

College of Technology Assessment Report 2013-2014 June 23, 2014

Introduction

The College of Technology's 2012-2013 Assessment Report is comprised of three sections. The first section includes a summary of the overall achievements in assessment for the College of Technology for 2013 - 2014. The second section includes examples of the findings based upon the College of Technology Assessment Process. The third section includes examples of using assessment findings to make (1) decisions and (2) improvements to programs

1. *Summary of overall assessment goals and achievement in assessment*

- The overall assessment goal for the College of Technology (COT) for 2013-2014 included having each program (29 programs) to assess one Student Learning Outcome (SLO). This SLO was selected either from the specific program SLOs or from the six overall COT SLOs that were established in Spring 2013. Programs were asked to assess the selected SLO in at least one class, utilizing at least one method of direct or indirect assessment. The assessment of the SLO was completed in either the Fall 2013 or Winter 2014 semesters. Reports for each program were submitted at the end of the Winter 2014 semester. These reports included a standardized narrative about the assessment process and results, and in some programs, a spreadsheet display of results as well as an example of the exam/project used in the assessment project. These reports can be found in the appendix.
- Of the 29 programs within the COT, we received 12 reports from SET (100%, not including Applied Technology, which was excluded from this processes¹) and 8 of 16 reports from STS by end of the Winter 2014 semester. While not all programs that submitted their report submitted it in the standardized form, all programs included the requested information.

▪ *Summary of the college's goals and achievements in its on-going efforts of assessment*

- Programs within the COT will continue the above assessment process in the 2014-2015 academic year. One change may include removing the overall COT SLOs so that the focus can remain on program specific SLOs. Also, in the 2013-2014 year, the COT Assessment Committee decided that programs would designate the assessed SLO as "achieved" or "in-progress". Achieved SLOs would not be reassessed in the near future and In-Progress SLOs would be reassessed the following year. It may be beneficial if programs can have more flexibility in their

¹ Applied Technology has only an advisor; it does not have courses associated with it. It is a program to complete community college work with a technical degree. Each student picks separate electives with the help of an advisor. These students do not necessarily have any courses in common, which makes it a difficult program to assess.

SLO selection, including repeating an “achieved” SLO the next year as well as waiting a few years to reevaluate an “in-progress” SLO. As a result, the COT Assessment Committee will reevaluate the overall assessment process and communicate the changes to program coordinators for the 2014-2015 year. These specific changes are addressed below. The requirement for the narrative report will remain.

- Another COT goal in our on-going efforts of assessment is to receive reports from greater than 85% of the programs in the 2014-2015 year.
- *The role of faculty and staff in the assessment process and how analysis of data led to representative changes*
 - The role of faculty and staff in the COT assessment process is twofold. First, a COT Assessment Committee was established in the 2013-2014. The committee was co-chaired by Mary Brake (School of Engineering Technology) and Christina Wall (School of Technology Studies). Approximately three other faculty members were committee members as well as the COT Dean and Directors of both schools. Committee meetings were held once a month throughout the 2013-2014 school year and updates on the assessment process in both schools were presented. The committee also established ways to assist program coordinators in their assessment process, including providing samples of assessment reports as well as offering one-on-one meetings to clarify any questions that program coordinators may have about the process or report requirements. Of the reports submitted by program coordinators in the School of Technology Studies, 80% of the programs coordinators participated in a one-on-one meeting prior to submitting their report.
 - Analysis of the reports has led to the following changes in COT assessment process for the 2013-2014 year:
 - In early fall 2013, the Assessment Committee suggested a template for programs to use when submitting their assessment reports. The Assessment Committee was given a nice template from the College of Arts and Sciences; that template and a reminder were sent out to program coordinators in the winter, 2014. Some programs chose to use the format compatible with their accrediting agency.

2. *Examples of findings in assessment through using appropriate assessment methods:*

- Computer Aided Engineering (CAE) MS program – used a rubric to assess students’ ability to ‘problem solve’. Students were proficient, but did not always show complete understanding. To close the loop, faculty recommend more lectures on application of boundary conditions.
- Interior Design (IDE) undergraduate program – used a rubric to assess all five college

SLOs using draft portfolios of juniors. Faculty found good proficiency on first three but need to improve students' demonstration of analytical skills and innovation. They plan to encourage students to take a course in construction and then re-assess in two year. (It will take this long for this course to have an impact.)

- Information Assurance (IA) undergraduate program – used a rubric to assess all Information Assurance SLOs using various case studies throughout the course. Students succeeded in demonstrating technical skills and innovation, but could improve on their “soft skills”.

3. *Examples of using assessment findings to make (1) decisions and (2) improvements to programs*

- Product Design and Development. Findings: Students lacked math preparation for PDD 111 Materials. Improvement: Require a new prerequisite for PDD 11 (Math 104 concurrent or higher).
- Engineering Management (grad program). Findings: 10% of students do not have enough training in engineering. Improvement: EM made a change to the program requirements. Starting in the fall, new students must take a physics course (graduate) and the first mechanical engineering technology course (Statics).
- Information Assurance. Findings: Classes at lower levels need to stress soft skills more frequently. Improvement: Review the prerequisite requirements.
- *Describe whether your college/unit intends to revise/update your assessment plan for next year.*

For the 2013-2014 academic year, we received assessment reports from 68% of the programs within the College of Technology. The goal for the 2013-2014 year is to receive reports from 85% of the programs. Also, there were some inconsistencies in the report format. Another goal would be to clarify the report format to provide more consistency throughout the College of Technology. Also, for the 2013-2014 school year, we decided that in addition to program SLOs, we also had to have and assess college SLOs. While this may continue to be a viable option, we decided to reevaluate this with faculty council during the Fall 2014 semester.