



Five-Year Review Planning Goals

5-Year Plan:

1. Summary of program changes: The First year of implementation of semester based curriculum was successful. The only significant change is the transfer of a semester based program. The aim of this change was not to delay any student's graduation.
2. Faculty: We have hired a tenure-track faculty position for a position that was left vacant the year before. Dr. Sumarano started in his Fall 2011 semester and comes to us with years of experience with 1020* and 1512 corporations.
3. Research: The computer engineering faculty are active in research and have been successful in publishing their work. Growth in research is a goal that the engineering faculty are aggressively pursuing.
4. Laboratory development: Engineering is being allocated space for faculty research and teaching in ScS 15. The space is being utilized for the development of an electronics laboratory and other computer engineering research space requirements. Two computer engineering faculty and a faculty from computer science work in this laboratory.
5. Equipment: Through our annual fundraising and departmental resources we are planning to upgrade the computer engineering laboratory ScS 15.
6. Growth: The computer engineering program is the fastest growing undergraduate program

B. &\$%) *

List the PLO(s) assessed. Provide a brief background of the program's history of assessing the PLO(s) (e.g. a first time part of other assessments etc.)

The program learning outcomes assessed for 2013-2014 are P*2s 3 and 5. The P*2s were assessed by using results from group projects or presentations across three classes. Since the BS in Computer Engineering is a new program that officially began in 2013, this year is part of the second 5-year cycle of assessment. The three classes were 1S3&1 Computer, Architecture 101 = P#4. & Senior Design 1 = P#4.3 Senior Capstone. While our 5-year assessment plan has eleven program learning outcomes, we elected to change them with the conversion of the semester system. The old learning outcomes with the new learning outcomes in red have been mapped out here:

Plan of P*2s:

P*2 1: , ability to apply (knowledge of mathematics, science, and) engineering. P*21

P*2 2: , ability to design and construct experiments as well as to analyze an experiment. P*28

P*2 3: , ability to design a system, component, or process to meet desired needs within realistic constraints such as economic, environmental, social, political, ethical, health and safety, manufacturability, and sustainability. P*2&

P*2 4: , ability to function on multidisciplinary teams. P*25

P*2 5: , ability to identify, formulate, and solve engineering problems. P*21

P*2 8: Demonstrating of professional and ethical responsibility. P*24

P*2 7: , ability to communicate effectively. P*23

P*2 9: : Broad education necessary to understand the impact of engineering solutions in a global, economic, environmental, and social context. P*24

P*2 10: Recognition of the need for and the ability to engage in life-long learning. P*27

P*2 11: : Knowledge of contemporary issues. P*2&

P*2 11: , ability to use the techniques, skills, and modern engineering tools necessary for engineering practice. P*28

1. & ' (\$ %

(\$ \$ari)e "o r assess \$e !t #rocess brief"" si !g the fo 'o *i !g s b-headi !gs.

\$ & \$) *# (+ !c' de if !e * or o'd i !str \$e !t& ho * deve 'o #ed& descri #tio ! of co !te !t)

The instruments used to assess P*2s were public presentations and group projects. Since professors use different grading scales, each question normalized to a rating scale 1-4 with 1 being the lowest score and 4 being the highest score. Questions focused on engineering as an analysis and design synthesis.

+ % & #

Students in different classes were assessed based on specific course materials in the computer engineering discipline. The knowledge of the successful in these courses is cumulative where 1S3&1 material is practice level while 1 = P# 4. & an 1 = P# 4.3 are mastery level. Problems were chosen by the procuring professor of the exemplary of the material in each course.

+ ! " %\$ \$ % #

The courses used for assessment are all required courses in the computer engineering discipline. Successful completion of each question requires essential knowledge for completion of the degree program. The selection was done in consultation between the individual procuring professors, the assessment coordinator, and the department chair for computer engineering.

\$! %\$ # (i/c' de *he!& *ho& a!d ho* co'ected)

Problems were collected by the responsible faculty assessment coordinator. Raw faculty scores were normalized across all sample problems on the 1-4 scale for correctness. Faculty scores were utilized to facilitate comparisons between introductory practice and mastery levels.

\$ ' #

1S3&1 through 1 = P# faculty
/ em: Implement an arithmetic logic unit with your partner.
 , average score of 4@: & .7 ?31 submissions@
Score of 1: & Score of 2: . Score of 3: ; Score of 4: 1&
Score of 3 or higher: 84.5E

1 = P# 4. &
/ em: Project presentation "F grade" by content organization and delivery.
 , average score of 4@: 3.8 ?15 submissions@
Score of 1: 1 Score of 2: - Score of 3: 3 Score of 4: 11
Score of 3 or higher: .3.3E

1 = P# 4.3
/ em: Final group project "F grade" on integration of member "design" components.
 , average score of 4@: 3.3 ?14 submissions@
Score of 1: - Score of 2: 1 Score of 3: ; Score of 4: 5
Score of 3 or higher: .& . E

Ru!ric for P* 23 ?4.&@:

?1@ Presen a ion gives vague specifica ion of pro9ec < leng h oo shor < im!alance" "elivery

?&@ Presen a ion con en missing a ma9or componen < leng h is shor < organi5a ion issues

?3@ Presen a ion organi5a ion has minor "iscon inui ies< con en misses only minor poin s< nee" o prac ice "elivery

?4@ Presen a ion organi5a ion is coheren < con en is comple ely specifie"< goo" "elivery

Ru!ric for P* 25 ?3&1 an" 4.3@:

?1@ 1orrec ly specifie" less han &5E of all componen s an" connec ions in circui "esigns

?&@ 1orrec ly specifie" &5E or more of all componen s an" connec ions in circui "esigns

?3@ 1orrec ly specifie" 5- E or more of all componen s an" connec ions in circui "esigns

?4@ 1orrec ly specifie" 75E or more of all componen s an" connec ions in circui "esigns

+. & ' (\$ & \$

(\$ \$ari)e "o r assess \$e !t res 'ts brief'" si !g the fo 'o *i !g s b-headi !gs.

#

' i h respec o P* 25: S u"en s in 1S 3&1 an" 1 = P# 4.3 wor(e" oge her o comple e a group pro9ec . ' hile s u"en s in 1S 3&1 were lef o hemselves wi h respec o !rea(ing "own group responsi!ili ies< s u"en s in 1 = P# 4.3 were gui"e" o speciali5e an" gra"e" !ase" on he 6uali y of heir in"ivi"ual componen s. , s u"en s move" from prac ice level o mas ery level< he level of un"ers an"ing increase" significan ly wi h an average pro9ec score of &..7 o 3.3. The !i-mo"el "is ri!u ion of un"ers an"ing(no -un"ers an"ing which was a pro!em when reviewing P* 2& las year "i" no appear wi h respec o P* 25. Pe"agogy "i" no change.

' i h respec o P* 23: S u"en s "i" an e\$cep tional 9o! presen ing heir ma erial for he mos par in 1 = P# 4.&. ' hile he class has effec ive communica ion as a learning ou come< s u"en s are force" !y heir pro9ec assignmen s o wri e< re-wri e< an" refine heir pro9ec specifica ions a leas four imes !efore hey !uil" he pro9ec . This forces he s u"en s o hin(very har" a!ou heir opic an" !ecome specialis s in heir wor(.

% \$ (+ \$# (, ha !ges i ! co rse co !te !t& co rse se- e !ce& st de !t advisi !g)

1onsis en sylla!i an" sample 6ues ions shoul" !e "velope" !y he "epar men for each course o uniformly measure he P* 2% s across courses ha may !e run !y mul iple professors. ' hile his may encourage professors o H each o he es I o some "egree< if he assessmen covers only he core ma erial< hen professors will have wi"er la i u"e o each he ma erial as hey see fi .

, \$ \$ +) * (! \$" + # (. eco \$ \$ e ! datio ! s to address fi ! di ! gs & ho * / * he !)

Professors in computer engineering should convene to prepare the assessment questions for each class. , " " i onally < crea ing Gues ions ha es in ro " uc ory < prac ice < an " mas ery levels < shoul " ! e consi " ere " .) owever < he assessmen Gues ions shoul " ! e ! alance " in ha hey can ! e solve " a he en " of a final eSam.

\$" (%\$ #

The syllabi and assessment questions use for 1 , PR assessment and , : # T assessment should be co-created to minimize the impact of program assessment on the student learning experience.

#. \$ (, \$

(\$ \$ ari) e " o r assess \$ e ! t # ' a ! s for the ! e 0 t " ear & i ! c ' di ! g the PLO(s) " o # ' a ! to assess & a ! " revisio ! s to the # rogra \$ assess \$ e ! t # ' a ! # rese ! ted i ! " o r ' ast five - " ear # ' a ! se f - st d " & a ! d a ! " other re ' eva ! t i ! for \$ atio ! .

' e plan o con inue assessmen wi h mi " erm eSam Gues ions an " final eSam Gues ions where feasi ! le for in " i vi " ual wor (for P * 2 S 1 < & 4 < 8 < an " 7 . P * 2 s 3 an " 5 reGuire assessmen of group wor (an " an a ! ili y o communica e respec ively. For P * 2 3 < group projec gra " es an " peer review Gues ionnaires will ! e use " for assessmen . For P * 2 5 < wri en an " oral assignmen s will ! e use " for assessmen . The ne \$ se of P * 2 s o assess ? on he new se @ are P * 2 1 < P * 2 4 < an " P * 2 7 . , Il P * 2 s will ! e assesse " ! y ei her mi " erm or final eSam Gues ions.

///. ! _____ - ! .

% & (- (% \$

The following table is enrollment data a e\$ race" from Pioneer + a a ' arehouse. This " a a in " i ca es ha he 1 ompu er # ngeeneering enrollment is increasing a a cons an ra e. The curren " a a as of Fall of & - 1 ; s an " s a 15 . . The curren facul y of 1 ompu er # ngeeneering are J Roger + oering > ames Tan " on an " , le \$ Sumarsono . The program is accre " i e " ! y , : # T un il he Fall of & - & & .

	!	% "	! + & \$	& \$	\$	\$	\$
/01/	. & \$	\$	/2	<u>13</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>63</u>	0
/014	. & \$	\$	52	<u>72</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>156</u>	0
/012	. & \$	\$	104	<u>63</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>168</u>	0
/017	. & \$	\$	140	<u>108</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>111</u>	0

