

CTE Annual Assessment Report Template

The purpose of CTE program-level assessment at PCC is to look at student achievement of degree and certificate-level outcomes and to help faculty focus on how to improve student learning based on assessment.

Please choose **one** of the degree and/or certificate outcomes that was part of this year's Summary Data Report, and provide a more in-depth explanation of your assessment process, results and how this might be used to enhance teaching and learning.

This form to be used for both assessments (first time the outcome is assessed) and for re-assessments (a follow-up for the initial assessment of the same outcome).

On completing the form, please e-mail it to learningassessment@pcc.edu.

SAC Assessment Contact(s):

<i>Name</i>	<i>e-mail</i>
Peter Kazarinoff	peter.kazarinoff@pcc.edu

1. Which SAC do you represent?

CMET – Civil Mechanical Engineering Technology

2. Which outcome is reported here? (Please provide the text of the outcome, and the degrees/certificates to which it applies).

Apply effective and efficient communication skills, teamwork that fosters inclusion, project and time management skills, ethical engineering practices and professional responsibility in order to plan, design, fabricate, construct and operate engineering systems or components.

3. Please share **how** this outcome was assessed to help us understand your process for assessment. Please attach a rubric, sample score sheet, or other assessment tool.

This outcome was assessed by the CMET SAC by grading the Global Energy Project Presentation Rubric for 4 groups presenting in CMET 122 Global Energy Physics. The Global Energy Project Presentation Rubric is a binary rubric used to critique the general professional presentation, figures and tables, writing style, presentation style and content of the CMET presenters. Please see attached rubric.

4. Please include information about your benchmark (the score that indicates successful attainment of the outcome), and how it was determined.

The benchmark score was determined to be 25.6 out of 32 or 80% of the possible 32 points. This benchmark was chosen because the rubric is meant to assess foundational presentation skills. In addition, 80% was chosen (rather than 70%) because the CMET students were informed of the rubric two to three weeks before the presentation. Therefore, the CMET students had ample opportunity to check that they were fulfilling the requirements of the Global Energy Project Presentation Rubric.

5. Please provide data collected in the assessment of this outcome (including score distribution and percent of students meeting benchmark). Summarize your findings in the box below. Attach supplemental information or appendices. For this report, **please do not include student identifying information**, but you can assign an arbitrary identifier, especially if you wish to reference individual scores in your discussion.

3 students (Group A) received a Final Score of 28/32. 4 students (Group B) received a Final Score of 32/32. 3 students (Group C) received a Final Score of 25/32. 1 student (Group D) received a Final Score of 20/28 (some categories were Not Applicable for this student since he did the project by himself). Please see attached (Global Energy Project assessment results).

7 out of 11 students achieved the benchmark set by the CMET SAC of 25.6/32. Please see attached

6. Please discuss your overall findings regarding student learning. (What did you learn from this assessment? Were there any surprises? Do the data make sense? How do the data relate to student learning?)

CMET students seemed to be lacking in General Presentation skills such as a proper introduction to a professional presentation. This may be attributable to the comfort level that CMET students have with each other at this point in the program.

All groups excelled at Presentation Style (good volume, good use of eye contact, etc). Again, this may be attributable to the comfort level that CMET students have with each other. They seemed at ease and were, a few exceptions, came across as well-seasoned presenters. Most, if not all, students have taken a Communications course which could also be a reason with their ease in speaking to a group.

7. Please reflect on the entire project and share how your CTE SAC will use the results to improve student mastery of this outcome. Are there changes that need to be made to improve teaching and/or learning?

As a reflection on this entire assessment project, our SAC will review the results during the in-service SAC day Fall 2019. We will use the results from this year as well as the results from the last two years to continue to refine our presentation rubric. A change that needs to be made is a practical sharing of the presentation rubric at the start of the academic year with all CMET faculty, both full time and part-time. First year classes such as CMET110 and CMET121 could incorporate presentations into the course and some second year courses such as CMET133 and CMET212 could incorporate presentations into the course as well.

8. What changes do you plan to make to your assessment of this outcome in the future?

In the future, we could use a different class, such as CMET223 to assess this outcome. The course the assessment was employed in this year (CMET122) is a first-year course. CMET223 is a second year course and taken by students at the very end of the CMET program.

Has the outcome been assessed before? (If not, skip this question).

9. Were any modifications to instruction implemented between the prior assessment and this one? How did the assessment methods and results compare with the prior assessment?

Yes, this outcome has been assessed before.

The modifications to instruction implemented between the prior assessment and this one included:

- The CMET122 instructor shared the presentation rubric with the students weeks in advance of the presentation.
- The presentation rubric was modified to a binary yes/no style rubric

These changes correspond to what we stated in the previous assessment report of the 2017-2018 academic year (section 7, page 14):

- “Instructor of course needs to be notified and shown the checklist well in advance of the quarter starting
- Checklist needs to be revised
- Level of “Exceeded Expectation” needs to be defined”

The presentation rubric was also slightly modified to fit the curriculum in CMET122. The results compared to the previous work below:

In 2018-2019 7 out of 11 students achieved the benchmark score of 80%

In 2017-2018 1 out of 4 groups achieved the benchmark score of 80%

To help us understand your SAC’s overall processes, please complete these additional questions.

1. Was the SAC able to include Part-Time (PT) and Full-Time (FT) faculty for this assessment? If PT faculty did not participate, please explain any barriers that might account for this fact.

In our initial meeting to work on the 2018-2019 Assessment, CMET part-time faculty were invited. 1 part time faculty member attended. The barriers to participation for the other part-time faculty included meeting time of day, no pay for attending the meeting, and meeting location as the Sylvania campus.

3. Is there anything else you would like to share with us? Please let us know.

Keeping part-time faculty involved in assessment is practically difficult, but incredibly important. Please share best practices from departments which do a good job including part-time faculty in assessment during the Fall 2019 in-service.

Thank you for completing this report!

We hope this has been a useful project to help your CTE SAC assist your students!