton

Thomas Singer, CMfgT
Sinclair Community College

Ronald Smelser
University of North Carolina at
Charlotte

Richard N. Smith
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

Craig W. Somerton
Michigan State University

David E. Stock
Washington State University

Lynn M. Stohlgren

Edward G. Tezak
Alfred State College

Siva Thangam
Stevens Institute of Technology

Tim Thomas
Pittsburg State University

Stephen R. Turns
The Pennsylvania State University

Jerry I. Tustaniwskyj
University of California, San Diego

Keshav S. Varde
University of Michigan - Dearborn

Curtis M. Vickery
Cameron Compression Systems

David E. Wagner
Trine University

Michael Ward
California State University, Chico

Richard C. Warder, Jr.
The University of Memphis

Wayne E. Whiteman
Georgia Institute of Technology

Dale A. Wilson
Tennessee Tech University

Garry G. Young
Entergy Nuclear

Mansour Zenouzi
Wentworth Institute of Technology

ASSE
Bret M. Clausen
CH2M Hill Constructors

Hamid Fonooni
East Carolina University

James Ramsay
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical
University – Daytona Beach

BMES
William Barnes
New Jersey Institute of Technology

Gail Dawn Baura
Keck Graduate Institute of Applied
Life Sciences

Paul J. Benkeser
Georgia Institute of Technology

Edward J. Berbari
Indiana University – Purdue
University Indianapolis

Susan M. Blanchard
Florida Gulf Coast University

Wm. Hugh Blanton
East Tennessee State University

Krishnan B. Chandran, DSc
University of Iowa

Richard J. Daken
New Jersey Institute of Technology

Richard C. Fries
Northwestern University

John D. Gassert
Milwaukee School of Engineering

Michelle J. Grimm
Wayne State University

Eric J. Guilbeau
Arizona State University

Peter G. Katona
George Mason University

Paul H. King
Vanderbilt University

Albert Lozano-Nieto
The Pennsylvania State University
Wilkes-Barre

Linda C. Lucas
University of Alabama at
Birmingham

Jon Moon
MEI Research, Ltd

Janet Rutledge
AT&T Bell Labs

Steven Schreiner
College of New Jersey

Scott Segalewitz
University of Dayton

John W. Steadman
University of South Alabama

Daniel Walsh
California Polytechnic State
University

Deborah S. Wells
PetroAlgae, LLC

2008-2009 Program Evaluators, continued



Roger S. White Phiama Consulting	Robert B. France Colorado State University	Yashwant K. Malaiya Colorado State University	Robert H. Sloan University Illinois at Chicago
Cameron H. Wright University of Wyoming	Robert Friedman New Jersey Institute of Technology	James McDonald Monmouth University	Christopher J. Smith Purdue University North Central
CSAB Rita M. Anderson University of South Carolina	Janos T. Fustos Metropolitan State College of Denver	Timothy J. McGuire Sam Houston State University	Stephanie Smullen University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Leemon Baird	Dick Gayler Kennesaw State University	Boleslaw Mikolajczak University of Massachusetts Dartmouth	Neelam Soundarajan The Ohio State University
Catherine Bareiss Olivet Nazarene University	Mary J. Granger George Washington University	Loretta Moore Jackson State University	Christopher W. Starr College of Charleston
Henry R. Bauer, III	Chia Y. Han University of Cincinnati	Michael G. Murphy Concordia University Texas	Jon Sticklen Michigan State University
Magdy Bayoumi University of Louisiana at Lafayette	Susan Haynes Eastern Michigan University	Thomas L. Naps University of Wisconsin – Oshkosh	George Stockman Michigan State University
Ralph B. Bisland University of Southern Mississippi	Iraj Hirmanpour Software Engineering Institute	Donald M. Needham U.S. Naval Academy	Massood Towhidnejad Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University – Daytona Beach
Michael W. Blasgen	Chenglie Hu Carroll College	Michael J. Oudshoorn The University of Texas at Brownsville	Deborah A. Trytten University of Oklahoma
Andrew S. Borchers Kettering University	Chenyi Hu University of Central Arkansas	William N. Owen University of South Alabama	John J. Uhran, Jr. University of Notre Dame
David Bover Western Washington University	Gurdeep Hura University of Maryland Eastern Shore	Allen Parrish University of Alabama	Yaakov Varol University of Nevada, Reno
Pearl W. Brazier The University of Texas – Pan American	Stephen Y. Itoga University of Hawaii at Manoa	Lynn M. Peterson The University of Texas at Arlington	Ranga R. Vemuri University of Cincinnati
Duncan A. Buell University of South Carolina	Stephen M. Jodis Armstrong Atlantic State University	Leah R. Pietron University of Nebraska at Omaha	Andy Wang Southern Polytechnic State University
Chia-Chu Chiang University of Arkansas at Little Rock	Elva J. Jones Winston-Salem State University	Shari Plantz-Masters Masters Consulting	Pearl Y. Wang George Mason University
Donald H. Cooley Utah State University	Vladan Jovanovic Georgia Southern University	David J. Powell Elon University	Christopher Ward IBM, T.J. Watson Research Center
Edward Corwin South Dakota School of Mines and Technology	Joseph M. Kizza University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	Rhys Price Jones George Washington University	Bob Weems University of Texas at Arlington
David L. Cozart Mercer University	Bradley Kjell Central Connecticut State University	Donna Reese Mississippi State University	Bruce A. White Quinnipiac University
Stewart Crawford BioGraphix, LLC & Visible Productions, LLC	Ojoung Kwon California State University, Fresno	Han Reichgelt Southern Polytechnic State University	Michael E. Whitman Kennesaw State University
John F. Dalphin The State University of New York at Potsdam	Cary Laxer Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology	Anthony S. Ruocco Roger Williams University	Mary Jane Willshire
Cristian Domnisoru University of St. Thomas	Roy B. Levow Florida Atlantic University	John S. Schlipf University of Cincinnati	Mudassar F. Wyne National University
Larry A. Dunning Bowling Green State University	Timothy E. Lindquist Arizona State University Polytechnic	Mark J. Sebern Milwaukee School of Engineering	Jenq-Foung J. Yao Georgia College and State University
Richard Enbody Michigan State University	Antonette M. Logar South Dakota School of Mines and Technology	Sung Y. Shin South Dakota State University	Frank H. Young Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology
Dick Fairley Colorado Technical University		Sajjan Shiva University of Memphis	

2008-2009 Program Evaluators, continued



HPS

Richard R. Brey
Idaho State University

Peter Collopy
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

Robert A. Fjeld
Clemson University

Phillip Patton
University of Nevada – Las Vegas

David A. Schauer
Uniformed Services University for
the Health Sciences

IEEE

Ikhlas M. Abdel-Qader
Western Michigan University

Reza Adhami
University of Alabama at Huntsville

Youakim Al Kalaani
Georgia Southern University

Nasser Alaraje
Michigan Technological University

Rocio Alba-Flores
Georgia Southern University

Lisa A. Anneberg
Lawrence Technological University

Thomas J. Aprille, Jr.

Stuart Asser
Queensborough Community
College

C. D. Avers

Orlando R. Baiocchi
University of Washington Tacoma

David Baker

Mark J. Balas
University of Wyoming

Steven F. Barrett
University of Wyoming

Eleanor Baum
The Cooper Union

Stephen B. Bayne
Texas Tech University

Wm. Hugh Blanton
East Tennessee State University

Leonard J. Bohmann
Michigan Technological University

William R. Boley
Northrup Grumman Corporation

Stephen F. Bonk
BAE Systems

Marcus M. Borhani
X-Fab Texas, Inc.

Tamal Bose
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and
State University

Nazeih M. Botros
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale

Richard Bova
 DeVry Institute of Technology, Long
Island City

Susan O. Brauer
 DeVry University

John A. Brogan
CPS Energy

Lewis Brown
South Dakota State University

Wayne Brown
Marietta Ink & Toner

J. W. Bruce
Mississippi State University

Karen L. Butler-Purry
Texas A&M University

Bill D. Carroll
University of Texas at Arlington

Richard P. Case

Arvind K. Chaudhary
Northrop Grumman Ship Building

C. L. Philip Chen
The University of Texas at San
Antonio

April Cheung
IMMI

Richard Cliver
Rochester Institute of Technology

David A. Conner

Charles E. Cote
Caelum Research Corporation

Paul B. Crilly
University of Tennessee

Jose B. Cruz, Jr.
Cruz & Associates

Patricia D. Daniels
Seattle University

James P. Davis
The Guilford Institute

Nathaniel J. Davis, IV
U.S. Air Force Institute of
Technology

Edwin de Angel
Cirrus Logic

Joanne E. DeGroat
The Ohio State University

David G. Delker
Kansas State University – Salina

Fred W. DePiero
California Polytechnic State
University

Edward T. Dickerson
University of Houston – Clear Lake

Curtis W. Dodd

John P. Donohoe
Mississippi State University

Gusteau Duclos
 DeVry Institute of Technology, Long
Island City

Kurt V. Eckroth
Waukesha County Technical
College

Clyde T. Eisenbeis
Emerson Process

Adel S. Elmaghraby
University of Louisville

Rasoul Esfahani
 DeVry University, Columbus

Perry K. Falk
Indiana University-Purdue University
Fort Wayne

Daniel M. Fleetwood
Vanderbilt University

Ralph M. Ford
The Pennsylvania State University
Erie, The Behrend College

Samuel Formby

Jeffrey E. Froyd
Texas A&M University

A. W. Galli
Clean Line Energy Partners

John Golzy
 DeVry University

Mario J. Gonzalez

Ilya Grinberg
State University of New York at
Buffalo

Thomas M. Hall, Jr.
Northwestern State University

James H. Hammond
L-3 Communications Ocean
Systems

Lorraine M. Herger
IBM

Gerald T. Heydt
Arizona State University

William T. Hicks
Purdue University New Albany

Larry D. Hoffman
Purdue University

Rafiqul Islam
Northwestern State University of
Louisiana

Douglas W. Jacobson
Iowa State University

Surinder Jain
Sinclair Community College

Brent Jenkins
Southern Polytechnic State
University

Edwin C. Jones
Iowa State University

Ismail Jouny
Lafayette College

Ahmed E. Kamal
Iowa State University

Laveen N. Kanal
LNK Corporation, Inc.

Claude I. Kansaku
Oregon Institute of Technology

Mohan Ketkar
Prairie View A&M University

Saeed M. Khan
Kansas State University - Salina

Alan R. Klayton
U.S. Air Force Academy

Tammy A. Kolarik

James J. Komiak
BAE Systems

Thomas H. Kuckertz
Prince William Sound Regional
Citizens' Advisory Council

Cass D. Kuhl
Analex – NASA Glenn Research
Center

K.S.P. (Pat) Kumar
University of Minnesota Minneapolis

2008-2009 Program Evaluators, continued



William D. Lane
Federal Communications
Commission

James Lansford
CSR, plc

Mark E. Law
University of Florida

Pamela Leigh-Mack
Virginia State University

David M. LeVine
Goddard Space Flight Center

Richard D. Lilley
Harris Corporation

Paul I. Lin
Indiana University-Purdue University
Fort Wayne

C. Steven Lingafelt
IBM

Luis A. Lopez
Hewlett Packard

Michael J. Loudis
State University of New York at
Morrisville

Albert Lozano-Nieto
The Pennsylvania State University
Wilkes-Barre

Leda Lunardi
North Carolina State University at
Raleigh

Syed M. Mahmud
Wayne State University

Phanindra K. Mannava
Intel Corporation

Mary Marchegiano
Delaware Technical & Community
College, Stanton

Terry Martin
University of Arkansas

W. Vance McCollough
Raytheon Company

Claire McCullough
University of Tennessee at
Chattanooga

James McDonald
Monmouth University

Michael R. McQuade
DuPont

Sigurd Meldel
San Jose State University

James Mikkelson

Michael K. J. Milligan
The Aerospace Corporation

Thomas G. Minnich
Bridgemont Community and
Technical College

Tony L. Mitchell
North Carolina State University at
Raleigh

Daniel J. Moore
Rose-Hulman Institute of
Technology

Bahman S. Motlagh
University of Central Florida

S. Hossein Mousavinezhad
Idaho State University

Steven E. Muldoon
Wayne State University

J. Keith Nelson
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

Victor P. Nelson
The Ohio State University

Robert L. Nevin

Brian Norton
Oklahoma State University

Philip D. Olivier
Mercer University

Robert G. Olsen
Washington State University

Efrain O'Neill-Carrillo
University of Puerto Rico at
Mayaguez

Cristian Penciu
DeVry University, Irving

James P. Penrod
University of Dayton

Lance C. Perez
University of Nebraska – Lincoln

Owe G. Petersen
Milwaukee School of Engineering

Robert F. Phelps
The Boeing Company

Stephen M. Phillips
Arizona State University

Suresh Rai
Louisiana State University

Richard A. Rikoski
Technical Analysis Corporation

Albert J. Rosa
Thomas-Rosa Partnership

Kenneth Rose
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

Branislav Rosul
Oakton County College

Diane T. Rover
Iowa State University

David J. Russomanno
University of Memphis

Ghassan A. Salim
California University of Pennsylvania

George Schanzenbach
The Pennsylvania State University

Cheryl B. Schrader
Boise State University

Noel N. Schulz
Kansas State University

Tomy Sebastian
Nexteer Automotive

Rama Shastri
Hewlett Packard

Raymond R. Shoults
The University of Texas at Arlington

Dennis A. Silage
Temple University

Gordon Silverman
Manhattan College

Larry A. Simonson
South Dakota School of Mines and
Technology

Darshan Singh

Thomas B. Slack
University of Memphis

Mark J. T. Smith
Purdue University

Nadine Smith
The Pennsylvania State University

S. Diane Smith
DeVry University, Phoenix

Mani Soma
University of Washington

Arun K. Soman
Iowa State University

Gregory D. Stanton
Smiths Detection

Murray Teitell
DeVry University, Long Beach

Gerald H. Thomas
Milwaukee School of Engineering

Nick Tredennick
Gilder Publishing

Satish Udpa
Michigan State University

Steven R. Walk
Old Dominion University

Richard Warren
Vermont Technical College

Douglas B. Williams
Georgia Institute of Technology

Edward Wilson
DeVry University

Raphael W. H. Wong
Booz Allen Hamilton

Keith D. Wright
DeVry University, Decatur

Chai Wah Wu
IBM

Ece Yaprak
Wayne State University

Oner Yurtseven
Indiana University – Purdue
University Indianapolis

John L. Vian
The Boeing Company

Li L. Zhang
DeVry University, Westminster

IIE
Suraj M. Alexander

Rajan Batta
State University of New York at
Buffalo

Leslie F. Benmark
DuPont

S. Hossein Cheraghi
Western New England College

F. F. Choobineh
University of Nebraska – Lincoln

Kenneth Currie
Tennessee Technological University

Catherine C. Dunn
Port of New Orleans

David Elizandro
Tennessee Technological University

Ted Eschenbach
TGE Consulting

Prasad Gavankar
PepsiCo

2008-2009 Program Evaluators, continued



Sunderesh S. Heragu
University of Louisville

Denise F. Jackson
University of Tennessee Space
Institute

Swatantra K. Kachhal
University of Michigan – Dearborn

D. L. Kimbler
Clemson University

K. S. Krishnamoorthi
Bradley University

Mary B. Kurz
Clemson University

Jerome P. Lavelle
North Carolina State University

Abu S. Masud
Wichita State University

Jessica O. Matson
Tennessee Technological University

Richard M. Morris
Georgia State University

Saeid Motavalli
California State University, East Bay

Jacqueline R. Mozrall
Rochester Institute of Technology

Hamid R. Parsaei
University of Houston

Patrick Patterson
Texas Tech University

Juan R. Perez
United Parcel Service

Michael W. Riley
University of Nebraska – Lincoln

Sanjiv Sarin
North Carolina A&T State University

Victor Zaloom
Lamar University

INCOSE
Jane C. Ammons
Georgia Institute of Technology

ISA
Raymond E. Floyd
Innovative Insights, Inc.

NICE
Janet M. Callahan
Boise State University

SME
Jeffrey Abell
General Motors Corporation

Danny J. Bee
University of Wisconsin – Stout

Ronald J. Bennett
University of St. Thomas

Walter W. Buchanan
Texas A&M University

Dianne Chong
The Boeing Company

Andy Drake
Weber State University

Ismail Fidan
Tennessee Technological University

Sunderesh S. Heragu
University of Louisville

Stanley N. Ihekweazu
South Carolina State University

Niaz Latif
Purdue University Calumet

Jorge Leon
Texas A&M University

Young B. Moon
Syracuse University

Paul D. Plotkowski
Grand Valley State University

Venkitaswamy Raju State
State University of New York at
Farmingdale

Robert J. Simoneau
The Pennsylvania State University
Erie, The Behrend College

Daniel E. Skurski
Grand Valley State University

Vederaman Sriraman
Texas State University – San Marcos

SME-AIME
Sukumar Bandopadhyay
University of Alaska Fairbanks

David D. Eyer

Charles Kliche
South Dakota School of Mines &
Technology

David G. McMahill
DuPont

Susan B. Patton
Montana Tech of the University of
Montana

Diane Wolfgram
Montana Tech of the University of
Montana

SNAME
Harold C. Alexander
Maine Maritime Academy

Robert G. Latorre
University of New Orleans

Vijay Panchang
Texas A&M University at Galveston

Robert E. Randall
Texas A&M University

Paul J. Roden
U.S. Coast Guard

SPE
Kashy Aminian
West Virginia University

Godwin A. Chukwu
University of Alaska Fairbanks

Tom Hooper
Devon Energy Corporation

TMS
Thomas R. Bieler
Michigan State University

Carl J. Boehlert
Michigan State University

Rudolph G. Buchheit
The Ohio State University

Elliot P. Douglas
University of Florida

Ronald Gibala
University of Michigan

Fernand D. Marquis
Naval Postgraduate School

Anthony Pengidore
APCPE, Inc.

William W. Shropshire
American Chemist Corporation

Elliott Slamovich
Purdue University

Raghu Srinivasan
Wright State University

ABET Professional Staff



Executive Office

Michael K. J. Milligan
Executive Director

Lance K. Hoboy
Interim Executive Director
(11/2008 – 5/2009)

Rachelle R. Daucher
Executive Assistant

Governance

Kathryn B. Aberle
Deputy Executive Director

International Development

George D. Peterson
Managing Director for International
Development, Executive Director
Emeritus

Daniela Iacona
International Relations Coordinator

Accreditation

Maryanne Weiss
Accreditation Director

Ellen L. Stokes
Accreditation Manager

Sherri Hersh
International Accreditation
Specialist

Beth Mundy
Assistant to the Accreditation
Director

Applied Science

Amanda Reid
Adjunct Accreditation Director
Applied Science

Elayna Lambert
Accreditation Assistant, Applied
Science Accreditation Commission

Computing

Doris K. Lidtke
Adjunct Accreditation Director
Computing

Arthur L. Price
Adjunct Accreditation Director
Computing

Norma A. Belton
Accreditation Assistant, Computing
Accreditation Commission

Engineering

M. Dayne Aldridge
Adjunct Accreditation Director
Engineering

Stephanie Jackson
Accreditation Assistant
Engineering Accreditation
Commission

Technology

David E. Hornbeck
Adjunct Accreditation Director
Technology

Dorothea I. Lindsey
Accreditation Assistant
Technology Accreditation
Commission

Planning and Operations

Lance K. Hoboy
Managing Director, Planning
and Operations & Chief Financial
Officer

Jennifer Knode
Human Resources & Office
Manager

Bryna Ashley
Receptionist & Administrative
Assistant

Finance & Accounting

Jessica Silwick
Accounting Manager

Kim Turner
Staff Accountant

LaTasha McKinney
Accounts Payable Clerk

Information Systems & Technology

Frank Sarlo
Information Systems & Technology
Director

Hwan-Kyung Chung
Lead Software Engineer

Venugopal Tati
Software Applications Developer

Jaye Brebnor
Senior PC Support & Desktop
Specialist

Professional Services

Gloria M. Rogers
Associate Executive Director
Professional Services

Regina L. Crites
Assistant to the Associate
Executive Director, Professional
Services

Susan O. Schall
Adjunct Director for Training

Lil Hughes Knipp
Marketing & Member Services
Director

Donna Clark
Meetings & Member Services
Manager

Keryl Cryer
Communications Specialist

Hope Joseph Nelson
Professional Services
Administrative Assistant

2009 Fellows of ABET



Richard O. Anderson, P.E.

Principle Engineer at Somat Engineering, Inc., Detroit, Michigan

“For leadership in the development and implementation of outcomes-based accreditation for continuous quality improvement of educational programs across all Commissions of ABET, for commitment to diversity, and for promotion of international accreditation.”



Lawrence G. Jones, Ph.D.

Senior Member of the Technical Staff at the Software Engineering Institute of Carnegie Mellon University

“For leadership in ABET’s Accreditation Council and Computing Accreditation Commission, resulting in harmonization of accreditation criteria, improved training of evaluators, and overall greater cooperation among ABET’s Commissions.”



Arthur L. Price, Ph.D.

Distinguished Member of the Technical Staff at Avaya (retired)

“For dedication and exemplary service to the computing and information systems community, as well as commitment to ABET, which has significantly improved the training and accreditation processes and enhanced the working relationships between ABET and CSAB.”



Kay G. Schulze, Ph.D.

Professor of Computer Science at the U.S. Naval Academy (retired)

“For outstanding leadership in transitioning the Computing Accreditation Commission to outcomes-based accreditation, promoting and developing accreditation of information technology programs, improving the efficiency of the accreditation processes, and fostering a collegial working environment with the other Commissions.”



Mary Leigh Wolfe, Ph.D.

Professor and Assistant Department Head for Teaching in the Department of Biological Systems Engineering at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

“For exemplary leadership of the ABET Engineering Accreditation Commission and service to ABET through contributions for improving volunteer training and criteria refinement, and for providing a model of excellence for Commission editors.”

From top to bottom: Richard O. Anderson, P.E.; Lawrence G. Jones, Ph.D.; Arthur L. Price, Ph.D.; Kay G. Schulze, Ph.D.; and Mary Leigh Wolfe, Ph.D.

2009 Linton E. Grinter Distinguished Service Award

Recipients of the Linton E. Grinter Distinguished Service Award, ABET's highest honor, are those ABET volunteers who follow in the namesake's footsteps and surpass even the highest service expectations of the organization. They are acknowledged for outstanding contributions to the technical disciplines through their work in ABET-related activities.

George D. Peterson, Ph.D., P.E.

Managing Director for International Development and Executive Director Emeritus at ABET, Inc.

“For his extraordinary vision that made ABET a global leader in the determination of quality in higher education in general, and in the disciplines that ABET accredits in particular; for, as a volunteer and then as Executive Director, instilling the principles of continuous quality improvement in ABET's accreditation criteria, and strategic planning and in mutual recognition agreements; and for elevating ABET to a leadership role in transforming applied science, computing, engineering, and technology education worldwide.”



ABET President Joseph L. Sussman, Ph.D., presents the 2009 Linton E. Grinter Distinguished Service Award to George D. Peterson, Ph.D., P.E., ABET's Managing Director for International Development and Executive Director Emeritus.

2009 President's Awards for Diversity

The President's Awards for Diversity recognize U.S.-based educational units, individuals, associations, and firms for extraordinary success in achieving diversity and inclusiveness, or for facilitating diversity and inclusiveness in the technological segments of our society.

The Bourns College of Engineering at the University of California, Riverside

“In recognition of extraordinarily successful initiatives for recruiting undergraduate and graduate students from diverse and disadvantaged backgrounds, retaining them through the bachelor's degree, and advancing them to graduate studies and careers in engineering.” Accepting the award, Dr. Chinya Ravishankar, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education and Professor of Computer Science and Engineering.

The College of Engineering at Florida A&M University and Florida State University


“In recognition of the creation of a unique engineering program—formed from the partnership between a Research-1 and a historically black university—that has succeeded by being among the top five engineering programs in bachelor's degrees awarded to black students as well as among the top ten in graduate degrees, and for successfully serving more than 40,000 diverse middle and high school students through outreach programs.” Accepting the award, Dr. Ching-Jen Chen, The Dean of Engineering and Professor of Mechanical Engineering.

The College of Engineering and Computer Science at California State University, Fullerton

“For its leadership and accomplishments in attaining significant achievements in diversity facilitated through innovative programs such as the Center for Academic Success in the College of Engineering and Computer Science (CASECS) and the Engineering and Computer Science (ECS) Scholars.” Accepting the award, Dr. Raman Unnikrishan, Dean of the College of Engineering and Computer Science.



Shown presenting and accepting ABET's 2009 President's Awards for Diversity (from left): Michael K. J. Milligan, Ph.D., P.E., Executive Director, ABET; Dr. Raman Unnikrishan, Dean of the College of Engineering and Computer Science, accepting for California State University, Fullerton; Dr. Chinya Ravishankar, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education and Professor of Computer Science and Engineering, accepting for the University of California, Riverside; Dr. Ching-Jen Chen, the Dean of Engineering and Professor of Mechanical Engineering, accepting for Florida A&M University and Florida State University; and David Holger, Ph.D., President, ABET



Who's Who on Our Covers




Front Cover

1. Gina L. Hutchins, Industry Advisor, United Parcel Service, pages 15 & 29
2. Allison Guettner, University of Texas at San Antonio graduate, ABET-accredited Civil Engineering program, page 12
3. Raman M. Unnikrishnan, Academic Constituent, California State University – Fullerton, pages 14, 25, 48 & 60
4. James H. Johnson, Jr., Academic Constituent, Howard University, page 14
5. Paurakh Rajbhandary, Trinity University Senior, ABET-accredited Engineering program
6. Maryanne Weiss, ABET Accreditation Director who has acted as the Managing Director for Accreditation since February 2008, page 57
7. Robert A. Herrick, ABET Board Member, pages 13, 27 & 46
8. Michael B. Gwyn, Industry Advisor, Benham Constructors, LLC, pages 15 & 29
9. Joseph L. Sussman, ABET President, pages 7, 46 & 59
10. Renata S. Engel, Academic Constituent, The Pennsylvania State University, page 14
11. Diane Chong, ABET Program Evaluator, pages 13 & 56
12. George Peterson, Managing Director for International Development and Executive Director Emeritus, pages 7, 8, 57 & 59



Back Cover

1. Keryl Cryer, Communications Specialist who creates, authors, and designs many of ABET's constituents' communications, page 57
2. Adam Roig, University of Texas-San Antonio Senior, ABET-accredited Mechanical Engineering program
3. Wayne Bergstrom, ABET Team Chair and Commissioner (EAC), pages 13, 25 & 47
4. Timothy Brandsma, Texas State University at San Marcos graduate, ABET-accredited Computer Science program, page 12
5. Lance K. Hoboy, ABET Comptroller who began the fiscal year as Managing Director, Planning and Operations, and capably served as Interim Executive Director from November 2008 – May 2009, then assumed the additional responsibilities of ABET Chief Financial Officer, pages 18 & 57
6. Peggy Liska, Texas A&M University student, ABET-accredited Electronics Engineering Technology program, page 12
7. Michael K. J. Milligan, ABET Executive Director effective June 1, 2008, pages 7, 9, 55, 57 & 60
8. Curtis Fitzgerald, University of Houston – Clear Lake graduate, ABET-accredited Environmental Science program, page 12
9. Mary Leigh Wolfe, ABET Fellow, pages 19, 25, 48 & 58
10. Ellen L. Stokes, ABET Accreditation Manager who celebrated 25 years with ABET and led her four-person team to process a record 894 evaluations in 2009, page 57
11. James C. Dalton, Industry Advisor, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, pages 15 & 29
12. Bryan Sonnier, Texas A&M University Senior, ABET-accredited Electronics Engineering Technology program
13. A. Joseph Turner, ABET Commissioner (CAC), pages 13, 23 & 48
14. Daniela Iacona, International Relations Coordinator who manages ABET's international interactions including Memoranda of Understanding and Mutual Recognition Agreements, page 57
15. Paul B. Kalafos, Jr., Industry Advisor, Northrop Grumman Corporation, pages 15 & 29
16. Mary Marchegiano, Academic Constituent, Delaware Technical & Community College, pages 14 & 55



111 Market Pl., Suite 1050
Baltimore, MD 21202
410-347-7700 ■ 410-625-2238 (Fax)
www.abet.org

