TO: Nashwan Younis, Chair of Civil and Mechanical Engineering
FROM: ETCS Assessment Committee
SUBJ: 2019-2020 Assessment Report for CE
DATE: February 5, 2020

The ETCS Assessment Committee has received and reviewed the CE program 2019-2020 Assessment report. Our comments below follow the rubrics derived from the revised Senate Document 98-22 Appendix D.

Overall, the ETCS Assessment Committee considers the CE assessment report to have several positives and meeting -and in many aspects exceeding- expectations. The following sections outline some of the observations and recommendations on the assessment report.

Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes

- CE has clear and specific student learning outcomes (SLOs) based on the EAC of ABET.
- We recommend providing additional information on how the SLOs will be assessed in the report. This information may be provided in a separate document, such as the assessment plan, but we recommend including it in the assessment report for clarity.
- The SLOs are student-centric, and their expectation levels seem to exceed that established by the University.

Programmatic Curricular Map

- The content alignment is done using common classes taken by the students. There does not seem to be electives used in mapping with the SLOs.
- They have a freshman engineering assessment, which is different from the CE assessment. The progression of student learning is related to SLOs is achieved.
- Classes and activities appear to engage students in work outlined in the SLOs.

Alignment with PFW Baccalaureate Framework

- The alignment of SLOs with the PFW Baccalaureate Framework has been provided in the report.

Assessment Plan

- The relationship between assessments and SLOs is not clearly established to let instructors properly assess the outcomes.
- Description of how SLOs relate to assessment is incomplete to provide sufficient information for use in determining progress towards an SLO and for instructors to properly assess student learning based on the content of the given SLOs.
- Both direct and indirect measures are used by the CE program to assess SLOs.
- The results given in the report are only from Fall 2019. This report is supposed to be an annual report to include results from both semesters.
- Limited information is provided about the data collection process. What activities in each course related to each of the SLOs are not explicit. It is unclear how in Table 6 "yes_A or yes_S" are given to various courses. Their final calculation of "% Achieved" has no use in assessment. No comment is made when a % falls below the established 75% minimum.

- The evidence of reliability in measures has not been established with what has been given in their report.

Reporting Results

- Results have been provided, but it is not clear how the results relate to SLOs.
- Historical comparison is made for exit surveys (Table 12, pg. 27).
- Interpretation of results has been made, but it is on few courses of F19.
- The results are not interpreted for the achievement of SLOs. Indirect measures also are not directly linked to SLOs (Table 10, pg. 24).

Report Dissemination and Collaboration

- The report is shared with the faculty.
- The report has been shared with their IAB members.

Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement, and Success

- The program has to work on its assessment process and procedures as given in this report
    - (1) to assess each outcome using specific indicators, and
    - (2) to show a historical progression of the assessment, evaluation, and improvements made in the achievement of the established SLOs.
- We recommend that the CE program develop its annual assessment report for the two semesters and provide straightforward percentages that relate to the achievement of SLOs.

Please contact us if you have any questions.