Calendar-Year Program Report

Program Title: Engineering Science
Calendar Year: 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COURSES AND OUTCOMES ASSESSED

ISLO #1: Communication – O,W
PSLO 3: Develop Communication Skills

ENGS 101
ENGS 202 (M)

ISLO #2: Critical Thinking – Problem Solving
PSLO 4: Critical Thinking

ENGS 205
ENGS 263 (M)

AGGREGATE REPORT

Assessment Results - AACU VALUE Rubric for ISLO 1 - PSLO 3

Subject	Course	Sections Participating	Total Measures	Outcome	Semester
ENGS	101	1	1	Not Met	Spring
ENGS	101	1	1	Not Met	Fall
ENGS	202(M)			No Measures/No Findings	
Program Title Courses - Overall Findings for PSLO 3					
Total Sections Selected for Assessment					
Total Sections Assessed					
% Sections Meeting or Exceeding Target (of those assessed)					
Recommendations, Reflections, and Notes:					
Appended.					

Assessment Results - AACU VALUE Rubric for ISLO 2 – PSLO 4

Subject	Course	Sections Participating	Total Measures	Outcome	Semester
ENGS	205			No Measures/No Findings	
ENGS	263			No Measures/No Findings	
Program Title Courses - Overall Findings for PSLO 4					
Total Sections Selected for Assessment					
Total Sections Assessed					
% Sections Meeting or Exceeding Target (of those assessed)					
Recommendations, Reflections, and Notes:					
Appended.					

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Directions: This portion of the document is designed to provide context for results, to discuss individual instructors' input on whether or not the methods they are using are effective.

Some questions to consider: is the assessment process for the outcome you're assessing sufficiently robust?

Are enough sections of the course being assessed to represent an accurate portrayal of program success?

If the targets have been met, might they be raised in the future?

If targets are consistently exceeded, might the assignment be made more demanding to challenge students effectively?

DATA-DRIVEN DECISIONS

Directions: What will you change as a result of the data?

If targets are not met: best practices suggest we make changes to course content, rubrics, or the assessment process, and spend the next cycle year reviewing the courses for which we didn't meet targets *in addition to* the PSLOs up for that cycle year. If there are problems, we want to catch them quickly. So, if targets are not met, what will be changed, and what is the timeline for addressing the issue?

If targets are met: Many people are under the impression that as long as targets are met, then there is no need to make changes. As evidenced in the directions in the previous section, we can still make changes. Perhaps a new target would be appropriate? Perhaps the assignment should be more challenging for students? Perhaps a more robust measurement of the PSLO or ISLO could be made?

RESOURCE ALLOCATION REQUESTS

RESOURCE ALLOCATION REQUEST FORM

Guidelines for Request:
1. Please ensure the request is linked to learning outcomes (course, program, and/or institutional)
2. Complete this form and send it to your academic dean for review and potential consideration at Provost's Cabinet.

PROPOSAL INFORMATION:
Applicant's Name: _____
Program Title: _____

a. Please describe the request (what is the problem that the request is trying to solve?)

b. Describe and or list the resource(s) you hope to acquire as a result of this request. (For instance, are you looking for course materials, additional instructors, etc.? What is the problem that this request is trying to solve?)

c. How is the request linked to learning outcomes assessment?

d. Please include any data that will help support this request (learning outcomes data)

e. Describe briefly your follow-up assessment (currently we assess on a three-year cycle, but learning outcomes that are addressed with resource allocation should be assessed again as soon as possible to determine the viability and sustainability of resource allocation)

f. Please include any alternative sources of funding you have considered for this initiative (grants, different pools of money on campus, etc.)

g. Approximately how many students do you anticipate will be served by this request each Academic year?

h. Total Amount Requested: _____

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Directions: some proposed areas of improvement might include: collection of data, distribution of data, what kinds of data is included/omitted, timelines, when or how work is completed, delegation of responsibilities, etc.

APPENDIX A: QUALITATIVE AND CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION FROM TASKSTREAM

ENGS 101 – Communication – Spring

Recommendations:	Require students to meet with the instructor individually and discuss/review the rough draft before the final draft can be submitted.
Reflections/Notes:	Comments and suggested corrections were made on every rough draft. Common issues on how to fix them were discussed in class. Despite this, several students submitted final drafts with little or no corrections made. The comments were made on Bb through their markup tools, are students even viewing the comments as they would a hard copy with corrections?

ENGS 101 – Communication – Fall

Recommendations:	Meet up with Lucas to: 1. Review course outcomes for ENGS 101 - do they cover what we want them to. 2. Review the course structure, i.e. when and how long the class meets for. 3. Review the arrangement of topics and projects, i.e. are projects worth it or a waste of time, and are there ways to better incorporate what students are supposed to learn with the projects? 4. Are we expecting/asking too much of this course and these students and they're getting burned out before the end of the semester?
Reflections/Notes:	It is always a struggle to keep students engaged far enough into the semester to get high submission rates on this project report. It seems apparent that the Coronavirus pandemic has made things even worse in that regard. I put a lot of effort into providing time in class for students to work on this report and ask questions, and I spent a lot of time trying to track down students to get them to complete it so they could pass the course. Unfortunately, it seems that a large percentage of students had already disengaged and had insufficient motivation to provide their best work.

I think the issue has more to do with retaining student engagement for the whole semester than with this specific assignment. Six students (32%) of the class scored 90% or greater on this assignment. It is not a question of the material being taught, but rather of the students choosing to participate.