NEASC INVENTORY OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS
(FOOD SCIENCE - AY 2016-17)

DEGREE GRANTING PROGRAM NAME	(1) List ONLY the program learning objective(s) assessed during the current reporting period	(2) For each learning objective listed in column (1), other than GPA, what data/ evidence was used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated objectives? (e.g., capstone assignment, portfolio review, licensure examination)	(3) What were the results/outcomes/findings/conclusion(s) of the assessment? Explain results/findings/conclusions for each program learning objective listed in column (1) .	(4) Who interprets the evidence? Describe the process (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee).	(5) What changes/improvements have been made as a result of using the data/evidence (3)? Link discussion in this column with a learning objective (1) and the results of assessing that objective (3)	(6) Date of most recent program review
Food Science Major	PLO1: Communicate complex technical information PLO4: Analyze food components PLO5: Identify food hazards	Direct: Collected Student Artifacts for learning objectives PLO1, PLO4, and PLO5.	The artifacts have not been analyzed. However rubrics have been created for POL1-POL5. They are located on the next page of the report.	The rubrics were created by the food science committee. The committee consists of the Food Science faculty within the department (Dr. Apostolidis and Dr. Mannam)	The artifacts have not been analyzed. The first round of artifact evaluation will happen this summer (Summer 2018).	2016-2017

Insert URL of the program web page where Program Learning Objectives for this program are published (NEASC requires this as part of being transparent to stakeholders): https://www.framingham.edu/academics/colleges/science-technology-engineering-and-mathematics/chemistry-and-food-science/

Below we are presenting the rubric.

For Post/Pre Exam PLO2-PLO5

For reporting we will be evaluating the whole performance pre vs. post.

We will be determining the change in %. The grades used will be:

Change 0-20% ➔ Poor, 0 Grade
Change 20-40% ➔ Fair, 1 Grade
Change 40-60% ➔ Good, 2 Grade
Change 60-80% ➔ Very good, 3 Grade
Change 80-100% ➔ Excellent, 4 Grade

For PLO1:

Rubric Item	0	1	2	3	NA	Instructor Weighting	Score	Comments
1.Identifies and summarizes the problem, question or issue								
2. Identifies the assumptions and/or constraints and how they apply to the problem								
3. Addresses specific technical requirements of assignment.								
4. Data Presentation and Evaluation. Analyzes supporting data/evidence								
Discusses implications and findings								
Figure(s) cited in text?								
Table(s) cited in text?								
Proper labeling of figures and/or tables								
5. Conclusions. Implications/recommendations are clearly discussed								
Conclusions summarize problem, constraints, data, or recommendations								
6. Communicates effectively. Appropriate format								
Grammar/Spelling/Punctuation								

Organization, logical flow of material Proper format/citation of references in text								
Proper format of references in reference section								

Guide to Evaluation:

1. The evaluation scales is from 0 to 3 according to the following criteria:
    - 0= Lack of Evidence (not attempted or missing)
    - 1= Emerging (poorly worded, incomplete)
    - 2= Developing (key details missing)
    - 3= Demonstrating (meets all assignment requirements)