

## AGENDA

### 2007 CHBE Departmental Advisory Committee Meeting

#### Meeting Goals – and Outcomes<sup>1</sup>

- Review of CHBE Program Objectives – *see next page*
- Review of Focus Area Proposal
  - *DAC members were supportive of changing the Focus Areas from graduation requirements to lists of suggested courses for students with particular interests. They strongly supported the idea of generating new/additional focus areas. The idea of additional focus areas was well received by the faculty.*
- Assessment Needs
  - FE Exam Results (April 2006, October 2006)
    - *In February 2006 there was a concern that CHBE students were beginning to take the FE exam too lightly, and there was considerable discussion of how the Department should respond. Options included trying to find an incentive. The DAC members were OK with mandating that the students pass the exam to graduate, if needed.*
    - *Suggestion from DAC to monitor the fluid dynamics subject results after (35/46 result in April 2006.)*
  - Survey Results: Alumni Surveys (2005, 2006) and Senior Exit Surveys (2006)
    - *ALUMNI SURVEY COMMENTS*
    - *In the “Strengths” questions, there were 3 “poor” responses on competence in computing. We suspect that respondents are thinking “programming” rather than competence in the use of computing software, and since we do not require programming any longer, the “poor” responses are understandable.*
    - *The 3 “poor” responses in the material science question generated some discussion. It should be monitored on future surveys since this area is very applicable to chemical engineers. [Update 2/25/2008 rwl: there were no “poor” responses to this question in 2007.]*
    - *The 5 “poor” responses to the process control systems question was discussed. While the DAC did not push for action, the instructor (R. Larsen) indicated that he was planning a major update of the course for Spring 2008 to try to increase student interest and participation.*
    - *SENIOR EXIT INTERVIEW COMMENTS*
    - *The poor response on Outcome D (Multi-D) was discussed. The College’s plans to reintroduce multi-D in some fashion were presented. It seems likely that*

---

<sup>1</sup> The DAC report was presented to the faculty orally in 2006. This report was developed from the notes taken by R. W. Larsen during that oral presentation.

*responses to this question will improve when multi-D is once again back in the curriculum.*

- Outcomes
  - Transport Project (Outcomes a and e)
    - *DAC members were very impressed with the quality of the transport projects. They felt the assessment rubric was useful.*
      - *Outcome A: avg = 2.1 ("acceptable" = 2)*
      - *Outcome E: avg = 2.1*
  - Computer Project (Outcome k)
    - *DAC members had difficulty assessing the results to this assignment without the context of the course and assignment (although the assignment was provided.) Conclusion: Reports are probably better than assignments for DAC review.*
      - *Outcome K: avg = 2.0 ("acceptable" = 2)*
- Development Ideas
  - How to get back in touch with alumni?
  - How to obtain nominees for COE Honor Roll?
  - What should the Department be doing with our alumni?
  - Other?
    - *We were out of time and DAC members had to leave – little discussion of these.*