American Council for Construction Education
Accreditation Committee – Open Session
Mobile, Alabama
Friday, 2/19/16 – 8:00 a.m.

I. Attendance:


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 2015 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 ten accreditation visits made this fall. Five of these visits were pilots using the new accreditation standards. New survey instruments were created in order to obtain additional information from the pilot accreditation visits. The feedback information from the fall accreditation visits was presented publicly for the first time at the council of chairs session yesterday.
b. **Update on Strategic Plan Goal 2.1, Improve Accreditation Process:** Goal 2.1 deals with utilizing technology in the accreditation process. Electronic submission of student work and assessment data for the SLOs prior to a visit may enable shortening the accreditation site visit by a day. There is a need for a template or format to be used in providing the SLO documentation. It was noted that a videoconference is useful to address any issues that arise.

c. **Review recent and pending visits:** John Schaufelberger noted that the recent and pending visits are listed in Tab 5.3 and 5.4 of the conference book. There are six accreditation visits scheduled for spring 2016 and nine accreditation visits scheduled for fall 2016.

d. **Review status of programs in candidate status:** Programs in candidate status are listed under Tab 8.3 in the conference book. There are 11 baccalaureate degree programs and 4 associate degree programs in candidate status. One additional program has applied for candidate status.

e. **Creating a candidate status for master degree program accreditation:** Currently when a master degree program applies for an accreditation visit there is no candidate status. Where the master degree program is in the same area of the college as the accredited bachelor degree program, this process has worked. There are cases where the master degree program is located in a different area of the college than the bachelor’s degree program. The accreditation committee conducted an electronic discussion concerning this and has recommended changes to Document 101 to create a candidate status for master degree program accreditations. If the Board of Trustees approves this recommendation on Saturday, future master degree accreditations will be placed in candidate status and assigned a mentor to assist with the accreditation process.

VI. **New Business**

a. **Transition to new standards:** John Schaufelberger asked visiting team chairs, program directors and visiting team members to share any lessons learned from the five pilot program visits. Following are the comments provided. The new standards provide a better feel for what is going on in the program. There were challenges with some mapping still needed and due to these being pilot visits the assessment cycle was not completed on outcomes until just before the site visit. The visit is no longer bean counting of hours. Sunday was spent reviewing outcomes rather than filing in boxes in the matrix. Enough student work to verify outcomes was provided for the most part, though documentation of all twenty outcomes was not required since this was a pilot visit. One challenge was the assessment and outcomes being at the listed level of the outcome, such as create level verses understand level. ACCE is still in the process of aligning its documents. Documents were provided electronically before the visit and the process worked well. Some documents were not provided to the team until the team arrived at the site. Both course binders and student learning outcomes binders were provided. The visiting team felt better having the course binders, but they will not be required under the new standards. A matrix may need to be
developed for mapping outcomes. The new self study document cannot be completed by cutting and pasting from the previously submitted self study. Writing the self study under the new standards will require a larger time commitment and program directors need to get everyone involved. Training aspects are a struggle. Future case studies training will emphasize three areas. One area is to standardize action verbs and outcome levels. Another deals with wording changes to the standards developed from pilot accreditation visit feedback. Once these changes are made, training can be developed for implementing these revised standards. The third area is to share lessons learned. As a result of feedback from the five pilot visits there will be some changes to the standards. This will require the guidance and accreditation committees to adjust their documents. Any changes made during the July meeting will occur after the self studies have been submitted for the fall accreditation visits. A task force will be organized to determine the best way to organize the student learning outcomes. They will come up with best practices to determine the materials needed to demonstrate the outcome has been met, how the outcomes were assessed, and the instruments used in the assessment.

VII. **Adjourned** at 8:46 a.m.