



Department of
Chemical and Biomedical Engineering
Fenn College of Engineering
Annual Report
Program Assessment
Masters of Science in Chemical Engineering
Academic Year 2007-2008

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION	2
1. DEGREE TITLES.....	2
2. PROGRAM MODES.....	2
3. CONTACT INFORMATION.....	2
B. PROGRAM EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES [OR GOALS]	3
C. DESCRIPTION OF ASSESSMENT TOOLS [OR RESEARCH METHODS]	5
1. DESCRIPTION OF ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY.....	5
D. FINDINGS	5
F. REVIEW	7
G. ACTIONS	8
APPENDIX	9
QUESTIONNAIRE USED FOR PROGRAM GOALS AND STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT ASSESSMENT	9

Prepared by: Dhananjai B. Shah /Jorge E. Gatica
Department of Chemical and Biomedical Engineering, *August 2008*

A. Background Information

[What information about your program or unit is it important for assessment reviewers to understand?]

1. Degree Titles

The program assessment below pertains to the Masters of Science in Chemical Engineering (MS ChE).

2. Program Modes

The MS ChE program is offered in two modes:

1. Thesis option
2. Project option

The assessment metrics are collected only for those students following the Thesis option.

3. Contact Information

Dr. Jorge E. Gatica
Professor and Graduate Program Director
Department of Chemical and Biomedical Engineering
Cleveland State University
Phone: (216) 687-2571
Fax: (216) 687-9220
Email: j.gatica@csuohio.edu

On Sabbatical Leave, July 2008 – January 2009

Dr. Jorge E. Gatica, Ph.D.
Visiting Professor & Senior Fulbright Scholar
Departamento de Ingeniería de Procesos y Gestión Industrial
Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Tecnología
Universidad Nacional de Tucumán
(011) 54 - 381 - 0381- 4107573 or 4364093 ext. 7723
Tucumán - Argentina

B. Program Educational Outcomes [or Goals]

[What are your programs' or units' goals? How and when were your unit's goals of student learning developed? Who was involved? Have you reviewed your goals? Have they been modified based on assessment information?]

ABET's Glossary

Program Outcomes: List of topics/skills that students are expected to know/have after completing the program curriculum.

The following description of Chemical Engineering and our specific program educational objectives is quoted from our departmental publications such as brochures, flyers, CSU graduate catalog (<http://www.csuohio.edu/gradcollege/catalog/>), web pages, etc.

The graduate program in chemical engineering provides advanced training in core areas and allows the student to take courses on an advanced level in specific areas of interest.

The master's program is designed to meet the needs of both part-time and full-time students. It provides an opportunity for students to hold full-time employment and further their education on a part-time basis. Full-time students can complete the program in one year. The program meets the needs of students planning to continue their studies at the doctoral level as well as students terminating their formal studies at the M.S. level.

Research activities of the faculty provide many opportunities for students to select projects applicable to a Master's Thesis ([CHE 699](#)) or a Master's Project ([CHE 698](#)). Research areas include reaction engineering, process modeling and control, tribology and surface phenomena, biochemical and biomedical engineering, material synthesis and processing, combustion, adsorption and diffusion in zeolites, transport phenomena, fluid mechanics, separation processes, statistical mechanics, glass forming, thermodynamics, and management of technology. The department is particularly strong in applications involving materials sciences and biomedical engineering.

(Program Educational Outcomes)

The goals of this program are to develop in the student:

1. A more general and fundamental understanding of the principles underlying a particular field of study, as well as those underlying related fields.
2. A familiarity with advanced methods of analysis and synthesis that are more powerful and more generally applicable than those taught at the undergraduate level.
3. The ability to independently read and understand the significance and limitations of the relevant literature.
4. The ability to formulate, initiate, and complete new and innovative research projects that contribute to the advancement of the field.
5. To communicate effectively in written and oral form.

These program objectives are mapped into specific elements evaluated during the assessment of the Thesis and its oral defense (cf. assessment process detailed below).

Significant constituencies of MS ChE program are the faculty advisors, employers, and thesis committee members.

Employers/Companies:

The main mode of soliciting input from external constituencies is through the departmental Industrial Advisory Committee (IAC). The IAC is comprised of practicing engineers. We intentionally set up the visiting committee to cover fairly new engineers (about 5 years of school) to higher-ranking individuals with 20-plus years of experience. Some of the members are our own alumni.

The visiting committee members receive announcements, news, etc. during the year. The main half-day meeting occurs once a year. There is an agenda set before the meetings and supplementary materials are sent to the members beforehand. The meeting minutes are transcribed and distributed to the committee members, faculty and others (e.g. the Dean) after the meeting.

Faculty (Advisor and Thesis Committee):

The Program Educational Objectives were originally outlined by departmental faculty after a year of deliberations in 2000. Curricular matters as well as Program Assessment of all Engineering graduate programs are overseen by their respective Department and the Engineering Graduate Affairs Committee. The major ongoing role of the faculty is to analyze and evaluate the input from the IAC, the GAC, and biannual alumni surveys, and combine these inputs with their own assessment of the program. These are discussed yearly at a faculty retreat.

C. Description of Assessment Tools [or Research Methods]

[What indirect and direct evidence have you gathered to measure accomplishment of your goals? What testing instruments, methods, and processes do you use to collect assessment data? Have these instruments been modified since your last report? If so, why?]

The major instrument used for the assessment of the Program Outcomes is a questionnaire completed by the Thesis Committee members and any faculty present at the Thesis oral defense. (a copy of the questionnaire and mapping into Program Outcomes is attached to this report).

This questionnaire has been modified since the last report to include a detail of presentations made at National and International Symposia from materials derived from Masters Thesis Research.

1. Description of Assessment Methodology

All results are compiled and analyzed by the Graduate Program Director or Graduate Program Committee. The results are normalized from 0 to 3. Results below 1.5 are highlighted as areas requiring action; results below 2.0 are identified as areas requiring attention, while results above 2.0 are considered satisfactory.

The compiled results are presented to the department faculty at the Department Annual Retreat (in November). The areas identified as critical are analyzed again and any discrepancies (stemming from results from different methods) are resolved. The Department Retreat is where possible actions are recommended and approved, with specific decision about timelines and responsibilities for implementation.

A summary of the Department Retreat is compiled by the Engineering Criteria Department Coordinator and circulated among faculty for accuracy. Curriculum changes are then officially brought before the Department, College and University committees for approval and implementation.

This year some changes were instituted to ensure that all Thesis defenses contribute to the assessment process (the questionnaires for this AY assessment were not received in a timely manner, questionnaires corresponding to some Theses defenses were never made available for assessment).

D. Findings

Materials corresponding to five (5) Masters Theses defenses and four (4) Masters Projects presentations were collected. The questionnaires reported on 3 presentations made at International Symposia, but no publications in peer-reviewed journals. [Note that the assessment of Masters Projects was an action decided in the AY 2005-2006]

The results for the 2007-2008 Academic Year are tabulated below

Objectives Criteria	Exemplary	Satisfactory	Unacceptable	Average
1				2.26
1a	4	15		2.21
1b	6	13		2.32
2				2.47
	9	10		2.47
3				2.26
	9	9		2.26
4				2.35
4a	6	12	1	2.26
4b	12	7		2.63
4c	6	12	1	2.26
4d	5	12	1	2.22
5				2.54
5a	6	10	3	2.16
5b	11	6	1	2.56
5c	12	6	1	2.58
5d	16	4		2.80
5e	6	12		2.33
5f	16	3		2.84

These results suggest that although most outcomes have been satisfactorily met, there is clearly some room for improving the attainment of some of the goals of the program. Particularly in areas such as:

[Goal 1: The development of a more general and fundamental understanding of the principles underlying a particular field of study, as well as those underlying related fields.]

[Goal 3: The ability to independently read and understand the significance and limitations of the relevant literature.]

[Goal 4: The ability to formulate, initiate, and complete new and innovative research projects that contribute to the advancement of the field.]

4.c. Adequacy of the depth of the research

4.d. Novelty of the research


Perhaps the most noticeable deficiency is in one of the components of the fifth goal:

[Goal 5: To communicate effectively in written and oral form.]

5.a. Quality of the writing style


Trends

The following trends [traced back to the previous Academic Year] can be reported



Student Academic Achievement Objectives trends for Graduate Program

With exception of goal 2, no appreciable changes can be observed in the metrics for most goals.



Trends in Graduate Program

While the trends seem to indicate a slight improvement in the achievement metrics, the data might be insufficient to draw any significant conclusion. Overall the program trends do not point to any deficiencies. The decrease in technical production might be a reflection in the drop of program graduates for the 2007-2008 Academic Year.

F. Review

These results, trends and possible remedial actions will be discussed at the next Department Retreat (November 2008).

G. Actions

A new course addressing issues pertaining to the writing and presentation of scientific reports. Once performance and trends can be identified, a curriculum modification might be considered (to include Technical Writing and Presentation of Scientific Results as part of the MS ChE Program).

APPENDIX

Questionnaire used for Program Goals and Student Academic Achievement Assessment

M.S. in Chemical Engineering Program

Assessment of Student Academic Achievement Objectives

This evaluation is to be completed by each member of the student's thesis or project committee, upon completion of the defense or oral presentation. Return form to the department secretary. Please check the appropriate box in each row.

The objectives of this program, are to develop in the student:	Level of Achievement		
	Exemplary	Satisfactory	Unacceptable
1. A more general and fundamental understanding of the principles underlying a particular field of study, as well as those underlying related fields.			
a. Depth of knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/> Student shows excellent understanding of fundamental pples. directly related to the project.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student displays good understanding of fundamentals directly related to project.	<input type="checkbox"/> Understanding of fundamental principles directly related to the project is weak.
b. Breadth of knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/> Student shows good understanding of related principles.	<input type="checkbox"/> Knowledge of related subjects is adequate.	<input type="checkbox"/> Knowledge of related subjects is weak.
2. A familiarity with advanced methods of analysis and synthesis that are more powerful and more generally applicable than those taught at the undergraduate level.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student is competent in the most advanced techniques needed for research in the field. Student can synthesize and integrate results and relate them to the hypothesis.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student is competent in experimental/analytical techniques needed for research in the field. Student can accept or reject hypotheses.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student is competent in analytical techniques, with little understanding of the principles underlying the techniques. Student has difficulty in addressing the hypothesis.
3. The ability to independently read and understand the significance and limitations of the relevant literature.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student actively searches all works directly and indirectly related to the project. Student can identify the strengths and limitations of various methods.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student has read the literature related to project, and understands how project fits into the literature.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student has read only some of the articles related to the project.
4. The ability to formulate, initiate, and complete new and innovative research projects that contribute to the advancement of the field.			
a. Impact on advancement of the field	<input type="checkbox"/> Work has strong impact on the field.	<input type="checkbox"/> Work has incremental impact on field.	<input type="checkbox"/> Work has no impact on the field.
b. Adequacy of the scope of the research	<input type="checkbox"/> Work has examined many facets of the problem.	<input type="checkbox"/> Amount of work is adequate.	<input type="checkbox"/> Amount of work done is inadequate.
c. Adequacy of the depth of the research	<input type="checkbox"/> Work has probed deeply the principles behind the problem.	<input type="checkbox"/> Work answers the basic questions of the problem.	<input type="checkbox"/> Work only touched the surface of the problem.
d. Novelty of the research	<input type="checkbox"/> The thesis is an innovative idea from the student; student shows creativity in designing experiments and solving problems.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student contributed originality to designing experiments and solving problems.	<input type="checkbox"/> The student followed directions from his/her advisor.
Over Please →			

5. To communicate effectively in written and oral form.			
a. Quality of the writing style	<input type="checkbox"/> Written sentences are complete and grammatical, and they flow together easily. Words are chose for their precise meaning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is grammatically correct. Paragraphs and sentences may not flow together perfectly.	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing contains grammatical errors.
b. Organization of the written Thesis	<input type="checkbox"/> Thesis is logically organized and easy to follow.	<input type="checkbox"/> Thesis organization is clear.	<input type="checkbox"/> Thesis is poorly organized.
c. Organization of the presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation is clear, logical and organized. Listener can follow line of reasoning. Pacing is correct for the audience.	<input type="checkbox"/> Listener can follow and understand the presentation.	<input type="checkbox"/> Talk is poorly organized. Speaker jumps around from topic to topic.
d. Clarity of language usage	<input type="checkbox"/> Speaker is comfortable in front of the group and can be heard by all.	<input type="checkbox"/> Grammatical errors and use of slang are evident. Some sentences may be incomplete.	<input type="checkbox"/> Speaker is difficult to understand or hear.
e. Ability to answer questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Answered questions directly and clearly.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student can answer questions, but with some difficulty.	<input type="checkbox"/> Students had difficulty understanding questions and answering clearly.
f. Quality of slides	<input type="checkbox"/> Slides enhance the presentation and are prepared in a professional manner.	<input type="checkbox"/> Slides are adequate for the presentation.	<input type="checkbox"/> Slides are inadequate (writing too small, too much or too little information per slide).

To be answered by the research advisor only:

Have any results from the Thesis work been presented at National or International Symposia? ____Yes ____No No. of Presentations ____
 If possible, add the details of the publications (or e-mail them to Becky to be filed with the Assessment Data)

Have any papers resulting from the Thesis work been accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals? ____Yes ____No
 If possible, add the details of the publications (or e-mail them to Becky to be filed with the Assessment Data) No. of Publications ____