

1: Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (APPM), | ABET

With an emphasis on interdisciplinary collaboration throughout, the text focuses on the growth of simulation, guidance for new faculty transitioning from a clinical to academic role, developing curricula for practice and academic settings, program evaluation, accreditation activities, and recommendation for research in nursing education.

Program Criteria -These criteria address program-specific requirements within areas of specialization. The minimum review and comment period is one year. Eligibility of Programs for Accreditation Review I. ABET defines an educational program as an integrated, organized experience that culminates in the awarding of a degree. The program will have program educational objectives PEOs , student outcomes SOs , a curriculum, faculty, and facilities. Programs will be considered for accreditation if they are offered by an institution of higher education that has verifiable governmental, national, or regional recognition to confer degrees. ABET accredits individual educational programs. ABET does not accredit departments or institutions. A program must be accreditable under one or more of the four commissions of ABET: CAC “ Programs accredited by CAC are those leading to professional practice across the broad spectrum of computing, computational, information, and informatics disciplines. CAC accredits a program at the baccalaureate degree level. Associate degree programs prepare graduates for careers as engineering technicians. ETAC accredits a program at the associate or baccalaureate degree level. Program names must meet the following ABET requirements. The program name must be descriptive of the content of the program. The program name determines the commission and the criteria applicable to its review. For a program to be eligible for an initial accreditation review ABET requires that: A program must have had at least one graduate within the two academic years prior to the on-site review. Application and Timeline for Accreditation Review I. Programs are considered for accreditation review only at the written request of the institution. An institution wishing to have programs considered for accreditation must submit to ABET a Request for Evaluation RFE not later than January 31 of the calendar year in which the review is desired. The RFE must be signed by the institutional Chief Executive Officer President, Chancellor, Rector, or equivalent and must be submitted with one official transcript of a recent graduate for each program listed on the RFE. When submitting an RFE for either a general or an interim on-site review, the institution may suggest the on-site review start date. Institutions outside the U. The institution must submit all forms by January If more than one ABET commission will be reviewing programs at an institution in the same academic year, the institution may request that all on-site reviews be conducted simultaneously. An RFE may be modified or withdrawn by the institution at any time up to the beginning of the July Commission meeting. The Self-Study Report addresses how a program meets each criterion in addition to applicable policy requirements. ABET conducts all reviews in English. Programs must submit all documentation including the Self-Study Report, transcripts, display materials, and correspondence in English. By May 1 of the calendar year in which the review is requested, the institution will receive an invoice for fees associated with the requested review. Payment is due 30 days from date of the invoice. The institution may reject a team member only in the case of real or perceived conflicts of interest. The institution and the team chair will mutually determine dates for any on-site review that is required. On-site reviews are normally conducted during September through December of the calendar year in which the review is requested. The institution will submit a Self-Study Report or an Interim Report, as required, for each program to be reviewed. The institution will provide the appropriate report directly to the team chair no later than July 1. The institution will provide the appropriate report directly to each program evaluator at the direction of the team chair. When an on-site review is required, the duration of the review is normally three days from team arrival to departure but may be extended or shortened depending on review requirements. Typically the on-site review is conducted from Sunday through Tuesday. As a result of the review, the institution will receive a Draft Statement to the Institution for review and comment. The Draft Statement will be modified to reflect these analyses, resulting in a Final Statement that reflects the final action by the commission. The institution will receive the Final Statement and the Summary of Accreditation Actions no later than August 31 of the calendar year following the review. Reviews are conducted to verify that a program is in compliance with the

appropriate accreditation criteria, policies, and procedures. In order for a program to be accredited, all paths to completion of the program must satisfy the appropriate criteria. Types of Review I. A Comprehensive Review addresses all applicable criteria, policies, and procedures. This general review applies to all programs accredited by a particular commission. A year in which such a review occurs is called a general review year. An Interim Review occurs between Comprehensive Reviews when Weaknesses or Deficiencies remain unresolved in a prior review. An Interim Review typically uses the accreditation criteria in effect at the time of the previous comprehensive review. However, an institution may elect to base its interim review on criteria in effect at the time of the last comprehensive review or on those in effect at the time of the Interim Review.

Submittal of Transcripts – Prior to arriving on-site, the team will request official transcripts of the most recent graduates from each program. Each program being evaluated will provide official transcripts with associated worksheets and any guidelines used by the advisors. **Additional Information** – Prior to arriving on-site, the team may request additional information that it deems necessary for clarification. Teams for on-site reviews will typically consist of a team chair and one program evaluator for each program being reviewed. The typical minimum team size is three members.

Comprehensive Review – The review team will examine all program aspects to judge compliance with criteria and policies. ABET will assist each program in recognizing its strong and weak points. To accomplish this, the team will: Interview faculty, students, administrators, and staff to obtain an understanding of program compliance with the applicable criteria, policies, and any specific issues that arise from the examination of the Self-Study Report and from the on-site review. These materials are provided either as a part of the Self-Study Report or as displays during the on-site visit, or accessed by evaluators within a suitable on-line storage location utilized by programs delivered fully or partially on line. Materials provided during the on-site visit are typically textbooks, assignments, exams, and examples of student work in a range of quality. Provide to the dean or other appropriate academic officer a copy of the Program Audit Form PAF for each program reviewed, along with an explanation of the seven-day period in which the institution can provide the Team Chair with corrections to any errors of fact in the oral presentation at the Exit Meeting or in the PAFs.

Effective Date of Initial Accreditation – For a program obtaining initial accreditation, the accreditation normally will apply to all students who graduated from the program no earlier than the academic year prior to the on-site review. Each commission, at the time of the accreditation decision, has the authority to set the date of initial accreditation as conditions warrant, but the date of initial accreditation can be no earlier than two academic years prior to the on-site review. In order for a program to be considered for retroactive accreditation two academic years prior to the on-site review, the program must inform the ABET team chair and the program reviewer prior to the on-site review. The program must also provide the following additional information to the review team: Documentation in the Self-Study Report that no changes that potentially impact the extent to which an accredited program satisfies ABET accreditation criteria and policies have occurred during the two academic years prior to that of the initial review. Transcripts and sample student work for both academic years prior to that of the initial review.

Types of Interim Reviews – There are two types of interim reviews: **Composition of Interim Review Team I. Draft Statement to the Institution** – The team chair prepares a Draft Statement of preliminary findings and recommendations to be edited by designated officers of the appropriate commission and for transmission to the institution. The Draft Statement will consist of general information plus a program-specific section for each program reviewed. The statement to each program will typically include the following: Therefore, the program is not in compliance with the criterion, policy, or procedure. Therefore, remedial action is required to strengthen compliance with the criterion, policy, or procedure prior to the next review. The institution may respond in 30 days to report progress in addressing shortcomings or to correct errors of fact in the Draft Statement. This is referred to as the day Due-process Response. Shortcomings are considered to have been resolved only when the correction or revision has been implemented during the academic year of the review and substantiated by official documents signed by the responsible administrative officers. All unresolved shortcomings will be evaluated by the appropriate commission at the time of the next review.

Post Day Due-process Information – When the program has submitted a due-process response within the day due-process period, the team chair may, at his or her discretion, in consultation with the commission

leadership, accept additional information after the day due-process period. Any such information must be limited to information that was judged by the team chair to be not available at the time of the day due-process period and must be received in time for proper consideration prior to the July Commission Meeting. Designated officers of the appropriate commission will edit the draft and the appropriate commission will determine the accreditation actions based on this draft. The Final Statement to the Institution will be completed after all updates from the July Commission Meeting are incorporated. The following actions are available to the commissions. In the case where two or more commissions are involved in the review of a single program, each commission determines an action independently. Normally, the more severe of the actions voted will be indicated as the action for the program. This action is taken only after a Comprehensive General Review and has a typical duration of six years. The Weaknesses are such that a progress report will be required to evaluate the remedial actions taken by the institution. This action has a typical duration of two years. The Weaknesses are such that an on-site review will be required to evaluate the remedial actions taken by the institution. The Deficiencies are such that a progress report will be required to evaluate the remedial actions taken by the institution. The Deficiencies are such that an on-site review will be required to evaluate the remedial actions taken by the institution. RE Report Extended " This action indicates that satisfactory remedial action has been taken by the institution with respect to Weaknesses identified in the prior IR action. This action is taken only after an IR review. This action extends accreditation to the next General Review and has a typical duration of either two or four years. VE Visit Extended " This action indicates that satisfactory remedial action has been taken by the institution with respect to Weaknesses identified in the prior IV action. This action is taken only after an IV review.

2: Annual Resident Reports

ACCSC STANDARDS OF ACCREDITATION TABLE OF CONTENTS July 1, Table of Contents Page i of vii Introduction 1 Chapter 1 - Rules of Process and Procedure 3 Section 1 - Definitions, Accreditation Obligations, Eligibility, and Process, & General Instructions 4.

Program Criteria -These criteria address program-specific requirements within areas of specialization. Proposed New Criteria and Changes to Criteria – Proposed new criteria or changes to existing criteria will be published for a period of public review and comment. The typical review and comment period is one year.

Eligibility of Programs for Accreditation Review I. The program will have program educational objectives PEOs , student outcomes SOs , a curriculum, faculty, and facilities. Programs will be considered for accreditation if they are offered by an institution of higher education that has verifiable governmental, national, or regional recognition to confer degrees. ABET accredits individual educational programs. ABET does not accredit departments or institutions. A program must be accreditable under at least one or more of the four commissions of ABET: ASAC – Programs accredited by ANSAC are those leading to professional practice utilizing science and mathematics along with engineering concepts as a foundation for discipline-specific practice, including the recognition, prevention, and solution of problems critical to society. CAC – Programs accredited by CAC are those leading to professional practice across the broad spectrum of computing, computational, information, and informatics disciplines. CAC accredits a program at the baccalaureate degree level. Associate degree programs prepare graduates for careers as engineering technicians. ETAC accredits a program at the associate or baccalaureate degree level. Program names must meet ABET requirements. The program name must be descriptive of the content of the program. The program name determines the commission and the criteria applicable to its review. If a program name invokes review by more than one commission, then the program will be jointly reviewed by all applicable commissions. For a program to be eligible for an initial accreditation review ABET requires that: A program must have at least one graduate before the academic year of the on-site review. This may occur one or two academic years prior to the on-site review. It serves to reduce the possibility that an institution without ABET accreditation experience will expend resources for an on-site review before there are adequate preparations and that ABET will commit volunteer resources before a program is sufficiently prepared for the review.

Application and Timeline for Accreditation Review I. Programs are considered for accreditation review only at the written request of the institution. An institution wishing to have programs considered for accreditation or reaccreditation must submit to ABET a Request for Evaluation RFE not later than January 31 of the calendar year in which the review is desired. The RFE must be signed by the institutional Chief Executive Officer President, Chancellor, Rector, or equivalent and must be submitted with one official transcript of a recent graduate for each program listed on the RFE. When submitting an RFE for either a general or an interim onsite review, the institution may suggest the onsite review start date. Institutions outside of the U. The institution must submit all forms by January If more than one ABET commission will be reviewing programs at an institution in the same academic year, the institution may request that all on-site reviews be conducted simultaneously. An RFE may be modified or withdrawn by the institution at any time up to the beginning of the July Commission meeting. The Self-Study Report addresses how a program meets each criterion in addition to applicable policy requirements. The Self-Study Report must include information about all methods of program delivery, all possible paths to completion of the degree, and remote offerings. ABET conducts all reviews in English. Programs must submit all documentation including the Self-Study Report, transcripts, display materials, and correspondence in English. By May 1 of the calendar year in which the review is requested, the institution will receive an invoice for fees associated with the requested review. Payment is due 30 days from date of the invoice. The institution may reject a team member only in the case of real or perceived conflicts of interest. The institution and the team chair will mutually determine dates for any on-site review that is required. On-site reviews are normally conducted during September through December of the calendar year in which the review is requested. The institution will submit a Self-Study Report or an Interim

Report, as required, for each program to be reviewed. The institution will provide the appropriate report directly to the team chair no later than July 1. The institution will provide the appropriate report directly to each program evaluator at the direction of the team chair. When an on-site review is required, the duration of the review is normally three days from team arrival to departure but may be extended or shortened depending on review requirements. Typically the on-site review is conducted from Sunday through Tuesday. As a result of the review, the institution will receive a Draft Statement to the Institution for review and comment. This response will be evaluated and used as the basis for revising the Draft Statement to create the Final Statement. The Draft Statement will be modified to reflect these analyses, resulting in a Final Statement that reflects the final action by the commission. The institution will receive the Final Statement and the Summary of Accreditation Actions no later than August 31 of the calendar year following the review. Reviews are conducted to verify that a program is in compliance with the appropriate accreditation criteria, policies, and procedures. In order for a program to be accredited, all paths to completion of the program must satisfy the appropriate criteria.

Types of Review

I. A Comprehensive Review addresses all applicable criteria, policies, and procedures. This general review applies to all programs accredited by a particular commission. A year in which such a review occurs is called a general review year. An Interim Review occurs between Comprehensive Reviews when Weaknesses or Deficiencies remain unresolved in a prior review. An Interim Review typically uses the accreditation criteria in effect at the time of the previous comprehensive review. However, an institution may elect to base its interim review on criteria in effect at the time of the last comprehensive review or on those in effect at the time of the Interim Review.

Submittal of Transcripts Prior to arriving on-site, the team will request official transcripts of the most recent graduates from each program. Each program being evaluated will provide official transcripts with associated worksheets and any guidelines used by the advisors.

Additional Information Prior to arriving on-site, the team may request additional information that it deems necessary for clarification. Teams for on-site reviews will typically consist of a team chair and one program evaluator for each program being reviewed. The typical minimum team size is three members. Program evaluators will typically be selected from the approved list maintained by the applicable ABET Member Society designated as Lead for that curricular area. ABET will assist each program in recognizing its strong and weak points. To accomplish this, the team will:

- Interview faculty, students, administrators, and staff to obtain an understanding of program compliance with the applicable criteria, policies, and any specific issues that arise from the examination of the Self-Study Report and from the on-site review.
- These materials are provided either as a part of the Self-Study Report or as displays during the onsite visit, or accessed by evaluators within a suitable on-line storage location utilized by programs delivered fully or partially on-line. Materials provided during the onsite visit are typically textbooks, assignments, exams, and examples of student work in a range of quality. Provision for access to online materials used by the program must be made available during an on-site visit.
- Provide to the dean or other appropriate academic officer a copy of the Program Audit Form PAF for each program reviewed along with an explanation of the seven-day period in which the institution can provide the Team Chair with corrections to any errors of fact in the oral statement or on the PAFs.

Each commission, at the time of the accreditation decision, has the authority to set the date of initial accreditation as conditions warrant, but the date of initial accreditation can be no earlier than two academic years prior to the on-site review. In order for a program to be considered for retroactive accreditation two academic years prior to the on-site review, the program must inform the ABET team chair and the program reviewer prior to the on-site review. The program must also provide the following additional information to the review team: Documentation in the Self-Study Report that no changes that potentially impact the extent to which an accredited program satisfies ABET accreditation criteria and policies have occurred during the two academic years prior to that of the initial review. Transcripts and sample student work for both academic years prior to that of the initial review.

Composition of Interim Review Team

I. The Draft Statement will consist of general information plus a program-specific section for each program reviewed. The statement to each program will typically include the following: Therefore, the program is not in compliance with the criterion, policy, or procedure. Therefore, remedial action is required to strengthen compliance with the criterion, policy, or procedure prior to the next review. The institution may respond in 30

days to report progress in addressing shortcomings or to correct errors of fact in the Draft Statement. This is referred to as the day Due-process Response. Shortcomings are considered to have been resolved only when the correction or revision has been implemented during the academic year of the review and substantiated by official documents signed by the responsible administrative officers. All unresolved shortcomings will be evaluated by the appropriate commission at the time of the next review. Any such information must be limited to information that was judged by the team chair to be not available at the time of the day due-process period and must be received in time for proper consideration prior to the July Commission Meeting. Designated officers of the appropriate commission will edit the draft and the appropriate commission will determine the accreditation actions based on this draft. The Final Statement to the Institution will be completed after all updates from the July Commission Meeting are incorporated. The following actions are available to the commissions. In the case where two or more commissions are involved in the review of a single program, each commission determines an action independently. Normally, the more severe of the actions voted will be indicated as the action for the program. This action is taken only after a Comprehensive General Review and has a typical duration of six years. The Weaknesses are such that a progress report will be required to evaluate the remedial actions taken by the institution. This action has a typical duration of two years. The Weaknesses are such that an on-site review will be required to evaluate the remedial actions taken by the institution. The Deficiencies are such that a progress report will be required to evaluate the remedial actions taken by the institution. The Deficiencies are such that an on-site review will be required to evaluate the remedial actions taken by the institution. RE Report Extended " This action indicates that satisfactory remedial action has been taken by the institution with respect to Weaknesses identified in the prior IR action. This action is taken only after an IR review.

SECTION V: PROGRAM EVALUATION AND ACCREDITATION. pdf

3: Common Program Requirements

Evaluation of a program's adherence to stated mission and goals, assessment and planning processes, organizational outcomes, support services and other elements within "The Requirements for Accreditation."

Skip breadcrumb navigation Annual Resident Reports To monitor the educational progress of residents and programs, the American College of Osteopathic Surgeons requires the submission of Annual Resident Reports. Submissions of the Annual Resident Reports begin on May 15th. Annual Resident Reports are due by June 30th. Components of the Annual Resident Report include submissions from both the resident and program director. Paper forms are not accepted. The Resident Evaluation of the Program Form must be completed in full, which includes attaching a copy of your operative log and outlining your scholarly activity. The Resident Evaluation of the Program form is available by logging in here. The Resident Evaluation of the Program form is due by June 30th. The annual review of residency training is a member benefit. All fees can be paid online through your www. All outstanding fees must be paid to receive the results of your Annual Resident Report. Program Directors Program Directors are required to submit 3 documents which will comprise the Annual Resident Report. The forms must be completed in full for each applicable resident, OGME All Annual Resident Report forms are due by June 30th. Annual Report Forms to be completed by the Program Director includes: The RESC reserves the right to request periodic reviews of the Program Directors Evaluation of the Resident form and all other material required to be maintained by the program. Download a copy of the Program Directors Evaluation of the Resident form. All other Annual Report forms must be submitted electronically and are available by logging in here. Traditional Annual Resident Reports are still required for: Submission of the reports for both program director and trainee are due no later than June 30th. Resident Operative Report Residents must attach a copy of their electronic Operative Log segregated totals to their Resident Evaluation of the Program form. Additionally, a copy of the operative report must be signed by both the resident and program director to verify that the information reported is accurate. The signed copy of the form must be maintained by the program. To attach the operative report to the Resident Evaluation of the Program form. Residents should download a PDF file and submit the correct operative report based on the system used for their OGME training level and the applicable training year.

4: Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (APPM), ABET

For technical assistance, please contact Chris Smith at or SmithC63@www.enganchecubano.com 2 Michigan Local Public Health Accreditation Program.

SECTION V: PROGRAM EVALUATION AND ACCREDITATION. pdf

Simple graphic design portfolio The Greek Mysteries and Their Influence upon Freemasonry A short account of that part of Africa, inhabited by the Negroes Fringe dweller on the night shift Human Nutrition in Tropical Africa (Fao Food and Nutrition Series) Algal Assays and Monitoring Eutrophication. Ed by P. Marvan. Proc of Wksp Held at Inst of Botany, Czechos Geology along Skyline Drive Conversion in late antiquity and the early Middle Ages 30,000 judges, 100 million cases : the scope of the enterprise Lost Voices of the Edwardians Modern business process automation yawl and its support environment Model airplane news magazine 2017 Fighting over Lawyer Bills Emotions revealed second edition paul ekman Png birth certificate application form The connectionist explanation of the mass minds dreams Swinburne, a biographical approach. Merchant writers of the Italian Renaissance Some reflexes of the Indo-European laryngeals in the Slav prosodic paradigms A monkey in the family JDBC and JSP concepts Six months in the federal states Explaining the persistent myth of property absolutism David Fagundes Experiences in theology Monitoring integrin activation by fluorescence resonance energy transfer Craig T. Lefort, Young-Min Hyun, The Australian Concise Oxford Dictionary Jimmy Ernst and the tradition of the artist-intellectual Stanley I. Grand. The thinking in c annotated solution guide And all the saints Hew strachan the first world war Miles to go miley cyrus The Two New Yorks Microwave dough craft Water treatment chemicals equipment Horripilations Unearthed Memorials Of Sarah Childress Polk Intermediate accounting chapter 17 solutions Bridge and Tunnel Maintainer The art of hitting .300 Legally sane ebook torrent