– Systems Engineering & Technical Management – 2014-15 Assessment Report

Cristina Crespo & James Eastham

Electrical Engineering & Renewable Energy Department

Contents

1 Introduction **3**
1.1 Program Goals and Design 3
1.2 Program Brief History 3

2 Program Mission, Educational Objectives, and Outcomes **4**
2.1 Program Mission 4
2.2 Program Educational Objectives 4
2.3 Relationship Between Program Educational Objectives and Institutional Objectives 4
2.4 Student Outcomes 4

3 Cycle of Assessment for Program Outcomes **5**
3.1 Introduction and Methodology 5
3.2 Assessment Cycle 5
3.3 Summary of Assessment Activities & Evidence of Student Learning 6
3.3.1 Introduction 6
3.3.2 Methodology for Assessment of Program Outcomes 6
3.3.3 2014-2015 Targeted Assessment Activities 7
3.3.4 Targeted Assessment for Outcome a: an ability to apply systems engineering methods to practical problems involving one or more engineering disciplines. 7
3.3.5 Targeted Assessment for Outcome b: knowledge and understanding of project management techniques and frameworks 8
3.3.6 Indirect Assessment 9

4 Changes Resulting From Assessment **10**

1 Introduction

1.1 Program Goals and Design

The Systems Engineering & Technical Management (SEM) program is designed as a dual major option for students with an ABET accredited primary major in an engineering discipline offered at Oregon Tech. Students first choose a primary ABET accredited major (e.g., Electrical Engineering, Renewable Energy Engineering, Mechanical Engineering), and complete additional specialized coursework to earn a second major in Systems Engineering & Technology Management. The program is designed so that both majors in the degree can be completed in 4 years by taking summer courses. ABET ETAC degree students may also pursue the dual major with departmental approval.

The purpose of the SEM program is to prepare graduates that are able to address complex problems in areas such as electrical and electronic systems, information systems, renewable energy systems, economic and financial systems, telecommunications, transportation, project management, and manufacturing. Systems engineering is not about specific technologies, but how to put heterogeneous technologies together to formulate system solutions to complex problems. As such, systems engineering is a multidisciplinary engineering discipline concerned with the design, modeling, analysis, and management of technological systems that employ a combination of devices, software, hardware, firmware, materials, and humans for such diverse purposes as communications, energy engineering, health care, transportation or manufacturing. The dual major curriculum provides engineering students with design viewpoints and methodologies that emphasize system integration, and with subject matter and tools for modeling and analysis especially appropriate for large complex systems, including system theory, simulation, computational data analysis and statistics, and engineering management

Graduates of the dual degree program are technically competent in an engineering discipline, but also have formal education, training and skills in systems engineering, project management, product development, strategy and innovation, as well as engineering management. This combined training makes them ideal candidates to assume functional managerial positions, such as project managers and technical team leaders.

The dual major in Systems Engineering & Technical Management is offered at the Oregon Tech Wilsonville campus.

1.2 Program Brief History

The DMSEM program was developed in response to requests from local industry. The Industry Advisory Boards of the EERE Department had recommended adding Systems Engineering coursework since 2008, based on the emerging need for systems engineers. At the time this program was initially developed (2013), there were 19 Systems Engineering BS degree programs in the US. None of these degrees were available in the State of Oregon. Due to the lack on systems engineering education in the state and the need for this skillset, the Engineering and Technology Industry Council (ETIC) committed $195,000 for Oregon Tech to develop and launch a dual major in this technical field. The program was approved by the Curriculum Planning Commission in February 2014, and is planned to be launched in Fall 2014.

2 Program Mission, Educational Objectives, and Outcomes

2.1 Program Mission

The mission of the DMSEM is to equip graduates with the knowledge and skills to address complex multidisciplinary problems involving the design, modeling, analysis, and management of technological systems that employ a combination of devices, software, hardware, firmware, materials, and humans for such diverse purposes as communications, energy engineering, health care, transportation or manufacturing. The dual major curriculum provides engineering students with design viewpoints and methodologies that emphasize system integration, and with subject matter and tools for modeling and analysis especially appropriate for large complex systems including system theory, simulation, computational data analysis and statistics, and engineering management.

2.2 Program Educational Objectives

The SEM dual major requires students to complete an ABET-accredited engineering major as a primary major (e.g., BSEE, BSREE, etc). In addition to the Program Educational Objectives of the primary major, the additional Program Educational Objectives for the SEM program are:

- PEO1: Graduates of the program will excel as professionals in the various fields of engineering.
- PEO2: Graduates of the program will demonstrate an ability to apply systems thinking and systems engineering methods to the solution of complex problems involving one or more engineering disciplines.
- PEO3: Graduates of the program will demonstrate an ability to manage technical projects in multidisciplinary teams, and will excel in problem solving, and effective communication.

2.3 Relationship Between Program Educational Objectives and Institutional Objectives

The SEM dual major is closely aligned with the university's mission of providing "innovative and rigorous degree programs" in technically-related fields "with an emphasis on application of theory to practice." It also supports the mission of the college of ETM to "educate leaders in the fields of engineering, technology, and management."

2.4 Student Outcomes

The SEM dual major requires students to complete an ABET-accredited engineering major (e.g., BSEE, BSREE, etc.). In addition to the ABET-EAC (a) through (k) Student Outcomes (assessed in the primary major), students pursuing the dual major in SEM must meet an additional SEM specific Student Outcome:

a an ability to apply systems engineering methods to practical problems involving one or more engineering disciplines

b knowledge and understanding of project management techniques and frameworks

3 Cycle of Assessment for Program Outcomes

3.1 Introduction and Methodology

The SEM specific Student Outcomes are covered in the three courses listed below, included as degree requirements in the SEM dual major program. The courses where assessment is performed are indicated with an asterisk (*). Outcome (a) is assessed in SEM421, and outcome (b) is assessed in SEM422.

- SEM421 Systems Engineering *
- SEM422 Advanced Systems Engineering *
- SEM423 Advanced Management for Engineers

3.2 Assessment Cycle

Given that the SEM program is structured as a dual major only, the overall assessment cycle for any program involving a primary engineering major with dual major in SEM would correspond to the combination of the assessment cycle for the primary engineering major and the assessment cycle for the SEM dual major.

Table 1 outlines how the SEM specific student outcomes are integrated into the typical three-year assessment cycle for the other engineering disciplines at Oregon Tech. For the three-year cycle of the particular primary major discipline, please refer to he corresponding Assessment report for that particular discipline. In the table, year 1 corresponds to the 2014-15 assessment period (from Spring 2014 to Winter 2015). Since the SEM dual major is expected to be launched in Fall 2014, it is expected that the amount of data collected in the first year or two may be limited (due to initial low enrollment numbers associated with a new program launch).

Table 1: SEM dual major outcome assessment cycle

Outcome	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
ABET (a) - (k)	As determined by cycle of primary engineering major		
a. Systems Engineering	√	√	√
b. Project Management	√	√	√

3.3 Summary of Assessment Activities & Evidence of Student Learning

3.3.1 Introduction

Formal assessment of the two SEM student outcomes was conducted during the 2014-2015 academic year using direct measures such as course projects and assignments. Indirect assessment of student outcomes is typically conducted via a senior exit survey. Since this is a new program and there are no graduating students expected until Spring 2016, no indirect assessment was conducted this year.

3.3.2 Methodology for Assessment of Program Outcomes

At the beginning of the assessment cycle, an assessment plan was generated by the Assessment Coordinator in consultation with the Assessment Handbook. The plan includes the outcomes to be assessed during the particular assessment cycle, as well as the courses and terms in which these outcomes are to be assessed.

The SEM assessment process uses assignments and projects in SEM courses specifically to assess programmatic student outcomes. These assignments are assessed based on rubrics created by Oregon Tech SEM faculty. A systematic, rubric-based process is used to assess the level of attainment of a given program outcome, based on a set of performance criteria. The work produced by each student is evaluated according to the different performance criteria, and assigned a level of 1-developing, 2-accomplished, or 3-exemplary. The results for each outcome are then summarized in a table, and reviewed by the faculty at the annual Closing-the-Loop meeting. The acceptable performance level is to have at least 80% of the students obtain a level of accomplished or exemplary in each of the performance criteria for any given program outcome. If any of the direct assessment methods reflects a performance below the established level, that triggers the continuous improvement process, where all the direct and indirect assessment measures associated with that outcome are evaluated by the faculty, and based on the evidence, the faculty decides the adequate course of action. The possible courses of action are:

- Collect more data (if there is insufficient data to reach a conclusion as to whether the outcome is being attained or not); this may be the appropriate course of action when assessment was conducted on a class with low enrollment, and it is recommendable to re-assess the outcome on the following year, even if it is out-of-cycle, in order to obtain more data.
- Make changes to the assessment methodology (if the faculty believe that missing the performance target on a specific outcome may be a result of the way the assessment is being conducted, and a more proper assessment methodology may lead to more accurate numbers); for example, this could be the suggested course of action if an outcome was assessed in a lower-level course, and the faculty decide that the outcome should be assessed in a higher-level course before determining whether curriculum changes are truly needed.
- Implement changes to the curriculum (if the faculty conclude that a curriculum change is needed to improve attainment of a particular outcome). A curriculum change will be the course of action taken when the performance on a given outcome is below the target level, and the evidence indicates that there is sufficient data and an adequate

assessment methodology already in place, and therefore there is no reason to question the results obtained.

If the faculty decide to take this last course of action and implement curriculum changes, the data from the direct assessments is analyzed and the faculty come up with a plan for continuous improvement, which specifies what changes will be implemented to the curriculum to improve outcome performance.

In addition to direct assessment measures, indirect assessment of the student outcomes is performed on an annual basis through a senior exit survey.

The results of the direct and indirect assessment, as well as the conclusions of the faculty discussion at the Closing-the-Loop meeting are included in the annual SEM Assessment Report, which is reviewed by the Department Chair and the Director of Assessment for the university. The suggested changes to the curriculum are presented and discussed with all the department faculty at the annual Convocation meeting in Fall, as well as with the EERE Industry Advisory Boards. If approved, these changes are implemented in the curriculum and submitted to the University Curriculum Planning Commission (if catalog changes are required) for the following academic year.

The sections below describe the 2014–15 targeted assessment activities and detail the performance of students for each of the assessed outcomes. The tables report the number of students performing at a developing level, accomplished level, and exemplary level for each performance criteria, as well as the percentage of students performing at an accomplished level or above.

3.3.3 2014-2015 Targeted Assessment Activities

The sections below describe the 2014-2015 targeted assessment activities and detail the performance of students for each of the assessed outcomes. The Tables report the number of students performing at a (1) developing level, (2) accomplished level, and (3) exemplary level for each performance criteria, as well as the percentage of students performing at an accomplished level or above (i.e., 2 or 3).

3.3.4 Targeted Assessment for Outcome a: an ability to apply systems engineering methods to practical problems involving one or more engineering disciplines.

This outcome was assessed in SEM421–Systems Engineering in Fall 2014 by means of a final project involving a paper and a presentation.

For the final project (paper and presentation), students selected a recent article or industry case involving a serious issue related to a product or service pertaining to the course (e.g. defect, technical issue, reliability problem, supply chain problem, etc.). Students analyzed the issue, explored how the problem could have happened, and developed a set of recommendations based on course learning. The project contained a quantitative component (e.g. data analysis, modeling, survey, interviews).

Five students were assessed in Fall 2014 using the performance criteria listed in the table below. The minimum acceptable performance level was to have above 80% of the students performing at the accomplished or exemplary level in all performance criteria.

Table 2 summarizes the results of this targeted assessment. The results indicate that the minimum acceptable performance level of 80% was met on all performance criteria for this program outcome, that is, 80% of students were able to apply systems engineering methods to practical problems involving one or more engineering disciplines.

Table 2: Targeted Assessment for Outcome a: 1) Criterion 1-knowledge of systems engineering methods, 2) Criterion 2-application of systems engineering methods to practical engineering problems

Performance Criteria	1-Developing	2-Accomplished	3-Exemplary	% Students ≥ 2
1 - Knowledge	1	1	3	80%
2 - Application	1	1	3	80%

3.3.5 Targeted Assessment for Outcome b: knowledge and understanding of project management techniques and frameworks

This outcome was assessed in SEM422–Advanced Systems Engineering in Winter 2015 by means of a homework assignment.

Homework #2 involved demonstration of project management knowledge and tools. Students demonstrated knowledge of the following topics: precedence relations, network diagram, critical path analysis, work breakdown structure, resource analysis, project costing, and project scheduling. Students used MS-Project to create project schedules (Gantt chart), resource charts, and analyze precedence relations and critical path.

Three students were assessed in Winter 2015 using the performance criteria listed in the table below. The minimum acceptable performance level was to have above 80% of the students performing at the accomplished or exemplary level in all performance criteria.

Table 3 summarizes the results of this targeted assessment. The results indicate that the minimum acceptable performance level of 80% was met on all performance criteria for this program outcome, this is, over 80% of students demonstrated knowledge and understanding of project management techniques and frameworks.

Table 3: Targeted Assessment for Outcome b: 1) Criterion 1-knowledge of project management techniques, 2) Criterion 2-knowledge of project management frameworks

Performance Criteria	1-Developing	2-Accomplished	3-Exemplary	% Students ≥ 2
1 - Techniques	0	1	2	100%
2 - Frameworks	0	1	2	100%

3.3.6 Indirect Assessment

Indirect assessment of the SEM program specific outcomes will be conducted via a Senior Exit Survey. The first cohort of students from this program is expected to graduate in Spring 2016, so indirect assessment will first be reported in the assessment report for the 2015-16 assessment cycle.

4 Changes Resulting From Assessment

This section describes the changes resulting from the assessment activities carried out during the assessment year 2014-2015. It includes any changes that have been implemented based on assessment in previous assessment cycles, from this or last year, as well as considerations for the next assessment cycle.

The SEM faculty reviewed the assessment results to determine whether any changes are needed to the SEM curriculum or assessment methodology based on the results presented in this document. The objective set by the SEM faculty is to have at least 80% of the students perform at the level of accomplished or exemplary in all performance criteria of the assessed outcomes. Table 4 provides a summary of the 2014-15 assessment results for the outcomes which were directly assessed.

Table 4: Summary of SEM direct assessment for AY2014-15

	Total Students	Students ≥ 2	% Students ≥ 2
a - Systems Engineering			
1 - Knowledge	5	4	80.0%
2 - Application	5	4	80.0%
b - Project Management			
1 - Techniques	3	3	100%
2 - Frameworks	3	3	100%

The results show that the threshold of attainment of this outcome was met in all performance criteria. The faculty identified no issues and therefore recommended no changes at this time. As this is a new program, the amount of assessment data available is still very limited. The program is expected to continue growing, making it easier to have a more substantial amount of assessment data to determine attainment of student outcomes.