August 14, 2013

Chris W. McGowan  
Dean, College of Science, Technology and Agriculture  
Southeast Missouri State University  
One University Plaza  
Mail Stop 6000  
Cape Girardeau, MO 63701

Dear Dr. McGowan:

The Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET recently held its 2013 Summer Meeting to act on the program evaluations conducted during 2012-2013. 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 Southeast Missouri State University 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.A. of the 2012-2013 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 stated in Section II.H. of the 2012-2013 Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (available at www.abet.org).

Assuring Quality - Stimulating Innovation
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.L. of the 2012-2013 Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (available at www.abet.org).

Sincerely,

David B. Beasley, Chair
Engineering Accreditation Commission

Enclosure:  Summary of Accreditation Action
           Final Statement

cc:  Kenneth W. Dobbins, President
      David K. Probst, Chair, Physics & Engineering Physics
      David R Hammond, Visit Team Chair
Engineering Physics (BS)

Accredit to September 30, 2019. A request to ABET by January 31, 2018 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, 2018. The reaccreditation evaluation will be a comprehensive general review.
Final Statement of Accreditation to

Southeast Missouri State University
Cape Girardeau, MO

2012-13 Accreditation Cycle

Assuring Quality • Stimulating Innovation
Introduction & Discussion of Statement Construct

The Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET has evaluated the engineering physics program of Southeast Missouri State University.

This statement is the final summary of the EAC evaluation, at the institutional and engineering-program levels. It includes any information received during due process. The statement that follows consists of two parts: the first addresses the institution and its overall engineering educational unit, and the second addresses the individual engineering program. It is constructed in a format that allows the reader to discern both the original visit findings and subsequent progress made during due process.

A program’s accreditation action is based upon the findings summarized in this statement. Actions depend on the program’s range of compliance or non-compliance with the criteria. This range can be construed 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 criterion, policy, or procedure.

- **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 review.
• 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 current accreditation action but is offered to assist the institution in its continuing efforts to improve its programs.

Southeast Missouri State University (SEMO) is a state-funded, public institution initially established to serve students from St. Louis to the Missouri Bootheel. As published in the undergraduate bulletin, the mission of the university is to provide “professional education grounded in the liberal arts and sciences and in practical experience.” The university consists of five colleges and two schools, and operates on a semester system with 11,700 full and part-time students enrolled during the fall 2012 term. Engineering and engineering technology programs reside in the College of Science, Technology and Agriculture, which has an enrollment of approximately 2,400 students, and is supported by 106 full-time and 20 adjunct faculty members. During the 2011-12 academic year, the college awarded 242 bachelors and 57 masters degrees.

The following units were reviewed and found to adequately support the engineering physics program: finance, library services, registrar, and admissions.

Institutional Strengths

1. Tracking of student progress towards completion of degree requirements at the university is comprehensively and accurately accomplished via the “Degreeworks” extension of the Banner software system. The university is on the cutting edge of implementation of this audit tool. The system provides students, faculty and administration with an extremely valuable mechanism for monitoring an individual’s progress, ensuring that all graduation requirements are met, and allowing students to understand the impact of changes in course selection, scheduling and even change in major.

2. The university makes substantial efforts in both recruitment and retention of minority and disadvantaged students, particularly from the St. Louis area, providing significant opportunities for economic advancement to lower-income populations. The present diversity
of the student body should encourage further growth in domestic as well as international, student enrollment.
Engineering Physics
Program

Program Criteria for Engineering, General Engineering, Engineering Physics, Engineering Science, and Similarly Named Engineering Programs

Introduction

The engineering physics program is the responsibility of the Department of Physics and Engineering Physics, in the College of Science, Technology and Agriculture. The program was begun in 1976 and was first accredited in 2000. The program includes eight faculty members and currently enrolls 71 students. During the 2011-12 academic year, seven students graduated from the program.

Program Strength

1. The program has the demonstrated ability to attract an increasing number of students, evident in an enrollment trend increasing at a long-term rate of slightly more than five students per year, from nine majors in Fall 2001 to 71 in Fall 2012.

Program Observation

1. The program has recently decided to add, beginning with the Spring 2013 term, a one credit-hour introductory course in the sixth semester curriculum to better prepare engineering physics students for undertaking the EP480 Capstone Design I course in the seventh semester, as well as the UI450 Capstone Experience in the eighth and final semester. This is an innovative, appropriate and prudent response to difficulties which a number of student teams have experienced in achieving adequate closure of the design-build-test-evaluate loop in UI450. This introductory course should engender realistic student anticipation of capstone requirements and performance standards, thereby providing better opportunities for a positive capstone project experience.