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Weakness # 1

Description of Weakness or Concern as written in Visiting Team Report

11.2.1 SLO Assessment Method. [See section 3 of this Report.] Determination of Achievement of Student Learning Outcomes, Part B requires that the program provide a syllabus for each course used to support the Student Learning Outcomes and that syllabi shall include the method of assessment of Course Learning Outcomes among other requirements. Some of the syllabi included the required information but many did not. The Visiting Team acknowledges finding the required information elsewhere in the SLO binders but the requirement that it be included in the syllabi is not met.[See Document 103 Section 3.1.5.3]

Status of Progress: ✔ Alleviated □ In Progress □ Correction Plan With Time Line Attached

First Year Report:

The CSM program will have all its syllabi in compliance with the ACCE standard of providing... "the method of assessment of Course Learning Outcomes" by the Spring 2019 semester. As the Visiting Team noted, they did find this information in the SLO binders, but it was not clearly identified in all course syllabi.

To conform to the standard, the evaluation method used to measure the "Course Outcomes/SLO's" will be in the section of the syllabus titled, "Course Outcomes and Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's)". In this section, the Course Outcomes/SLO's are listed and identified by Program Outcomes and where appropriate, also by SLO number. Under each Course Outcome will be listed the assessment method used, such as exam questions, laboratory activities, writing assignments, group projects, etc. The overall grading method for the course, along with the grading scale are included in the, "Evaluation Section" of the syllabus. This weakness will be resolved in time for the "Second Year Report", since the Visiting Team, acknowledged... "finding the require information elsewhere in the SLO binders".

Second Year Report:

Alleviated: All CSM Program syllabi are in compliance with ACCE standards.

Third Year Report:
Weakness # 2

**Description of Weakness or Concern as written in Visiting Team Report**

11.2.2 QIP & SLO Assessment Results. [See Section 3 of this Report.] Results from the assessment based on student achievement for each Student Learning Outcome needs to be included in the program’s Quality Improvement Plan. While related information was eventually located elsewhere in the provided documentation, it was not included in the QIP. [See ACCE Document 103 Section 3.1.5.3F]

**Status of Progress:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alleviated</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Correction Plan With Time Line Attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**First Year Report:**

The Program is in the process of updating its Quality Improvement Plan to include, "Results from the assessment based on student achievement for each Student Learning Outcome," which the Visiting Team, was able to locate in the provided documentation, but was not able to find in the QIP. In the past, the Program used two to six courses to measure a specific SLO. In the future, the Program will use only one course to measure a specific SLO, with a matrix showing where the SLO was introduced, reinforced and eventually measured for accreditation purposes. The collected information, along with the assessment process and how the information will be used to improve the Program will be included in the revised QIP.

**Second Year Report:**

The Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) is in the process of being rewritten to reflect the current method used to measure each of the 20 ACCE required SLOs. In the past, we had used several courses to measure each of the 20 SLOs. As of the Spring 2019 semester, we are only using one course to measure each SLO. By this time next year, this "weakness" will have been alleviated, with several semesters of data collected, analyzed; with an action plan developed and evaluated to assist in the continuous improvement of the Program.

**Third Year Report:**
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Weakness # 3

Description of Weakness or Concern as written in Visiting Team Report

11.2.3 Inadequate Computer Lab Access. [See Section 6 of this Report.] Physical facilities, such as offices, classrooms, laboratories, and associated equipment, should be available and maintained to adequately support the degree program’s mission, goals, and objectives; to enable students to attain required learning outcomes; and to provide faculty and staff with adequate space. There is inadequate quantity of teaching, research, and laboratory space for faculty and students. There is also inadequate access to laboratory and computer laboratory spaces for students outside of scheduled class times. For example, student use of computer laboratories outside of class time is restricted by the room schedules and building hours. While the new engineering building and the transfer of engineering programs out of the current building will free-up additional space, the net gains will be inadequate for current and projected needs. [See ACCE Document 103 Section 6.1.1]

Status of Progress: □ Alleviated ✓ In Progress □ Correction Plan With Time Line Attached

First Year Report:

The resolution to the weakness identified by the Visiting Team, regarding Physical facilities and equipment is in the process of being rectified, and these changes will be apparent by the time the third-year report is written.

First and foremost, the new Engineering Building (Ingram Hall) partially opened for classes this fall (2018). This move has allowed most of the Engineering faculty and their programs (Electrical, Industrial and Manufacturing) to move to the new facility. However, the building was not 100% finished for the opening of the Fall 2018 semester, but hopefully the move can be completed by the Spring of 2019. Once the move is completed, the renovations to R. F. Mitte building, which houses the CSM programs can begin. These renovations have been in the planning stage for some time and can be implemented as early as the Summer of 2019. A meeting to review the 100% SD Drawings was held in November of 2018. However, as the existing Engineering programs move to Ingram Hall, a new Civil Engineering Program is being created and will be housed in the remodeled R.F. Mitte building along with the CSM Program. This program will allow CSM to share newly created lab spaces in Soils and Materials. In the remodel, the CSM Program will gain additional square footage needed for the growing program. The computer lab issue is one that can be resolved in the next few years as well.

The new Engineering Building houses the Collaborative Learning Center (CLC), which students can use for STEM tutoring. In addition, the CLC lab also has 32 Engineering Workstation Computers, with CSM specific software installed, which students can use during normal hours of operation. Also, the library is being remodeled and will include “Learning Centers” which will include computers with appropriate CSM software installed.

Second Year Report:

Improvements to the RF Mitte Building are scheduled to begin in December 2019 after a year of planning. By the end of our third report, most, if not all, of the facility problems should be resolved. Highlights of the remodel include the following.

1) Developing a new construction lab, which will be relocated from the currently shared lab with the Concrete Industry Management and Civil Engineering programs. It will include more “clear” work space for building construction mockups, a dust collect system and expanded storage.

2) Increasing the current number of computers in the 4236 computer lab from 24 to 40.

3) Creating a VDC lab with open lab times and additional computers.

4) Developing a new soils lab to be shared with the newly established Civil Engineering program.

Third Year Report:

Rev. 22-Jan-19
Weakness # 4

Description of Weakness or Concern as written in Visiting Team Report

11.2.4 Public Disclosure of Assessment Information. [See Section 8 of this Report.] Institutions are required to broadly and accurately publish the objectives of the degree program, admission requirements, degree program assessment measures employed, the information obtained through these assessment measures and actions taken as a result of the feedback, student achievement, the rate and types of employment of graduates, and any data supporting the qualitative claims made by the degree program. The Visiting Team was not able to find the degree program assessment measures employed, the information obtained through these assessment measures and actions taken as a result of the feedback on the website. [See ACCE Document 103 Section 8.1.5.1]

Status of Progress: □ Alleviated ✔ In Progress □ Correction Plan With Time Line Attached

First Year Report:

The CSM Program's, "Public Disclosure of Assessment information is found in the Department of Engineering Technology's website (www.txstate.edu/technology/). Currently, the CSM portion of the website is undergoing a major update, which was delayed by the retirement of the Department's website Administrator. By the time the second-year report is due, the information the Visiting Team noted they were unable to find, will be posted.

Second Year Report:

The CSM Program's website is undergoing a major overhaul, and the task should be completed by the end of the Spring 2020 semester, which is a semester later than reported in our first year's progress report. In addition to improving the website, the section on "Public Disclosure of Assessment Information" will include a summary of comments made during the "Senior Exit Interviews". The website will also become more interactive with an increased number of graphics to target students that are considering a construction major. The site will use communication formats geared to the younger generation.

Third Year Report:

Rev. 22-Jan-19
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Concern # 1

Description of Weakness or Concern as written in Visiting Team Report

11.3.1 Leadership Transition. [See Section 2 of this Report.] The degree program or educational unit needs to be headed by a qualified administrator. The Visiting Team acknowledges the value of the decades of service that the senior faculty have contributed to the Department and the program and encourages the Department and the CSM Program to make sure the quality of the program's leadership is maintained through any possible transition. [See ACCE Document 103 Section 2.1.2.2]

Status of Progress: □ Alleviated ✓ In Progress □ Correction Plan With Time Line Attached

First Year Report:

Both the Engineering Technology Department and the CSM Program are aware that decades of experience and institutional memory will be leaving the department as both the current Department chair, Dr. Andy Batey and the CSM Program Director, Dr. Winek prepare for retirement. Dr. Batey has announced that he is retiring January 31st, 2019 and currently, the Department is seeking a possible internal candidate. If none is found, a national search will be conducted. Dr. Winek has pledged to announce his retirement at least a year in advance. Depending on the situation at the time, he is willing to stay on as a CSM Faculty member in a teaching and advisory role for up to another year. Currently, he is training and familiarizing Dr. Smith with the duties associated with the role of CSM Program Director, should it become necessary for him to serve as Interim CSM Program Director. The CSM Program Faculty is maturing, making the transition process less disrupting. Dr. Lee will be applying for "Full" professor this year and has been with the program for nine (9) years. Dr. Talley is applying for both tenure and Associate Professor and has been with the Program for seven (7) years.

In conclusion, both the Department Chair and CSM Program Director are implementing strategies that will maintain quality leadership as the two administrators with decades of experience, depart.

Second Year Report:

The leadership transition is now underway that includes modifications to the first year report based on changes that have taken place since its writing. First, Dr. Batey retired at the end of January 2019. Dr. Jim Wilde assumed the position. He was promoted from Program Coordinator of the Concrete Industry Management Program and is familiar with both the Construction Program and Departmental operations. Dr. Winek announced he is stepping down as the CSM Program Coordinator next year but will remain a CSM faculty member for at least the next academic year. He has been working with Dr. Spencer, a ten-year veteran of the Program to replace him. She was unanimously recommended by the Senior Faculty to assume the position for three (3) years. This position is renewable annually after the initial appointment. Adding more stability to the program, Dr. Lee was promoted to "Professor" and is heading up our proposed Masters Degree in Construction Management. Also, Dr. Talley was tenured, promoted to Associate Professor and is now assuming more significant service work within the Program.

Third Year Report:

Rev. 22-Jun-19
Concern # 2

Description of Weakness or Concern as written in Visiting Team Report

11.3.2 Size of Construction Faculty. [See Section 4 of this Report.] The size of the faculty needs to be commensurate with the number of courses offered, the number of students, and the other responsibilities of the faculty. If the program's growth continues, the number of faculty in the program will be insufficient. [See ACCE Document 103 Section 4.1.2.1]

Status of Progress: □ Alleviated ✔ In Progress □ Correction Plan With Time Line Attached

First Year Report:

Balancing the size of the faculty in relationship to the number of CSM students has been a challenge, because of the rapid growth of the number of students entering the program. To deal with this situation, 3 measures have been instituted or will be instituted to maintain a proper balance between the number of students in the Program and faculty, which CSM does not want to exceed a 50:1 ratio.

First, we have set a maximum enrollment of 640 students. The Program is currently at 533 students, which is a 4% gain over last year. This could indicate the Program is beginning to plateau. To control enrollment, we already have in place, "Pre-Construction," which requires all potential CSM students to complete a 30-hour sequence of courses, receiving a "C" grade or better in each of the courses and a 2.5 GPA overall in those 30 hours. When completed, the student makes application to become a "Full" major. These applications are reviewed by the CSM Faculty and if approved, the student is moved to "Full" major status and allowed to take upper-level CSM courses. Where the number of students attempting to enter the "Full" major becomes excessive, the Pre-Construction GPA will be adjusted to control the number of students entering the major to match the number of Faculty and facility capacity.

Second, the Program is beginning to offer appropriate courses for on-line delivery. This reduces the strain on our physical facilities and improves the efficiency of our CSM Faculty.

Third, we are adjusting the number of lectures (4 course instructors) and per course faculty, to help teach additional CSM courses, necessary to maintain a proper student to faculty ratio. The CSM faculty realizes that balancing faculty size to be commensurate with the number of students, will always be a challenge. However, now that it appears program growth is either slowing or plateauing, this situation may be stabilizing.

Second Year Report:

We continue to work towards "right sizing" the faculty to deal with the increasing CSM enrollments, which are rapidly approaching the planned cap of 640 majors. Last year (Fall, 2018) the program was at 533 majors; and this year, (Fall, 2019) the enrollment grew to 560 students. To ultimately control enrollment and maintain the quality of the Program, we will select the top 160 students as determined by GPA to matriculate from the Pre-Construction major to the Full Construction major. This year we are hiring two new tenure track faculty to begin employment during the 2020/2021 Academic Year. They will help with both undergraduate instruction and implementing our new Construction Management Masters Program. This will bring the CSM Faculty to 13, including five (5) tenure/tenure track Faculty, three (3) Professors of Practice, two (2) Senior Lecturers, three (3) Temporary Full-Time Lecturers and the one (1) additional Full-Time Teaching Equivalent (FTE) from a combination of adjunct faculty. This will place the student to faculty ratio at 40:1 as of Fall 2020, which is the target for the program.

Third Year Report:
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Concern

# 3

Description of Weakness or Concern as written in Visiting Team Report

11.3.3 Faculty Compensation. [See Section 4 of this Report.] Faculty compensation shall be competitive with comparable positions within the institution to ensure that quality faculty and high morale exist. Salary data that was made available to the Visiting Team indicates that CSM faculty salaries are consistently and significantly lower than their peers in the Ingram School of Engineering and the Department of Engineering Technology. The Visiting Team is concerned the CSM Program will not have the ability to attract and retain qualified faculty to meet its growing needs. [See ACCE Document 103 Section 4.1.5]

Status of Progress: □ Alleviated ✓ In Progress □ Correction Plan With Time Line Attached

First Year Report:

The university uses the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA), Faculty Salary Study to set faculty salaries at discipline specific national median salary points by faculty rank. Furthermore, Texas State determines disciplines by using the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP), which is the federal system used to both define and distinguish between different fields of study.

The CIP code used for the Department of Engineering Technology and its three (3) Programs, including Construction Science and Management is 15. The CIP code used for the Ingram School of Engineering, which the salary comparison was based, is 14. Based on CUPA data, these CIP codes are associated with different salary levels, with Faculty in Engineering Programs earning more than Faculty in Engineering Technology Programs, which is consistent across the CUPA comparison set. Therefore, the Construction Science and Management Program cannot be instrumental in changing either the CUPA median salary or the CIP classification for the program.

Second Year Report:

The CSM Program is required to work within the salary guidelines and limitations set by the University and the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) salary guidelines, which the administration uses to establish salaries in different disciplines. However, what we as a Program can do to raise salaries is help faculty work towards promotion, which carries with it a 7% raise; help them properly prepare their paperwork for annual merit raises (when funds are available); and bring new hires in at the highest starting salaries possible, based on the CUPA median salary and marketability.

Marketability adjustments allow the Department to start a faculty member at a higher salary than the CUPA median salary if it can be justified.

The good news is that two of our CSM Professors were promoted this past year. Also, this year there was a maximum 3% merit raise for the 2019/2020 year for all University faculty.

Third Year Report:

Rev. 22-Jun-19