

## **“103 OBS Revision” Task Force**

John Schmidt (Chair), David Batie, Chuck Berryman, Tom Burns, Richard Burt, Souhail Elhouar, Michael Emmer, Lauren Evans, and Drew Yantis

**The charge of the “103 OBS Task Force” was to address the issues and concerns related to Document 103 OBS raised by the accreditation visiting team members and program chairs during the five pilot accreditations in fall 2015. Following are the issues/concerns raised and the changes made to the OBS standards.**

- Overlap of Standard 2.1.2 (Institutional support) and section 7 (Financial resources). Standard 2.1.2 could be modified to EXCLUDE Financial Resources to be addressed in Section 7.
- Standard 2.1.1.2. C appears to be redundant with Standard 2.1.1.1. B and could be eliminated.
- Not sure of the value of Standard 2.1.1.3 because an educational unit by its nature is distinct and identifiable, whether it is a department, school, or college.

**This resulted in reformatting section 2 and eliminating 2.1.2.**

- The requirements prescribed in Section 3.1.4 preceding Table 3.1.1 seem unnecessary. By going to outcome-based standards, we have said that our construction courses should provide the necessary educational foundation for students to meet each of the prescribed SLOs in Section 3.1.5. If that is the case, why do we need all of the prescriptive standards contained in Section 3.1.4?

**The requirements prescribed in Section 3.1.4 preceding Table 3.1.1 were moved to the Intent section of Standard 3 as a guideline (not a requirement)**

- Standards are vague as to type and quantity of student work.

**Section 3.1.5.3 part E now requires: “Produce evidence in the form of assessment tools, any associated grading rubrics, and one example of graded student work to prove adequacy of the assessment tool in evaluating students’ ability to meet each Student Learning Outcome.”**

- Concordance document talked about how “every student shall meet” an outcome, but the reality is that the performance criteria are typically set to thresholds of 70% or 80%.

**In 3.1.5.1 and 3.1.5.2 “a graduate” was changed to “graduates”**

- Standardization and consistency of the syllabi - does this mean consistent as far as font and spacing, or just content?

**Section 3.1.5.3 part B now requires: “Provide a syllabus for each course used to support the Student Learning Outcomes. Syllabi shall include the following:**

- **Course Learning Outcomes in relation to the Student Learning Outcomes,**
- **Instructional methods**
- **Topical outline,**
- **Method of assessment of Course Learning Outcomes, and**
- **Grade performance criteria.**

**Section 3.1.5.3 (Determination of Achievement of Student Learning Outcomes) was reorganized/revised to provide more clarity and avoid redundancy.**

- Standard 8.1.2 states that the educational unit must have a policy on faculty roles in continuing education. I am not sure how this relates to a quality undergraduate educational program and is a problem for some of our 2-year programs, due to small number of faculty.

**Section 8.1.2 was revised to remove the requirement for faculty role in continuing education.**

- Frequency of data collection and assessment have not been specified.

**Section 9.1.4.1 now requires: “Data collection to measure achievement of goals and Learning Outcomes shall occur at least annually.”**

**Section 9.1.4.2 now requires: “The results of each assessment cycle shall be documented in a systematic manner. A complete cycle is defined as an assessment of all ACCE Student Learning Outcomes. The cycle shall not exceed three years.”**

#### **Other Changes:**

**A broader definition of a “degree program” was provided in definition section: “ACCE accredits post-secondary degree programs in construction. A degree program is an educational system with identified academic coursework, containing the body of knowledge necessary to obtain a college or university degree in that field of study. The degree program has objectives, learning outcomes, a curriculum, faculty, and facilities.” Considering this definition much of the burden of proof in many areas were moved to the “degree program” vs “educational unit.”**

**An attempt was made to avoid using the word “should.” Although there are still 10 of them in the Intent sections.**