1. Assessment information collected
During these two academic years, we collected data using 3 direct assessment mechanisms and 1 indirect method.

1) All 11 ABET a-k outcomes were assessed by the faculty teaching the senior capstone design projects on a 1-5 scale. The results are shown for this 2 year period.
   2017 (19 students): a=4.04, b=3.99, c=4.01, d=4.14, e=4.14, f=4.16, g=3.96, h=4.14, i=4.03, j=4.18, k=4.16
   2018 (13 students): a=4.25, b=4.18, c=4.07, d=4.31, e=4.19, f=4.33, g=4.30, h=4.23, i=4.19, j=4.16, k=4.15
   Assessed value for each of the a-k outcomes is above the 3.0 threshold.

2) ABET outcomes a, b, e, k and outcomes c, d, f, g, h, i, and j were assessed in 2016-17 and 2017-18, respectively, by faculty in their FPAR (Faculty Performance Indicator Assessment Reports). Results are given in terms of the percentage of students that exceeded the performance threshold in each of the outcomes.
   a = 88%, b = 90%, c = 100%, d = 98%, e = 92%, f = 96%, g = 100%, h = 100%, i = 97%, j = 100%, k = 96%
   Each of the outcomes is above the threshold value of 75%

3) The nationally normed FE exam was taken by graduating seniors. The results of the FE exam over the last 2 years (S16, F16, S17, F17) are 84% of 31 UAF EE students passed compared to the national average of 72%.

4) All 11 ABET a-k outcomes were indirectly assessed by the seniors. The results (in a 1-5 scale) are shown for this two year period.
   2017 (19 students): a=4.17, b=4.00, c=4.01, d=4.58, e=3.99, f=4.38, g=3.94, h=3.84, i=4.49, j=3.46, k=3.62
   2018 (13 students): a=4.38, b=4.46, c=4.08, d=4.15, e=4.46, f=4.31, g=4.08, h=4.00, i=4.62, j=3.46, k=4.38
   Assessed value for each of the a-k outcomes is above the 3.0 threshold.
2. Conclusions drawn from the information summarized above
As shown by relatively low score of 3.46/5 in senior exit survey (4) for outcome j - a knowledge of contemporary issues, it appears that at least some seniors perceive that they are not learning about contemporary issues. On the other hand scores on this outcome from faculty assessment of capstone design projects (1) and FPARs (2) indicate that faculty believe students are indeed learning contemporary issues. This dichotomy points out that students need to be explicitly told what topics they are learning are contemporary. Given that all outcomes assessed by three independent methods were above the respective threshold for each method, faculty decided to take no actions at this time on addressing outcome j, other than keep a close eye on it during the next assessment cycle.

3. Curricular changes resulting from conclusions drawn above
Overall our program is strong and there were no significant curricular changes resulting from the above conclusions. However, senior exit surveys from 2017 and 2018 indicate: 1) Even though no scores were below threshold, we continue to struggle with students understanding that they are being taught “Outcome J - knowledge of contemporary issues. Faculty teaching contemporary issues in advanced senior level classes will explicitly point out to students that certain topics they are learning are contemporary issues in industry and society.

4. Identify the faculty members involved in reaching the conclusions drawn above and agreeing upon the curricular changes resulting
The entire ECE department faculty reached the above conclusions and resulting minor curricular changes. The ECE faculty includes:
Bill Bristow <bill.bristow@gi.alaska.edu>
Denise Thorsen <denise.thorsen@alaska.edu>
Dejan Raskovic <draskovic@alaska.edu>
Richard Wies <rwwiesjr@alaska.edu>
Charlie Mayer <cemayer@alaska.edu>
Michael Hatfield <mhatfield@alaska.edu>
Stephen Stephens <swstephens@alaska.edu>
Vikas Sonwalkar <vssonwalkar@alaska.edu>

5. Has your SLOA plan been updated to include assessment of the program’s Communication Plan, as required by Faculty Senate motion?
Yes.