



INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY CONSORTIUM COMMITTEE (IFCC)

AVIATION MAINTENANCE TECHNOLOGY MEETING MINUTES

Date: Thursday, March 24, 2022

Time: 10:00 am

Location: WebEx

Meeting Facilitator: Jon Byrd, GNTC & TCSG State Aviation Program Advisor

Recorder: Jon Byrd

Attendees: Steve Conway (TCSG), Jon Byrd (GNTC & TCSG), Joey Turner (Augusta Tech), Clarence Willis (Atlanta Tech), Michael Engel, Shane Waldon, & Daniel Whitehead (Central Georgia Tech), Marcy Smith & Alan Biercewicz (Chattahoochee Tech), Elizabeth Anderson (GNTC), Tal Loos (Savannah Tech), David Kuipers & Victoria Herron (South Georgia Tech); Observing Guest/Non-Voting – Martin Keyhayes (Middle Georgia State University)

WELCOME AND CALL TO ORDER:

Jon Byrd welcomed everyone to the meeting, and with help from Steve Conway, noted attendees and colleges represented. Jon then briefed on highlights of the upcoming Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 147 rule change set forth by U.S. Congress, including the “light switch” implementation approach each Aviation Maintenance Technician School (AMTS) and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is facing within the 120-day timeline once the rule change is published in the Federal Register

DISCUSSION:

Alan Biercewicz asked Jon if, once the new curriculum is implemented, will current students that have successfully completed AVMT courses prior to the rule change would be required to take them over. Jon’s answer, per the FAA Interim Rule Change (IFR) was no, but we should keep that in mind when adjusting the new course standard drafts that Tal has proposed. Joey Turner then asked Jon about additions to the Powerplant curriculum per the ACS that are not currently in our course standards and if we would have to go back and teach those students those Knowledge/Risk/Skills (K/R/S), or would the credit hours still stand for those students, and the answer is two-fold – current students have until 31 July 2023 to test under the current FAA Practical Test Standards (PTS) which would not include those ACS K/R/S components; However, each AMTS could start addressing and introducing those components to their existing students if they choose to do so. Clarence Willis then asked about how the new rule will affect them since they are currently pursuing the Powerplant Rating add-on to their Air Agency Certificate. Jon answered based on what is interpreted from the IFR. Atlanta Tech and Chattahoochee Tech would both be affected since they are pursuing FAA certification.

Jon then turned it over to Tal to highlight the proposed course standards he created last year (02Mar2021), and recently revised, to align with the new, pending FAA Airmen Certification Standards (ACS) that each Aviation Maintenance Technician School (AMTS) must align their new curriculum and operations to for certification. Tal started off making sure we all understood that what he created is a starting point and we should look at each standard during a future meeting and adjust as we all decide following discussion. He mentions that each college could build their projects to meet the ACS, even though each college that we do not write the course standards verbatim to the ACS components. He also stated that we currently have odd credit hours, and based on the current TCSG formulas, he adjusted the class times to help make the credit hours even. He mentioned that in the previous/current rule, our 1910/1935 hours includes "dead time," so he adjusted the proposed standards based on that, and did away with the Lab 3 hours which could create the odd credit hours. He also mentioned that if the FAA changes any components in the ACS, as long as it is not a major change, the course standard revision to align with the federal change should not be an issue.

Jon then brought up a concern about creating our course standards could limit those colleges that would like to still have lab hours, if there are no lab hours created in those standards in KMS. Steve suggested that we could continue with AVMT course options so colleges could choose one or the other if they wanted to offer lab hours (ex. Current AVMT2010, 2011). Jon then suggested we have an in-person meeting soon to involve industry to fine-tune our course standards. Tal responded and agreed, and made sure we all understood that the standards he has submitted have met the high-level components set forth by the FAA ACS. Tal then mentioned that we can go ahead and build the standards in KMS and let them sit there until we are ready. This would help with the timeline. Victoria Herron then mentioned, as an example, AVMT2210 and AVMT2220, she is concerned that we are removing too many hours and they would like to keep the existing hours. Tal then pointed out that the hours in those competencies did decrease, but the credit hours have increased overall, and that this is a standard that we all can fine-tune and get to the level we all want it to be by increasing the hours if need be. Victoria followed up that we should keep the quality of instruction we deliver to our students should be a top priority and that she agrees on an in-person meeting soon. Tal then responded that his proposed standards are not set in stone and agrees that we should meet in person soon to discuss and fine-tune. Steve Conway then described the challenges programs like AVMT face with the Lab 3 hours currently showing in courses. He encouraged us to really think about moving the current Lab 3 hours to Lecture or Lab 2 while not letting course credits creep up too much. There is a balancing act with these types of course revisions. He commended Tal on the work he has done so far on creating the new proposed standards to meet the FAA ACS and accommodate the TCSG Lecture, Lab 2, and Lab 3 credit hours formulas. Steve then mentioned that Tal's comments of building the KMS standards and letting them sit there is a good idea due to the tight timeline we are up against once the rule revision is published in the U.S. Federal Register. Steve finally mentioned that the in-person meeting in the Boardroom at TCSG can accommodate WebEx participants for those that cannot make the meeting, or prefer to not meet in person. Tal then followed up that since the FAA will soon no longer mandate hours, revisions would be simpler and the IFCC could meet more often to discuss and adjust the course standards as the group sees fit. Alan Biercewicz asked Tal if the reduction of instructional hours in his proposed standards means our six-term program can now be offered in only five semesters. Steve Conway addressed the question by explaining student load (credit hours) vs. instructor load (contact hours). Tal replied that he stills see it as a six-term program, but the class times can be less during the day freeing up instructors' time. Jon then asked Steve Conway about how long it will take to build the courses in KMS, and then about Program Outcomes and Occupational Analysis. Steve replied that the time could vary based on how many existing courses he could copy and edit versus than building an entire new course altogether. He also stated the Program Outcomes and Occupational Analysis deal

with Program Standards and we would address those as part of the last/final steps. Jon then mentioned that we would wait to hear from Steve on when those courses would be completed in KMS before we schedule the in-person meeting. Steve then responded that he and Tal would talk tomorrow (25Mar2022) and he would have a better idea on a completion date after his conversation with Tal. Tal mentioned to Steve that he could help build those courses in KMS. Mike Engel then mentioned concerns they learned through recertification dealing with inconsistencies with FAA inspectors. He then mentioned the Lab 3 hours should still be considered in the new standards for hands-on projects. He then offered CGTC as a central location we could meet for the in-person meeting. Elizabeth Anderson then asked Steve if Lab 3 hours would need to be completely eliminated. Steve responded that it is a good idea that we have “good reasoning” for keeping any Lab 3 hours in courses. Mike Engel then added that he advocates Lab 3 hours for quality of instruction concerns.

Tal then volunteered the TCSG credit formula ratios for our consideration – 1 credit hour is equal to 15 hours of lecture, or 30 hours of Lab 2, or 45 hours of Lab 3.

Joey Turner then mentioned the “money factor” about the new rule change (equipment, materials, etc.). Jon then mentioned the approved \$2.5m recently in the State of Georgia budget that would be divvied out to the colleges with the Aviation Maintenance Technology program., and encouraged everyone to dig into the ACS to make sure we obtain the equipment necessary to meet the minimums set forth the ACS. Mike Engel mentioned that he hopes the money allocated would differ to each college based on enrolled students and number of cohorts.

CONCLUSION AND ACTION ITEMS:

Jon will follow up with Steve Conway on the completion of the KMS standards and we will then move forward with scheduling the in-person meeting location and date.

Meeting Adjourned: 11:15 am

Minutes Submitted By: Jon Byrd