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Accredit to September 30, 2016. A request to ABET by January 31, 2015 will be required to initiate a reaccreditation evaluation visit. In preparation for the visit, a Self-Study Report must be submitted to ABET by July 01, 2015. The reaccreditation evaluation will be a comprehensive general review.
Dear Dr. Voland:

Computing Accreditation Commission (CAC) of ABET recently held its 2010 Summer Meeting to act on the program evaluations conducted during 2009-2010. Each evaluation was summarized in a report to the Commission and was considered by the full Commission before a vote was taken on the accreditation action. The results of the evaluation for Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne are included in the enclosed Summary of Accreditation Actions. The Final Statement to your institution that discusses the findings on which each action was based is also enclosed.

The policy of ABET is to grant accreditation for a limited number of years, not to exceed six, in all cases. The period of accreditation is not an indication of program quality. Any restriction of the period of accreditation is based upon conditions indicating that compliance with the applicable accreditation criteria must be strengthened. Continuation of accreditation beyond the time specified requires a reevaluation of the program at the request of the institution as noted in the accreditation action. ABET policy prohibits public disclosure of the period for which a program is accredited. For further guidance concerning the public release of accreditation information, please refer to Section II.L. of the 2009-2010 Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (available at www.abet.org).

A list of accredited programs is published annually by ABET. Information about ABET accredited programs at your institution will be listed in the forthcoming ABET Accreditation Yearbook and on the ABET web site (www.abet.org).
It is the obligation of the officer responsible for ABET accredited programs at your institution to notify ABET of any significant changes in program title, personnel, curriculum, or other factors which could affect the accreditation status of a program during the period of accreditation.

Please note that appeals are allowed only in the case of Not to Accredit actions. Also, such appeals may be based only on the conditions stated in Section II.G. of the 2009-2010 Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (available at www.abet.org).

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David P. Kelly, Chair
Computing Accreditation Commission

Enclosure: Summary of Accreditation Action
Final Statement

cc: Michael Wartell, Chancellor
    Peter A. Ng, Chair and Professor of CS
    David Allen Cook, Visit Team Chair
ABET
Computing Accreditation Commission

FINAL STATEMENT

to

INDIANA UNIVERSITY—PURDUE UNIVERSITY FORT WAYNE
Fort Wayne, IN

Team Chair: David A. Cook
Stephen F. Austin State University
Nacogdoches, TX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Richard Gayler</td>
<td>Kennesaw State University</td>
<td>Kennesaw, GA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDIANA UNIVERSITY–PURDUE UNIVERSITY, FORT WAYNE

FINAL STATEMENT

This is a confidential statement from the Computing Accreditation Commission to the institution. It is intended for internal use only and is not for release except as allowed by policies of ABET, Inc.

I. INTRODUCTION

Indiana University – Purdue University Fort Wayne (IPFW) is a state-assisted regional university serving the second largest city and its surrounding region of Indiana. IPFW is the fifth largest university of Indiana whose mission is:

... to provide quality postsecondary education in northeastern Indiana by focusing on student learning, while fostering intellectual exploration and attainment, and serving the region.

With support from the Indiana-Purdue Foundation in 1958, the university became a merged entity of Indiana University and Purdue University in 1964 when it assumed its current name. Its campus is undergoing expansion and new building growth. IPFW currently educates over 12,000 students, approximately 90% of whom are in undergraduate programs and employs over 350 full-time faculty members. The university graduates approximately 1,500 students each year.

The College of Engineering, Technology, and Computer Science is one of ten schools and divisions of the university. It has been able to avoid current declining enrollment trends, and has experienced a 10% increase in enrollment this year alone.

The following program at Indiana University–Purdue University Fort Wayne was evaluated during the 2009-10 cycle for possible accreditation under the CAC/ABET “Criteria for Accrediting Computing Programs” (Criteria) dated November 1, 2008.

• BS Degree in Computer Science, evaluated under the Computer Science Program Criteria

The program was previously evaluated during the 2003-04 cycle, accredited at that time and required to submit an interim report in the 2005-06 cycle. As a result of the evaluation of the interim report, accreditation was extended to 2010.
II. REPORT OF FINDINGS

The Criteria is composed of the General Criteria and Program Criteria. Each criterion provides the underlying principles that each program must meet. A program must meet both the General Criteria and all applicable Program Criteria to be accredited.

This section contains the findings from the time of the visit. It also includes an evaluation of any information provided by the program during the due process response. CAC considers the following comments to relate directly to its accreditation actions.

A program’s accreditation action will be based upon the findings summarized in this statement. Actions will depend on the program’s range of compliance or non-compliance with the criteria. This can be determined from the following terminology:

- **Deficiency:** A deficiency indicates that a criterion, policy, or procedure is not satisfied. Therefore, the program is not in compliance with the criteria.

- **Weakness:** A weakness indicates that a program lacks the strength of compliance with a criterion, policy, or procedure to ensure that the quality of the program will not be compromised. Therefore, remedial action is required to strengthen compliance with the criterion, policy, or procedure prior to the next evaluation.

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

- **Observation:** An observation is a comment or suggestion that does not relate directly to the accreditation action but is offered to assist the institution in its continuing efforts to improve its programs.
The Department of Computer Science administers the B.S. in Computer Science program. It also administers programs as follows: A.S. in Computer Science, A.S. in Information Systems, B.S. in Information Systems, and a M.S. in Applied Computer Science. It also oversees the B.A. program in Computer Science administered in cooperation with the School of Arts and Science. The published materials clearly delineate the requirements and accreditation status of each program.

The Department had over 350 students at the beginning of the 2009 fall semester. Of these, approximately 300 are undergraduate students and about 50 are graduate (master) students. Of the undergraduate students, over 60% are computer science students.

The Department of Computer Science has 12 faculty members, 11 of which are full-time. Only the full-time faculty teaches courses in the CS program.

Program Strengths

1. The Computer Science faculty presents a friendly, “easy to approach” view to the students. Students that were interviewed felt that each faculty member was approachable and ready to help them. The student feeling of “I can get help from almost anybody when I need it” makes this program stand out. Several of the students were transfer students from other institutions, and they pointed out that the faculty here gives this program a unique advantage. The students were motivated and eager to learn, and were quick to recommend this program based on quality of the faculty.

2. There have been four department chairs (including one interim chair) during the last evaluation cycle. In many cases, this would be a dividing factor in a department. However, the faculty was unanimous in praising the current department chair. They said he provided a “unifying” environment. The new department chair also received high reviews from other department heads, other department faculty, CS students, and the administration. The team has rarely seen such a cohesive faculty.

3. This institution portrayed an unusual “cohesiveness” among other department and supporting facilities. Partly due to the size, there is an overwhelming feeling of “we are working together for the common good of the students”. The team has seldom seen such a high degree of respect and community spirit, from the top down to the bottom. The students see this in action, and it increases the “student experience”. Many of the students we interviewed commented on the high degree of cooperation among departments and faculty. In particular, the library is an integral part of the department, providing excellent research assistance and support for the CS students and faculty, in spite of limited staff.

4. In our interviews with the “senior faculty”, the senior faculty took very seriously their role as mentors to the junior faculty. They took this responsibility seriously, and in several cases, senior faculty members were willing to take on an increased course load so that the junior faculty could get a good start on research in their careers. This reflects very positively on the
commitment of the senior faculty to the mission and goal of their department, and to the careers of other faculty members.

Status of Shortcoming from the Previous Review

Program Concerns

1. (Standard I-5) The results of the program’s periodic assessments must be used to help identify opportunities for program improvement on a sustained basis. Because the process is new and its long-term effects cannot be evaluated, a concern remains.

Status: The assessment process is greatly improved since the previous visit, but better use of relevant data, including the inclusion of additional direct measurements would enhance the ability of the program to determine the extent to which program outcomes are achieved. The concern remains and contributes to the concern relative to the Continuous Improvement Criterion.

Findings from the Current Review

Program Weakness

1. ABET Policies and Procedures. Section II-L-6 of the ABET Policies and Procedures states that accredited programs should be identified as “Accredited by the Computing Accreditation Commission of ABET, 111 Market Place, Suite 1050, Baltimore, MD 21202-4012 - telephone: (410) 347-7700.” The program Website, instead, indicates that the program is accredited by the “…Computing Accreditation Commission of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology…”

Due-process response: The oversight on their website has been corrected.

Due-process evaluation: The website has been updated appropriately. The weakness has been resolved.

Program Concerns

1. Criterion 4. Continuous Improvement. The Continuous Improvement Criterion requires that the program use relevant data to regularly assess its outcomes and the extent to which they are being met. The extent to which program outcomes are achieved is regularly assessed through many indicators of indirect measurements, including student surveys, and some direct measures. More effective use of direct measurements would enhance the ability of the program to guide program improvement.

Due-process response: The institution acknowledged our comments, and will examine their current measures and update them as appropriate.
Due-process evaluation: The concern remains unresolved. This should be an area to be carefully examined during the next visit.

2. **Criterion 7. Facilities.** Although adequate for student use, many of the lab machines are five years old, creating software limitations and/or performance issues in some courses. The university is transitioning to a four-year replacement policy, with a three-year policy as the goal. Since the policy has not yet been implemented, there is a concern until its effectiveness can be demonstrated.

Due-process response: All the machines are being replaced this year, and the institution anticipates the implementation of a three-year replacement cycle.

Due-process evaluation: The replacement of the machines this year is a positive step addressing this concern, but until the three-year replacement cycle is fully implemented, the effectiveness of the implementation plan remains to be evaluated. Thus, the concern remains.

3. **Criterion 8. Support.** The team was very impressed with the library and its support of both faculty and student research. The tools and support processes for helping students identify and acquire research material were the best we have seen in an institution of this size. The library is undergoing an expansion, and will literally become the center of student life at IPFW. However, the library is seriously understaffed. In light of expanding student size, the library might eventually be unable to meet student and faculty needs. The team found that the current staffing is adequate, but future expansion might cause the support level to drop to an unsatisfactory level.

Due-process response: The institution acknowledged the issues raised and will work on the funding issues. While those issues are being addressed, the computer science department has committed to working with the administration and current library staff to ensure that the students are adequately served.

Due-process evaluation: The concern remains unresolved, as the funding of the library is still an issue with the University's administration. This will be an area of interest for the next visit.

The program satisfies the General Criteria and the Program Criteria except as noted above.
III. SUMMARY

The following is a summary of this evaluation for the institution during the 2009 – 2010 cycle:

Computer Science Program

Concerns:

- Criterion 4 Continuous Improvement. The extent to which program outcomes are achieved is regularly assessed through many indirect measurements and some direct measurements. More effective use of direct measurements would enhance the ability of the program to guide program improvement.
- Criterion 7 Facilities. The program is moving towards a shorter, three year replacement cycle for laboratory computers, but until the replacement policy is fully implemented its effectiveness remains to be evaluated.
- Criterion 8 Support. Increasing student enrollment relative to library staffing could erode the ability of library personnel to provide support to the CS faculty and students.