American Council for Construction Education
Accreditation Committee – Open Session
Orlando, Florida
Friday, 2/24/17 – 8:00 a.m.

I.   **Attendance:**

  a. **Committee Members:** Craig Capano Pam Dullum, Sean Foley, John Gaver, Jim Goddard, Murray Jones, Susan Labas, Don McCollister, Bob Meyer, Charles Roesset, Scott Seltveit, Khalid Siddiqi, John Schaufelberger - chair.

  b. **Visitors:** Irtishad Ahmad, Scott Arias, Alan Atalah, Philip Barlow, Dan Bawinkel, Wylie Bearup, Nicole Bouteiller, Michael Cannistraci, Abdol Chini, John Daavettila, Leslie Feigenbaum, Christine Fiori, Robert Ford, Richard Gebken, Robert Hamilton, Al Hauck, Paul Holley, Rogers Hunt, Mike Jackson, Jeff Kim, Brent MacDonald, Andrew McCoy, Don McNabb, Hung Nguyen, Wallied Orabi, Andrew Payne, Warren Plugge, Robert Ries, Talat Salama, John Schwarz, Omidreza Shoghli, Richard Vanderweide, Brian Wasserman.

II. **Chair Welcome**

  a. **Opening Remarks:** The meeting was called to order at 8:00 a.m. with a committee quorum present.

  b. **Introductions:** The chair welcomed everyone to the committee meeting and self introductions were made.

III. **Review Minutes from July Annual Meeting:** Minutes from the July 2016 Annual Meeting Open Session of the Accreditation Committee were distributed and approved.

IV. **Self-Assessment Survey:** The committee members will be sent a self-assessment survey to complete next month. Results will be summarized and discussed in the July accreditation committee meeting. Please make sure you respond to the survey.

V. **Old Business**

  a. **Council of Chairs:** Sean Foley provided the report from the Council of Chairs. Responses were obtained from the visiting team chairs and program directors for the six accreditation visits made this fall. This was the first semester that programs were required to use the new accreditation standards. There was not a lot of new feedback from these visits. There were some misunderstandings with documentation of student learning outcomes (SLO) and some problems with section nine involving assessment plans and strategic plans. Ideas for SLO documentation were presented at yesterday's baccalaureate caucus. A summary of the feedback information from the accreditation visits was presented at the

council of chairs session yesterday. This will be done once a year. The Council of Chairs will be working on annotating the concordance document. A question concerning needed clarifications in the concordance document has been added to the survey of visiting team chairs and program chairs. Links to other documents and videos may be placed in the concordance document.

b. **Revisions of ACCE Documents:** The ACCE Board approved the revisions to our accreditation standards contained in ACCE Document 103 at the July 2016 meeting. As a consequence of these change, the guidance for preparation of the self-evaluation study contained in ACCE Document 102 and the visiting team report format contained in ACCE Form A3 were modified in August. A concordance document was published at the end of August containing these revised documents. Starting July 2017, all programs must use these revised documents. Several programs have indicated the concordance document was extremely helpful in writing their self-evaluation study.

c. **Review recent and pending visits:** John Schaufelberger noted that the recent and pending visits are listed in Tab 5.2 and 5.3 of the conference book**.**   There are nine accreditation visits scheduled for spring 2017 which include six baccalaureate, one initial, and two masters. There are seven accreditation visits scheduled for fall 2017.

d. **Review status of programs in candidate status:** Programs in candidate status are listed under Tab 8.3 and 8.4 in the conference book. There are nine baccalaureate degree programs and two associate degree programs in candidate status.

e. **Board appointed mentors:** A weak area of the organization has been the mentor program. Mentors are assigned in two ways. Mentor are appointed for candidate programs and these mentors report to the guidance committee. Candidate program mentors remain until accreditation is achieved. The accreditation committee can recommend the board to assign a mentor to an accredited program. These board appointed mentor report to the accreditation committee and typically remain until the next accreditation visit. Reports are sent to ACCE twice a year. This time there was an excellent response from the board appointed mentors and the reports were very comprehensive.

VI.   New Business

a. **ACCE Strategic Goal 2.1.2 – Improve Accreditation Technology:** ACCE's Board of Trustees developed a strategic plan during fall 2014. That strategic plan with revisions is listed in Tab 7 of the meeting book. Revisions to the strategic plan have eliminated a couple of the original goals due to lack of practicality.

- An original goal was to examine creating a phased self-evaluation study to break the completion of the self-study into more manageable pieces. The self-evaluation study is a snapshot at an instance in time and it was decided this would not be practical to do in a phased manner.

- Another original goal was to create an extended accreditation period for a program which had no weaknesses the last two site visits and had not had a leadership change. It would be rare for a program to meet these requirements and during the extended accreditation period the program could have a leadership change which might significantly affect the program quality. Based on this it was determined this goal should be abandoned. One action to meet the goal of improving outcomes based accreditation process has been Richard Burt and John Schaufelberger discussing ACCE's new outcomes based standards at ASC meetings. This has provided information concerning the standards to a larger base.

- Another goal still being pursued is improving the accreditation process. ACCE is looking for one or two pilot programs in fall 2017 to use drop box or similar to upload all SLO information. This could be only scanned images or could be searchable tabbed pdfs. This would allow the visiting team to review the information before the site visit and could allow the site visit length to be shortened. Student confidentiality has been an obstacle to doing this previously. Now only one example of graded work will be required for each SLO so the volume of student work is much less. Another obstacle is the due date of the self-evaluation study is earlier than many programs do their assessment of the most recent term prior to the site visit. Whether the SLO information is provided by drop box or sent as files with the self-evaluation study an addendum could be sent with the most recent term information or the the assessment information for the previous period could be allowed. Also, recording some sessions of the ACCE meeting and posting to YouTube is being examined. The annotation of the concordance with links to other documents and videos are another way to use technology to improve the accreditation process.

VII.   **Adjourned** at 8:49 a.m.