

End of the Academic Year 2011-2012 – DDT Program *Results & Improvement Plan for Next Year*

Directions: Please fill in the 6 blue shaded items below with brief sentences – required for reporting to the Learning Council.

Save and Send Your Work...

To type in this form please “save” this file to your computer. Exit your e-mail. Open this file on your computer.

Select “save as” and rename the file to add your program and last name.

For example the file “...template” would be renamed and saved as “...template Subject Area Jones.” Save your work along the way.

Due Date: *Please e-mail your completed form by attaching it to an e-mail message and sending it to Jessica King (jking84@valenciacollege.edu) by Tues., May 15th.*

We will have attached this page from your original plan, please complete this only if your leadership team has changed.

Academic Program / Discipline Area (for General Education) or Co-Curricular Program Area				
Drafting and Design Technology				
Planning Team Leader(s) ¹	Campus	E-mail Address	Phone Extension	Mail Code
Andrew Ray	West	ARay@valenciacc.edu	1847	4-41
Planning Team Members ²	Campus	E-mail Address	Phone Extension	Mail Code
Robert Watson	Adjunct	Robert.Watson@kratosdefense.com	None	4-41
Irma Berner	East	iberner@valenciacollege.edu	2627	3-25

Please fill in the blue shaded areas with brief sentences. A second page is provided for longer comments.

These six items are required for the report to the Learning Council.

¹ Planning Team Leaders assume the responsibility for coordinating activities associated with the expectations for the design, approval and implementation of Assessment Plans.

² Planning Team membership, whenever possible, should reflect the ***Principles for selection of members for assessment plan work teams***. For faculty teams the principles include: College-wide representation where possible; Full-time faculty from the respective program / discipline (tenured, tenure track, and non-tenure earning 4 / 8 / 10 month faculty); Adjunct faculty when an adequate number of full-time faculty do not teach in the program / discipline; Faculty from both disciplines or programs when an outcome is assessed in two programs or a program other than the primary discipline. For plans developed in Student Affairs planning teams should include the following: College-wide representation where possible; Staff from the targeted program area; Part-time Student Affairs professionals when an adequate number of full-time staff do not work in the targeted program area; Faculty / staff from other program / discipline areas working on the same or similar outcomes; Students representation when possible.

Documenting the Assessment Process

1. In a sentence or two, what did you do and who was responsible for coordinating the collection of student artifacts / data?

The capstone course in the DDT Program is ETD2731 Mechanical Drafting II. The Professor administers a standardized final written exam and assigns a final drafting project, and is responsible for collecting them. Grading of projects follows a standardized rubric of deducting for drafting errors or omissions. If needed, students can receive a copy of the graded drawings.

2. At what point in the academic year / semester were the student artifacts / data collected?

The learning artifacts are collected during finals week of the capstone course (most recently in April, 2012).

Improvement Plan and Use of the Assessment Results – Next Year's Cycle

3. What were your results? (Please e-mail the data when you submit this form if possible, for example rubric scores in an Excel sheet.)

The results indicated that both the Final Exam and Final Project were of sufficient complexity to determine student mastery of the subject, and should be used in subsequent semesters as appropriate evaluation tools. The grading criteria for drafting is a list of required elements and a listing of deduction points for errors and omissions following industry protocols. This has proven to be effective and fair in assessing student performance, but could use some further refinement regarding the qualities/description of good drafting.

4. What are the changes / improvements you plan to make within the curriculum (targeted courses), co-curricular program, or student activity over the next year? (Please use the following page if you need more space for your response.)

Coordination with professors teaching foundation courses in this program will guarantee readiness and proficiency for the capstone course. It is recommended that students be introduced early in the course to the assessment criteria, final exam format and content, project expectations and guidelines, deliverables, and presentation requirements to better prepare them to succeed. It is recommended that students be required to include this work in a revised version of their portfolio, which they undertake in prerequisite courses. We will also do a better job of documenting student work, and will collect the learning artifacts in a designated cabinet in 9-204.

5. What changes, if any, will be made to the common course outlines, the catalog, etc.

None are recommended.

Next Steps – Planning for Next Year's Cycle— Academic Year 2012-2013

6. What are your next steps – acting on the results? (These steps will guide others in the next cycle... moving the process forward.) If these steps include the development and implementation of a new assessment, include that information here. If you plan to change the current assessment or the program learning outcome that you focus on, you will want to do that here.

Ray and Watson will continue to refine the grading rubric by end of Summer 2012, and both will encourage more industry input during the review of the final project when the class is offered again in Spring 2013. Advice and review will be sought from the Advisory Committee during the next meeting scheduled for Fall 2012. Ray and Berner will work to keep software current with industry practices.

Please include the name of the person completing this page and your program: **Andrew Ray- Program Chair (assisted by Irma Berner)**

Additional Space for Comments (Optional)

3) *If you have additional comments for the following question, please share them here:* What were your results?

For the Final Project, students were given detailed drawings and a 3D model of a mounting bracket and bearing housing. Their task was to design an Adapter Plate to join the given parts following industry guidelines, including ANSI (American National Standards Institute) guidelines. The final design was submitted as 11x17 drawing printouts and in computer files on flashdrives, and included full details to fabricate the Adapter Plate, including the necessary Geometric Tolerancing and Dimensioning practices learned in the course. In addition, students were required to design and detail an Inspection Gage for the Adapter Plate, again using GTOL dimensioning. The qualitative portion of the grading criteria was based on quality of design, drafting accuracy, and professional layout.

4) *If you have additional comments for the following question, please share them here:* What are the changes / improvements you plan to make within the curriculum (targeted courses), co-curricular program, or student over the next year?

6) *If you have additional comments for the following question, please share them here:* What are your next steps – acting on the results? If these steps include the development and implementation of a new assessment, include that information here. If you plan to change the current assessment or the program learning outcome that you focus on, you will want to do that here.

We will continue to refine the evaluation rubric, and encourage more industry input and feedback on the quality of student work, specific software programs used and skills taught, and potential certifications that could form part of this assessment.