TO: Guoping Wang, Interim Chair of Electrical and Computer Engineering
FROM: ETCS Assessment Committee
SUBJ: 2019-2020 Assessment Report for EE
DATE: February 5, 2020

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

Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes

- Clarity and specificity of 1-7 SLOs are based on the EAC of ABET. But how they will be assessed is a different aspect not indicated in their F19 report. They may have shown that in their assessment plan given some years back to the ETCS assessment committee.
- 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 and two electives, ECE 483 and ECE485 (Table 2 pg. 7 and Table 3 pg. 8). The program should exclude the electives from the curricular map.
- They have a freshman engineering assessment, which is different from the EE program assessment. The progression of student learning is clearly related to SLOs is achieved.
- Classes and activities appear to engage students in the work outlined in the SLOs.

Alignment with PFW Baccalaureate Framework

- The alignment of SLOs with the PFW Baccalaureate Framework is not provided in the report.

Assessment Plan

- The relationship between assessments and SLOs is not 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 EE 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. It is not clear what activities in a course relate to SLOs. In other words, it is not known how the %s in Table 3 were arrived at. Are these numbers from some specific activities, or are they from the overall course performance of students? Similarly, Table 5 pg. 11, do the numbers reflect the overall course score or refer to some specific activities? Similar comment for Table 6, pg. 12.
- 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.
- The historical comparison does not appear to have been done.

- Interpretation of results has been done, but it is not clear whether the results relate to the achievement of SLOs. Indirect measures also are not directly linked to SLOs.

Report Dissemination and Collaboration

- The report is shared with the faculty.
- The EE department shares the program's status and other program-related items with their IAB members, but it is not clear if the assessment of SLOs is discussed with them (Appendix B, pg. 21).

Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement, and Success:

- The program has to work on its assessment process and procedures as given in here
    - (1) to assess each outcome using specific indicators, and
    - (2) to show the historical progression of the assessment, evaluation, and improvements made in the achievement of the established SLOs.
- We recommend that the EE program develop their annual assessment report for the two semesters, give meaningful scores that relate to the achievement of SLOs, and involve their IAB members in assessing and evaluating the program.

Please contact us if you have any questions.