



PAVE Kick-Off Meeting Summary

For Distribution to the ABET Community

For questions, please contact the following:

PAVE (general)

Gloria Rogers
Associate Executive Director
of Professional Services
ABET
410-843-7180
grogers@abet.org

Recruitment and Selection

Lori Heffelfinger
Consultant
Cardea Communications
310-543-7632
lorih@heffelfingerco.com

Training

Maryanne Weiss
Accreditation Director
ABET
410-347-7730
mweiss@abet.org

Evaluation

Jennifer Jones
Consultant
Cardea Communications
703-560-3838
jennifer@cardeacom.net

Introduction

This document serves as a summary of the kick-off meeting of the Partnership to Advance Volunteer Excellence (PAVE), held in Baltimore on Wednesday, August 30, 2006. It includes summary notes from each session (agenda attached).

The PAVE kick-off meeting was attended by volunteers involved in program evaluator selection and training for ABET member societies, current members of ABET's commissions, ABET member society staff, ABET staff, and ABET President Richard C. Seagrave. Sixteen member societies were represented. (A complete list of attendees is attached to this report.)

Purpose of the PAVE Kick-off

The purpose of the meeting was two-fold. First, the participants were given an overview of the process improvements for recruiting, selecting, training, and evaluating program evaluators designed and piloted during the two-year Participation Project. Cardea and member society representatives who were a part of the design and pilot teams provided an overview of the improvements in the morning session (power point presentation attached).

The second purpose of the meeting was to gain an understanding from member societies about how to best implement the process improvements in their societies. As President Dick Seagrave's invitation noted,

“Each and every society has a stake in the processes touched by this initiative, and our experience and insight in these areas are worth sharing with one another.... The purpose of the PAVE planning meeting is to develop action plans for implementing these improvements ABET-wide. As the implementers, society liaisons and key volunteers must determine together how to carry this phase forward.”

Member Society Feedback and Recommendations

The meeting provided two sessions where member societies offered suggestions on key action steps to be considered in developing an implementation plan. First, member society representatives were divided into three groups, each group reviewing one of the three areas—Recruitment and Selection, Training, and Performance Appraisal. Each small group then reported out to the larger group, and additional comments were solicited for each area. The summary of recommended key action steps from the small group break-out sessions are provided on the following pages.

Key Action Steps and Issues

Small Group Session #1: Summary

Recruitment and Selection

1. Consider how societies can customize application form or components to add further questions (Sept 2006).
2. Members societies can review the online application and provide feedback (Sept/Oct 2006).
3. Decide how to manage data collected on the applicants especially those who aren't chosen. Must be efficient and secure (fall 2006).
4. Soft rollout of the application form (Nov. 2006).*
5. Formal process to get feedback from societies to go to full implementation (May 2007).
6. Create a recruitment pitch, especially for industry. Add testimonials (fall 2006).
7. Society selection processes in place (fall 2006).
8. Booth at national diversity conferences (fall 2006-spring 2007).

Online application form available at: www.abet.org/volunteer.shtml.

*Societies who are eager to get started in fall 2006-spring 2007 (i.e., ASME, BMES, ASCE, etc.) should start using the provided tools immediately. Other societies should test the tools and provide feedback prior to full implementation.

Training

1. Develop flow chart approval process for implementation; communicate to all stakeholders.
2. Identify costs (money and time); communicate to all stakeholders.
3. Metrics: Compare old vs. new training and observer vs. non-observer (PEV performance).
4. Offer pilot model to larger pool of new PEVs, which then go out on visits fall 2007.
5. Evaluate the EC2000 roll-out model as roll-out for new training.
6. Develop one-day version (from one-and-a-half-day version)—one to include program criteria and one without.
7. Evaluate trainer options:
 - a. Needs assessment
 - b. Train the trainer
 - c. Competency model for trainers
 - d. Sustainability of number of trainers for current training model
8. Evaluate impact of PEV-candidate-only training. Poll institutions for needs; identify options to foster transparency.
9. Identify options for “upgrading” current PEVs’ training (including ensuring all PEVs have knowledge of the Competency Model)
10. Develop Competency Model for mentors. Evaluate need for/type of training. How they get selected and evaluated and by whom?

Performance Appraisal

1. Define inputs/outputs for competency preliminary decision.
2. Write up and distribute evaluation policy and procedure (in APPM?).
3. Share decision module/framework with member societies.
4. Instructions/tip sheet to team chairs on how to give peer-to-peer feedback.
5. Draft letter to PEV (recognition, remediation, removal).
6. Collaboration between/among the member societies' accreditation committees.
7. Publish performance stats on web (ID core metrics that are input).
 - a. Dash board:
 - i. Define targets.
 - ii. Define performance.
 - iii. Identify metrics.
8. Draw relationship between data and competencies.
9. As transition to new evaluator (rubrics) also provide historical data.
10. Correlate data points—TC and PEV—action recommended, number of shortcomings sited.
11. Track evaluation actions each society takes (reward, remediation, removal).

After the small groups reported their recommendations, a second small group session was initiated to look at all the recommendations in the three areas in totality. Participants from member societies were grouped together. Other participants with only one or two member society representatives were grouped together based on society size similarity.

The charge to the small groups in the afternoon was to evaluate all the recommendations and determine what their member societies could commit to doing to advance the recommendations (using the action steps as a guide). Each group was also asked to answer two questions: 1) What are you most excited about? and, 2) What are you most challenged by?

After the small group session #2, all participants gathered to hear the reports from each small group. The table on the following pages summarizes these reports.

Key Actions and Issues Small Group Session #2: Reports

Member Society	Action Items	Most excited about?	Most challenged by?
AAEE	▶ PEVs must be approved.		
ACSM	▶ Will explain products to society members (need communication tools to do this ASAP—electronic format). ▶ Utilize these products to begin implementation (evaluation guide most important to us).	▶ Evaluation Process	▶ What's next?
AICHe	▶ Remove “prescription”—figure out how to train (beyond PEV—i.e., institutional reps.). ▶ Build on mentor experiences.	▶ Everything ▶ More highly qualified PEVs via training	▶ Best mechanism without program criteria ▶ Need more training ▶ Costs
AIHA	▶ Communicate benefits of PAVE.		
ANS	▶ See list above. ▶ Roll out at next society meeting October 2006.	▶ Evaluation ▶ Will get better at what we do	
ASCE	▶ Application process—tailor application to maintain our standards while implementing application. ▶ Take action to get women/diverse pool.		

Member Society	Action Items	Most excited about?	Most challenged by?
<p>ASME</p>	<p><u>Recruitment and Selection</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No need for specific modifications to application: this form is ready to go. ▶ Recruiting is still the biggest issue—continue to use process started this past spring. <p><u>Training</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Exploring and preparing “Post Training,” training on program criteria—webinars—teleconferences. ▶ Currently rolling out mentor program. ▶ ASME volunteers to participate in next round of post-pilot training. <p><u>Evaluation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ ASME will get competency model info out to PEVs. ▶ ASME willing to collaborate with other society training on evaluation and accreditation process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A lot of it ▶ Training effectiveness ▶ Moving forward in the right direction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Recruiting ▶ Size: no staff support ▶ Costs ▶ Sharing information
<p>BMES</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Communicate direction to society leaders on recruiting, selection, training, evaluation. ▶ Communicate on how well we are doing as a small, relatively new society. ▶ Activate accreditation committee with evaluation process. ▶ Place recruitment ads on website. ▶ Pitch board on recruitment. ▶ Enhance gender/diversity recruitment—unique pitches to each target population. 		

Member Society	Action Items	Most excited about?	Most challenged by?
<p>IEEE/CSAB</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Preparing modules for refresher training of existing PEVs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ use available PP data to guide process. ▶ Devise a training plan: one-day or day-and-a-quarter face-to-face (“4 door model to 2 door model”). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ plus preparatory work ▶ including program criteria ▶ Designing a hybrid training model that accommodates societies of different sizes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ address the observation that “one size does not fill all” and the need to address centralization/decentralization issues. ▶ Write a draft “roles and responsibilities.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ review the current situations and the suggestions of the PP Phase II report and 30 August PPT presentation. ▶ Review and assist in development of online application form. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ back to original committee. ▶ maybe a pilot later. ▶ Suggest a draft roll-out plan, sketch timing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Training will address the real needs of PEVs ▶ Active learning ▶ Small group interaction during training ▶ more focused evaluation ▶ a mechanism for remedial training ▶ Use of competencies throughout the whole process ▶ use of electronic communication in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ pre-work ▶ electronic version of application ▶ focus on competencies is a positive ▶ extend outreach to new forums and new target populations ▶ Using data and measurements for decision-making <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ basing decisions on data and statistics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Losing society control—over-centralization. ▶ Impact on PEV pool (time of training, credentials) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ especially industry PEVs ▶ Cost ▶ Responsibilities on training ▶ Who trains? ▶ High selectivity of the selection process can turn candidates off ▶ Need to communicate expectations ▶ Role of society in process of evaluator recognition, remediation, removal ▶ Document the process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ including timeline (July feedback too late) ▶ how will executive committee of the commission communicate with society about recognition, remediation and removal? ▶ Who makes the final decision and how?

PAVE Kick-Off Meeting Summary

Member Society	Action Items	Most excited about?	Most challenged by?
NCEES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ State board: to become a PEV. ▶ Annual governance meeting: Cont. with ABET training. ▶ Survey member societies regarding our satisfaction with ABET (want more responsiveness—feel ignored/small societies aren't listened to). ▶ Need ready access to info on competency model on ABET website. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ better process ▶ training potential 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Need ABET to follow up on our requests ▶ Make it easy to remove people from database ▶ Strong tech support from ABET (these are nuances that get in my way as a volunteer) ▶ Costs ▶ Case for change
SAE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Form sub-team: ABET Liaison Committee to implement plan (short-, mid-, and long-term). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Training ▶ Whole process: get the best PEVs as possible ▶ Make it better ▶ Be in the room ▶ Collaboration ▶ Perf. App—recog 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Is a one-day training possible? ▶ Concerns on impact ▶ Who are the trainers? Need the highest level. ▶ What will ABET take on? ▶ Recruitment diversity ▶ All resources

Consider Unique Needs of Societies with Fewer Programs (taken from flip charts and participant comments)

- Little/no staff support.
- Need pooling/regionalized training option so that we can leverage other groups.
- Need clarification about costs (shouldn't cost more in money or time than today—though will given the pre-work time; want cost/benefit).
- Need help in communicating the products, process, and action from this to key volunteers and staff (need more detailed info/ability to answer questions).
- Some will move forward as best they can, given resource constraints.
- Some can't move forward until some answers are given (particularly training).
- Will look to how to combine forces with other societies.

Closing Comments

There were a few minutes remaining in the day for participants to share some closing comments. President Dick Seagrave thanked all the participants and discussed the work the ABET leadership is doing regarding the financial model and the costs for the implementation of the process improvements. He assured the group that the leadership was focusing on addressing costs.

Other comments included:

- While the meeting's leaders were criticized for stifling conversation in the morning, that changed throughout the day and there was good discussion.
- Now what?
- Would have been helpful to have this meeting earlier. It would have stopped the frustration.
- Stay the course and put the pedal to the metal.
- A multi-year rollout should be considered. A transition period, with a soft roll-out—a model we should keep in mind.
- Continue and enhance the communication to stakeholders.
- Don't forget the rewards piece of the PEV lifecycle. Look for best practices (i.e., among NSF, ASEE).



Agenda

Wednesday, August 30, 2006
BWI Airport Marriott Hotel

<i>Why We're Here</i>	8:00
Welcome from the President, Dick Seagrave Carrying the Good Work Forward, George Peterson, Executive Director Facilitator's Welcome Cardea Who's in the Room? Cardea What're Your Expectations? Cardea	
<i>Participation Project Background and Results</i>	9:00
Dan Hodge, Associate Executive Director, Accreditation Tom Perry and Amy Bentow, ASME Susan Schall, IIE, ABET Board of Directors Jim O'Brien, ASCE Jennifer Jones, Lori Heffelfinger, Cardea Kate Aberle, Associate Executive Director, Operations	
<i>Creating a Framework for Implementation</i>	10:15
Small Group Session (with break)	
LUNCH	
<i>Plenary: Small Group Highlights</i>	1:00
<i>Building an Implementation Plan</i>	1:30
Small Group Session #2 (with break)	
<i>What Does the Plan Look Like?</i>	3:00
<i>Next Steps</i>	3:45
<i>Closing</i>	4:00




Attendee List

Wednesday, August 30, 2006
BWI Airport Marriott Hotel

Society	Position	Name	E-Mail
ABET	Associate Executive Director of Accreditation	Dan Hodge	dhodge@abet.org
ABET	Advisory Committee	Dave Soldan	soldan@ksu.edu
ABET	President	Dick Seagrave	seagrave@iastate.edu
ABET	Executive Director	George Peterson	gpeterson@abet.org
ABET	Associate Executive Director of Professional Services	Gloria Rogers	grogers@abet.org
ABET	Associate Executive Director of Planning and Operations	Kate Aberle	kaberle@abet.org
ABET	Director of Accreditation	Maryanne Weiss	mweiss@abet.org
ABET	Meetings and Member Services Specialist	Stephanie Engelhardt	sengelhardt@abet.org
ABET	Communications Specialist	Keryl Cryer	kcryer@abet.org
ACSM	Executive Director	Curt Sumner	curtis.sumner@acsm.net
AICHe	Liaison	Jeff Sirola	sirola@eastman.com
AICHe	Participation Project Advisory Committee Chair, BOD Representative	Larry Kaye	larry.a.kaye@exxonmobil.com
AIHA		Bob Herrick	rherrick@mindspring.com
ANS	Liaison	Gil Brown	gilbert_brown@uml.edu
ASAC/ABET	ASAC Training Committee Chair	Turner Hughey	thughey@chromcraftcorp.com
ASCE	Liaison	Dion Coward	dcoward@asce.org
ASCE	Liaison	Jim O'Brien	jobrien@asce.org
ASCE	Liaison	Ping Wei	pwei@asce.org
ASEE	President-Elect	Jim Melsa	melsa@iastate.edu
ASHRAE	TAC Member	Ed Clancy	cclancy2@aol.com
ASME	Liaison	Amy Bentow	bentowa@asme.org
ASME	EAC Member	Bill Wepfer	bill.wepfer@dlpe.gatech.edu
ASME	EAC Member	Dick Warder	rcwarder@memphis.edu


PAVE Kick-Off Meeting Summary

Society	Position	Name	E-Mail
ASME	TAC Member, Chair of ASME Committee on Technology Accreditation	John Hartin	jhartin@purdue.edu
ASME	Liaison	Tom Perry	perryt@asme.org
BMES	Executive Director	Barbara Dunlavey	barb.dunlavey@bmes.org
Cardea	Consultant	Jennifer Jones	Jennifer@Cardeacom.net
Cardea	Consultant	Lori Heffelfinger	lorih@heffelfingerco.com
CSAB	CAC Member	Della Bonnette	dtb@louisiana.edu
CSAB	BOD Representative, Past CAC Member	Pat Walsh	walsh@acm.org
EAC/ABET	EAC Training Committee Chair	Susan Conry	conry@clarkson.edu
IEEE	Chair of IEEE/EAB Accreditation Policy Council	Dave Baker	wdbite@rit.edu
IEEE	Chair of IEEE/CEAA	Franc Noel	f.noel@ieee.org
IEEE	Vice Chair of IEEE/CTAA	Marty Reed	mareed@us.ibm.com
IEEE	VP Educational Activities	Moshe Kam	m.kam@ieee.org
IEEE	Liaison	Rae Toscano	r.toscano@ieee.org
IEEE	Staff	Sharon Strock	s.strock@ieee.org
IEEE	EAC Member	John Orr	orr@wpi.edu
IEEE	BOD Representative	Arnie Peskin	a.peskin@ieee.org
IIE	BOD Representative	Susan Schall	soschall@adelphia.net
NICE	Educational Liaison	Harrie Stevens	stevenshj@alfred.edu
NICE	Educational Liaison	Greg Geiger	ggeiger@ceramics.org
NCEES	BOD Representative	Monte Phillips	mlphillips@unitelc.com
SAE	Liaison	Linda Shonka	lshonka@sae.org
SNAME	BOD Representative	Ed Wiggins	egwigg@verizon.net
TAC/ABET	TAC Training Committee Chair	Kevin Taylor	k.d.taylor@ieee.org



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

PAVE
Partnership to Advance
Volunteer Excellence
August 30, 2006



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Why We're Here

Dick Seagrave,
ABET President

2



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Carrying the Good Work Forward

George Peterson,
ABET Executive Director

3



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

PAVE Kick-Off Meeting

Facilitator's Welcome

Jennifer E. Jones
President, Cardea Communications

4




Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

PAVE Kick-Off Meeting

- ◆ Review agenda
- ◆ Agree on ground rules
- ◆ Set our intent

5



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Who's in the Room?

... I didn't know that about you ...

6




Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Today's Agenda

- ◆ Why We're Here
- ◆ Participation Project Background
- ◆ Creating a Framework for Implementation
 - ◆ Small Group Session #1
 - ◆ Small Group Report outs
- ◆ Building a Plan: Connecting the Dots
 - ◆ Small Group Session #2
- ◆ What Does the Plan Look Like?
- ◆ Next Steps

7




Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

For Today...

Suspend judgment to discover
what's possible ...

8




Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Ground Rules

- ◆ Recognize the wisdom in the room.
- ◆ Listen.
- ◆ Collaborate.
- ◆ Stay true to process improvements.
- ◆ Show up; be on time.
- ◆ Sit loosely in the saddle.
- ◆ Be responsible for outcomes.

9




Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

What Is Our Intent?

“Determine how best to implement the good work our colleagues have produced... It is critical we do this together.”

President Seagrave
July 17, 2006

10



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

What Is Your Intent?

- ◆ “The reason I’m here ...”
- ◆ “My expectation for the day is...”

11



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

The Case for Change

Dan Hodge,
Associate Executive Director,
Accreditation

12



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

The Participation Project

- ◆ Design “a comprehensive and effective program that optimizes the use of the expertise and experience of the volunteer professionals that participate in ABET’s outcomes-based accreditation process.”

Participation Project Concept Paper

13




Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

The Participation Project

- ◆ Enhance the value of accreditation
- ◆ Embrace commitment to continuous improvement
- ◆ Align PEV process with vision of outcomes-based accreditation

14




Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

How Did We Get Here?

A Systems Approach

15




Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

How Did We Get Here?

A Systems Approach

- ◆ Needs Assessment (2004)
- ◆ Design of Recommendations (2005)
- ◆ Pilots & Modifications (2006)
- ◆ Implementation Planning (2006-2007)
- ◆ Implementation

16



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Thanks to Your Peers...

- ◆ Amy Bentow, ASME
- ◆ Della Bonnette, CSAB
- ◆ Diana Briedis, AIChE
- ◆ Jim Bryne, TAC
- ◆ Stephen Brock, AIAA
- ◆ Gary Bubenzer, ASAE
- ◆ Neal Coulter, CSAB
- ◆ Pat Daniels, EAC
- ◆ Tom Edgar, AIChE
- ◆ Pam Eibeck, ASME
- ◆ Ken Fisher, ASME
- ◆ Dennis George, ASAC/AIHA
- ◆ John Hartin, ASME
- ◆ Bob Herrick, ASAC
- ◆ Jerry Higgins, SME-AIME
- ◆ Charles Holley, ASCE
- ◆ Dave Hornbeck, TAC Adjunct Director
- ◆ Dave Holger, Accreditation Council Chair
- ◆ Larry Kaye, AIChE
- ◆ Bill Kelly, ASCE

17



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

And More Peers...

- ◆ Dianna Kocurek, AAEE
- ◆ Bob Laurenson, EAC
- ◆ Tom Lenox, ASCE
- ◆ Mike Leonard, IIE
- ◆ David Little, ASQ
- ◆ Jim O'Brien, ASCE
- ◆ John Orr, IEEE
- ◆ Tom Perry, ASME
- ◆ Jim Plasker, ACSM
- ◆ Dale Pounds, SME
- ◆ Dennis Readey, TMS
- ◆ Steve Ressler, ASCE
- ◆ Paul Ricketts, ASME
- ◆ Mike Robinson, TAC/ANS
- ◆ Kay Schulze, CAC
- ◆ Dave Soldan, IEEE
- ◆ Lewis Thigpen, ASME
- ◆ Jill Tietjen, NCEES
- ◆ Rae Toscano, IEEE
- ◆ Carolyn Solimine, IEEE

18



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

And More...

- ◆ Susan Schall, IIE
- ◆ Joe Turner, CAC
- ◆ Patrick Usoro, ASME
- ◆ Bill Wepfer, ASME
- ◆ Stu Zweben, CAC
- ◆ ABET Staff
 - ◆ Stephanie Engelhardt
 - ◆ Liz Glazer
 - ◆ Gloria Rogers
 - ◆ Earl Wade
 - ◆ Maryanne Weiss
- ◆ IEEE Committee on Engineering Accreditation Activities
- ◆ IEEE Committee on Technology Accreditation Activities.
- ◆ ASME Committee on Engineering Accreditation
- ◆ ASME Committee on Technology Accreditation

19



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Thank You Member Societies

- ◆ AAEE
- ◆ AIAA
- ◆ AIChE
- ◆ AIHA
- ◆ ACSM
- ◆ ANS
- ◆ ASAE
- ◆ ASCE
- ◆ ASEE
- ◆ ASME
- ◆ ASQ
- ◆ CSAB
- ◆ IEEE
- ◆ IIE
- ◆ NCEES
- ◆ SME-AIME
- ◆ TMS

20



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Design Team Products

- ◆ Competency Model – sets expectations
- ◆ R&S:
 - ◆ Pro-active recruiting processes
 - ◆ On-line application & references
 - ◆ Selection process using new tools
- ◆ Training:
 - ◆ Adult-learning based training (pre-work/F2F)
 - ◆ Opportunities to demonstrate competencies
- ◆ Evaluation:
 - ◆ Competency-based evaluation form
 - ◆ Peer ratings

21




Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

What are Competencies?

- ◆ Competencies are behaviors (which include knowledge, skills, and abilities) that define a successful PEV
- ◆ Set expectations
- ◆ Align with vision, values, and strategy
- ◆ Drive continuous improvement

22

 Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Team Chairs' Endorsement


<u>Competency</u>	<u>Important/very important</u>
♦ Effective Communicator	98%
♦ Interpersonally skilled	97%
♦ Professional	96%
♦ Organized	94%
♦ Team Oriented	93%
♦ Technically current	92%

23

 Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION

24

 Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Recruitment & Selection

What we heard ...

- ◆ “How do we attract a large enough pool of candidates that will facilitate the selection model that was presented?”
- ◆ “The recruitment process needs to be radically overhauled. The current process is simply resume based. We need more narrative questions and perhaps more detailed letters of recommendation.”
- ◆ “Need strong training of society committees that make selection of PEVs.”

25

 Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Recruitment & Selection Pilot

What we did...

- ◆ Piloted with “live applicants” - ASME
 - ◆ Recruiting e-mails (targeted industry and female candidates)
 - ◆ New competency-based application form
 - ◆ New competency-based reference form
 - ◆ Guide for Selection process
- ◆ Piloted on-line technology with “mock applicants” - IEEE

26


 Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Recruitment & Selection Pilot

Key Findings...

- ◆ Pro-active recruiting
 - ◆ E-mail yielded more applicants and more diversity
- ◆ Application
 - ◆ Applicants put in the time to complete the lengthier application
 - ◆ Applicants agreed to complete additional forms
 - ◆ Open-ended questions yielded more valuable information
 - ◆ References validated or changed selection team decisions

27


 Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Recruitment & Selection Pilot

Key Findings...

- ◆ Selection
 - ◆ Selection Committee meeting is important to the process
 - ◆ Evaluating candidates against selection criteria (i.e. the competencies) improved process
 - ◆ Some applicants that would have been selected in the past were not chosen

28




Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Diversity Stats from Pilot

- ◆ # of Engineering Applications: 37
 - ◆ Female: 13
 - ◆ Industry: 7
 - ◆ Government: 4
- ◆ # of Technology Applications: 14
 - ◆ Female: 2
 - ◆ Industry: 5
 - ◆ Government: 1


29



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

TRAINING

30




Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Training

What we heard...

- ◆ “Need standardized training where PEVs participate in a “mock” visit and are familiar with forms.”
- ◆ “How do we structure training so the necessary attributes and skills are made obvious during training (as a result of the training itself)?”

31




Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Current Training

Society Trainer Perspective...

- ◆ 6-8 hours of “death by PowerPoint”
- ◆ Limited interaction
- ◆ Little opportunity to ensure consistent knowledge of criteria and assessment process among participants
- ◆ No opportunity to demonstrate and assess competencies

32


 Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Training Design Team

What we did...

- ◆ Diverse opinions and debate – lots of “storming”
- ◆ Agreed significant change required
- ◆ “Learn by Doing” format recommended
 - ◆ Pre-Work
 - ◆ Experiential face-to-face
 - ◆ Mentors

33


 Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Prototype Design Team

What we did...

- ◆ Created “straw dog” first week of January
- ◆ Key milestones:
 - ◆ Conduct Beta test June 17-18 in Chicago
 - ◆ Conduct Pilot July 17-18 in Arlington
- ◆ *“Lots of work... we’ll never get it done by June.”*

34




Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Training Pilot

What we did...

- ◆ Pre-Work CD with Checks for Understanding
 - ◆ Mentor Assigned
 - ◆ Self-Study
 - ◆ Complete Pre-visit forms
- ◆ 1.5 days simulating campus visit
 - ◆ Sunday team meeting
 - ◆ Display materials and lab interview
 - ◆ Draft statement homework
 - ◆ Monday night meeting

35




Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Training Pilot

What we did...

- ◆ Role plays
- ◆ Didactic
- ◆ Small group interaction
- ◆ Scenario cards
- ◆ Triads
- ◆ Independent learning

36


 Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Training Pilot

Key Findings...

- ◆ From pilot, 4.5 average rating
- ◆ No participant said they would not attend a day and a half of this training
 - ◆ 3 said, "Yes, only with minor reservations"
 - ◆ 12 out of 15 said, "Absolutely"

37


 Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Training Pilot

Key Findings...

- ◆ "Night and day difference over death by PowerPoint."
- ◆ "Pre-work helped get us ready for the workshop."
- ◆ "Should be 2.5 days."
- ◆ "This is better by orders of magnitude." (Observer)


38



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

EVALUATION

39




Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Evaluation

What we heard...

- ◆ "Evaluation forms should reflect desirable attributes."
- ◆ "Please tell us how to assess against the competencies."
- ◆ "We need guidelines or a formalized process for post-visit PEV evaluation."

40




Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Evaluation Pilot

What we did...

- ◆ Performance Appraisal forms:
 - ◆ Describe how competencies are demonstrated pre-visit and during visit
 - ◆ Provide Performance metrics
 - ◆ Require comments for below “met expectations”
 - ◆ 360-degree feedback
- ◆ Decision framework
 - ◆ Closed loop process

41



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Evaluation Pilot

What we did...

- ◆ Nine institutions
- ◆ Four commissions
- ◆ 10 Team Chairs
- ◆ 2 Co-Chairs
- ◆ 45 PEVs

42

ABET Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Evaluation Pilot

Key Findings...

Competency	# of PEVs rated below 3 by Team Chair	# of PEVs rated below 3 by Peers
Technically Current	7	---
Organized	6	6
Team Oriented	4	8
Interpersonally Skilled	---	4
Effective Communicator	---	3
Overall ¹	6	8

¹ Overall rating of below 3

43

ABET Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Evaluation Pilot

Key Findings...

- ◆ 89% = easy to follow
- ◆ 78% = rating scheme was clear
- ◆ 55% = very likely or likely to improve the skills of PEVs in the future
- ◆ 66% = very likely or likely will improve consistency
- ◆ 67% = helpful to professional development

44



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Where Are We Now?

- ◆ Competency Model approved for inclusion in ABET's Rules of Procedure
- ◆ Design Work; Pilots Completed
- ◆ Performance Appraisal Process approved by Accreditation Council

45



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Recruitment and Selection

<u>What is the same?</u>	<u>What is different?</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ Societies still make decisions re: WHO is recruited & selected & assigned.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ New tools:<ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ On-line competency based application◆ On-line competency based references◆ ABET will assist in Diversity recruiting & provide promo materials

46




Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Training

<p><u>What is the same?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ ABET Commissions oversee curriculum design & training process◆ Member society recruitment for trainers◆ Member Society trains on Program Criteria	<p><u>What is different?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ Simulated visit based on adult learning methods◆ Regional trainings commission specific◆ Train-the-trainer Lead, Support Facilitators selected by Board-appointed Volunteer Training Committee◆ Expanded Mentor Role◆ Observers at Training◆ PEV candidates only
---	--

47




Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Evaluation

<p><u>What is the same?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ On-line form◆ Executive Committees' decision◆ Member society input◆ ABET manages logistics	<p><u>What is different?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ Competency-based◆ 360 ' evaluation◆ Definable rubrics◆ Closed loop process for recognition, remediation, removal
---	--

48



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Where Do We Need to Go? PAVE

- ◆ Determine best implementation strategies together
- ◆ Hear the wisdom in the room
- ◆ Suspend judgment to discover what's possible

49



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Why Do We Need an Implementation Plan?

- ◆ Failure rate is unacceptable
- ◆ Responsive to identified, verified, and confirmed needs
- ◆ Confirms mutual goals –
 - ◆ Be in service
 - ◆ Be prepared
 - ◆ Be acknowledged

50




Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Why Do We Need an Implementation Plan?

Mutual commitment to quality assurance


51



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Questions & Answers

52



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Creating a Framework for Implementation

- ◆ Level 1: Milestones
- ◆ Level 2: Key Action Steps
- ◆ Level 3: Tasks

53



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Milestones

- ◆ Recruitment & Selection
 - ◆ On-line application: Sept. 2006
 - ◆ PEV Selection: Jan-Mar 2007
- ◆ Training
 - ◆ Train-the-Trainer: Jan/Feb 2007
 - ◆ Regional Trainings: April/May 2007
- ◆ Performance Appraisal
 - ◆ 2006-2007 Visit Cycle

54



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Small Group Session #1

- ◆ What will it take to implement in your society?
- ◆ Identify Key Action Steps

55




Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Plenary: Small Group Highlights

- ◆ Key Action Steps: Report Outs
- ◆ Have we missed anything?

56



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Small Group Session #2

- ◆ Connecting the dots
- ◆ Collaborate to begin building the plan
- ◆ Share best practices
- ◆ What's possible?

57



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

What Does the Plan Look Like?

- ◆ Member Society Reports
- ◆ What have we started to build together?
- ◆ What are the next steps?

58



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

Thank You!

George Peterson

59



Copyright © 2006 by ABET, Inc.

APPENDIX

60