



Outcome 4 (Explain various process instrumentation theories.): Assessed two class 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 class student exams. 100% C or better. Exceeded



- Collegewide initiatives (e.g. High Impact Practices)
- Faculty staff, student development
- Other

No changes were implemented ~~23~~ *(if no options above were selected)*

If you checked ~~Other~~ above, please describe.

6.

DEAN SECTION ~~(Due to the program in January 15)~~

*After completing the Dean Section and signing it, the dean is to send form to the program, copy [uaa\\_oaa@alaska.edu](mailto:uaa_oaa@alaska.edu) for posting. If the program is delivered on one or more community campuses, the dean should consult with the appropriate community campus director(s) on the response and appropriate community campus director(s) emailing the response to the program*

1. Based on the program's responses above, what guidance is moving forward?
  - 1.) The faculty have shown the effectiveness of the assessment process. I agree that adding hands on lab to address the short fall in technical knowledge would help. Based on this, I would suggest that there are direct changes being made. It is my recommendation that the faculty continue to examine the student learning outcomes as per the 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.
  - 2.) The assessment process has allowed the faculty to find a deficiency in the students learning

Dean's signature

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dean White", written over a horizontal line.

Date: 1/4/2024