

# COLLEGE ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Assessed Year: 2015-2016

*College: Engineering, Technology, & Computer Science*

*Contact: Kim McDonald, Associate Dean*

*Report Date: 2/22/17*

**ASSESSMENT**

INDIANA UNIVERSITY–PURDUE UNIVERSITY FORT WAYNE



™

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Contents

Tips and Hints _____	1
Section 1: Summary of Findings for all Departments/Programs _____	2
Section 2: Recommendations for Academic Departments _____	3
Section 3: Results of Activities Related to Prior Year Findings _____	4
Section 4: Conclusions and Future Directions _____	5
Attachments _____	6

## Tips and Hints

When you click on tip text, the whole tip is selected so that you can revise the placeholder instructional text. Edit the placeholder text and format it any way you want or cut and paste into the form field. The table of contents updates automatically as you add pages to each section in your document. To see the updates, right-click anywhere in the table of contents and select *Update field*.

### **Report Expectations:**

The finished report should be about 4 -5 pages in length. Include as attachments:

1. Either letters to colleges describing your evaluation of their annual assessment report or the completed Appendix D Rubrics for all departments/programs in your college.
2. Attach all Departmental/Program Annual Assessment reports so that these can be published at <http://www.ipfw.edu/offices/assessment/reports/reports-program.html>.

### **Assistance:**

If at any point you have questions about completing or submitting this report, please contact the [Office of Assessment](#).

# SECTION 1: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR ALL DEPARTMENTS/PROGRAMS

## Section 1: Summary of Findings for all Departments/Programs

**Instructions:** In this box, please summarize your review of all departments. You can either do a narrative or summarize all departments within each of the departmental review rubrics and paste in this box.

All undergraduate programs within the College of ETCS submitted an assessment report; all of these reports were reviewed by the college committee. The major findings based on these reviews include the following:

1. Since most programs within the college are ABET-accredited, review processes are fairly well established and multiple stakeholders are involved in the assessment process. Three programs, Information Systems, Information Technology, and Organizational Leadership, do not go through a professional accrediting process. In general, these programs are in the beginning stages of developing an established plan for collecting and reporting data and to date, less assessment data has been collected.
2. All of the programs have clearly stated student learning outcomes.
3. Most ETCS programs' SLOs are aligned to the foundation areas of the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework, however a few programs need to incorporate this alignment in the assessment plans.
4. A few programs, through their curriculum maps, provide some indication of progression of student learning through the major, others do not.
5. Many of the programs need to provide past iterations of results to better contextualize current results, to discern improvements that have been made, and to determine if these changes currently are being assessed.
6. Most of the programs provide recommendations for improvements based on their assessment results.

## SECTION 2: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS

### Section 2: Recommendations for Academic Departments

Each program's plan and report within the college was reviewed by two members of the ETCS Assessment Committee. Completed rubrics were put on One Drive along with each program's plan and report. The committee also met twice after the review to discuss their findings. The associate dean, who chairs this committee, drafted letters for all the programs. These letters provided a summary of the committee's feedback and recommendations. Those committee members reviewing specific programs reviewed these draft letters and made changes when needed. All the letters submitted to the chairs and the dean are attached.

## SECTION 3: RESULTS OF ACTIVITIES RELATED TO PRIOR YEAR FINDINGS

### Section 3: Results of Activities Related to Prior Year Findings

Since this was the first year the college conducted a review of programs' plans and reports, there is nothing to discuss regarding changes based on last year's review. However, the following items are occurring:

1. Plans will not be reviewed next year unless programs make changes resulting in an additional review.
2. The committee will meet this spring to review this first year's activities and processes and make recommendations regarding ways to improve these processes.
3. Some programs, particularly those who are currently working on their ABET self-study, have already used some of the feedback they received to revise their assessment plans/processes.

# SECTION 4: CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

## Section 4: Conclusions and Future Directions

Overall, the college level review process went well and the committee found reviewing other programs' plans and reports to be helpful. More specific recommendations to improve the college level review/process will be discussed this semester. The committee did have some recommendations to improve the rubrics provided by the university's Office of Assessment. These include the following:

1. There is no rubric for program educational objectives or goals, only student learning outcomes. Since ABET requires both, it may be helpful to have a rubric for these objectives – at least for those programs that are accredited by professional bodies that require both.
2. The rubric on “expectation level” (under SLOs) may be unclear and difficult to assess for those programs without professional accreditation standards/expectations.
3. Student learning development of SLOs – to clearly show progression may take a lot of consideration and time to do in a thorough manner. However, indicating the amount of emphasis in terms of SLOs on a curricular map is very doable.
4. The student engagement rubric is not very clear. The committee felt it only applied if a curricular map based on learning activities was employed. It might be possible to get to this through an examination of course syllabi, but this would be a time consuming process.
5. Data collection and design integrity – the committee wasn't clear what was meant by “design integrity”. The recommendation is to eliminate “design” and focus on data collection integrity.

# ATTACHMENTS

## Attachments

1. Provide either letters to colleges describing your evaluation of their annual assessment report or the completed Appendix D Rubrics for all departments/programs in your college.
2. Attach all Departmental/Program Annual Assessment reports so that these can be published at <http://www.ipfw.edu/offices/assessment/reports/reports-program.html>.