

## Undergraduate Outcomes Assessment Committee Minutes #12

Wednesday, February 27th, 2013

Taylor Room, Campus Center

Present: Peter Hansen (Chair), Art Heinricher (Dean of Undergraduate Studies), Chrysanthe Demetry (Morgan Teaching & Learning Center), Satya Shivkumar, Tanja Dominko (Secretary)

Chair Peter Hansen called the meeting to order at 10:05am.

### 1. Acceptance of the Minutes for Meeting #10 and #11

Minutes of the meeting #10 held on 2/13/2013 were approved as distributed.

Minutes of the meeting #11 held on 2/20/2013 were approved as distributed.

### 2. MQP review forms

The committee continued the discuss MQP Program review evaluation instruments received from different undergraduate programs. Departments are using a variety of different approaches to evaluate their MQP programs and learning outcomes. In the absence of an institutional evaluation form, Departments have developed their own instruments with questions that align with WPI institutional MQP learning outcomes.

- - In some programs, questions are evaluated using qualitative indicators and can be rated with a descriptive scale, such as “highly present”, “moderately present” or “not present”.
- - Some programs employ evaluation of both the **extent to which an outcome was part of the project** (0=not at all, 1=insignificant or minimal extent, 2=to a significant extent) and the **level of accomplishment** (on a scale 1-5) for all outcomes scored with at least a value of 2.
- - Some programs evaluate their MQP project outcomes using a numerical scale from 0-4 or 0-5 in addition to NA (non-applicable) score.
- - Some programs employ a combination of descriptors and numerical values.

To be able to compare evaluations of MQP outcomes across WPI programs, the committee believes there is a need to develop a common scale for evaluations as well as some common phrasing. While this may be ideal, the committee also realizes that the existing instruments have been in use for a number of years and have served engineering departments well as a source of data in preparation for ABET evaluations.

The committee would like to sponsor a brainstorming wine/cheese reception in conjunction with the Morgan Teaching Center on Wednesday, April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2013 to present our findings and discuss some recommendations, especially for the engineering departments that are preparing for ABET review in 2014. The committee is mindful

that MQP program evaluations must satisfy the A-K criteria from ABET evaluations while at the same time address institutional MQP learning outcomes.

Respectfully submitted,

Tanja Dominko, Secretary