

## **APPENDIX F**

### **May 2009 Assessment Information**

At the March 2009 Departmental Advisory Committee (DAC) meeting one of the planned agenda items was to look at some Ethics Case Studies as evidence of Outcome F. However, because of a communication failure, the case studies had been discussed in class and no student papers were available. At that time I informed the DAC members that I would be asking them to assess the case studies at a later date.

Then, at the DAC meeting, a deficiency in one element of Outcome C was identified. The faculty responded with changes in requirements in the senior design reports, which were to be completed in a little over a month. The faculty opted to have the DAC members review the new senior design reports to see if the concern in Outcome C had been resolved.

Finally, as I prepared the self-study report it became apparent that the way we had been handling the survey results (looking for problems rather than successes), I had no definitive statement that we had or had not met our Program Objectives. Since I was asking the DAC to do some work anyway, I asked them to re-assess the survey data and make a statement about program objectives as well.

Since this assessment was performed via email, I am presenting the various responses here because no summary was prepared by the DAC members.

Ron Larsen, May 28, 2009

#### **Item 1. CHBE Educational Objectives**

I asked the DAC members to reassess the alumni and employer survey results and select one of the following options:

- It appears that the CHBE program IS meeting the educational objectives.
- It appears that the CHBE program IS NOT meeting the educational objectives.
- From the available data, I CAN'T TELL whether or not the CHBE program is meeting

All of the DAC members who responded selected the first option. Two DAC members added comments:

With respect to meeting the CHBE educational objectives, I have reviewed the student, alumni, and employer feedback documents. I concluded that the surveys produced some important, objective feedback. There were no fair or poor rankings. Most of the responses were either good or excellent. While there were a few comments that indicated a desire for more specific skills, I saw no evidence of flawed preparation in the fundamentals. This seems fairly normal as we often tend to hope for a sharper specific tool for use to work on a specific problem. However, what is really desired is confidence that our fundamental understanding of the science and engineering will lead us in the right direction. Thus, I concluded that the CHBE program IS meeting the educational objectives of the program.

Having just gone through an ABET visit I looked at the information you provided in the manner that our visitor looked at ours. What our visitor was looking for was a direct assessment of whether our graduates were achieving the objectives. Most of the feedback I see from the students focus on what they did while at MSU and thus indicate how well your program outcomes were being met but not necessarily the objectives (results your graduates are expected to demonstrate after they leave MSU). The feedback from the employers was a much better source of information. From this information it would appear that the CHEBE program is meeting its educational objectives.