Student Learning Assessment Program

## Response to Summary Form

**Undergraduate Programs 2017**

Department: School of Technology

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Level[[1]](#footnote-1)\*** | Comments |
| Learning Objectives | Level 2, B.S. Applied Engineering & Technology | The program has adopted four of the five undergraduate learning goals: critical thinking, writing, speaking, and responsible citizenship. Are there any opportunities to include quantitative reasoning in your program? The program has completely eliminated all learning objectives related to the content and skills you seek for AET. The objectives for a major program should encompass the undergraduate learning goals as well as those expected for your major. |
| **How, Where, and When Assessed** | Level 1-2, B.S. Applied Engineering & Technology | Most of the questions asked in the last couple of years’ response are still applicable. Are you using rubrics for each of the assignments mentioned? It appears as if you do not have a standard rubric for your program, so you may want to consider that for gathering assessment data. It would be good to identify which assignments are collected for assessment purposes for the designated courses. The measures for many objectives are really more explanations of assignments and the focus of the various classes than a list of measures used to assess student learning. I assume that the faculty member is responsible for collection, but what is used to ascertain knowledge and skills remains unclear as does the instrument used to measure the knowledge and skills. It is not clear what courses are used, so it is not clear that your assessments are multiple. Without identifying specific courses and assignments it is not assured that assessment will take place in a systematic way to allow performance to be gauged over time. Remember that the idea is to assess individual student attainment of knowledge and skills, but also to gather data that speak to the program as a whole. AY17 was the last year for which Watson-Glaser data will be available, so you will need to consider a new measure for critical thinking this coming year.  |
| **Expectations** | Level 1-2, B.S. Applied Engineering & Technology | You have good details on what you expect to see—the kind of details that should be covered in a rubric, and you offer them as examples, not a clear report of what is happening. Expectations do not coincide with the objective in all cases. This column is a bit of an eclectic mix of expectations, criteria, and assignment explanations. The expectations should match the measure. So, if the measure is a test, the expectations are the percentages correct. If the measure involves a rubric, then the expectations are about the holistic scores, and so on. You have expectations listed for objectives that are not given. |
| **Results** | Level 1, B.S. Applied Engineering & Technology | Results are not really results of specific measurements. There is a collection of information here about the program that is not related to student learning outcomes. What do international agreements with other universities tell you about whether your students can function as responsible citizens? Looking at ways students participate in the co-curricular can point you towards places for assessment, but you need some results. Perhaps you want to survey your students and find out what they have experienced and how that experience has added to their educational experience. There are no real results for objective 4. You indicate that students “typically” meet certain levels, but this column should indicate the number of students for each measure for which you are offering the results and then what those results were. How many students are included in the results given as percentages? |
| **How Results Will be Used** | Level 2, B.S. Applied Engineering & Technology | A feedback loop appears to be in place; however, because of some missing information in the report, the responsibilities and how data are used is not completely evident. The actual process for sharing and assessing data is rather vague and up in the air. It is not clear what is routinely shared and discussed or who is responsible. You have a remediation plan in place for students not meeting expectations, so that is positive. The proposed capstone course sounds like a good idea for the major and would give you a site for capturing data as well. |

Some of the information in Part Two does not make sense to me. You talk about students completing methods courses, student teaching, and cooperating teachers, but I thought the CTE program was for teacher licensure, not the AET program. You talk about a curriculum and content of the field in the narrative sections, but you list no objectives related to this content. Part Two should focus on this past year and what your program has done; it is difficult to tell what was past practice and what continues. Most of the comments I made last year are still here because they have not been addressed.

1. \* Levels should not be interpreted as grades or scores; they are stages of implementation based on patterns of characteristics described by North Central Association. These levels are approximations based on the information provided in the summaries. Please refer to the checklist for the Primary Traits listed for each level on the assessment web site at [www.eiu.edu/~assess](http://www.eiu.edu/~assess). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)