

**Assurance of Student Learning
2019-2020**

Ogden College of Science and Engineering

School of Engineering and Applied Sciences

Electrical Engineering program, #537

Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages.

Student Learning Outcome 1: ABET EAC Outcome #1: Upon graduation our students have the ability to identify, formulate, and solve complex engineering problems by applying principles of engineering, science, and mathematics.

Instrument 1 | Artifacts assessed in certain courses/sections

Instrument 2 | Senior Exit Surveys

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.

Met

Not Met

Student Learning Outcome 2: ABET EAC Outcome #2: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to apply engineering design to produce solutions that meet specific needs with consideration of public health, safety, and welfare, as well as global, cultural, social, environmental, and economic factors.

Instrument 1 | Artifacts assessed in certain courses/sections

Instrument 2 | Senior Exit Surveys

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.

Met

Not Met

Student Learning Outcome 3: ABET EAC Outcome #3: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to communicate effectively with a range of audiences.

Instrument 1 | Artifacts assessed in certain courses/sections

Instrument 2 | Senior Exit Surveys

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.

Met

Not Met

Student Learning Outcome 4: ABET EAC Outcome #4: Upon graduation, our student have the ability to recognize ethical and professional responsibilities in engineering situations and make informed judgments, which must consider the impact of engineering solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts.

Instrument 1 | Artifacts assessed in certain courses/sections

Instrument 2 | Senior Exit Surveys

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 4.

Met

Not Met

Student Learning Outcome 5: ABET EAC Outcome #5: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to function effectively on a team whose members together provide leadership, create a collaborative and inclusive environment, establish goals, plan tasks, and meet objectives.

Instrument 1 | Artifacts assessed in certain courses/sections

Instrument 2 | Senior Exit Surveys

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 5.		Met	Not Met
Student Learning Outcome 6: ABET EAC Outcome #6: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to develop and conduct appropriate experimentation, analyze and interpret data, and use engineering judgment to draw conclusions.			
Instrument 1	Artifacts assessed in certain courses/sections		
Instrument 2	Senior Exit Surveys		
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 6.		Met	Not Met
Student Learning Outcome 7: ABET EAC Outcome #7: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to acquire and apply new knowledge as needed, using appropriate learning strategies.			
Instrument 1	Artifacts assessed in certain courses/sections		
Instrument 2	Senior Exit Surveys		
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 7.		Met	Not Met
Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)			
<p>The WKU electrical engineering program is accredited by ABET, and uses ABET EAC Outcomes 1-7 for assessment. Our assessment process for each Outcome involves (a) instructors completing rubrics in certain upper-division courses according to our assessment plan, and (b) students in the major completing a survey during the senior design course.</p> <p>Regarding (a), one common action item was to add courses to our assessment plan in addition to those already part of the plan. This is, in part, to ensure a sufficient number of student scores for each Outcome.</p> <p>The EE program assessment plan calls for rubric collection each semester (fall and spring), and a meeting of EE faculty to discuss the rubric results.</p> <p><u>NOTE:</u> the EE faculty has defined what is meant by “junior courses” and “senior courses” in our assessment; all 300-designated courses and several 400-designated courses (EE 420, 431 and 473) are to be considered junior-level. This is based on the fact that students are normally expected to take these courses during their junior year. The remaining 400-designated courses are to be considered senior level. Program Success Targets were redefined slightly to be target weighted averages of 2.50 for <i>junior</i>-level courses (instead of 300-designated courses, as was done previously) and 3.00 for <i>senior</i>-level courses (instead of 400-designated courses, as was done previously).</p>			

Student Learning Outcome 1

Student Learning Outcome ABET EAC Outcome #1: Upon graduation our students have the ability to identify, formulate, and solve complex engineering problems by applying principles of engineering, science, and mathematics.

Measurement Instrument 1 Artifacts were assessed in some or all sections of the following courses: EE 300, EE 420, EE 431, EE 460, EE 473, ENGR 490 and ENGR 491.

Criteria for Student Success The following rubric is used when assessing student performance:

Student Learning Outcome 1: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to identify, formulate, and solve complex engineering problems by applying principles of engineering, science, and mathematics.				
	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1
	3	2	1	
Calculation (Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric)	Calculations attempted are essentially all successful and sufficiently comprehensive to solve the problem. Calculations are also presented elegantly (clearly, concisely, etc.)	Calculations attempted are essentially all successful and sufficiently comprehensive to solve the problem.	Calculations attempted are either unsuccessful or represent only a portion of the calculations required to comprehensively solve the problem.	Calculations are attempted but are both unsuccessful and are not comprehensive.
Define Problem (Problem Solving VALUE Rubric)	Demonstrates the ability to construct a clear and insightful problem statement with evidence of all relevant contextual factors.	Demonstrates the ability to construct a problem statement with evidence of most relevant contextual factors, and problem statement is adequately detailed.	Begins to demonstrate the ability to construct a problem statement with evidence of most relevant contextual factors, but problem statement is superficial.	Demonstrates a limited ability in identifying a problem statement or related contextual factors.
Identify Strategies (Problem Solving VALUE Rubric)	Identifies multiple approaches for solving the problem that apply within a specific context.	Identifies multiple approaches for solving the problem, only some of which apply within a specific context.	Identifies only a single approach for solving the problem that does apply within a specific context.	Identifies one or more approaches for solving the problem that do not apply within a specific context.
Evaluate Potential Solutions (Problem Solving VALUE Rubric)	Evaluation of solutions is deep and elegant (for example, contains thorough and insightful explanation) and includes, deeply and thoroughly, all of the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/reasoning, examines feasibility of solution, and weighs impacts of solution.	Evaluation of solutions is adequate (for example, contains thorough explanation) and includes the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/reasoning, examines feasibility of solution, and weighs impacts of solution.	Evaluation of solutions is brief (for example, explanation lacks depth) and includes the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/reasoning, examines feasibility of solution, and weighs impacts of solution.	Evaluation of solutions is superficial (for example, contains cursory, surface level explanation) and includes the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/reasoning, examines feasibility of solution, and weighs impacts of solution.

We look for a minimum average of 2.50 for each assessed junior-level course section, and 3.00 for each assessed senior-level course section. Of the courses assessed for this Outcome, EE 300, 420, 431 and 473 are considered junior-level, with the remaining courses considered senior-level.

Program Success Target for this Measurement	Target weighted averages are 2.50 for assessed junior-level course sections combined, and 3.00 for assessed senior-level course sections combined.	Percent of Program Achieving Target Weighted Averages for course sections assessed:	Junior-level course sections: 2.86 Senior-level course sections: 3.48
--	--	--	--

Methods	<p>Instructors choose artifacts to assess, using the above rubric, in their respective courses/sections. These artifacts will be different course section-to-course section, instructor-to-instructor, and semester-to-semester. Each item of the rubric (e.g., calculation, define problem, etc.) was weighted equally when scoring the rubric. In some cases, specific items may not have been scored.</p> <p>We looked at the average obtained for each course section assessed, with each of the junior-level course sections targeted to achieve a minimum average of 2.50, and each of the senior-level course sections targeted to achieve a minimum average of 3.00. It was observed that some course sections met their targets, and some did not.</p> <p>We also performed weighted averages of all assessed junior-level course sections (combined) for the academic year, and all assessed senior-level course sections (combined) for the academic year to determine if, overall, the Outcome was met. The weighted averages were expected to be 2.50 or above for assessed junior-level course sections (combined) and 3.00 or above for assessed senior-level course sections (combined). This was our Program Success Target. As indicated above, we achieved an average of 2.86 for assessed junior-level course sections overall, and 3.48 for assessed senior-level course sections overall.</p>		
Measurement Instrument 2	Senior Exit Surveys were given to students taking the senior design course during Fall 2019 and Spring 2020. Students were asked to “Rate your ability to identify, formulate, and solve complex engineering problems by applying principles of engineering, science, and mathematics” on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 5 being the highest).		
Criteria for Student Success			
Program Success Target for this Measurement	Target average of 3.75	Percent of Program Achieving Target Weighted Average:	4.50
Methods	For this year there were 10 scores total, 8 for Fall 2019 and 2 for Spring 2020. The above average of 4.50 is the average of all 10 scores received on this particular item from both semesters.		
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.		Met	Not Met
Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			
The EE faculty added EE 420, EE 431, EE 460 and EE 473 to the list of courses to assess for this Outcome. This action has resulted in more data obtained, which should help ensure the accuracy/reliability of assessments.			
Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			
The EE program assessment plan calls for rubric collection each semester (fall and spring), and a meeting of EE faculty to discuss the rubric results.			

Student Learning Outcome 2

Student Learning Outcome	ABET EAC Outcome #2: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to apply engineering design to produce solutions that meet specific needs with consideration of public health, safety, and welfare, as well as global, cultural, social, environmental, and economic factors.																																															
Measurement Instrument 1	Artifacts were assessed in some or all sections of the following courses: EE 300, ENGR 490, ENGR 491																																															
Criteria for Student Success	<p>The following rubric is used when assessing student performance:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin: 10px 0;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5" style="text-align: left; padding: 5px;">Student Learning Outcome 2: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to apply engineering design to produce solutions that meet specific needs with consideration of public health, safety, and welfare, as well as global, cultural, social, environmental, and economic factors.</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="width: 25%;"></th> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;">Capstone 4</th> <th colspan="2" style="width: 40%; text-align: center;">Milestones</th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">Benchmark 1</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Acquiring Competencies (Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric)</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Reflect: Evaluates creative process and product using domain-appropriate criteria.</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Create: Creates an entirely new object, solution or idea that is appropriate to the domain.</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Adapt: Successfully adapts an appropriate exemplar to his/her own specifications.</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Model: Successfully reproduces an appropriate exemplar.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Solving Problems (Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric)</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Not only develops a logical, consistent plan to solve problem, but recognizes consequences of solution and can articulate reason for choosing solution.</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Having selected from among alternatives develops a logical, consistent plan to solve the problem.</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Considers and rejects less acceptable approaches to solving problem.</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Only a single approach is considered and is used to solve the problem.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Embracing Contradictions (Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric)</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Integrates alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas fully.</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Incorporates alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas in a exploratory way.</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Includes (recognizes the value of) alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas in a small way.</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Acknowledges (mentions in passing) alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Connecting, Synthesizing, Transforming (Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric)</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Transforms ideas or solutions into entirely new forms.</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Synthesizes ideas or solutions into a coherent whole.</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Connects ideas or solutions in novel ways.</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Recognizes existing connections among ideas or solutions.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Implement Solutions (Problem Solving VALUE Rubric)</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Implements the solution in a manner that addresses thoroughly and deeply multiple contextual factors of the problem.</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Implements the solution in a manner that addresses multiple contextual factors of the problem in a surface manner.</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Implements the solution in a manner that addresses the problem statement but ignores relevant contextual factors.</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Implements the solution in a manner that does not directly address the problem statement.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Identifying specific project objectives, standards, and constraints based on general project requirements</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">All important objectives, standards, and constraints are identified and clearly implemented</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Most important objectives, standards, and constraints are identified and implemented with minor deficiencies</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Some objectives, standards, and constraints are identified with some deficiencies</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Objectives, standards, and/or constraints not clearly identified or contain significant deficiencies</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="margin-top: 10px;">We look for a minimum average of 2.50 for each assessed junior-level course section, and 3.00 for each assessed senior-level course section. Of the courses assessed for this Outcome, EE 300 is considered junior-level, with the remaining courses considered senior-level.</p>			Student Learning Outcome 2: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to apply engineering design to produce solutions that meet specific needs with consideration of public health, safety, and welfare, as well as global, cultural, social, environmental, and economic factors.						Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1		3	2			Acquiring Competencies (Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric)	Reflect: Evaluates creative process and product using domain-appropriate criteria.	Create: Creates an entirely new object, solution or idea that is appropriate to the domain.	Adapt: Successfully adapts an appropriate exemplar to his/her own specifications.	Model: Successfully reproduces an appropriate exemplar.	Solving Problems (Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric)	Not only develops a logical, consistent plan to solve problem, but recognizes consequences of solution and can articulate reason for choosing solution.	Having selected from among alternatives develops a logical, consistent plan to solve the problem.	Considers and rejects less acceptable approaches to solving problem.	Only a single approach is considered and is used to solve the problem.	Embracing Contradictions (Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric)	Integrates alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas fully.	Incorporates alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas in a exploratory way.	Includes (recognizes the value of) alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas in a small way.	Acknowledges (mentions in passing) alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas.	Connecting, Synthesizing, Transforming (Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric)	Transforms ideas or solutions into entirely new forms.	Synthesizes ideas or solutions into a coherent whole.	Connects ideas or solutions in novel ways.	Recognizes existing connections among ideas or solutions.	Implement Solutions (Problem Solving VALUE Rubric)	Implements the solution in a manner that addresses thoroughly and deeply multiple contextual factors of the problem.	Implements the solution in a manner that addresses multiple contextual factors of the problem in a surface manner.	Implements the solution in a manner that addresses the problem statement but ignores relevant contextual factors.	Implements the solution in a manner that does not directly address the problem statement.	Identifying specific project objectives, standards, and constraints based on general project requirements	All important objectives, standards, and constraints are identified and clearly implemented	Most important objectives, standards, and constraints are identified and implemented with minor deficiencies	Some objectives, standards, and constraints are identified with some deficiencies	Objectives, standards, and/or constraints not clearly identified or contain significant deficiencies
Student Learning Outcome 2: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to apply engineering design to produce solutions that meet specific needs with consideration of public health, safety, and welfare, as well as global, cultural, social, environmental, and economic factors.																																																
	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1																																												
	3	2																																														
Acquiring Competencies (Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric)	Reflect: Evaluates creative process and product using domain-appropriate criteria.	Create: Creates an entirely new object, solution or idea that is appropriate to the domain.	Adapt: Successfully adapts an appropriate exemplar to his/her own specifications.	Model: Successfully reproduces an appropriate exemplar.																																												
Solving Problems (Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric)	Not only develops a logical, consistent plan to solve problem, but recognizes consequences of solution and can articulate reason for choosing solution.	Having selected from among alternatives develops a logical, consistent plan to solve the problem.	Considers and rejects less acceptable approaches to solving problem.	Only a single approach is considered and is used to solve the problem.																																												
Embracing Contradictions (Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric)	Integrates alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas fully.	Incorporates alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas in a exploratory way.	Includes (recognizes the value of) alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas in a small way.	Acknowledges (mentions in passing) alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas.																																												
Connecting, Synthesizing, Transforming (Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric)	Transforms ideas or solutions into entirely new forms.	Synthesizes ideas or solutions into a coherent whole.	Connects ideas or solutions in novel ways.	Recognizes existing connections among ideas or solutions.																																												
Implement Solutions (Problem Solving VALUE Rubric)	Implements the solution in a manner that addresses thoroughly and deeply multiple contextual factors of the problem.	Implements the solution in a manner that addresses multiple contextual factors of the problem in a surface manner.	Implements the solution in a manner that addresses the problem statement but ignores relevant contextual factors.	Implements the solution in a manner that does not directly address the problem statement.																																												
Identifying specific project objectives, standards, and constraints based on general project requirements	All important objectives, standards, and constraints are identified and clearly implemented	Most important objectives, standards, and constraints are identified and implemented with minor deficiencies	Some objectives, standards, and constraints are identified with some deficiencies	Objectives, standards, and/or constraints not clearly identified or contain significant deficiencies																																												
Program Success Target for this Measurement	Target weighted averages are 2.50 for assessed junior-level course sections combined, and 3.00 for assessed senior-level course sections combined.	Percent of Program Achieving Target	Junior-level course sections: 2.43 Senior-level course sections: 3.34																																													
		Weighted Averages for course sections assessed:																																														

Methods	<p>Instructors choose artifacts to assess, using the above rubric, in their respective courses/sections. These artifacts will be different course section-to-course section, instructor-to-instructor, and semester-to-semester. Each item of the rubric (e.g., acquiring competencies, solving problems, etc.) was weighted equally when scoring the rubric. In some cases, specific items may not have been scored.</p> <p>We looked at the average obtained for each course section assessed, with each of the junior-level course sections targeted to achieve a minimum average of 2.50, and each of the senior-level course sections targeted to achieve a minimum average of 3.00. It was observed that some course sections met their targets, and some did not.</p> <p>We also performed weighted averages of all assessed junior-level course sections (combined) for the academic year, and all assessed senior-level course sections (combined) for the academic year to determine if, overall, the Outcome was met. The weighted averages were expected to be 2.50 or above for assessed junior-level course sections (combined) and 3.00 or above for assessed senior-level course sections (combined). This was our Program Success Target. As indicated above, we achieved an average of 2.43 for assessed junior-level course sections overall, and 3.34 for assessed senior-level course sections overall.</p>		
Measurement Instrument 2	Senior Exit Surveys were given to students taking the senior design course during Fall 2019 and Spring 2020. Students were asked to “Rate your ability to apply engineering design to produce solutions that meet specific needs with consideration for public health, safety, and welfare, as well as global, cultural, social, environmental, and economic factors” on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 5 being the highest).		
Criteria for Student Success			
Program Success Target for this Measurement	Target average of 3.75	Percent of Program Achieving Target Weighted Average:	4.00
Methods	For this year there were 10 scores total, 8 for Fall 2019 and 2 for Spring 2020. The above average of 4.00 is the average of all 10 scores received on this particular item from both semesters.		
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.		Met	Not Met
Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			
EE 300 was added to the assessment plan for this Outcome, with assessment performed in Fall 2019. However, the number of student scores from EE 300 was low, and must be increased for this to be a reliable measure.			
Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			
<p>From last year’s assessment, the EE faculty had decided to monitor the low compiled averages for the year in both ENGR 490 and 491, and revisit. Also, it was agreed that adding some emphasis in EE 300 would be helpful. The ENGR 490 and 491 compiled averages for this year are seen to exceed the target. Although EE 300 was added to the assessment for this Outcome, it did not quite meet the target; however, only six scores were obtained from EE 300.</p> <p>The EE program assessment plan calls for rubric collection each semester (fall and spring), and a meeting of EE faculty to discuss the rubric results.</p>			

Student Learning Outcome 3

Student Learning Outcome ABET EAC Outcome #3: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to communicate effectively with a range of audiences.

Measurement Instrument 1 Artifacts were assessed in some or all sections of the following courses: EE 300, ENGR 490, ENGR 491

Criteria for Student Success The following rubrics are used when assessing student performance:

Student Learning Outcome 3: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to communicate effectively with a range of audiences.				
Oral Communication	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark
	4	3	2	1
Organization (Oral Communication VALUE Rubric)	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the presentation.
Language (Oral Communication VALUE Rubric)	Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is not appropriate to audience.
Delivery (Oral Communication VALUE Rubric)	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable.
Central Message (Oral Communication VALUE Rubric)	Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.)	Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material.	Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable.	Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation.
Content	Technical/Professional information at an appropriate level for course, Key concepts and terms explained clearly. Research and/or analysis of topic clearly evident Audience gains significant new knowledge and insight	Technical/Professional information at an appropriate level for course, some concepts not completely clarified, research and/or analysis of topic generally evident. Audience gains some new knowledge and insight.	Technical/Professional information at a marginal level for course, many concepts unclear or not discussed. Audience gains little new knowledge or insight	Technical/Professional information unacceptable for course, most concepts unclear or not discussed, audience gains no new knowledge or insight
Multimedia	Multimedia clearly enhances presentation. Concepts made clearer, most information easy to see and follow, details minimized and main points stand out	Multimedia contributes to the quality of the presentation. Most concepts made clearer, most information generally easy to read and follow, main points stand out, a few details difficult to follow	Multimedia poorly prepared or used inappropriately, generally do not enhance concepts, sometimes confusing, hard to see, read, and/or follow, may be confusing	Multimedia not used or so poor they are distracting, do not contribute to presentation.
Question and Answer (if applicable)	Answers confidently and adequately with no hesitation or stumbling over words.	Answers adequately with some hesitation, may stumble over a few words, some slight lack of confidence, overall good at answering questions	Answers not always adequate and show uncertainty, pauses more obvious, and somewhat distracting.	Questions either not answered or done so with great difficulty, significant uncomfortable pauses, little to no confidence.

Student Learning Outcome 3: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to communicate effectively with a range of audiences.				
Written Communication	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark
	4	3	2	1
Context of and Purpose for Writing (Written Communication VALUE Rubric)	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).
Content Development (Written Communication VALUE Rubric)	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.
Control of Syntax and Mechanics (Written Communication VALUE Rubric)	Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error free.	Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.	Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.
Interpretation (Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric)	Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms. Makes appropriate inferences based on that information.	Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms. <i>For instance, accurately explains the trend data shown in a graph.</i>	Provides somewhat accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms, but occasionally makes minor errors related to computations or units.	Attempts to explain information presented in mathematical forms, but draws incorrect conclusions about what the information means.
Content	Technical/Professional information at an appropriate level for course, Key concepts and terms explained clearly. Research and/or analysis of topic clearly evident Reader gains significant new knowledge and insight	Technical/Professional information at an appropriate level for course, some concepts not completely clarified, research and/or analysis of topic generally evident. Reader gains some new knowledge and insight.	Technical/Professional information at a marginal level for course, many concepts unclear or not discussed. Reader gains little new knowledge or insight	Technical/Professional information unacceptable for course, most concepts unclear or not discussed, reader gains no new knowledge or insight

We look for a minimum average of 2.50 for each assessed junior-level course section, and 3.00 for each assessed senior-level course section. Of the courses assessed for this Outcome, EE 300 is considered junior-level, with the remaining courses considered senior-level.

Program Success Target for this Measurement	Target weighted averages are 2.50 for assessed junior-level course sections combined, and 3.00 for assessed senior-level course sections combined.	Percent of Program Achieving Target Weighted Averages for course sections assessed:	junior-level course sections (oral): 3.50 junior-level course sections (written): 2.98 senior-level course sections (oral): 3.59 senior-level course sections (written): 3.55
Methods	Instructors choose artifacts to assess, using the above rubrics, in their respective courses/sections. These artifacts will be different course section-to-course section, instructor-to-instructor, and semester-to-semester. Each item of the rubrics (e.g., organization, language, etc.) was weighted equally when scoring the rubric. In some cases, specific items may not have been scored.		

	<p>We looked at the average obtained for each course section assessed, with each of the junior-level course sections targeted to achieve a minimum average of 2.50, and each of the senior-level course sections targeted to achieve a minimum average of 3.00. It was observed that most course sections met their targets, but one did not.</p> <p>We also performed weighted averages of all assessed junior-level course sections (combined) for the academic year, and all assessed senior-level course sections (combined) for the academic year to determine if, overall, the Outcome was met. The weighted averages were expected to be 2.50 or above for assessed junior-level course sections (combined) and 3.00 or above for assessed senior-level course sections (combined). This was our Program Success Target. As indicated above, we achieved an average of 3.50/2.98 (oral/written) for assessed junior-level course sections overall, and 3.59/3.55 (oral/written) for assessed senior-level course sections overall.</p>		
Measurement Instrument 2	Senior Exit Surveys were given to students taking the senior design course during Fall 2019 and Spring 2020. Students were asked to “Rate your ability to communicate effectively with range of audiences” on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 5 being the highest).		
Criteria for Student Success			
Program Success Target for this Measurement	Target average of 3.75	Percent of Program Achieving Target	4.20
		Weighted Average:	
Methods	For this year there were 10 scores total, 8 for Fall 2019 and 2 for Spring 2020. The above average of 4.20 is the average of all 10 scores received on this particular item from both semesters.		
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.			Met
Not Met			
Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			
The EE faculty has decided to add EE 345, EE 380 and EE 473 to the list of courses to assess for this Outcome (both oral and written), with the understanding that assessing both oral and written components may not be appropriate for a given course section. This action will result in more data, which should help ensure the accuracy/reliability of assessments.			
Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			
The EE program assessment plan calls for rubric collection each semester (fall and spring), and a meeting of EE faculty to discuss the rubric results.			

Student Learning Outcome 4

Student Learning Outcome	ABET EAC Outcome #4: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to recognize ethical and professional responsibilities in engineering situations and make informed judgments, which must consider the impact of engineering solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts.																																											
Measurement Instrument 1	Artifacts were assessed in some or all sections of the following courses: EE 300, ENGR 490, ENGR 491																																											
Criteria for Student Success	<p>The following rubric is used when assessing student performance:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin: 10px 0;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5" style="text-align: center; background-color: #f2f2f2;">Student Learning Outcome 4: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to recognize ethical and professional responsibilities in engineering situations and make informed judgments, which must consider the impact of engineering solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">Capstone 4</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Milestones</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Benchmark 1</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">4</th> <th style="text-align: center;">3</th> <th style="text-align: center;">2</th> <th style="text-align: center;">1</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ethical Issue Recognition (Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric)</td> <td>Student can recognize ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context AND can recognize <u>crossrelationships</u> among the issues.</td> <td>Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context OR can grasp <u>crossrelationships among the issues</u>.</td> <td>Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues and grasp (incompletely) the complexities or interrelationships among the issues.</td> <td>Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues but fails to grasp complexity or <u>interrelationships</u>.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts (Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric)</td> <td>Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, and is able to consider full <u>implications</u> of the application.</td> <td>Student can independently (to a new example) apply ethical perspectives/ concepts to an ethical question, accurately, but does not consider the specific <u>implications</u>.</td> <td>Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, independently (to a new example) and the <u>application</u> is inaccurate.</td> <td>Student can apply ethical perspectives/ concepts to an ethical question with support (using examples, in a class, in a group, or a fixed-choice setting) but is unable to apply ethical perspectives/concepts <u>independently</u> (to a new example.).</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Responsibility of Engineer</td> <td>Given a situation, clearly articulates the responsibilities of the engineer in a global and societal context with all major issues addressed</td> <td>Given a situation, generally articulates the responsibilities of the engineer in a global and societal context with most major issues addressed</td> <td>Given a situation, attempts to articulate the responsibilities of the engineer in a global and societal context but misses several key points</td> <td>Has not grasped the role of a responsible engineer in a global society</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cultural Impact of Solutions</td> <td>Clearly articulates the impact of engineering solutions in a global society</td> <td>Can basically articulate the impact of engineering solutions in a global society</td> <td>Has some ability to articulate the impact of engineering solutions in a global society</td> <td>Cannot articulate the impact of engineering solutions in a global society</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Application of appropriate code of ethics</td> <td>Clear link of dilemma and resolution (s) to an appropriate code of ethics</td> <td>Link between dilemma and final resolution to appropriate code of ethics</td> <td>Superficial discussion of a code of ethics to dilemma and resolution</td> <td>Code of ethic not incorporated into discussion of dilemma or resolution</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>We look for a minimum average of 2.50 for each assessed junior-level course section, and 3.00 for each assessed senior-level course section. Of the courses assessed for this Outcome, EE 300 is considered junior-level, with the remaining courses considered senior-level.</p>				Student Learning Outcome 4: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to recognize ethical and professional responsibilities in engineering situations and make informed judgments, which must consider the impact of engineering solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts						Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1		4	3	2	1	Ethical Issue Recognition (Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric)	Student can recognize ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context AND can recognize <u>crossrelationships</u> among the issues.	Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context OR can grasp <u>crossrelationships among the issues</u> .	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues and grasp (incompletely) the complexities or interrelationships among the issues.	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues but fails to grasp complexity or <u>interrelationships</u> .	Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts (Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric)	Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, and is able to consider full <u>implications</u> of the application.	Student can independently (to a new example) apply ethical perspectives/ concepts to an ethical question, accurately, but does not consider the specific <u>implications</u> .	Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, independently (to a new example) and the <u>application</u> is inaccurate.	Student can apply ethical perspectives/ concepts to an ethical question with support (using examples, in a class, in a group, or a fixed-choice setting) but is unable to apply ethical perspectives/concepts <u>independently</u> (to a new example.).	Responsibility of Engineer	Given a situation, clearly articulates the responsibilities of the engineer in a global and societal context with all major issues addressed	Given a situation, generally articulates the responsibilities of the engineer in a global and societal context with most major issues addressed	Given a situation, attempts to articulate the responsibilities of the engineer in a global and societal context but misses several key points	Has not grasped the role of a responsible engineer in a global society	Cultural Impact of Solutions	Clearly articulates the impact of engineering solutions in a global society	Can basically articulate the impact of engineering solutions in a global society	Has some ability to articulate the impact of engineering solutions in a global society	Cannot articulate the impact of engineering solutions in a global society	Application of appropriate code of ethics	Clear link of dilemma and resolution (s) to an appropriate code of ethics	Link between dilemma and final resolution to appropriate code of ethics	Superficial discussion of a code of ethics to dilemma and resolution	Code of ethic not incorporated into discussion of dilemma or resolution
Student Learning Outcome 4: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to recognize ethical and professional responsibilities in engineering situations and make informed judgments, which must consider the impact of engineering solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts																																												
	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1																																								
	4	3	2	1																																								
Ethical Issue Recognition (Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric)	Student can recognize ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context AND can recognize <u>crossrelationships</u> among the issues.	Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context OR can grasp <u>crossrelationships among the issues</u> .	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues and grasp (incompletely) the complexities or interrelationships among the issues.	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues but fails to grasp complexity or <u>interrelationships</u> .																																								
Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts (Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric)	Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, and is able to consider full <u>implications</u> of the application.	Student can independently (to a new example) apply ethical perspectives/ concepts to an ethical question, accurately, but does not consider the specific <u>implications</u> .	Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, independently (to a new example) and the <u>application</u> is inaccurate.	Student can apply ethical perspectives/ concepts to an ethical question with support (using examples, in a class, in a group, or a fixed-choice setting) but is unable to apply ethical perspectives/concepts <u>independently</u> (to a new example.).																																								
Responsibility of Engineer	Given a situation, clearly articulates the responsibilities of the engineer in a global and societal context with all major issues addressed	Given a situation, generally articulates the responsibilities of the engineer in a global and societal context with most major issues addressed	Given a situation, attempts to articulate the responsibilities of the engineer in a global and societal context but misses several key points	Has not grasped the role of a responsible engineer in a global society																																								
Cultural Impact of Solutions	Clearly articulates the impact of engineering solutions in a global society	Can basically articulate the impact of engineering solutions in a global society	Has some ability to articulate the impact of engineering solutions in a global society	Cannot articulate the impact of engineering solutions in a global society																																								
Application of appropriate code of ethics	Clear link of dilemma and resolution (s) to an appropriate code of ethics	Link between dilemma and final resolution to appropriate code of ethics	Superficial discussion of a code of ethics to dilemma and resolution	Code of ethic not incorporated into discussion of dilemma or resolution																																								
Program Success Target for this Measurement	Target weighted averages are 2.50 for assessed junior-level course sections combined, and 3.00 for assessed senior-level course sections combined.	Percent of Program Achieving Target Weighted Averages for course sections assessed:		Junior-level course section: 3.27 Senior-level course sections: 3.67																																								
Methods	<p>Instructors choose artifacts to assess, using the above rubric, in their respective courses/sections. These artifacts will be different course section-to-course section, instructor-to-instructor, and semester-to-semester. Each item of the rubric (e.g., ethical issue recognition, application of ethical perspectives/concepts, etc.) was weighted equally when scoring the rubric. In some cases, specific items may not have been scored.</p> <p>We looked at the average obtained for each course section assessed, with each of the junior-level course sections targeted to achieve a minimum average of 2.50, and each of the senior-level course sections targeted to achieve a minimum average of 3.00. It was observed that</p>																																											

	<p>most course sections met their targets, but one did not.</p> <p>We also performed weighted averages of all assessed junior-level course sections (combined) for the academic year, and all assessed senior-level course sections (combined) for the academic year to determine if, overall, the Outcome was met. The weighted averages were expected to be 2.50 or above for assessed junior-level course sections (combined) and 3.00 or above for assessed senior-level course sections (combined). This was our Program Success Target. As indicated above, we achieved an average of 3.27 for assessed junior-level course sections overall, and 3.67 for assessed senior-level course sections overall.</p>		
Measurement Instrument 2	<p>Senior Exit Surveys were given to students taking the senior design course during Fall 2019 and Spring 2020. Students were asked to “Rate your ability to ability to recognize ethical and professional responsibilities in engineering situations and make informed judgments, which must consider the impact of engineering solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts” on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 5 being the highest).</p>		
Criteria for Student Success			
Program Success Target for this Measurement	Target average of 3.75	Percent of Program Achieving Target	4.40
		Weighted Average:	
Methods	<p>For this year there were 10 scores total, 8 for Fall 2019 and 2 for Spring 2020. The above average of 4.40 is the average of all 10 scores received on this particular item from both semesters.</p>		
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 4.			Met
Not Met			
Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			
<p>EE 300 was added to the assessment plan for this Outcome, with data taken in Fall 2019. This action was taken because there was a concern last year that the number of scores for this Outcome was low. However, adding EE 300 added only six scores this year since EE 300 was assessed only in Fall 2019 and not in Spring 2020. Moving forward we will likely see more scores for this Outcome from EE 300.</p>			
Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			
<p>The EE program assessment plan calls for rubric collection each semester (fall and spring), and a meeting of EE faculty to discuss the rubric results.</p>			

Student Learning Outcome 5

Student Learning Outcome

ABET EAC Outcome #5: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to function effectively on a team whose members together provide leadership, create a collaborative and inclusive environment, establish goals, plan tasks, and meet objectives.

Measurement Instrument 1

Artifacts were assessed in some or all sections of the following courses: EE 300, EE 431, ENGR 490, ENGR 491

Criteria for Student Success

The following rubric is used when assessing student performance:

Student Learning Outcome 5: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to function effectively on a team whose members together provide leadership, create a collaborative and inclusive environment, establish goals, plan tasks, and meet objectives				
	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1
		3	2	
Contributes to Team Meetings (Teamwork VALUE Rubric)	Helps the team move forward by articulating the merits of alternative ideas or proposals.	Offers alternative solutions or courses of action that build on the ideas of others.	Offers new suggestions to advance the work of the group.	Shares ideas but does not advance the work of the group.
Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members (Teamwork VALUE Rubric)	Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by both constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others as well as noticing when someone is not participating and inviting them to engage.	Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others.	Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by restating the <u>views</u> of other team members and/or asking questions for clarification.	Engages team members by taking turns and listening to others without interrupting.
Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings (Teamwork VALUE Rubric)	Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough, comprehensive, and advances the project. Proactively helps other team members complete their assigned tasks to a similar level of excellence.	Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough, comprehensive, and advances the project.	Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished advances the project.	Completes all assigned tasks by deadline.
Fosters Constructive Team Climate (Teamwork VALUE Rubric)	Supports a constructive team climate by doing all of the following: • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication. • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work. • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it. • Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.	Supports a constructive team climate by doing any three of the following: • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication. • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work. • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it. • Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.	Supports a constructive team climate by doing any two of the following: • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication. • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work. • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it. • Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.	Supports a constructive team climate by doing any one of the following: • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication. • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work. • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it. • Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.
Responds to Conflict (Teamwork VALUE Rubric)	Addresses destructive conflict directly and constructively, helping to manage/resolve it in a way that strengthens overall team cohesiveness and future effectiveness.	Identifies and acknowledges conflict and stays engaged with it.	Redirecting focus toward common ground, toward task at hand (away from conflict).	Passively accepts alternate <u>View points/ideas/opinions.</u>

We look for a minimum average of 2.50 for each assessed junior-level course section, and 3.00 for each assessed senior-level course section. Of the courses assessed for this Outcome, EE 300 and EE 431 are considered junior-level, with the remaining courses considered senior-level.

Program Success Target for this Measurement	Target weighted averages are 2.50 for assessed junior-level course sections combined, and 3.00 for assessed senior-level course sections combined.	Percent of Program Achieving Target Weighted Averages for course sections assessed:	Junior-level course sections: 3.02 Senior-level course sections: 3.45	
Methods	<p>Instructors choose artifacts to assess, using the above rubric, in their respective courses/sections. These artifacts will be different course section-to-course section, instructor-to-instructor, and semester-to-semester. Each item of the rubric (e.g., contributes to team meetings, facilitates the contributions of team members, etc.) was weighted equally when scoring the rubric. In some cases, specific items may not have been scored.</p> <p>We looked at the average obtained for each course section assessed, with each of the junior-level course sections targeted to achieve a minimum average of 2.50, and each of the senior-level course sections targeted to achieve a minimum average of 3.00. It was observed that some course sections met their targets, but some did not.</p> <p>We also performed weighted averages of all assessed junior-level course sections (combined) for the academic year, and all assessed senior-level course sections (combined) for the academic year to determine if, overall, the Outcome was met. The weighted averages were expected to be 2.50 or above for assessed junior-level course sections (combined) and 3.00 or above for assessed senior-level course sections (combined). This was our Program Success Target. As indicated above, we achieved an average of 3.02 for assessed junior-level course sections overall, and 3.45 for assessed senior-level course sections overall.</p>			
Measurement Instrument 2	Senior Exit Surveys were given to students taking the senior design course during Fall 2019 and Spring 2020. Students were asked to “Rate your ability to function effectively on a team whose members together provide leadership, create a collaborative and inclusive environment, establish goals, plan tasks, and meet objectives” on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 5 being the highest).			
Criteria for Student Success				
Program Success Target for this Measurement	Target average of 3.75	Percent of Program Achieving Target Weighted Average:	4.40	
Methods	For this year there were 10 scores total, 8 for Fall 2019 and 2 for Spring 2020. The above average of 4.40 is the average of all 10 scores received on this particular item from both semesters.			
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 5.			Met	Not Met
Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)				
EE 345, EE 431, and EE 460 were added to the assessment plan for this Outcome, with assessment of EE 431 done in Spring 2020.				
Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)				
The EE program assessment plan calls for rubric collection each semester (fall and spring), and a meeting of EE faculty to discuss the rubric results.				

Student Learning Outcome 6

Student Learning Outcome	ABET EAC Outcome #6: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to develop and conduct appropriate experimentation, analyze and interpret data, and use engineering judgment to draw conclusions.																																					
Measurement Instrument 1	Artifacts were assessed in some or all sections of the following courses: EE 431, EE 460, ENGR 490 and ENGR 491																																					
Criteria for Student Success	The following rubric is used when assessing student performance:																																					
Student Learning Outcome 6: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to develop and conduct appropriate experimentation, analyze and interpret data, and use engineering judgment to draw conclusions																																						
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="531 412 795 456"></th> <th data-bbox="802 412 1083 456" style="text-align: center;">Capstone 4</th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1089 412 1640 456" style="text-align: center;">Milestones</th> <th data-bbox="1646 412 1919 456" style="text-align: center;">Benchmark 1</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="531 461 795 505"></th> <th data-bbox="802 461 1083 505" style="text-align: center;">3</th> <th data-bbox="1089 461 1362 505" style="text-align: center;">2</th> <th data-bbox="1369 461 1640 505"></th> <th data-bbox="1646 461 1919 505"></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="531 509 795 695">Design Process (Inquiry and Analysis VALUE Rubric)</td> <td data-bbox="802 509 1083 695">All elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are skillfully developed. Appropriate methodology or theoretical frameworks may be synthesized from across disciplines or from relevant subdisciplines.</td> <td data-bbox="1089 509 1362 695">Critical elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are appropriately developed, however, more subtle elements are ignored or unaccounted for.</td> <td data-bbox="1369 509 1640 695">Critical elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are missing, incorrectly developed, or unfocused.</td> <td data-bbox="1646 509 1919 695">Inquiry design demonstrates a misunderstanding of the methodology or theoretical framework.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="531 699 795 862">Conclusions (Inquiry and Analysis VALUE Rubric)</td> <td data-bbox="802 699 1083 862">States a conclusion that is a logical extrapolation from the inquiry findings.</td> <td data-bbox="1089 699 1362 862">States a conclusion focused solely on the inquiry findings. The conclusion arises specifically from and responds specifically to the inquiry findings.</td> <td data-bbox="1369 699 1640 862">States a general conclusion that, because it is so general, also applies beyond the scope of the inquiry findings.</td> <td data-bbox="1646 699 1919 862">States an ambiguous, illogical, or unsupported conclusion from inquiry findings.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="531 867 795 1003">Compliance with Standards</td> <td data-bbox="802 867 1083 1003">Test performed in full compliance with applicable standard</td> <td data-bbox="1089 867 1362 1003">Test performed in general compliance with standard with only minor procedural error that does not completely invalidate the result</td> <td data-bbox="1369 867 1640 1003">Test performed in general compliance with standard, but a procedural error resulted in faulty results</td> <td data-bbox="1646 867 1919 1003">Test not performed in compliance with standard and results invalid</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="531 1008 795 1101">Application of Results</td> <td data-bbox="802 1008 1083 1101">Results of experiment applied completely and accurately to the situation</td> <td data-bbox="1089 1008 1362 1101">Results applied generally/conceptually correct with only a minor error</td> <td data-bbox="1369 1008 1640 1101">Results applied generally/conceptually correct with a few errors</td> <td data-bbox="1646 1008 1919 1101">Results not applied correctly to the situation</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="531 1105 795 1219">Designing an experiment or experimental procedure</td> <td data-bbox="802 1105 1083 1219">Students select and/or design all appropriate test(s) or process(es) to the situation at hand.</td> <td data-bbox="1089 1105 1362 1219">Students generally select and/or design the appropriate test(s) or process (es) to the situation at hand.</td> <td data-bbox="1369 1105 1640 1219">Students select or design some appropriate tests or processes, with a notable error or omission.</td> <td data-bbox="1646 1105 1919 1219">Students select or design some appropriate tests or processes, with significant errors or omissions.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1		3	2			Design Process (Inquiry and Analysis VALUE Rubric)	All elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are skillfully developed. Appropriate methodology or theoretical frameworks may be synthesized from across disciplines or from relevant subdisciplines.	Critical elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are appropriately developed, however, more subtle elements are ignored or unaccounted for.	Critical elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are missing, incorrectly developed, or unfocused.	Inquiry design demonstrates a misunderstanding of the methodology or theoretical framework.	Conclusions (Inquiry and Analysis VALUE Rubric)	States a conclusion that is a logical extrapolation from the inquiry findings.	States a conclusion focused solely on the inquiry findings. The conclusion arises specifically from and responds specifically to the inquiry findings.	States a general conclusion that, because it is so general, also applies beyond the scope of the inquiry findings.	States an ambiguous, illogical, or unsupported conclusion from inquiry findings.	Compliance with Standards	Test performed in full compliance with applicable standard	Test performed in general compliance with standard with only minor procedural error that does not completely invalidate the result	Test performed in general compliance with standard, but a procedural error resulted in faulty results	Test not performed in compliance with standard and results invalid	Application of Results	Results of experiment applied completely and accurately to the situation	Results applied generally/conceptually correct with only a minor error	Results applied generally/conceptually correct with a few errors	Results not applied correctly to the situation	Designing an experiment or experimental procedure	Students select and/or design all appropriate test(s) or process(es) to the situation at hand.	Students generally select and/or design the appropriate test(s) or process (es) to the situation at hand.	Students select or design some appropriate tests or processes, with a notable error or omission.	Students select or design some appropriate tests or processes, with significant errors or omissions.
	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1																																		
	3	2																																				
Design Process (Inquiry and Analysis VALUE Rubric)	All elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are skillfully developed. Appropriate methodology or theoretical frameworks may be synthesized from across disciplines or from relevant subdisciplines.	Critical elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are appropriately developed, however, more subtle elements are ignored or unaccounted for.	Critical elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are missing, incorrectly developed, or unfocused.	Inquiry design demonstrates a misunderstanding of the methodology or theoretical framework.																																		
Conclusions (Inquiry and Analysis VALUE Rubric)	States a conclusion that is a logical extrapolation from the inquiry findings.	States a conclusion focused solely on the inquiry findings. The conclusion arises specifically from and responds specifically to the inquiry findings.	States a general conclusion that, because it is so general, also applies beyond the scope of the inquiry findings.	States an ambiguous, illogical, or unsupported conclusion from inquiry findings.																																		
Compliance with Standards	Test performed in full compliance with applicable standard	Test performed in general compliance with standard with only minor procedural error that does not completely invalidate the result	Test performed in general compliance with standard, but a procedural error resulted in faulty results	Test not performed in compliance with standard and results invalid																																		
Application of Results	Results of experiment applied completely and accurately to the situation	Results applied generally/conceptually correct with only a minor error	Results applied generally/conceptually correct with a few errors	Results not applied correctly to the situation																																		
Designing an experiment or experimental procedure	Students select and/or design all appropriate test(s) or process(es) to the situation at hand.	Students generally select and/or design the appropriate test(s) or process (es) to the situation at hand.	Students select or design some appropriate tests or processes, with a notable error or omission.	Students select or design some appropriate tests or processes, with significant errors or omissions.																																		
We look for a minimum average of 2.50 for each assessed junior-level course section, and 3.00 for each assessed senior-level course section. Of the courses assessed for this Outcome, EE 431 is considered junior-level, with the remaining courses considered senior-level.																																						
Program Success Target for this Measurement	Target weighted averages are 2.50 for assessed junior-level course sections combined, and 3.00 for assessed senior-level course sections combined.	Percent of Program Achieving Target Weighted Averages for course sections assessed:	Junior-level course sections: 3.11 Senior-level course sections: 3.66																																			

Methods	<p>Instructors choose artifacts to assess, using the above rubric, in their respective courses/sections. These artifacts will be different course section-to-course section, instructor-to-instructor, and semester-to-semester. Each item of the rubric (e.g., design process, conclusions, etc.) was weighted equally when scoring the rubric. In some cases, specific items may not have been scored.</p> <p>We looked at the average obtained for each course section assessed, with each of the junior-level course sections targeted to achieve a minimum average of 2.50, and each of the senior-level course sections targeted to achieve a minimum average of 3.00. It was observed that most course sections met their targets, but one did not.</p> <p>We also performed weighted averages of all assessed junior-level course sections (combined) for the academic year, and all assessed senior-level course sections (combined) for the academic year to determine if, overall, the Outcome was met. The weighted averages were expected to be 2.50 or above for assessed junior-level course sections (combined) and 3.00 or above for assessed senior-level course sections (combined). This was our Program Success Target. As indicated above, we achieved an average of 3.11 for assessed junior-level course sections overall, and 3.66 for assessed senior-level course sections overall.</p>		
Measurement Instrument 2	Senior Exit Surveys were given to students taking the senior design course during Fall 2019 and Spring 2020. Students were asked to “Rate your ability to develop and conduct appropriate experimentation, analyze and interpret data, and use engineering judgment to draw conclusions” on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 5 being the highest).		
Criteria for Student Success			
Program Success Target for this Measurement	Target average of 3.75	Percent of Program Achieving Target Weighted Average:	4.70
Methods	For this year there were 10 scores total, 8 for Fall 2019 and 2 for Spring 2020. The above average of 4.70 is the average of all 10 scores received on this particular item from both semesters.		
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 6.		Met	Not Met
Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			
EE 380, ENGR 490 and ENGR 491 were added to the list of courses to assess for this Outcome. Sections of the ENGR courses were assessed this year.			
Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			
The EE program assessment plan calls for rubric collection each semester (fall and spring), and a meeting of EE faculty to discuss the rubric results.			

Student Learning Outcome 7

Student Learning Outcome	ABET EAC Outcome #7: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to acquire and apply new knowledge as needed, using appropriate learning strategies.																																
Measurement Instrument 1	Artifacts were assessed in some or all sections of the following courses: EE 300, ENGR 490, ENGR 491																																
Criteria for Student Success	<p>The following rubric is used when assessing student performance:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5" style="text-align: center;">Student Learning Outcome 7: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to acquire and apply new knowledge as needed, using appropriate learning strategies.</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">Capstone 4</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Milestones</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Benchmark 1</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">3</th> <th style="text-align: center;">2</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="width: 25%;">Independence (Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning VALUE Rubric)</td> <td>Educational interests and pursuits exist and flourish outside classroom requirements. Knowledge and/or experiences are pursued independently.</td> <td>Beyond classroom requirements, pursues substantial, additional knowledge and/or actively pursues independent educational experiences.</td> <td>Beyond classroom requirements, pursues additional knowledge and/or shows interest in pursuing independent educational experiences.</td> <td>Begins to look beyond classroom requirements, showing interest in pursuing knowledge independently.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transfer (Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning VALUE Rubric)</td> <td>Makes explicit references to previous learning and applies in an innovative (new and creative) way that knowledge and those skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.</td> <td>Makes references to previous learning and shows evidence of applying that knowledge and those skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.</td> <td>Makes references to previous learning and attempts to apply that knowledge and those skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.</td> <td>Makes vague references to previous learning but does not apply knowledge and skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Initiative (Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning VALUE Rubric)</td> <td>Completes required work, generates and pursues opportunities to expand knowledge, skills, and abilities.</td> <td>Completes required work, identifies and pursues opportunities to expand knowledge, skills, and abilities.</td> <td>Completes required work and identifies opportunities to expand knowledge, skills, and abilities.</td> <td>Completes required work.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>We look for a minimum average of 2.50 for each assessed junior-level course section, and 3.00 for each assessed senior-level course section. Of the courses assessed for this Outcome, EE 300 is considered junior-level, with the remaining courses considered senior-level.</p>			Student Learning Outcome 7: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to acquire and apply new knowledge as needed, using appropriate learning strategies.						Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1			3	2		Independence (Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning VALUE Rubric)	Educational interests and pursuits exist and flourish outside classroom requirements. Knowledge and/or experiences are pursued independently.	Beyond classroom requirements, pursues substantial, additional knowledge and/or actively pursues independent educational experiences.	Beyond classroom requirements, pursues additional knowledge and/or shows interest in pursuing independent educational experiences.	Begins to look beyond classroom requirements, showing interest in pursuing knowledge independently.	Transfer (Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning VALUE Rubric)	Makes explicit references to previous learning and applies in an innovative (new and creative) way that knowledge and those skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.	Makes references to previous learning and shows evidence of applying that knowledge and those skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.	Makes references to previous learning and attempts to apply that knowledge and those skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.	Makes vague references to previous learning but does not apply knowledge and skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.	Initiative (Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning VALUE Rubric)	Completes required work, generates and pursues opportunities to expand knowledge, skills, and abilities.	Completes required work, identifies and pursues opportunities to expand knowledge, skills, and abilities.	Completes required work and identifies opportunities to expand knowledge, skills, and abilities.	Completes required work.
Student Learning Outcome 7: Upon graduation, our students have the ability to acquire and apply new knowledge as needed, using appropriate learning strategies.																																	
	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1																													
		3	2																														
Independence (Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning VALUE Rubric)	Educational interests and pursuits exist and flourish outside classroom requirements. Knowledge and/or experiences are pursued independently.	Beyond classroom requirements, pursues substantial, additional knowledge and/or actively pursues independent educational experiences.	Beyond classroom requirements, pursues additional knowledge and/or shows interest in pursuing independent educational experiences.	Begins to look beyond classroom requirements, showing interest in pursuing knowledge independently.																													
Transfer (Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning VALUE Rubric)	Makes explicit references to previous learning and applies in an innovative (new and creative) way that knowledge and those skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.	Makes references to previous learning and shows evidence of applying that knowledge and those skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.	Makes references to previous learning and attempts to apply that knowledge and those skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.	Makes vague references to previous learning but does not apply knowledge and skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.																													
Initiative (Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning VALUE Rubric)	Completes required work, generates and pursues opportunities to expand knowledge, skills, and abilities.	Completes required work, identifies and pursues opportunities to expand knowledge, skills, and abilities.	Completes required work and identifies opportunities to expand knowledge, skills, and abilities.	Completes required work.																													
Program Success Target for this Measurement	Target weighted averages are 2.50 for assessed junior-level course sections combined, and 3.00 for assessed senior-level course sections combined.	Percent of Program Achieving Target	Junior-level course sections: 2.67 Senior-level course sections: 3.54																														
Methods	<p>Instructors choose artifacts to assess, using the above rubric, in their respective courses/sections. These artifacts will be different course section-to-course section, instructor-to-instructor, and semester-to-semester. Each item of the rubric (e.g., independence, transfer, etc.) was weighted equally when scoring the rubric. In some cases, specific items may not have been scored.</p> <p>We looked at the average obtained for each course section assessed, with each of the junior-level course sections targeted to achieve a minimum average of 2.50, and each of the senior-level course sections targeted to achieve a minimum average of 3.00. It was observed that</p>																																

	<p>most course sections met their targets, but some did not.</p> <p>We also performed weighted averages of all assessed junior-level course sections (combined) for the academic year, and all assessed senior-level course sections (combined) for the academic year to determine if, overall, the Outcome was met. The weighted averages were expected to be 2.50 or above for assessed junior-level course sections (combined) and 3.00 or above for assessed senior-level course sections (combined). This was our Program Success Target. As indicated above, we achieved an average of 2.67 for assessed junior-level course sections overall, and 3.54 for assessed senior-level course sections overall.</p>		
Measurement Instrument 2	Senior Exit Surveys were given to students taking the senior design course during Fall 2019 and Spring 2020. Students were asked to “Rate your ability to acquire and apply new knowledge as needed, using appropriate learning strategies” on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 5 being the highest).		
Criteria for Student Success			
Program Success Target for this Measurement	Target average of 3.75	Percent of Program Achieving Target Weighted Average:	4.40
Methods	For this year there were 10 scores total, 8 for Fall 2019 and 2 for Spring 2020. The above average of 4.40 is the average of all 10 scores received on this particular item from both semesters.		
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 7.		Met	Not Met
Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			
No specific actions have been identified for this Outcome.			
Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			
The EE faculty had previously decided to monitor the prior low compiled averages in ENGR 490 and 491, and revisit. This academic year the compiled averages in those courses were higher.			
The EE program assessment plan calls for rubric collection each semester (fall and spring), and a meeting of EE faculty to discuss the rubric results.			