August 27, 2018

King Alexander  
President and Chancellor  
Louisiana State University and A&M College  
3810 West Lakeshore Dr.  
Baton Rouge, LA 70808

Dear Dr. Alexander:

I am pleased to transmit to you the findings of the Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET with respect to the evaluation conducted for Louisiana State University and A&M College during 2017-2018. Each of ABET’s Commissions is fully authorized to take the actions described in the accompanying letter under the policies of the ABET Board of Directors.

We are pleased that your institution has elected to participate in this accreditation process. This process, which is conducted by approximately 2,000 ABET volunteers from the professional community, is designed to advance and assure the quality of professional education. We look forward to our continuing shared efforts toward this common goal.

Sincerely,

Michael R. Lightner  
President

Enclosure: Commission letter and attachments
August 27, 2018

Mary Julia Wornat
Interim Dean, College of Engineering
Louisiana State University and A&M College
3304 Patrick F. Taylor Hall
Baton Rouge, LA 70803

Dear Dr. Wornat:

The Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET recently held its 2018 Summer Meeting to act on the program evaluations conducted during 2017-2018. 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 Louisiana State University and A&M College 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 2017-2018 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 2017-2018 Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (available at www.abet.org).
ABET requires that each accredited program publicly state the program’s educational objectives and student outcomes as well as publicly post annual student enrollment and graduation data as stated in Section II.A.6. of the Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (available at www.abet.org).

ABET will examine all newly accredited programs’ websites within the next two weeks to ensure compliance.

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 2017-2018 Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (available at www.abet.org).

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Ann L. Kenimer, Chair
Engineering Accreditation Commission

Enclosure: Summary of Accreditation Action
          Final Statement

cc: King Alexander, President and Chancellor
    Craig M. Harvey, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
    Cass D Kuhl, Team Chair
Accredit to September 30, 2022. A request to ABET by January 31, 2021 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, 2021. The reaccreditation evaluation will be a comprehensive general review.
Engineering Accreditation Commission

Final Statement of Accreditation to

Louisiana State University and A&M College
Baton Rouge, LA

2017-2018 Accreditation Cycle
Introduction and Discussion of Statement Construct

The Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of ABET has conducted an evaluation of the chemical engineering and computer engineering programs at Louisiana State University and A&M College relative to shortcomings remaining after the 2015 general EAC review.

This statement is the final summary of the EAC evaluation. The statement consists of two parts: the first part of the statement addresses the institution and its overall engineering educational unit; the second part addresses the individual engineering programs. Its format allows the reader to discern both the original report findings and any 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.

Information Received During Due-Process

1. 30-day due-process response: Information was received in the 30-day due-process response period relative to the computer engineering program. No 30-day due-process response was received relative to the chemical engineering program.

Institutional Summary

Louisiana State University and A&M College is a land-, sea- and space-grant, state supported university and is designated by the Carnegie Foundation as a Doctorate-granting Institution with high research activity. It is the flagship institution within the Louisiana State University System. The College of Engineering is the largest of the 14 colleges/schools in the university, and offers nine ABET accredited undergraduate engineering programs. Chemical and computer engineering were the only programs evaluated during this interim review. At the time of the previous review, the college had 6,264 students, 133 tenure-track faculty members, 21 full-time instructional faculty members, and 23 part-time instructors. It awarded nearly 800 engineering degrees in the prior academic year.
Chemical Engineering
BS Program

Program Criteria for Chemical, Biochemical, Biomolecular, and Similarly Named Engineering Programs

Introduction
The chemical engineering BS program is housed in the Cain Department of Chemical Engineering in the College of Engineering. The program had nearly 900 full-time students, 14 full-time faculty members, and 77 graduates at the time of the previous review.

Program Weakness
1. Criterion 4. Continuous Improvement The previous review cited that the process used to access and evaluate the extent to which student outcomes were being attained was not adequate. The method used to access the majority of student outcomes was conducted by industry volunteer constituents evaluating junior and senior projects. The majority of assessments were subjective.

The interim report included documentation of the revised evaluation and assessment process used to analyze the level of attainment of student outcomes (a) through (k). The process uses an augmented, faculty-centered process for evaluating outcome attainment using targeted assignments, test questions, proficiency goals in one or two specific junior and senior level courses for each outcome. Outcomes are analyzed incrementally in a three-year cycle. The interim report included assessment results for the first two sets of outcomes and demonstrated a continuous improvement process with direct measurements.

- The weakness is resolved.

Program Concerns
1. Criterion 6. Faculty The previous review cited a risk that the program might not have sufficient number of faculty to cover all of the curricular areas of the program plus accommodate adequate levels of student-faculty interaction, advising and counseling. Student program enrollment had grown significantly with nearly 900 students enrolled and 14 full-time faculty
members at the time of the last review. The review indicated that a search was underway for three additional faculty members and, if filled, would strengthen compliance with this criterion.

The interim report and additional communication with the program corrected the faculty size at the time of the last review to 15.58 as detailed in the self-study report Table 6-2, which has subsequently grown to 19.25 faculty members. The interim report indicated a search for two tenure tenure-track faculty members, with a goal to fill one of these positions by spring 2018. The dean and department chair have established a target of 25 full-time faculty members for this program by 2020.

- The concern is resolved.

2. Criterion 8. Institutional Support The previous review cited that there was a risk the program might not have the support to maintain and operate the unit operations lab. In particular there was no succession plan for the two individuals who manage the lab, one who was a retired scientist. The previous review also found that the chemistry department could only handle two-thirds of the chemical engineering students in organic chemistry laboratories, with the remaining students having to take these laboratories out of sequence during their junior year.

The interim report indicated that a lab technician and lab manager have been hired to support the undergraduate labs. In addition, one full-time and one part-time instructor have been hired to assume the duties of the present unit operation lab manager.

The interim report also indicated that approximately 40 percent of students took CHEM2364, Organic Chemistry Lab, in the prescribed semester and 80 percent of the students took it within one semester of the prescribed semester. The lab is not a prerequisite for any other courses in the program and may be taken after the prescribed semester.

- The concern is resolved.
Computer Engineering
BS Program

Program Criteria for Electrical, Computer, Communications, Telecommunication(s), and Similarly Named Engineering Programs

Introduction

The computer engineering BS program is housed in the Division of Electrical and Computer Engineering in the College of Engineering. The program had 178 students, five full-time faculty members, and had 18 graduates at the time of the previous review.

Program Deficiency

1. Accreditation Policy and Procedures Manual  The previous review cited that the program name was not shown consistently on transcripts of its graduates and in the institution’s electronic and print publications as compared to the ABET Request for Evaluation (RFE). On the RFE the degree appeared as Bachelor of Science and the program name appeared as Computer Engineering. The degree level and name of the program as found on the transcripts of its graduates was Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineer; Major: Computer Engineering. The 2016-17 general catalog did not list Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering among the degree programs that are offered by the institution.

The interim report indicated that LSU requested a change to Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering that was approved by the Louisiana Board of Regents in November 2016. The change is reflected in their 2017-18 catalog and in the institution’s other electronic publications. Starting in December 2017, graduates of the program will receive a diploma and transcript with the revised degree and name citation.

While the catalog and institution’s electronic publications reflect the revised name, awarded degrees and student transcripts still are inconsistent with the program’s content and RFE.

• This deficiency remains unresolved.
• **30-day due-process response:** The EAC acknowledges receipt of documentation for five students indicating that the awarded degree was the Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering on both diploma and transcripts from December 2017.

• The deficiency is resolved.

**Program Concerns**

1. **Criterion 4. Continuous Improvement** *The previous review cited that there was a risk that the program might not consistently assess and evaluate student outcomes. The program used course-based embedded assessment. This was accomplished by faculty selecting, with little coordination, graded questions from homework or exams. The assessment for an outcome could occur in different courses semester-to-semester and assess different aspects of the outcome possibly resulting in variable and unreliable results.*

   The interim report indicated that the program has revised its assessment process to assess of same outcomes in the same courses, year on year. The interim report mapped specific student outcomes to associated embedded assessment courses. The program also has established the specific criteria and threshold to assess whether an outcome is met.

   • The concern is resolved.

2. **Criterion 6. Faculty** *The previous review cited that there was a risk that any further reduction in faculty size, or increase in faculty responsibilities, could jeopardize the requirements of this criterion. The faculty in the program had been reduced from nine full-time faculty members during the 2009 visit to five full-time members with the same student enrollment.*

   The interim report provided documentation that faculty size at the time of the previous review was actually 7.35 full-time faculty members as detailed in the self-study report Table 6-2 and that this number has remained the same. Enrollment has been consistent in the program and for fall 2017 semester at 175 students. The program maintains a student to faculty ratio of 25:1 that is the lowest within the College of Engineering. The interim report documented that
it is able to offer a selection of courses with sufficient frequency for students to progress through the curriculum.

- The concern is resolved.