

NAIT Board of Certification  
Meeting Minutes: November 16, 2005  
St. Louis, MO

Present:

1. Dr. Dennis Field (Chair)
2. Mr. Mark Durivage (CCTI Division, Region 3)
3. Dr. Richard Phillips (CCTI Division, Region 5)
4. Mr. Stephen Dunn (Industry Division, Region 3)
5. Mr. Ed Christy (Industry Division, Region 5)
6. Mr. Sergio Sgro (Student Division)
7. Dr. James Smallwood (University Division, Region 3)
8. Dr. Mark Miller (Lay Public Representative)
9. Dr. Dru Wilson (Lay Public Representative)
10. Mr. Dave Monforton (Certification Officer)
11. Mr. Rick Coscarelli (guest)
12. Dr. Linda Nelson (guest, elected University Division, Region 6 with term starting in 2006)

Absent:

1. Dr. Nicholas Akinkuoye (CCTI Representative, Region 4)
2. Dr. Feng-Chang Roger Chang (Industry Division)
3. Dr. Farzin Heidari (University Division, Region 4)
4. Dr. LaVerne Harris (University Division, Region 5)

Welcoming Remarks:

The meeting was called to order at 1:10 p.m.

Minutes of the Previous Meeting:

**Motion by Phillips: *Approve the minutes of the Board of Certification meeting from Louisville, Kentucky on October 20, 2004. Seconded by Miller. Motion carried.***

Unfinished Business:

1. Question regarding a requirement that students take the certification exam to graduate.
  - Field reported that some NAIT programs have exit exam requirements for graduation, but such a requirement at the discretion of the program. We would like to see more programs using the NAIT exam, and there is potential for its use, but further work needs to be done to broaden the exam's appeal to additional programs. Field handed out copies of the certification news release featured in the IT Insider (Fall 2005, volume 7, number 2) to Board members, and provided information about the updated exam released in spring 2005. The release outlined progress regarding efforts to better define the exam content and add additional content area to the exam. The goal was to first get a better sense of how well the original exam reflected accreditation requirements with respect to curriculum, and then add in some questions in content areas—general education and mathematics, for example—known to be missing from the original exam. The news release is attached.
  - Nelson asked for some information about the cost and purpose of the exam. The information was provided.
2. Discussion regarding the impact of the certification fee increase and the change in the PASS requirement (shift from a requirement to pass each subsection to one requiring only a minimum score for the total test)
  - Field reported on a conversation with Coscarelli: It is too early to tell if there is any impact from the fee increase. There was a spike in certification applications (420), but the spike was attributed to people requesting certification prior to implementation of the exam only requirement.
  - The pass rate for the updated exam is slightly higher than for the original exam; however, the total test score required to pass was set to yield a slightly higher pass rate.
3. Field reported that the Central NAIT Office is very interested in moving forward with efforts to put the certification exam online. There is a concern that we are missing significant opportunities to market certification to students as a result of the turn-around time associated with exam scoring.
  - Field noted that beta-testing an online administration of the exam was included in the three-year goals set last year, and that the exam had been made available online for Board of Certification members several years ago.

- Both Phillips and Wilson offered to investigate having their institutions host an exam site via Blackboard or WebCT. Coscarelli indicated that the Central Office was investigating options and issues related to putting the exam online, but that he was not in favor of having individual institutions hosting the site since continuity was an issue.
  - Coscarelli brought up the issue of how to increase demand for certification. The Central Office would like to put the exam online so that we can get demographic information, score the exam, and present the examinee with certification options immediately.
  - As part of the discussion related to increasing demand for certification, Coscarelli reported on talks with Caterpillar about their ThinkBIG and ThinkBIGGER programs. They may be interested in incorporating NAIT certification in some manner in these programs.
4. Smallwood asked Coscarelli about the possibility of international accreditation and certification. Coscarelli indicated that NAIT is involved in some preliminary discussions with at least one international organizations interested in accreditation issues. The primary concern revolves around teams that would be assigned to do the on-site visits.
  5. Coscarelli was asked why the exam study guide was not posted on the NAIT website. He deferred the question to Monforton. Monforton explained that he sends the study guide out when requested. This process allows him to track requests and follow up later to see if recipient wants to follow through with the certification exam process. The Board offered an alternative solution to the current process, an auto-reply with the study guide as an attachment to any e-mail requesting the document. **Motion by Miller: Move that the NAIT Central Office set up an auto-reply e-mail system to deliver the study guide. Seconded. Motion carried.**
  6. Reviewed progress on the list of three-year goals, action items, and milestones list.
    - 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.
      - ***Thirteen institutions have completed administration of the updated exam, however only eight had more than five examinees during the initial administration.***
    - Increase by at least 10%, the number of certified individuals.
      - ***The Central Office reported 376 certified individuals for 2003-2004 and 420 certified examinees currently—an 11.7% increase. However, this is a one-time spike due to individuals requesting certification prior to the requirement that everyone must pass the exam to be eligible for certification, rather than a general upturn in the numbers.***
    - 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.
      - ***Complete***
    - 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.
      - ***Behind schedule—content area experts have not yet been identified.***
    - Generating two specialty exams complete through pretest activities—one in Drafting/CAD, and the other in Manufacturing Technology.
      - ***The number of specialty exams has been increased to five since individuals have volunteered (or agreed) to head up the additional three efforts to generate at least 100 questions in each content area. Assignments are as follows:***
        - ***Manufacturing Technology: Mark Miller and Steve Dunn***
        - ***Drafting/CAD: An individual has been suggested, but must be notified and agree to serve***
        - ***Electronics: Julio Garcia and Mohan Kim (San Jose State University)***
        - ***Transportation: Mark Durivage***
        - ***Graphic Design: Linda Nelson***
    - Complete a manual addressing policy development for the Board of Certification, including sections on question review/replacement and policy updates.
      - ***Field assignment***
    - 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.

- *Mark Miller has moved to University of Texas at Tyler, so TAMU-Kingsville may or may not be an option here. In any case, other programs have indicated an interest in serving as beta sites, so this is not expected to be an issue.*

New Business:

1. None

Adjournment:

**Motion by Miller: *Move to adjourn.* Seconded by Dunn. Motion carried.**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:20 p.m.