



**SOUTH DAKOTA BOARD OF REGENTS
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS FORMS**


**Institutional Program Review
Report to the Board of Regents**

Use this form to submit a program review report to the system Chief Academic Officer. Complete this form for all units/programs undergoing an accreditation review, nationally recognized review process, or institutional program review. The report is due 30 days following receipt of the external and internal review reports.

UNIVERSITY:	SDSU
DEPARTMENT OR SCHOOL:	Engineering
PROGRAM REVIEWED:	BS Mechanical Engineering
DATE OF REVIEW:	9/29/2015

University Approval

To the Board of Regents and the Executive Director: I certify that I have read this report, that I believe it to be accurate, and that it has been evaluated and approved as provided by university policy.



President of the University

11/4/2016

Date

1. Identify the program reviewers and any external accrediting body:

Engineering Accreditation Commission of the Accreditation Board for Engineering & Technology (ABET); it appointed the following reviewers:

Team Chair: Dr. Karen Fujikawa; Manager, BWR Stress Analysis, Castle Rock, CO
Program Evaluator: Dr. Gary Young; Director of License Renewal, Russellville Nuclear Power Plant, Russellville, OH

2. Items A & B should address the following issues: mission centrality, program quality, cost, program productivity, plans for the future, and assessment of progress.

2(A). Describe the strengths and weaknesses identified by the reviewers

Strengths: (1) College of Engineering facilities; (2) engagement with regional employers; (3) commitment to providing the best teaching training for faculty members (provided by the American Society for Engineering Education); (4) engagement with the Electrical Engineering Department in providing ME-EE multi-disciplinary senior design project teams.

The EAC of ABET was so impressed with the accreditation visit and the high quality of the Mechanical Engineering self-study document provided by the program that it asked

permission to use it (and the self-study documents for the other three engineering programs) to place on display as a model for engineering programs at other universities at its annual ABET conference.

2(B). Briefly summarize the review recommendations

- Concern #1¹: should more consistently use documented processes for assessing and evaluating student learning outcomes.
- Concern#2¹: the department should fill its two faculty vacancies and consider adding another faculty member to address recent high enrollment growth.
- Concern #3¹: the department should have resources necessary to hire more laboratory technical support and more administrative support for the department head.

¹ABET definition for a Concern: “*A Concern indicates that a program currently satisfies a criterion, policy, or procedure; however, the potential exists for the situation to change such that the criterion, policy, or procedure may not be satisfied.*”

2(C). Indicate the present and continuous actions to be taken by the college or department to address the issues raised by the review. What outcomes are anticipated as a result of these actions?

Concern #1: An improved assessment plan, including documentation, was developed in response to the shortcoming cited. It is currently in practice.

Concern #2: The vacant faculty positions were under national searches at the time of the visit, and both positions were filled. A new position is being funded in FY17 for likely filling by Fall 2017.

Concern #3: The college is providing new funding support in FY17 for both laboratory technical support and administrative support.