

Physic and Engineering

Learning Outcome:

Critical Thinking: Students will be able to examine, critique and synthesize information in order to arrive at reasoned conclusions.

Outcome Measure:

ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

75% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Reading/Critical Thinking.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient					
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Critical Thinking	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%	76.9%	88.9%	72.7%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The students are in general achieving the benchmark.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

The variability in the data appears to be the result of relatively small sample sizes.

Rubric Used

No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile test results.

Physic and Engineering

Learning Outcome:

Oral Communication: Students will effectively communicate complicated technical information orally.

Outcome Measure:

PHY475 Senior Lab project technical talk.

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

At least 75% of students will achieve an average score of 2.5 or higher on criteria on the Oral Presentation rubric in a talk juried by department faculty.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Students at 2.5 or higher					
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Oral Presentation Rubric Scores	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92.8%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The students are achieving the benchmark.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

In the future the department may want to analyze the data base on individual components of the Oral Presentation Rubric rather than using a single average score for each student.

Rubric Used

Physics and Engineering Oral Presentation Rubric

	Outstanding	High satisfactory	Low Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
<input type="checkbox"/> Command of Material	<input type="checkbox"/> D clearly knows material D expands on PPT slides D content appropriate for audience	<input type="checkbox"/> D knows most key facts D some expansion on slides D partial adaption for audience	<input type="checkbox"/> D reads some, knows some D no expansion on slides D little adaption of content for audience	<input type="checkbox"/> D reads many sentences from slides D dependent on notes D lacks adaption of content to audience
<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Organization	<input type="checkbox"/> D clear and concise outline D relevant graphics and key text on slides D ± 30 s of time limit	<input type="checkbox"/> D clear outline D too much information on slides <input type="checkbox"/> D ± 60 s of time limit	<input type="checkbox"/> D some sense of outline D too much information and detail <input type="checkbox"/> D ± 1.5 m of time limit	<input type="checkbox"/> D no clear sense of outline D slides are paragraphed; too much detail on one slide D ± 2 m of time limit
<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation Skills	<input type="checkbox"/> D clearly practice several times; smooth transitions D free of uhms and the like <input type="checkbox"/> D clearly heard and used inflection for emphasis D engages audience with eye contact D engages audience with gestures	<input type="checkbox"/> D Practiced, but transitions not smooth D few uhms <input type="checkbox"/> D understood much of the time and some inflection D some engagement with eye contact D some engagement with gestures	<input type="checkbox"/> D practiced, but no transitions between slides D many uhms <input type="checkbox"/> D some difficulty hearing and little inflection D infrequent eye contact <input type="checkbox"/> D some distracting gestures	<input type="checkbox"/> D not practiced, doesn't anticipate content of next slide D uhms and the like detract from the presentation D cannot be heard and/or speaks in a monotone D no eye contact <input type="checkbox"/> D frequent distracting gestures
<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation Tools	<input type="checkbox"/> D PPT background matched to content, legible font, graphics, seamless transitions D Appropriate graphics used.	<input type="checkbox"/> D appropriate background, font, transitions <input type="checkbox"/> D Some graphics used to enhance presentation.	<input type="checkbox"/> D distracting backgrounds, transitions, fonts hard to read <input type="checkbox"/> D graphics do not enhance presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> D no attention to backgrounds, transitions, fonts very hard to read D distracting use of graphics

Physics and Engineering

Learning Outcome:

Written Communication: Students will effectively communicate complicated technical information in writing.

Outcome Measure:

PHY475 Senior Lab Written Technical Report.

ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

PHY475: At least 75% of students will achieve an average score of 2.5 or higher on criteria on the Written Report rubric.

ETS: 75% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Writing.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

PHY475:

	Percentage of Students at 2.5 or higher					
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Written Report Rubric	75%	N/A	100%	100%	84%	64.2%

ETS:

	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient					
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Writing	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%	61.5%	94.4%	72.7%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The students are consistently hitting the benchmarks in both the written report and the ETS exam. The dip in the ETS exam in 2015-16 was due to small sample size (if one student had a slightly higher score the benchmark would have been met).

The reports that students are writing in the senior lab have been uneven. Examining the data from 2017-18 the main areas of weakness are:

- Information literacy (multiple references and the references cited)

- A well-written conclusion
- Uncertainties and error propagation discussed in the paper.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

The department will be undergoing program review in the coming year and will look at the alignment between the ETS exam and the written report expectations. It is clear that the students are not fully understanding the expectations for the final lab report that is being used in this class.

Rubric Used
ETS: No rubric.

PHY457 Written Report Rubric:

	Outstanding	High satisfactory	Low Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Structural pieces	<p>D abstract is a clear and concise summary of all relevant results and descriptions in the order emphasized in the paper.</p> <p>D introduction indicates precise subject, scope, and purpose</p> <p>D main body is a well-organized, logical and contains all necessary information without extra information.</p> <p>D conclusion appropriately sums up, gives conclusions, and recommendations</p> <p>D multiple references from reputable sources.</p> <p>D references cited in the body of the document</p>	<p>D abstract could be made clear and/or concise with minor changes.</p> <p>D introduction is missing one of the following: precise subject, scope, and purpose.</p> <p>D main body lacks some organization</p> <p>D conclusion does two of the following: sums up, gives conclusions, and recommendations</p> <p>D most references from distinct reputable sources</p> <p>D some citation of reference in body</p>	<p>D abstract is missing some information and/or contains unnecessary information.</p> <p>D introduction is missing two of the following: precise subject, scope, and purpose.</p> <p>D main body is missing some important pieces and/or is not well organized</p> <p>D conclusion does one of the following: sums up, gives conclusions, and recommendations</p> <p>D some references from reputable sources</p> <p>D limited citation of references</p>	<p>D abstract does not contain necessary information</p> <p>D introduction does not give precise subject, scope and purpose.</p> <p>D main body is not well organized, lacks logical arguments and relevant data</p> <p>D conclusion does provide any summation, conclusions, or recommendations</p> <p>D no bibliography, or all references from untrusted sources</p> <p>D no citation of references</p>
Data	<p>D data is clearly presented in properly formatted tables, figures and graphs where appropriate.</p> <p>D all uncertainties are shown and error propagation are carried out where appropriate.</p>	<p>D some data could be presented more clearly</p> <p>D most uncertainties are shown and propagation of error carried out.</p>	<p>D data is poorly presented and some key data is missing.</p> <p>D many uncertainties are missing and/or propagation or error not carried out correctly</p>	<p>D several pieces of key data are missing</p> <p>D no uncertainties of measurements are show</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> Grammar Spelling, and Style	<p>D no grammatical or spelling errors</p> <p>D equations well formatted, and variables introduced as needed.</p> <p>D appropriate style (no first person, past tense when reporting what was done)</p> <p>D clear sentences and ideas are presented in a way that won't be misunderstood</p> <p>D concise and quantitative as subject matter permits</p> <p>D arguments are complete and logical</p>	<p>D few grammatical and spelling errors</p> <p>D a few errors in formatting equations</p> <p>D a few informal statements and/or tense</p> <p>D a few unclear sentences</p> <p>D a few unnecessary words and ideas</p> <p>D most arguments are complete</p>	<p>D some grammatical and spelling errors</p> <p>D poorly formatted equations</p> <p>D several areas with are too informal and tense errors</p> <p>D many complex and unclear sentences</p> <p>D frequent extra and inexact words</p> <p>D several arguments are difficult to follow</p>	<p>D many grammatical and spelling errors</p> <p>D incorrect equations</p> <p>D very informal and/or use of future tense where not appropriate</p> <p>D many sentences are unclear and have overly complex construction</p> <p>D many vague, inexact, many idle words</p> <p>D arguments are incomplete, illogical, and may contain unnecessary information and specialized jargon</p>

Physic and Engineering

Learning Outcome:

Information Literacy: Students will be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and cite information for the task at hand.

Outcome Measure:

PHY475 Senior Lab Written Technical Report.

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

PHY475: At least 75% of students will achieve an average score of 2.5 or higher on criteria on the information literacy portion of the Written Report rubric.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Students at 2.5 or higher					
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Written Report Rubric IL	25%	N/A	63%	86%	53%	42.8%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The students are not achieving the benchmark. It is clear from looking at the writing rubric results, that this is the weakest category for students.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

The department needs to work with students to clarify expectations for the use and citation of material in technical write-ups. This will be part of the curricular adjustments made as the result of program review.

Rubric Used

PHY457 Written Report Rubric:

	Outstanding	High satisfactory	Low Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Structural pieces	<p>D abstract is a clear and concise summary of all relevant results and descriptions in the order emphasized in the paper.</p> <p>D introduction indicates precise subject, scope, and purpose</p> <p>D main body is a well-organized, logical and contains all necessary information without extra information.</p> <p>D conclusion appropriately sums up, gives conclusions, and recommendations</p> <p>D multiple references from reputable sources.</p> <p>D references cited in the body of the document</p>	<p>D abstract could be made clear and/or concise with minor changes.</p> <p>D introduction is missing one of the following: precise subject, scope, and purpose.</p> <p>D main body lacks some organization</p> <p>D conclusion does two of the following: sums up, gives conclusions, and recommendations</p> <p>D most references from distinct reputable sources</p> <p>D some citation of reference in body</p>	<p>D abstract is missing some information and/or contains unnecessary information.</p> <p>D introduction is missing two of the following: precise subject, scope, and purpose.</p> <p>D main body is missing some important pieces and/or is not well organized</p> <p>D conclusion does one of the following: sums up, gives conclusions, and recommendations</p> <p>D some references from reputable sources</p> <p>D limited citation of references</p>	<p>D abstract does not contain necessary information</p> <p>D introduction does not give precise subject, scope and purpose.</p> <p>D main body is not well organized, lacks logical arguments and relevant data</p> <p>D conclusion does provide any summation, conclusions, or recommendations</p> <p>D no bibliography, or all references from untrusted sources</p> <p>D no citation of references</p>
Data	<p>D data is clearly presented in properly formatted tables, figures and graphs where appropriate.</p> <p>D all uncertainties are shown and error propagation are carried out where appropriate.</p>	<p>D some data could be presented more clearly</p> <p>D most uncertainties are shown and propagation of error carried out.</p>	<p>D data is poorly presented and some key data is missing.</p> <p>D many uncertainties are missing and/or propagation or error not carried out correctly</p>	<p>D several pieces of key data are missing</p> <p>D no uncertainties of measurements are show</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> Grammar Spelling, and Style	<p>D no grammatical or spelling errors</p> <p>D equations well formatted, and variables introduced as needed.</p> <p>D appropriate style (no first person, past tense when reporting what was done)</p> <p>D clear sentences and ideas are presented in a way that won't be misunderstood</p> <p>D concise and quantitative as subject matter permits</p> <p>D arguments are complete and logical</p>	<p>D few grammatical and spelling errors</p> <p>D a few errors in formatting equations</p> <p>D a few informal statements and/or tense</p> <p>D a few unclear sentences</p> <p>D a few unnecessary words and ideas</p> <p>D most arguments are complete</p>	<p>D some grammatical and spelling errors</p> <p>D poorly formatted equations</p> <p>D several areas with are too informal and tense errors</p> <p>D many complex and unclear sentences</p> <p>D frequent extra and inexact words</p> <p>D several arguments are difficult to follow</p>	<p>D many grammatical and spelling errors</p> <p>D incorrect equations</p> <p>D very informal and/or use of future tense where not appropriate</p> <p>D many sentences are unclear and have overly complex construction</p> <p>D many vague, inexact, many idle words</p> <p>D arguments are incomplete, illogical, and may contain unnecessary information and specialized jargon</p>

Physics and Engineering

Learning Outcome:

Quantitative Reasoning: Students will be able to solve problems that are quantitative in nature.

Outcome Measure:

ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

Outcome Measure:

ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

95% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Math.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient					
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Math	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	90.9%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The students are consistently hitting the benchmark.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

None at this time.

Rubric Used

No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile test results.