GUIDELINES FOR READINESS REVIEWERS

This is an internal guideline document to assist Readiness Reviewers in understanding the following aspects:

- Purposes of a Readiness Review (REv)
- Readiness Reviewers – Eligible Candidates
- Expectations from Readiness Reviewers
- Internal Readiness Review Timeline
- Guidelines for conducting a Readiness Review
  - Expectations for a Readiness Report
  - Appendix – Readiness Review (REv) Worksheet
- Outcomes of a Readiness Review (REv)

Purposes of a Readiness Review

A Readiness Review is a screening process for an institution's preparedness to have its program(s) reviewed <u>and</u> for the Readiness Review Committee to determine:

- program eligibility,
- program appropriateness/suitability for one or more of the ABET commissions,
- program readiness and preparedness for an on-site review,
- potential major non-compliance issues against applicable criteria or policy, *and*
- to assist a program to determine the timing for initiating a formal review.

Readiness Reviewers – Eligible Candidates

Readiness Reviewers are recruited every June/July on a needed basis. Candidates can be qualified Team Chairs who are *not* current members of the Board of Directors, or Commissioners for the upcoming cycle. Candidates can be past commissioners, commissioners in their 5th year, current/past Board of Delegates members, current/past Area Delegation members, and past members of the Board of Directors.

Expectations from Readiness Reviewers

- Readiness reviewers are required not to disclose REv results and details to anyone outside the REv process including team chairs, program evaluators, or editors. Results of a Readiness Review should not be allowed to bias any accreditation review teams.

- Readiness Reviewers are advisors to the Readiness Review Committee at ABET HQ only and must not discuss their findings with the relevant institution/program. It is up to the institution/program to release the REv results to any third party that is not involved in the REv process.

ABET

- Readiness Reviewers associated with a review of program(s) at a given institution will be considered to have a conflict of interest regarding subsequent review activities at that institution.

- Readiness Reviewers are expected to attend training (online webinar) during the August-September timeframe and will be invited to provide feedback in the January-February timeframe after the Readiness Review Cycle ends in late December.

Internal Process Timeline – From October to December

- **Two weeks prior to October 1, the REv submission deadline** – Adjunct Accreditation Directors (adjuncts) touch base with the pre-approved Readiness Reviewers and ensure their availability.
- **First week of October** – Staff finalizes the received Requests for Readiness Review (RREvs).
- **Second week of October** – After consultation with the appropriate adjunct, staff sends assignments with this guideline document to reviewers.
- **November 5** – Reviewers return readiness review worksheets to the adjuncts.
- **November 10-15** (2nd week of November) – Adjuncts send the collected worksheets with their feedback to staff for drafting feedback letters.
- **November 15-30 –** Staff completes drafts for all cases.
- **December 1-5** – Staff sends drafts to Adjuncts for feedback and editing.
- **December 5-10** – All drafts are sent to Senior Director for Accreditation Director for feedback and editing.
- **December 10-15** – Staff finalizes all letters.
- **December 15-20** – Staff sends REv results to institutions.

Guidelines for Conducting a Readiness Review

Reviewers are asked to focus on the following area and use the Readiness Review Worksheet (see **appendix**) to report feedback.

- **Program name** – Please examine whether the program name is descriptive of the curriculum, whether it is appropriate for the commission being requested, and whether it is properly aligned with the PEOs, SOs, transcripts, and the program website.

  Note: Starting the 2022-23 Review Cycle, APPM Section I.C.4.c. requires that *the program name, curriculum, electronic and print publications, program educational objectives, and graduate transcripts determine the commission and the criteria applicable to a program's review*. The name of a program is still the main driver for determining a suitable commission and criteria applicable to the program's review. However, whenever suitable commission(s) and criteria applicable to a program's review cannot be determined based on the program name, it is necessary to further examine the PEOs, SOs, curriculum, etc.

- **Degree level** – Please pay attention to whether the degree level the program is claiming is comparable to the degree level in the U.S. For example, in some countries, academic

education and certification for professional licensing are combined in a five-year academic program. Though it may seem that the program is at the master's degree level because of the length of study or because of the education system in the program's country, the program level may actually be equivalent to the Bachelor's degree level in the U.S. Additionally, in some countries, it is mandatory for high school graduates to complete a college preparation year prior to being admitted to a college program. College freshmen may have completed some college-level courses/credits before being admitted to the program under ABET review. In those cases, those mandatory college-level courses/credits during the college preparation year must be included in the program review.

- **Campus(es) of the program offering** – If the program is requesting a review to cover only some of the program's offering sites, it may be necessary for the campus information to be indicated explicitly on the institution's electronic and print publications, graduates' transcripts, and ABET RFE. If the program is requesting a review to cover all of the program's offering sites, please examine whether there are any potential major non-compliance issues to prevent the program from seeking accreditation for a program that includes all locations.

- **Understanding key requirements applicable to a program review** – Reviewers will read the response to **Criterion 1 through Criterion 6 and program criteria if applicable** to determine if the program understands the applicable requirements and is providing plausible responses from which a review team may begin the pre-visit analysis.

- **Major Non-Compliance Issues** – There are two types of major non-compliance issues: (1) one that can be addressed before submission of the self-study report in the upcoming review cycle and (2) one that cannot. An REv is not a detailed analysis of each possible issue. However, if the program appears to have any apparent/major non-compliance issue preventing the program from becoming accredited successfully, reviewers should report it. Reviewers should also comment on whether this could possibly be addressed in time before the on-site review or within the end of the upcoming review cycle. The length of time for resolving the non-compliance issue may impact the recommendation to "Postpone" or "Not Submit".

Expectations for a Program Readiness Report

For your reference, each program requesting a REv is asked to use the applicable Readiness Review Template posted on the ABET website at http://www.abet.org/accreditation/get-accredited/accreditation-step-by-step/readiness-review/, instead of the related Self-Study Template.

In general, regardless of the applicable commission, the following sections are NOT-REQUIRED for a Readiness Review:

- Supplemental materials
- Criterion 7 on Facilities
- Criterion 8 on Institutional Support
- Appendix C on Equipment
- Signature Attesting to Compliance

Refer to the applicable Readiness Review Template for details and adjusted requirements.

Outcome of a Readiness Review (REv):

According to ABET Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (APPM) section **I.C.5.b.(3)**, the outcome of a Readiness Review (REv) for a program is one of three non-binding options:

- I.C.5.b.(3)(a) A recommendation to submit the RFE in the immediate upcoming accreditation review cycle, addressing the REv suggestions, if any;
- I.C.5.b.(3)(b) A recommendation to postpone the RFE submission unless substantive changes in the Self-Study preparation and documentation are made; or
- I.C.5.b.(3)(c) A recommendation not to submit the RFE in the immediate upcoming accreditation review cycle because it is likely to be rejected.

Guidance for Each Type of Recommendation

Type of Recommendation	Scenario for Each Recommendation
Submit	Use this recommendation when the Self-Study shows that (1) the program understands the requirements of C1 through C6 and program criteria, and (2) there is **nothing** lacking that can be a major non-compliance issue for the program going through the review in the immediate upcoming review cycle.
Postpone	Use this recommendation when the Self-Study shows that (1) the program understands most of the criteria requirements but (2) there are one or more **potential** major non-compliance issues that may take time to address and prevent the program from being accredited in the immediate upcoming review cycle.
Not-Submit	Use this recommendation when the Self-Study shows that (1) the program does not seem to understand most of the criteria requirements and (2) there are **apparent** major non-compliance issues that the program will definitely need more time beyond the immediate upcoming review cycle to address.

Note: It is normal for there to be gray areas in terms of making a suitable recommendation. If the above Table doesn't help you make a suitable recommendation, please do not hesitate to discuss your case with the responsible Adjunct Accreditation Director.

ABET

APPENDIX
2025-26 READINESS REVIEW (REV) WORKSHEET
(One Worksheet per Program)

Institution Name: _____

Program Name: _____

Location (List all if the program is offered at more than one campus): _____

Applicable Program Criteria, if any: _____

Reviewer (Your Name): _____

Alignment	Yes, No, or Not Sure	Reviewer's Comment
Does the program name appear to align with the curriculum and faculty qualifications?		
Does the program appear to be appropriate for the assigned commission?		
Eligibility per APPM (Any possible issues?)	Yes, No, or Not Sure	Reviewer's Comment
Program Name		
Degree Level		
Campus(es) of the Program Offering (If there is more than one campus, what issues should be considered for all campuses to be reviewed?)		
Transcript (Is the transcript issued in compliance with the APPM requirements?)		
APPM (Any other APPM related issues? E.g., APPM I.A. regarding public release or APPM I.E.1. regarding all paths to completion of the program must be accreditable)		

Criterion	Understand What's been asked for? (Y/N)	Any Show Stoppers? (Y/N)	Reviewer's Comment
Student – Do institutional policies and procedures for admitting new and transfer students appear to meet Criterion 1?			
PEOs – Does the program have PEOs aligned with the ABET definition and have a periodic review process that involves all identified constituents?			
SOs – Does the program adopt the ABET SOs or adequately map their own SLOs to ABET SOs?			
CI – Does the program have an adequate CI plan in place for assessing and evaluating each SO?			
Curriculum – Does the program show a Table 5-1? Does each path to the curriculum meet all parts of C5? If not, please explain.			
Curriculum Credits – For a CAC or EAC program that is not in a typical US semester credit hour system, please specify if there is any potential issue regarding equivalency.			
Faculty – Does the program describe the faculty members that will serve the program, their qualifications for what they teach, and other ways they serve (advising, etc.)?			
Program Criteria – If applicable, does the program describe in this section how the program criteria are met by the curriculum and faculty?			

Overall	Yes or No	Reviewer's Comment
Other major issues if any? (E.g. Understanding key general criteria requirements <u>and</u> program criteria requirements if applicable? Preparedness for an on-site review in the immediate upcoming review cycle?)		

Recommendation (Submit, Postpone, or Not-Submit)	
Give brief reasons for your recommendation as if writing to the institution.	