

NAIT Board of Certification
Meeting Minutes: October 20, 2004
Louisville, Kentucky

Present:

1. Dr. Dennis Field (Chair)
2. Mr. Ed Christy (former Industry Representative)
3. Dr. Farzin Heidari (University Representative)
4. Dr. Mark Miller (Lay Public Representative)
5. Mr. Dave Monforton (Certification Officer)
6. James Ejiwale substituting for Dr. Ivan Mosley, Sr. (Student Division Representative)
7. Dr. Richard Phillips (CCTI Representative)
8. Dr. James Smallwood (University Representative)
9. Mr. Rick Coscarelli (guest)
10. Dr. Sheila Rowe (guest)

Absent:

1. Dr. Nicholas Akinkuoye (CCTI Representative)
2. Dr. Feng-Chang Roger Chang (Industry Division)
3. Dr. Raj Desai (University Representative)
4. Mr. Mark Durivage (CCTI Representative)
5. Mr. John Denny (Industry Division)
6. Mr. Stephen Dunn (Industry Division)
7. Dr. Dru Wilson (Lay Public Representative)

Welcoming Remarks:

The meeting was called to order at 1:15 p.m.

Minutes of the Previous Meeting:

Motion by Phillips: Approve the minutes of the Board of Certification meeting from Nashville, Tennessee on November 19, 2003. Seconded. Motion carried.

Unfinished Business:

1. Discussion regarding the automatic certification eligibility of graduates and faculty from NAIT accredited programs undertaken at the suggestion of the NAIT Executive Committee.
 - Phillips reported that based on his discussions, eliminating the automatic eligibility for certification upon graduation from a NAIT-accredited program was not a big deal to CCTI stakeholders.
 - Miller reported that people with whom he spoke felt it would have more value if eligibility were not automatic. He also stated that the response to the question of automatic certification eligibility was not overwhelming.
 - Field noted a similar experience—very limited response. [While not part of the Board discussion, I think it is important to note that I did receive an e-mail from Charles Patrick of Morehead State University expressing reservations about the validity of the exam and its “use to judge both the applicant as well as the program from which the applicant graduated.” This e-mail and a subsequent discussion at the NAIT Business Meeting on October 23rd with Drs. Patrick and Zagari of Morehead State generated some additional investigative actions by the Board.]
 - Miller stated he felt we were on the right track and that we should go forward with the removal of automatic certification eligibility of graduates and faculty from NAIT accredited programs. As a motion to this effect had already been passed at the last Board meeting, no action other than providing a specific date for implementation was required. January 1, 2005 was set as the implementation date.
2. Core exam content (based on NAIT Accreditation criteria) versus specialty exams (based on program options and tracks).
 - At the last Board meeting, there was an action item assigned for Phillips to survey other CCTI stakeholders about appropriate certification exam content. There did not seem to be much concern about the exam content. (Later in the meeting, Phillips noted that these programs felt that they already had specific specialty exams available and in use to complement a general NAIT exam).

3. Exam cut score.
 - There was a motion during the last Board meeting to change the requirement that a minimum score must be achieved in each of the four subsections, to a requirement that a minimum score must be achieved on the entire exam. The primary reason offered for this motion was that many programs do not require their students to take coursework in one of the subsections, for example safety, which puts those students at a disadvantage. The motion carried during the last meeting, however, based on the psychometric properties report for the current exam, it was decided to first remove marginal items before settling on a cut score. **Motion by Miller: *Authorize Field to remove marginal items (approximately five per subsection) at his discretion before deciding on a cut score based on the remaining items.* Seconded. Motion carried.**
4. There was discussion on a variety of related topics with Monforton and Coscarelli, including:
 - Marketing NAIT certification to students
 - Miller suggested that a notification be put on-line that even after passing the exam, the individual is not a CIT until the fee has been paid.
 - Phillips recommended that registration information be added to the exam to ensure that examinees receive information about the process.
 - Monforton thought we might get more members if those that take the exam get reminded about following through with the certification process. He noted that people that stay in as NAIT members are those that are certified members, and raised the question as to how we can best track individuals.
 - Miller indicated that most students have graduated and are gone by the time the schools receive the scores, making it difficult to follow up with them.
 - Field noted that one potential solution to this problem is to put the exam on-line with immediate feedback on the scores. Miller volunteered to beta test an on-line administration of the exam.
 - Phillips asked if individuals have to be from accredited schools to take the exam. Monforton replied that they did not have to be from accredited schools. It would be a conflict of interest to enact that requirement.
 - Accreditation doesn't, and shouldn't, link to pass/fail rates.
 - The suggestion was made that students be asked to fill out contact information, so that the NAIT Central Office can follow up with them regarding membership and certification.
 - It was also noted that perhaps we may be able to generate some industry interest and knowledge about certification—thereby indirectly stimulating student interest—by preparing a one-page overview of NAIT certification to be handed out to individuals in Human Resource departments at specific businesses.
 - Generating a marketing list for graduate schools
 - How do we request permission to pass student contact information on to graduate school?
 - Add a question to the exam: Are you interested in graduate school?
 - Monforton indicated that he would write a question to allow the release of information to graduate schools.
 - Monforton stated that he doesn't always know who has graduate programs. It is sometimes happenstance that he finds out.
 - **Motion by Miller: *Change the scored portion of the exam to 140 items. Develop a total cut score utilizing passing rate information based on the 140 items. Add a question to the exam regarding interest in graduate school.* Seconded. Motion carried.**
5. Field asked if the NAIT Central Office is able to track certification numbers to monitor any big swings in those numbers as a result of the policy change. Monforton indicated they are able to track those numbers.
6. Coscarelli discussed the findings of the NAIT Central Office regarding the fee structure of the exam and certification process (see attachment). He asked the Board of Certification to consider a periodic review of the fee structure, perhaps every three years for needed updates. Miller noted that the fees haven't changed much. **Motion by Miller: *Implement the certification fee schedule based on information provided by the NAIT Central Office.* Seconded. Motion carried.**
7. Field reported on the preliminary results of the bias study (Note: These data included the 20 questions that are to be removed). Essentially, although there was evidence of both gender and ethnic bias in a number of the questions, the bias was relatively balanced on both sides; i.e., approximately equal numbers of questions were biased in favor of males and in favor of females. The same was true of ethnicity. There was no evidence of pervasive bias throughout the exam in favor of one gender or ethnic group.

8. Miller reported on his survey of Industrial Technology Department Chairs. Miller, Heidari, and Marsh detail the format and results of this survey in their NAIT 2004 conference selected paper. Essentially, with almost half of the institutions that house NAIT accredited programs reporting, they found that the current exam does not address many of the content areas that the programs would like to see on the exam. Further, a majority of the respondents indicated that they would prefer to have the exam split into two parts, a general exam and one of a number of specialty option exams.
9. Finally, a list of three-year goals, action items, and milestones list was generated.
 - Increase to at least 25, the number of programs using the exam ***routinely*** as an assessment tool. Routinely means that the exam has been administered multiple times to at least five examinees at a time, with plans to continue using the exam as evidenced by a satisfaction survey.
 - Increase by at least 10%, the number of certified individuals.
 - Complete and make available a hardcopy study guide that includes lists of reference books, content coverage, at least 10 sample exam questions in each content area, and a discussion of the types of things that successful examinees are expected to know.
 - Double the number of items in the item bank. Sub-goals involve identifying content area experts within one year who are willing to assist the Board; increasing the item bank by 40 items within two years; and increasing the item bank by 160 items within three years.
 - Generating two specialty exams complete through pretest activities—one in Drafting/CAD, and the other in Manufacturing Technology.
 - Complete a manual addressing policy development for the Board of Certification, including sections on question review/replacement and policy updates.
 - Beta test on-line examination administration with at least one NAIT program. Texas A&M-Kingsville has volunteered to serve as the first beta site.

New Business:

1. None

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:25 p.m.