

REPORT ON AY2022-2023 ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT

Submission date: 11/17/2023

Assessment Plan covered in the report: Process Technology AAS

College: Community and Technical College

Campuses where the program(s) is delivered: Anchorage KOD KPC MSC PWSC

Submitted by: William Howell, Assistant Professor, wrhowelljr@alaska.edu

After responding to the questions below, the program should email this form to the dean, with a copy to the appropriate community campus director(s) if the program is delivered on a community campus.

- 1. Please list and number the Program Student Learning Outcomes your program assessed in AY23. For each outcome, indicate one of the following: Exceeded faculty expectations, Met faculty expectations, or Did not meet faculty expectations.**

Example: 1. Communicate effectively in a variety of contexts and formats – Exceeded faculty expectations; 2. Adopt critical perspectives for understanding the forces of globalization and diversity – Met faculty expectations.

Outcome #3 (Calculate various process equipment theory results): Assessed one class. 11 student exams. 55% C or better. Below faculty expectations

Outcome #4 (Explain various process instrumentation theories.): Assessed two classes. 10 student exams. 100% C or better. Exceeded faculty expectations.

Outcome #5 (Explain various process instrumentation and the uses of the instrumentation in control loops): Assessed two classes. 10 student exams. 100% C or better. Exceeded faculty expectations.

Outcome #6 (Sketch accurate piping and instrument diagrams (P&IDs).): Assessed two classes. 21 student exams. 90% C or better. Exceeded faculty expectations.

- 2. Describe your assessment process in AY23 for these Program Student Learning Outcomes, including the collection of data, analysis of data, and faculty (and other, e.g., advisory board) conversations around the findings. (1000 words or less)**

Program Assessment is accomplished using a three-year rotation. Designated Program Student Learning Outcomes data is submitted by faculty to the KPC Faculty Services Office Manager. The data is correlated with program student outcomes. Aggregated data is reviewed by faculty at the annual faculty assessment meeting and by smaller departmental groups. Faculty provide comments for the narrative report.

- 3. What are the findings and what do they tell the faculty about student learning in your program? (1000 words or less)**

Current student performance as measured by the AY23 assessment is in line with traditional student success metrics, with the exception of Outcome #3. Based on these results, the program is assessed to be meeting these PLSOs but improvement is needed for Outcome #3

- 4. Based on the findings, did the faculty make any recommendations for changes to improve student achievement of the Program Student Learning Outcomes? Yes**

- i. Please describe the recommended action(s), what improvements in student learning the program hopes to see, the proposed timeline, and how the program will know if the change(s) has worked. If no recommendations for changes were made, please explain that decision. (1000 words or less)**

Based on the assessment above and industry feedback, we are in the process of revising the PRT A130 curriculum to add an in-person lab, which will focus on hand tool familiarization and practical application of theory. Success will be assessed based on student performance for Outcome #3.

- 5. In the past academic year, how did your program use the results of previous assessment cycles to make changes intended to improve student achievement of the Program Student Learning Outcomes? Please check all that apply.**

- Course curriculum changes
- Course prerequisite changes
- Changes in teaching methods
- Changes in advising
- Degree requirement changes
- Degree course sequencing
- Course enrollment changes (e.g., course capacity, grading structure [pass/fail, A-F])
- Changes in program policies/procedures
- Changes to Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)

- College-wide initiatives (e.g., High-Impact Practices)
- Faculty, staff, student development
- Other
- No changes were implemented in AY23. *(If no options above were selected)*

If you checked “Other” above, please describe. (100 words or less)

- 6. Do you have any information about how well these or other past improvements are working? Are they achieving their intended goals? Please include any data or assessment results that help you demonstrate this. (1000 words or less)**

Curriculum changes were implemented for the Fall 2023 semester. Data is not yet available, but will be collected IAW the Assessment Plan.

DEAN SECTION (Due to the program on January 15)

After completing the Dean Section and signing it, the dean should email this form to the program, and copy uag_oaa@alaska.edu for posting. If the program is delivered on one or more community campus, the dean should consult with the appropriate community campus director(s) on the response and copy the appropriate community campus director(s) when emailing the response to the program.

- 1. Based on the program’s responses above, what guidance and support do you have for the program moving forward? (200 words or less)**

1.) The faculty have shown the effectiveness of the assessment process. I agree that adding a hands-on lab to address the short fall in technical knowledge would help. Based on this, I would say that there are direct changes being made. It is my recommendation that the faculty continue to examine the student learning outcomes as per their plan. If they need additional support, contact the Director of KPC or myself.

- 2. Discuss what the program is doing particularly well in terms of its processes for the assessment and improvement of student learning, for example, the use of a common rubric or prompt, a signature assignment, etc. (200 words or less)**

2.) The assessment process has allowed the faculty to find a deficiency in the students learning and directly address it. The faculty in the Process tech and Instrumentation programs show the value of the assessment process and have been actively improving their programs in a clear and direct fashion. They are to be commended for their work on improving the student success in their program.

Dean's signature:



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Amy White", is written above a solid horizontal line.

Date: 1/4/2024