Screen Options ▼   Help ▼

[WordPress 4.0](#) is available! [Please update now](#).

Comments

All | Pending (0) | Approved | Spam (0) | Trash (2)

Search Comments

| Bulk Actions ▼ Apply   All comment types ▼ Filter | | | 48 items |

☐	Comment	In Response To ▲
☐	Submitted on 2014/09/12 at 8:22 pm Suggestion: Update definitions of our anchor programs/membership in this section to reflect those listed on the ATMAE Venn (About ATMAE): http://www.atmae.org/?page=AboutATMAE	1.02 Definition Industrial/Engineering Technology and Applied Engineering – Degree Programs 2 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/10/15 at 12:01 pm Please give example wording.	1.02 Definition Industrial/Engineering Technology and Applied Engineering – Degree Programs 2 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/09/30 at 1:07 pm Revised wording: The Executive Director of the Association is the executive with authority over operations of the Accreditation program, unless that authority, in whole or in part, devolves to a Director (remove "or Coordinator") of Accreditation, pursuant to the Bylaws of the Association or by contractual agreement.	2.0 Administrative Organization 1 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/09/30 at 1:16 pm	2.01.1.g Board of Accreditation Membership:
☐	Comment	In Response To ▲

	Comment	In Response To ▲
☐	This section, in general, should be discussed. Suggested rewording: The number of Program Sponsor representatives shall be determined by the chair of the Board of Accreditation, (add) Director of Accreditation, and the Executive Director of the Association. Also substitute "Director of Accreditation" for "Executive Director of the Association".	**Program Sponsors** 2 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/10/15 at 12:18 pm change Executive Director to Director of Accreditation	**2.01.1.g Board of Accreditation Membership: Program Sponsors** 2 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/11/05 at 4:47 pm The terms of office should be shortened or lengthened to provide continuity and to avoid a situation of coterminous expirations.	**2.01.1.k Board of Accreditation Membership: Initial Terms of Office; May Be Shortened to Provide Continuity** 1 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/11/06 at 2:30 pm Policies related to program sponsorship are unclear.	**2.01.6 Program Sponsors** 1 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/09/30 at 1:18 pm Suggest replacing "Executive Director" with "Director of Accreditation".	**2.03.1 Accreditation Personnel & Policy Recommendation Committee: Membership** 1 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/09/30 at 1:21 pm	**2.03.2 Accreditation**
☐	Comment	In Response To ▲

	Comment	In Response To ▲
☐	Suggested rewording to item "d. approve or disapprove institutional applications for accreditation when applications are received by the Executive Director"; replace "Executive Director" with "Director of Accreditation".	Personnel & Policy Recommendation Committee: Authority 1 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/11/06 at 9:25 am Referred comment: The administration of this policy should be addressed. Presently 20% of the fee is withheld, when the fee is actually quite low to begin with considering what is involved.	2.05.6 Approved Consultants: Fees 1 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/11/05 at 4:55 pm Referred comment: This policy requires clarification. The committee chair should report to the Board of Accreditation.	2.06.2 Standards and Accreditation Committee: Reporting Lines 1 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/11/05 at 4:40 pm Referred comment: This policy should reflect an approved 2013 motion to limit the recusal period for visiting team members to seven (7) years.	2.07 Conflict of Interest 1 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/09/12 at 8:39 pm I believe that the area of Program Structure is one that needs to be reviewed. It was designed to fit an older model and a more prescriptive process. I am designing a new BS Eng Tech degree that combines courses in Computer Science along with our Automation/Robotics classes from Applied Engineering. Our CSCI program is ABET, and our AETM program is ATMAE accredited. We potentially have two different options before us and our administration would like us to go ABET for this new program. I suspect it is because of a perceived value opinion of those from the sciences (Provost is a Chemist, and new President is a Physicist).	3.01 Types of Programs 2 View Post
☐	Comment	In Response To ▲

Comment	In Response To ▲
I have no problem with an ABET accreditation if it is the best option for us. I have been a huge advocate for ATMAE as you know and will continue to push for us where I can. Our Dept already has an Occupational safety and Environmental Health (OSEH) program in-house that is ABET.

How can ATMAE grow and reel in more BS programs like the one I have designed? This is the subject of my email.

I would ask you to consider proposing the following changes to the Handbook:

7.5 Program Structure & Course Sequencing:
Eliminate the maximum of 36 credits of technical coursework. This significantly reduces the amount of Engineering Technology degree programs that could qualify for ATMAE accreditation.

Reduce or eliminate completely the requirement of a minimum number of managerial-related coursework for the BS.

I suggest the following structure to satisfy the above suggestions and will thus open up a vast amount of opportunity for us to grow 4-year program accreditation targeted at Engineering Technology and other technical management-related programs like Operations Mgt.

Bachelor's Degree: Programs/options shall be a minimum of 120 semester hours and shall meet the following minimum/maximum foundation semester hour requirements:
General Education (must include oral and written communications) 18-36
Mathematics 6-18
Physical Sciences*.. 6-18
Technical Management and/or Technical/Applied Engineering .... 36+
Electives 0-18

It is also important to note that we already combine the management/technical category for our Associates and Master's program structure. I understand the previous intent – to have both and to prevent a 4-yr technical heavy program or a 4-yr mgt program, but I think we should reconsider this.

Now that we are no longer a pure association of industrial technologists (single degree and definition – for years we were drifting from this anyway with 2 year technical degrees etc.), and have opened up the Association for others – see Venn: http://www.atmae.org/?page=AboutATMAE — why not also compete head on with ABET for the Engineering Technology programs? According to our CHEA recognition, there is nothing to preclude this.

Current CHEA-Recognized Scope of Accreditation:

Associate, baccalaureate, and master's degree programs in technology, applied technology, engineering technology, and technology-related disciplines delivered at national or regional accredited institutions in the United States. (2011)

I'd love to see open up some possibilities. 4-yr programs are important for us as they generate members that are willing to serve the Association. 2-yr program faculty are not as inclined (generally) to be active in serving the Association. We all | |
| Comment | In Response To ▲ |

	Comment	In Response To ▲

know active CCTI people, but they are mush less active as a population than that of the University Division folks. We need members to serve on Accreditation Teams, etc to grow as we accredit more programs, etc.

I still support pursuing 2-yr programs – this is just another way to grow us on the 4-yr front.

Wondered if you had seen this 2009 report. It shows that ATMAE is roughly the same size in program accreditation as AACSB and about 1/5 the size of ABET (all commissions).
http://www.chea.org/pdf/Condition_US_Accreditation_in_2009.pdf

ATMAE is growing as our ~539 programs (2009 CHEA report) approaches now the same size of ETAC Commission of ABET (~632 – 2012 source below).
http://www.abet.org/tac-changes-name/

We are positioned well to compete in my opinion. Please consider – this could be a catapult strategy to really impact the growth of our profession and Association.

John R. Wright, Jr., Ph.D., CSTM – Professor of Automation & Electronics
ATMAE Charles W. Keith Award Recipient

Submitted on 2014/11/06 at 1:38 pm

This policy should be edited to remove the reference to the retired set of standards (2009).

3.01 Types of Programs
2 View Post

Submitted on 2014/11/08 at 1:03 pm

The program should examine the process used to assign the teams and how the background of the team members is presented to the institutions, along with how they may perceive a conflict. Early stage team formation can be blamed for the results of the team report.

3.03 The Visiting Team
1 View Post

Submitted on 2014/11/07 at 10:44 pm

While the specific wording of this policy does not preclude conducting out-of-cycle accreditation visits, it may be beneficial to the program to build additional capacity by expanding the review period or having a second two-month period during which accreditation reviews can take place.

3.04 Schedule for Visitations
1 View Post

	Comment	In Response To ▲

	Comment	In Response To ▲
☐	Submitted on 2014/09/26 at 3:44 pm All self-study report data ought to be uploaded to a database and reports should be published by populating a self-study report template. Administrative data ought to be uploaded by the full-time staff and the institutional unique data by the institution. Qualtrics or SurveyMonkey can probably configured to do most if not all the data collection.	3.07 Self-Study Report 2 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/10/15 at 12:23 pm Does the Association Office have the computing power to implement this suggestion?	3.07 Self-Study Report 2 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/09/26 at 3:46 pm All visiting team report data ought to be uploaded to a database and reports should be published by populating a visiting team report template. Administrative data ought to be uploaded by the full-time staff and the institutional unique data by the visiting team. Qualtrics or SurveyMonkey can probably configured to do most if not all the data collection.	3.08 Visiting Team Report 4 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/09/27 at 9:17 am In addition to check boxes for compliance, partial compliance, and non-compliance, we should consider the addition of "not applicable" for standards like 7.16 and 7.17.	3.08 Visiting Team Report 4 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/11/06 at 9:30 am Referred comment: Depending on when the site visits take place, the report may be submitted to the institution for review and comment in the off-contract period. Forty-five days may be too long of an interval.	3.08 Visiting Team Report 4 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/11/08 at 1:17 pm Options need to be investigated such as Task Stream, Coursesites.com and Hightail, in addition to Qualtrics and Survey Monkey.	3.08 Visiting Team Report 4 View Post
☐	Comment	In Response To ▲

	Comment	In Response To ▲
☐	Submitted on 2014/09/30 at 1:23 pm Replace "Executive Director" with "Director of Accreditation" throughout this section for consistency.	3.09 Board of Accreditation Action 2 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/10/15 at 12:06 pm Agree	3.09 Board of Accreditation Action 2 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/11/06 at 6:42 am Referred comment: Deferred accreditation could also be considered another accreditation action. If the Board needs more information before making a decision because of a disparity between a site visit report and a program's response to the report, the difference should be resolved.	4.02 Accreditation Actions 1 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/09/26 at 3:54 pm Is this a standard to which institutions are supposed to be in compliance? According to a reasonably recent visiting team report template (TeamWorksheetFillinFormOutcomesAssessmentModel022210mdscUnlocked.doc) it is. However it appears to be an afterthought vice a deliberate addition. Perhaps it's in the process of being addressed. If not, we ought to consider addressing.	4.05 Program Responsibility to Provide Information to the Public 2 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/11/06 at 9:31 am Referred comment: There should be ongoing evidence of this requirement.	4.05 Program Responsibility to Provide Information to the Public 2 View Post
☐	Submitted on 2014/10/15 at 12:33 pm	PA.1 Preparation of Self-Study 2 View Post
☐	Comment	In Response To ▲

Comment	In Response To ▲
The Self-Study Report shall follow the guidelines of the Accreditation Handbook version in place at the time of accreditation application. The report shall be completed by a representative portion of the institutions administrative staff, teaching faculty, and students directly related to the program(s) to be reviewed.	
Submitted on 2014/11/07 at 10:34 pm There should be a mechanism to upload supporting documentation for review by the visiting teams a month or more before the visit. The visit should be more about interviews. Having a resource room causes visiting teams to have to find evidence.	PA.1 Preparation of Self-Study 2 View Post
Submitted on 2014/09/27 at 8:43 am Consider requiring programs to idenfiy their CIP Codes in addition to program titles. CIP Codes data can be compile and sliced and diced to gleen some additional insight on ATMAE accredited programs. Program titles really don't lend themselves to good analysis.	7.01 Program Title, Mission, and General Outcomes 2 View Post
Submitted on 2014/10/15 at 12:38 pm Evidence must exist that the programs are understood and accepted by the university/college community, and the business/industry community. Consider moving this statement to a different location.	7.01 Program Title, Mission, and General Outcomes 2 View Post
Submitted on 2014/09/27 at 8:51 am Consider suggesting as part of the validation process that programs consider using the CIP Codes to SOC (Standard Occupational Classification) crosswalk in addition to the using external experts, advisory committees, etc.	7.02 Competency Identification & Validation 1 View Post
Submitted on 2014/09/27 at 9:24 am	7.05.b Program Structure & Course Sequencing:
Comment	In Response To ▲

Comment	In Response To ▲
Programs/options need to give the first paragraph special attention if their graduation requirements exceed the minimum 120 semester hours and ought to be explicit with respect to justifying where, how, and why hours are allocated. Probably applicable to 7.05a and 7.05c as well.	Bachelor's Degree 1 ▸ View Post
Submitted on 2014/09/15 at 11:36 am Rewording to this section has been suggested as follows: Original: "A minimum of fifty percent of the regular tenure track, or full time, faculty members assigned to teach in the program of study content area(s) shall have an earned doctorate or other appropriately earned terminal degree as defined by the institution." Revision: "A minimum of fifty percent of the full-time faculty members (tenure track or non-tenure track) assigned to teach in the program of study content area(s) shall have an earned doctorate or other appropriately earned terminal degree as defined by the institution."	7.08.b Administrative Support & Faculty Qualifications: Bachelor's Degree 1 ▸ View Post
Submitted on 2014/10/15 at 12:42 pm Student attainment of course competencies shall be mapped to the program's stated outcomes.	7.11 Program/Option Operation 1 ▸ View Post
Submitted on 2014/10/15 at 12:44 pm Summary data shall be available for graduate evaluations of the program/option and be made public..	7.12 Graduate Satisfaction with Program/Option 1 ▸ View Post
Submitted on 2014/09/25 at 11:37 am After years of having formal feedback from employers as part of the accreditation standards, ABET dropped the requirement. It proved to be extremely difficult to obtain significant employer feedback. I think this is something ATMAE should strongly consider removing from the accreditation criteria.	7.13 Employment of Graduates 2 ▸ View Post
Comment	In Response To ▲

Comment	In Response To ▲
Submitted on 2014/10/15 at 12:49 pm Summary data shall be available for the employment of graduates and be made public.	7.13 Employment of Graduates 2 View Post
Submitted on 2014/09/27 at 9:13 am For our consideration: should a program/option goal be the preparation of students to pass exams? Or should we be preparing students to be skilled and knowledgeable, and wouldn't the exam be a means for ascertaining the extent to which they're skilled and knowledgeable?	7.17 Student Success in Passing Certification Exams 1 View Post
Submitted on 2014/10/15 at 12:45 pm Evidence that program stakeholders participate in this process must be demonstrated and appropriate data shall be made public.	7.19 Outcome Measures Used to Improve Program 1 View Post
Submitted on 2014/09/26 at 4:13 pm The process for handling an institution's official reaction to a visiting team report appears to work–see paragraph 8.5d, page 15 of the 2011 Outcomes Assessment Accreditation Handbook.	General Comments About ATMAE Accreditation Standards 6 View Post
Submitted on 2014/09/27 at 8:28 am Let's ensure all documents are scrubbed for uniformity of terms—ie advisory council vice advisory committee.	General Comments About ATMAE Accreditation Standards 6 View Post
Submitted on 2014/09/30 at 1:37 pm Add a new Section 2.9 "Director of Accreditation". 2.9.1 Responsibilities: The responsibilities of the Director of Accreditation shall include: (a) Serve as a non-voting member of the Board of Accreditation.	General Comments About ATMAE Accreditation Standards 6 View Post
Comment	In Response To ▲

Comment	In Response To ▲

(b) Serve as Secretary for the Board of Accreditation and when necessary appoint an individual who is not a Board of Accreditation member to serve as a Recorder of Board of Accreditation for hearings, committee meetings, and business meetings. Schedule hearings, committee meetings, and business meetings; and prepare agendas and appropriate documentation needed to conduct such on behalf of the Board of Accreditation.

(c) Facilitate and manage the accreditation process, including oversight and coordination of site visits, hearings, and training. Have primary responsibility of coordinating with programs seeking accreditation, reaccreditation, and those institutions currently accredited.

(d) Serve as Treasurer and handle all fund transactions as they relate to accreditation and consistent with the overall management and policies of the Association.

(e) Serve as liaison with all recognition agencies associated with ATMAE accreditation (i.e. CHEA, ASPA) including addressing requirements of interim and progress reporting and attaining, retaining, and maintaining membership and recognition status. Update the Board of Accreditation and, where appropriate, make recommendations with regard to membership and status.

(f) Respond to inquiries and issues related to accreditation on behalf of the Board of Accreditation. Promote the growth, quality, and continuous improvement of the Association's accreditation program.

(g) Coordinate the formal complaint process and the reconsideration process with the Board of Accreditation.

(h) Monitor the accreditation and higher education environment for changes that might require modification of ATMAE accreditation processes and procedures.

Submitted on 2014/10/07 at 8:26 am

If you could please, where it says "Executive Board" replace that phrase with "Board of Directors." We are trying to do a better job clarifying between the Board of Directors and the Executive Committee. thank you.

General Comments About ATMAE Accreditation Standards

6 View Post

Submitted on 2014/11/06 at 1:35 pm

ATMAE's accreditation logo use policy should be present. Programs that are accredited by ATMAE are permitted to use the logo in publications and displays if the following guidelines are met:

1. The logo can only be used to promote the specific programs that are currently accredited by ATMAE.
2. When non-accredited programs are included in the publication or display, accompanying text must be provided to show the distinction.

General Comments About ATMAE Accreditation Standards

6 View Post

Comment	In Response To ▲

Comment	In Response To ▲

3. The entire logo must be used.
4. The logo may be reduced or enlarged to suit the use and the scale of the design elements must be retained.
5. The logo may be used in black and white or in color. If color is used, the colors must be those described in ATMAE's identity guide.
6. When the logo is used on official stationary, marketing materials and websites, accompanying text must make it clear that ATMAE accreditation applies only to the specific programs that are accredited by ATMAE and not other programs, departments, colleges, or schools.

Submitted on 2014/11/08 at 1:09 pm

One handbook is needed that undergoes version control and which also agrees with the training material.

General Comments About ATMAE Accreditation Standards

6 View Post

Submitted on 2014/09/15 at 12:17 pm

These changes have been suggested to the Definitions of Terms. In addition to improving the grammar, examples are recommended.

Definition of Terms

2 View Post

Program: A defined course of study leading to a degree denoted by a unique name on the official transcript. Examples: AS in Applied Computer Graphics Technology; BS in Computer Graphics Technology

Option: A subset of a degree program that may be denoted by a unique name on the official transcript. Examples: MS in Computer Graphics Technology-Thesis Option; MS in Computer Graphics Technology-Direct Project Option; MS in Computer Graphics Technology-Directed Course Work Only Option

Program Mission: A general statement that identifies the broad purpose of a degree program. Example: The mission of the abc degree program at the xyz college is to produce competent applied engineering technologists ready for initial employment in the .

Program Outcomes: A list of general expectations for "what" you expect students to achieve in the form of knowledge and skills resulting from or because of the program of study. Example: The applied engineering technologist will be able to demonstrate job ready oral and written communication knowledge and skill.

Outcome Measures: A series of summative assessment activities using instruments such as certification exams, portfolios of student work, and alumni and employer surveys undertaken after students have completed a program to determine the overall effectiveness of the outcomes identified and covered in the program. Examples: Employer survey question –

Comment	In Response To ▲

Comment	In Response To ▲
To what degree does the applied engineering technology graduate of xyz college demonstrate job expected written and oral communication knowledge and skill. (use a Likert-type scale). End of program – ATMAE certification examination results.

Competencies: A series of measurable activities that demonstrate "how" students are achieving the desired learning outcomes most often assessed within courses or units of instruction. Example: As a result of this course the student will be able to apply system thinking. (Listed in a course syllabus and mapped to the Program Outcomes).

Competency Measures: Formative assessment activities using direct or indirect measures to determine students' progress in achieving a competency such as written tests, demonstrations and observations, case studies and discussion groups, exemplars, peer reviews, self-assessments, presentations, mock events, and monitors. Example: Observe direct or indirect measures for examples of how students apply system thinking in solving barriers to completion of a group project. (Course embedded competency measure). | |
| Submitted on 2014/09/27 at 9:07 am

Consider adding the term "goal" and/or "program goal" and clarify/deconflicting what might be the difference(s) in usage in 7.10 especially and 7.16, and 7.17.

Is "general outcomes" and/or "program outcomes" supposed to be "student outcomes"? | Definition of Terms

2 View Post |
| Comment | In Response To ▲ |

Bulk Actions [▼] Apply

48 items

Thank you for creating with WordPress.

Get Version 4.0