

Program Assessment Report

15/16 Program Assessment Report					BASELINE YEAR
	Demonstrate the use of computer aided engineering design, using 2D & 3D drawings, sketching and solid modeling.	Properly select materials based on their physical properties	Properly select machine elements using analysis of stresses and properties for structures, frames, beams and columns.	Demonstrate an understanding of fluid mechanics.	Comments
Course MECT1150 Assessment Final Exam Benchmark Grade of C or better Faculty Ken Ekegren	44% of students met benchmark 16 students				This "Final" included the final project and final written exam. Only one did not meet the benchmark on the project, but only 30% met the benchmark on the written portion. This indicates a need to reallocate time to the fundamentals of orthographics and less on 3D modeling software.
Course: MECT2230 Assessment: Final Exam Benchmark: Grade of C or better Faculty Ken Ekegren		74% of students met benchmark 43 students			This was the last time that Test 3 was used exclusively. The final will be changed to be a two part test, assessing both the general knowledge and the lab portion. This will give a better overview of the student's knowledge.
Course: MECT2440 Assessment: Final Exam Benchmark: Grade of C or better Faculty: Ken Ekegren			86% of students met benchmark 30 students		Reasonable assessment tool. Larger number of students gave a more believable response this year.
Course: MECT1750 Assessment: Lab Report Benchmark: Grade C or better Faculty: Ken Ekegren				100% of students met benchmark 37 students	The final lab report is probably not the best indicator, as it appears to have been a pass/fail type of grading. Perhaps assessment using the second midterm would be a better indicator.

--	--	--	--	--	--

15/16 Program Assessment Report					BASELINE YEAR
	Demonstrate basic understanding of industrial electricity applied to power, circuits and programmable controllers	Work in teams to apply critical thinking skills and engineering concepts to complete real world projects.	Apply computer programming that generates code to operate robotic equipment.		Comments
Course ELET1710 Assessment Final Exam Benchmark Grade of C or higher Faculty Randy Storms			90% of students met benchmark 11 students		One student did not take the final. The rest passed with high marks. Assessing the midterm may be a better indicator to manage continuous improvement.
Course: ELET2240 Assessment: Final Exam Benchmark: Grade of C or better Faculty Randy Storms	47% of students met benchmark 19 students				I changed the assessment to Final Exam after being informed that this class does not include a final project.
Course: MECT2910 Assessment: Final Presentation Benchmark: Grade of B or better		100% of students met benchmark			

Faculty: Ken Ekegren		25 students			
Course: Assessment: Benchmark Faculty:					

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

BASIC PARAMETERS:

- 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.

