

# UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

## Feedback to Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2003-2004 Annual Reports

DEPARTMENT CHEMICAL ENGINEERING DATE 4-11-2005

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Renee Mabey

### STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- |                                       |        |                 |                   |
|---------------------------------------|--------|-----------------|-------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced?          | YES___ | NO <u>X</u> ___ | QUALIFIED Y/N ___ |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES___ | NO <u>X</u> ___ | QUALIFIED Y/N ___ |
| • Do goals address student learning?  | YES___ | NO <u>X</u> ___ | QUALIFIED Y/N ___ |

*Comments:*

### ASSESSMENT METHODS

- |  |                   |       |                            |
|--|-------------------|-------|----------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced?   | YES <u>Y</u> ___  | NO___ | QUALIFIED Y/N ___          |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?        | YES___            | NO___ | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> ___ |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? | YES <u>UG</u> ___ | NO___ | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>G</u> ___ |

*Comments*

*No goals stated in this report*

**Undergraduates:**      **Senior Design Projects:** peer and faculty assessment  
                                 **Portfolio Review:**  
                                 **FE Exam Results**  
                                 **Alumni Surveys**  
                                 **Employer/Recruiter Surveys**  
                                 **Placement Data**  
                                 **Exit Interviews**  
                                 **Course Evaluations**  
                                 **Co-op Supervisor Surveys**  
                                 **Co-op Student Assessments**

**Graduates:**              **Student evaluations of courses.**  
                                 **(“Program Assessment occurs 3 every three years.”)**

### ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- |  |                   |                 |                            |
|--|-------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Were any assessment results reported?  | YES <u>UG</u> ___ | NO <u>G</u> ___ | QUALIFIED Y/N ___          |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? | YES___            | NO___           | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> ___ |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?            | YES___            | NO___           | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> ___ |
| • Were the results tied to goals for student learning?   | YES___            | NO <u>X</u> ___ | QUALIFIED Y/N ___          |

*Comments:*

**Undergraduate:**

No goals stated. Results reported:

“Good Marks.”

Items reported:

content issues in two areas – global context, societal impacts

credit hours in ChE412 – need for an increase

emphasis areas for curriculum

**Graduate:**

No results reported. Courses ‘fine tuned.’

**CLOSING THE LOOP**

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?

YES\_UG, G\_ NO\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?

YES\_UG\_\_\_ NO\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_G\_\_

**Comments:**

**No goals stated in the report.**

**Undergraduate:**

Specific actions were articulated. A course will be added; credit hours were adjusted for a specific course; required credits for a degree were changed from 134 to 133; and elective courses will be added. It would appear the department is responsive to findings of assessment.

**Graduate:**

Courses were fine tuned by faculty teaching the courses. Program assessment performed every three years.

**SUMMARY*****Strengths******Areas for Improvement***

- ☒ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☐ Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- ☐\_UG\_ Assessment methods are clearly described.
- ☐\_UG\_ Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- ☐\_UG\_ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- ☐\_UG\_ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- ☐\_UG\_ Results are reported.
- ☐\_UG\_ Results are tied to closing the loop.  
(decision-making is tied to evidence)

- ☐ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☒ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- ☒\_G\_ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- ☐ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- ☐ No results are reported.
- ☐ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.  
(decision-making is not directly tied to evidence)

**OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The Chemical Engineering Department seems to have an understanding of assessment as related to student learning, and as related to program assessment. No goals for student learning are stated in the report, most likely due to unclear instructions for completing the annual report form.

Assessment activities are well reported for the undergraduate program.

Graduate Program Assessment is completed every 3 years. Assessment of Student Learning at the Graduate level is not reported; it is assumed that 2004-2005 is not an assessment period. The Department states it does have an assessment plan. The Department is aware that assessment is ongoing and an agent for informed decision-making.