



Annual Meeting 2019

Standards Committee

Meeting Minutes

July 25, 2019 8:00-10:00 am

I. Attendance:

a. Committee Members

Chini (C), Batie (VC), Berryman, Clarke, Diab, Elhouar, Gao, Gordon, Hunt, Matthews, McCuen, Orabi, Schmidt, Safavi

b. Visitors

Bond, Degenhart, Henmann, Schaufelberger, Svoboda

c. Committee Members absent

Burns, Burt, Crask, Fosheim, Fuller, Lavy, Rapp, Yantis, Zick

II. Chair Welcome

a. Opening Remarks

Abdol Chini (C) made Opening Remarks welcoming all to the meeting.

III. Minutes from February 19, 2019 Meeting

Minutes were approved by voice vote of the Committee.

IV. Meeting

a. Standards Committee Self-Assessment Survey 2019

1. Chini (C) presented the findings of the Committee Assessment
2. Questions 1-12 averaged a 4.50 score
3. Question 13/14 "Please indicate your opinion on the appropriateness of the Standards Committee procedures in review and change of the Standards." had a score of 4.42 with the response: "The process depends to a great deal on subcommittees, which minimizes the input of the overall committee on recommended changes/revisions."
4. Question 15/16 "Please indicate your opinion as to whether the Standards Committee membership adequately reflects the general membership with respect to diversity of industry segments and educational programs." had a score of 3.75 with the following responses:
 1. Committee would benefit from more industry members.
 2. More diversity both on the academic and industry side is needed.
 3. Could have more representation from the industry.
 4. More active industry members are needed.
 5. Not too many industry representatives
5. Question 17/18 "Please indicate your opinion as to whether the Standards Committee meetings have adequate attendance to review standards as charged" had a score of 4.33 with the following response: "8am on first



Annual Meeting 2019

morning of conference is not a great time for any committee but certainly not Standards.”

6. Question 19 “What suggestions do you have to improve the function of the Standards Committee? (Your Comments, please.) had the following responses:
 1. The Standards Committee is effective.
 2. The subcommittees should be more active between the meetings.
 3. More diversity as previously suggested.
 4. Change the procedures for identifying and addressing areas of the standards that need to be revised.

Chini noted that he will make an announcement at the Associate and Baccalaureate Program Caucus that Programs submit request of changes and potential problem areas of the Standards so that discussions on those areas can be made at the next meeting.

Chini will talk to Steve Nellis regarding starting the Standards committee meeting later in the morning (9-11am or 10am -12pm) and providing teleconference access to the meeting for industry members.

b. Discussion of Council of Chairs Report

1. Chini (C) presented the findings of the Council of Chairs comments to the Committee.
 - a. Item #1: SLO 9 (Bachelor’s Degree) - the focus must be on "Apply construction management skills" as a member of a multidisciplinary team. This concept required much discussion with the VT to understand our philosophy regarding SLO 9.
 - i. Comment: Consider changing “Apply” to “understand” for SLO 9
 - b. Item #2: SLO 8 (Associate Degree): "Discuss basic principles of ethics in the construction industry" In several of our curriculum construction courses, the instructors do discuss principles of ethics in construction; yet the Program is required to show work sample of the students regarding this SLO. This is difficult to assess.
 - i. Comment: “Discuss” in the 2015 version was changed to “understand” in 2018 version.
 - ii. Assessment evidence must be provided.
 - c. Item #3: 6.1.2 The Library adequacy is difficult to assess.
 - i. Comments: Investigate language of access. Look at possibly eliminating the Library requirement.
 - d. Item #4: 4.1.1.3: As long as there are non-tenure-track 'Professors of Practice', 'Clinical Professors', or whatever the institution calls them, it will be difficult to affirm that an institution values experience as important as formal education.



Annual Meeting 2019

- i. Comments: Teams should look at the University hiring requirements and recent hiring advertisements to determine how they portray professional experience.
 - e. Item #5: 8.1.1.3 How long do IAB minutes have to be kept?
 - i. They should be kept for at least one year, some felt it should be longer. This is a Guidance requirement that should be addressed.
 - f. Item #6: The Academic Quality Plan: If the department and program are one of the same (only one program in the department), then we N/A the educational unit AQP questions, and only answered the questions for the Program. The Academic Quality Plan is always difficult to compare as ACCE wording often different than Program's wording.
 - i. The AQP verbiage is defined under Section 8.1.1.3.
 - g. Item #7: Originally, the Standards Committee intentionally made the 4-digit format to indicate a required Standard (i.e. 8.1.2.1, 7.1.1.1, etc.). All other sets of numbering relate to context, heading, introduction, or clarifications. There are many 3-digit Standards that look like clarifications but use the word "shall" thus making it a required Standard. See 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.2.1 thru 3.2.4, 3.3.1 thru 3.3.8, 5.1.1 thru 5.1.1 thru 5.1.10, 6.1.1 thru 6.1.3, 8.1.2, 8.1.4, and 8.1.5. For clarity, it may be in the best interest of all to revisit the numbering scheme.
 - 1. The verbiage numbering has already been changed. This is old documentation
 - h. Item #8: Review Self Study Guide for redundancies
 - i. This is the responsibility of the Guidance Committee.
- c. Time Frames for Changing ACCE Documents 103:**
 - 1. Chini addressed the Time frames for changing the 103 document for the benefit of the committee members. The time frame is:
 - a. July 2020 Annual Meeting: Approval of changes by the Standards committee.
 - b. August 25, 2020: Committee Chair submits changes to the President.
 - c. August 31, 2020: Submission by the President of proposed changes for comments by interested parties.
 - d. October 1, 2020: Closing date for receipt of comments.
 - e. October 15, 2020: Submission of comments to committee members for consideration.
 - f. December 5, 2020: Telephone conference meeting of committee to verify proposed amendments.
 - g. January 10, 2021: Submit final proposals to the President.
 - h. January 15, 2021: Consolidated listing of proposed changes to Board members for review.
 - i. February 2021 Mid-Year Meeting: Discussion and approval actions by Board of Trustees.
 - j. July 2021: Annual Meeting Effective implementation date for changes.



Annual Meeting 2019

V. Special Committee Agenda Items

a. Subcommittee Review of Documents 103A (Burns (C), Hunt, Matthews, Orabi, Safavi)

1. Rogers Hunt reported for the committee
2. The Committee has reviewed the SLOs and make the following recommendations for change:
 1. SLO 2. Apply the skills to estimate quantities and costs for the bidding process in a construction project.
Revised: Apply quantity takeoff skills for bidding or budgeting purposes on a construction project.
 2. SLO 5. Apply the interpretation of construction documents (contracts, specifications, and drawings) used in managing a construction project.
Revised: Apply an interpretation of construction contract documents used in building a construction project.
 3. SLO 9. Understand the fundamentals of contracts, codes, and regulations that govern a construction project.
Revised: Understand the fundamentals of regulatory documents (i.e. codes, conditions) found in construction contract documents
 4. SLO 10. Understand basic construction methods, materials and equipment.
Revised: Understand basic construction methods and materials.
 5. SLO 11. Understand basic safety hazards on a construction site and standard prevention measures.
Revised: Understand standard prevention measures used on a construction site to alleviate common safety hazards.
 6. SLO 13. Understand the basic principles of mechanical, electrical and piping systems.
Revised: Understand the basic principles of MEP systems
3. The committee is also reviewing the website of the Canadian accreditation program.

b. Subcommittee Review of Documents 103B (Schmidt (C), Diab, Elhouar, Fuller, Gao, McCuen, Yantis)

1. John Schmidt addressed the committee discussions.



Annual Meeting 2019

2. Wanted to state that the Gen Ed requirements cannot be used for assessment in the SLOs.
 3. The committee is making the recommendation that section 3.1.6 be moved to Section 9 as these items deal with assessment. John Schaufelberger said that the syllabus requirements should remain in section 3.1. Items 3.1.6.3 – 3.1.6.6 can be moved to Section 9.
- c. **Subcommittee Review of Documents 103M** (Berryman (C), Clarke, Fosheim, Lavy, Rapp)
1. Chuck Berryman stated that there are no anticipated changes to the 103M Standards. When changes are made in 103B, there may be areas affected

VI. New Business

a. CHEA New Requirement

- b. Chini addressed the new CHEA requirement that will affect all future program accreditation. The requirement is:
 1. *To be recognized, the accrediting organization must demonstrate that it requires all accreditation standards be met for an institution or program to obtain and maintain accredited status.*
- c. This means that we would need to deny accreditation to any program when a weakness was found during a site visit.
- d. John S made the following possible recommendations to address this issue:
 - i. One of the strategies that we could consider is to allow the Accreditation Committee to vote to defer action on a visiting team report containing one or more weakness for a period, such as a year, to enable the program to correct the weaknesses and report action taken. Then one person could be sent to visit the program to verify weakness resolution. This procedure is currently allowed for initial accreditation visits, but not for re-accreditation visits.
 - ii. Another strategy might be to revise our Documents 103 to contain standards and administrative requirements. Lack of compliance with a standard would still be a weakness, but lack of meeting an administrative requirement could be considered an administrative shortcoming, which would be a new category. For example, missing some information on a course syllabus might be considered an administrative shortcoming, rather than a weakness.
- d. Chini asked that Tom Burns, John Schmidt and Chuck Berryman review the documentation and determine a level of standard or deficiency that can alleviate the use of a Weakness when it is an



Annual Meeting 2019

administrative issue. The decision needs to be completed for an August 15, 2019 date to meet the December deadline report established by CHEA. They will forward their recommendation to Abdol Chini.

2. International Programs – General Education Requirements

- a. The committee will review the general education credit hours required for communications, math, and sciences in relation to accrediting International programs, as those classes may not be required in some international programs.

VII. No further business appearing the Meeting was Adjourned at 10:00 am

Respectfully Submitted: David L. Batie (VC)