|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **18/19 Program Assessment Report BASELINE YEAR** | | | | | | |
|  | Use computer-aided drafting or design tools to prepare graphical representations of electromechanical systems. | Use circuit analysis, analog and digital electronics, basic instrumentation, and computers to aid in the characterization, analysis, and troubleshooting of electromechanical systems | Use statics, dynamics (or applied mechanics), strength of materials, engineering materials, engineering standards, and manufacturing processes to aid in the characterization, analysis, troubleshooting of electromechanical systems. |  |  |
| **Course**: ENRD 2150  **Assessment**: Final Exam  **Benchmark: Grade of C or better**  **Faculty** Jim Bevington/M. Hanning | 1 Section Fa2018: N=11. 9 out of 11 met benchmark. 1 Section Sp2019: N=60. 54 out of 60 met benchmark. Overall 89% met the benchmark. |  |  |  | Overall 89% of students meant the benchmark indicating a good understanding of the principals of modeling software. This assessment is a good indicator for mechanical design software. In DC Circuits students do at least one lab examination on Multisim which assesses electrical competency? In Fa 2019 they did a lab midterm on Multisim. Perhaps this should be added looking for C or better. |
| **Course**: ELET 2450  **Assessment**: Motor Control Lab/Assignment  **Benchmark: Grade of C or better**  **Faculty** Jonathan DeWitt |  | 2 Sections Sp 2019 (CN1, CN2) CN1: N=11. 6 out of 11 (55%) met benchmark.  CN2: N=17. 15 out of 17 (88%) met benchmark. |  |  | This was assessed in a motor control lab/project within the Electronics course where the students will model the motor system in Multisim and then physically build the circuit to complete the lab comparing measured values against modeled Multisim values. The data was a little misleading for the CN1 section. The lab was done in two parts each being 10 points. So in order to meet the benchmark students had to attempt both parts. Out of the students in the first section who attempted both parts 6 out of 6 met the benchmark. The remaining 5 students either only attempted 1 part or no parts. In the second section of those who attempted both parts 15 out of 15 met the benchmark. This shows a firm grasp of the material for those students who attempted the whole assignment. Some students who were about to graduate decided they simply didn’t need the points these lab projects gave for their final grade. |
| **Course**: MECT2440  **Assessment**: Final Exam  **Benchmark: Grade of C or better**  **Faculty** Mike Beebe |  |  | 1 Section Fa2018. N=49. 43 out of 49 (88%) met benchmark. |  | Overall 88% of students achieved the benchmark indicating a good grasp of the fundamentals of design. |

**Reflection question to help you write your comment narrative and choose your benchmarks**

**BASIC PARAMTERS:**

* Your benchmarks should coincide with benchmarks for any external agency you need to report to. DO NOT do double work.
* This first year we are only using two variables- your benchmark and % of students that met the benchmark. If you prefer your benchmark as a number (74% or higher vs. C or higher) obviously you are free to do that. Again, ESPECIALLY if your external accreditor has that benchmark.
* Each faculty member should assess at least one program outcome.
* First year of this you can use 1 assignment in 1 class to measure the outcome if you are allowed to do that from your accrediting agency.
* Subsequent years you will want to use the same assignment across multiple sections to get your numbers up to a data reliable level.

**REFLECTION QUESTIONS: These are only given to help you to reflect, not for you to answer necessarily.**

1. Does my accreditor need different benchmark numbers? SEE parameters above ☺
2. Is there anything unusual about this batch of students I used for the assessment? Example given above \* for PSYC 2010 was actually experienced by a faculty member. Most of the students in a particular human growth and development section on quarters had taken the A & P sequence. It was a fluke; the success rates for the class were through the roof.
3. Do I see a trend on this particular outcome from the previous year? (this is assumed this form will be used in subsequent years)
4. In relation to question above - what did I do differently this year?
5. Is this an introduction class to our program- does that have any impact on success rates?
6. Was the sample size too small? Was it a bad night and all the good students stayed home? (Probably not, but this type of creative brainstorming actually helps us to see patterns that are right in front of our faces that we discount because of their simplicity.