To: WSU Design Engineering Technology (DET) Program Faculty and Staff

From: Dean David L. Ferro

Re: Dean's Response to DET Self-Study, Reviewers' Report, and DET Program's Response to Utah Review

Date: 8/18/15

Thank you all for your many contributions to WSU's DET Review process. All DET faculty members as and others in the Engineering Technology (ET) department, especially the chair, Rick Orr, as well as COAST/EAST's former dean, Warren Hill, participated in various stages of this review, and I am grateful to you for your thoughtfulness and thoroughness in addressing concerns of importance to the program, department, college, and university.

Like the writers of the Review Report, I would characterize the program as very effective in meeting the missions of the parent units. Faculty members have been sensitive to changes in their discipline areas and have revised curriculum to keep up with those changes. They have been supportive of co-curricular activities, internships, community-engaged learning, new tools, and collaborative multidisciplinary projects. The faculty have kept up-to-date vis-à-vis industry.

With respect to challenges identified by reviewers and addressed by faculty:

1. Program Challenges: Most of the programs in the college – definitely in ET - are teaching overload. Fortunately, we have only recently received Engineering Initiative money that will assist with this. However, in addition, this is an opportunity to re-examine two things: the emphasis areas that the program is engaged in and the use of efficient instruction through additional adjuncts and online/hybrid technology. Both are unaddressed in the reports. Fortunately, the college is engaged in a strategic planning process. The budget for the program has remained the same for the past five years, not decreased by 20%. There is some variation within the department, however, if you look at human resource allocation given enrollments.

2. Standards Not Met: A. I believe that additional advisement will assist department. B. The architecture aspect of the department needs to be looked at strategically and a decision made as to its future. C. Agree that the ABET process is sufficient for Continuous Improvement.

3. Recommendations for Change: A. There are many options for increasing technology and the dean's office can assist with this. B. The Provost's office has assisted with the hiring of a new adviser in CS and ET. This should help – although, the department doesn't see advising as an issue. Also, again, some strategic planning will assist this as well. C. Agree with department's response. D. I agree with assessors that department minutes generally might be helpful. However, the program meets irregularly on an as-needed basis, and this is impractical. The department does keep minutes when program status is also discussed. E. Agree with assessors that other team opportunities would help although it is not critical. F. Understand the confusion of 2012 versus 2015 IAC report and am happy to see that the IAC met in 2015. However, agree strongly with assessors that the program should meet with IAC once per year.

4. Additional Recommendations. Mission: A. It works if the mission statement is embedded in the syllabi. Any opportunity to clarify is recommended. However, the mission statement can also be found at department level. B. General education seems adequate.
5. Additional Recommendations. Curriculum. C. Recently the college has purchased several additional 3D printing devices and upgraded labs.
6. Additional Recommendations. Learning. B. There has been some revision of Revit classes.
7. Additional Recommendations. Assessment. D. This is not a requirement of ABEET because of its difficulty. This is a reasonable approach.

WSU's DET program is healthy. It has taken many positive steps to remain so. Its next steps will carry it yet farther along a road to success for students, faculty, and staff.

David L. Ferro, dean

College of Engineering, Applied Science & Technology