

# **Academic Assessment Plan**

**(M.S., Ph.D. / Microelectronics-Photonics)**

**2016 Calendar Year Report**

## **Program Goals**

- 1. Provide students with interdisciplinary education and training in engineering and science to meet the needs of emerging technology industries.**
- 2. Place students in interdisciplinary groups performing rigorous and challenging research to prepare them for careers in industrial research teams, national labs, and academic positions.**
- 3. Prepare students to be effective in technology management and entrepreneurship.**

## **Student Learning Outcomes**

- 1. Conduct independent investigations (M.S.) or define and explore new areas of research (Ph.D.) in an interdisciplinary environment, expanding the breadth and depth of state-of-the-art knowledge in the field of micro to nanoscale materials, processing, and devices.**
- 2. Master knowledge, practices, and skills from traditional graduate level programs in Physics, Chemistry, Electrical Engineering, Chemical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, Biological Engineering, and Biomedical Engineering, regardless of prior traditional educational background.**
- 3. Communicate effectively deep level knowledge of their work to persons well-versed in their field, detailed technical concepts to persons with strong technical backgrounds outside of their field, and general concepts and applications to the general public.**
- 4. Work efficiently in interdisciplinary team environments, fully supporting team goals through active membership or through team leadership as appropriate.**
- 5. Implement intellectual property management and research commercialization processes, encouraging migration of ideas from formulation to societal benefit during their professional careers.**
- 6. Execute duties found in entry-level professional positions with the operational skills equivalent to at least one year's experience in that position.**

**7. Embrace the role of citizen-scientist in both their professional and societal communities, utilizing their sound ethical and analytical backgrounds, to lead the discussions that will be needed to balance what can be done with what should be done.**

### **Process for Assessing each Student Learning Outcome**

**1. Ph.D. Candidacy Exam Process (Direct): This process addresses the Ph.D. level knowledge portion of outcomes 1 and 2, communications requirements of outcome 3, IP and the commercialization aspects of outcome 5, and professional behaviors found in outcomes 6 and 7. Assessment of the report year will begin on January 15<sup>th</sup> of the following year and results will be reported by May 31<sup>st</sup>.**

The microEP Ph.D. candidacy process is in two parts which may be taken in either order. One part is a formal written research proposal 15 pages in length that is similar in nature to a NSF proposal. It is written in strong collaboration with the major professor, and must be presented and approved by the student's Ph.D. committee at the end of the formative stage of the research definition but well before the student is deep into the execution stage of the research. It is designed to assure that the field of the research is well understood by the student, that the proposed research topic has sufficient depth and breadth to demonstrate Ph.D. level professional work, and that the research has a reasonable chance of completion within four years after being accepted as a Ph.D. student after completion of a MS degree.

The second part is a written exam with oral discussion taken by the student during prior to the start of the spring semester. This exam is a combination of a NSF solicitation and a Request for Quotation received by a technology-based company. Students are allowed access to any written information they wish to use, but they may not discuss the exam scenario or their work with any person. The student is limited to 15 pages, and the written document and the oral discussion are both evaluated by the same faculty panel. A student who fails the exam may take it one additional time during the same time the following year. This document is almost always the first complex problem assessment and development proposal written by the student, and provides very good information on how the student will perform in the types of assignments typically given in a professional position where a Ph.D. is the minimum education requirement for being hired.

### **Data Collection and Analysis:**

Candidacy Research Proposal, 2016 Calendar Year

Number of Students Presenting Candidacy Research Proposal / Number Accepted = 8

### Written Candidacy Exam, Spring 2016

Number of Students Taking Exam: 17

Number of Students Passed Exam (First Attempt): 8

Number of Students Passed Exam (Second Attempt): 4

Number of Students Failed Exam (First Attempt): 4

Number of Students Failed Exam (Second Attempt)\*: 1

\* - Removed from microEP PhD program

### Students Admitted to microEP PhD Candidacy, 2016 Calendar Year

Number of Students Admitted to Candidacy\*\* = 8

\*\* - Passed both parts of microEP PhD candidacy process

### Five Year Statistics for Written Candidacy Exam

Pass rate (first attempt) =  $38/56 = 68\%$

Pass rate (second attempt) =  $9/12 = 75\%$

### **Assessment:**

- The candidacy exam process continues to provide a good assessment of the student's capability to meet the requirements of PhD level research. The written candidacy exam provides a good indication of how the student will perform in the types of assignments typically given in a professional position where a Ph.D. is the minimum education requirement for being hired.
- Several students who do not pass the written candidacy exam on the first attempt voluntarily move to other PhD programs at the university.
- The written candidacy exam results are presented to and accepted by the microEP faculty.
- The exam was moved in 2016 from the week of spring break to the week before the start of the spring semester. This allows the student to take the exam without the pressures of other course requirements during the semester and it is easier to fill the faculty review

panels earlier in the semester than it is in April (a busy time for conference travel and thesis/dissertation defenses). Students and faculty expressed approval with the change.

- The microEP director and associate director review the results of the written exam and the faculty panel assessment with each student examinee and their major professor. Constructive feedback is given to the students regarding strengths and areas for improvement – either in preparation for their PhD research and dissertation or to re-take the exam the following year.
- The microEP staff solicits feedback from the faculty and students each year following the exam on the exam process and ways in which it may be improved. For example, addition of a summary highlighting the novel fundamental aspects of the written proposal is being considered for addition to the candidacy exam in 2018.

**2. Curriculum and career advising each semester at pre-registration (Indirect): This process addresses outcomes 2, 4, and 6. Assessment of the report year will begin on January 15<sup>th</sup> of the following year and results will be reported by May 31<sup>st</sup>.**

This formal advising process gives an opportunity to discuss with the student such things as their academic performance in the prior semester, how they are working with their professor and their research group members, and what is affecting their ability to make satisfactory progress on their research. All students are advised by Director Rick Wise and co-advised by their major professor.

**Data Collection and Analysis:**

18 MS and 44 PhD students were advised for Spring 2016.

19 MS and 45 PhD students were advised for Fall 2016.

**Assessment:**

The advising process is helpful to the program director to get to know the students better and to track the progress of the students, or address issues, toward completing their degree requirements. It is also used as a time to check milestones including their research document (3-5 page description of their intended research initially signed by their committee and updated each semester by the student and approved by their major professor), committee form, title form, annual reviews, and reminders of dates for their written candidacy exam and candidacy research proposal.

**3. Small Group Student Meetings (peer assessment and mentoring) (Indirect): This process addresses outcomes 3, 4, 6, and 7. Assessment of the report year will begin on January 15<sup>th</sup> of the following year and results will be reported by May 31<sup>st</sup>.**

These peer mentoring groups are led by senior microEP students, and participation is required for all microEP students during their first two years in the program. The groups meet six times each fall and spring semester and focus on working group style presentations to other students that are not already familiar with the work. In this way, they practice communicating with young professionals unfamiliar with their field, and also have an opportunity to discuss operational problems with their peers and receive feedback on their way of handling the problems.

**Data Collection and Analysis:**

Spring 2016:

23 first and second year students in five Small Group Teams met six times.

Attendance (excluding illness and conference travel) = 95%

Fall 2016:

22 first and second year students in five Small Group Teams met six times.

Attendance (excluding illness and conference travel) = 96%.

**Assessment:**

The Small Group Leaders teach the students to use MS Project to map out their key project as a graduate student – meeting the requirements to get their graduate degree. Each student's MS Project file must be updated and submitted to microEP management three times in the fall semester and four times in the spring semester. The student's completed MS Project summary of their graduate program path is included as an appendix in their thesis/dissertation.

The students also prepare and practice presenting their research to their small group team and are coached by their small group leader. Each small group rotates presenting their research at monthly Research Communication Seminars to all microEP students. This practice improves the student's public speaking skills and prepares them for conference presentations, oral defense of candidacy exams, and defense of their thesis/dissertation.

- 4. Small Group Leader meetings (Indirect): This process addresses outcomes 4, 6, and 7. Assessment of the report year will begin on January 15<sup>th</sup> of the following year and results will be reported by May 31<sup>st</sup>.**

Senior microEP students that lead these small groups experience their first taste of administrative responsibility, performance assessment and feedback, and management team discussions as they find common issues of concern from the different Small Groups. They have the responsibility to not only assess and prioritize common issues and the responsibility to propose and help implement program changes needed to address the issues. These meetings are facilitated by Associate Director Panneer Selvam.

#### **Data Collection and Analysis:**

MicroEP program management met with Small Group Leaders on May 19, August 9, December 12, to share best practices, discuss and implement new initiatives among the students, and to gain support among these student leaders to affect these changes. Initiatives for 2016 included volunteering for the semiannual Lake Fayetteville Clean-Up (April 9), Razorback Regional Greenway Trail Clean-Up (July 23 and November 19), and Butterfield Elementary after school Science Club (September 27 and October 11). Also, four students from the Springdale High School Engineering and Architecture were hosted by four microEP students in “Shadow a Grad Student for a Day” events (February 12 and February 19) – two of them are now enrolled as undergraduates at the University of Arkansas. Beginning in spring 2016, in addition to the student presentations of their research to other microEP students at the monthly Research Communications Seminar, the students also gave a three minute elevator pitch. Besides being a valuable skill for concisely communicating their research to those not familiar with the field, it will also encourage the students to compete in the Three Minute Thesis competition which is now sponsored by the University of Arkansas Graduate School and International Education.

#### **Assessment:**

The Small Group Team concept is working as intended giving senior microEP students an opportunity to develop their leadership skills and more direct access to the program management to explore and implement new initiatives to help other students in the program with their professional and academic development.

- 5. Annual student performance reviews (Indirect): This process addresses outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6. Assessment of the report year will begin on January 15<sup>th</sup> of the following year and results will be reported by May 31<sup>st</sup>.**

An annual review process was established by the Graduate School several years ago that is designed to tell the student if they are making satisfactory research and academic progress toward their degree, or if they are not. The microEP grad program expanded the feedback forms significantly to allow the major professor to separately address the quantity and quality of a student's work in many different performance attributes including academic progress, interaction with professor, interaction with other students, laboratory work, research documentation, thesis/dissertation progress, and research planning. The student fills out a self-assessment and then brings that document with him/her to the meeting with the major professor, which gives the student practice in how to align their self-assessment of their work to their direct supervisor's assessment. All review forms are then reviewed by Associate Director Panneer Selvam to both create a program wide composite view and to identify any students that need further program level performance review before the forms are forwarded to the Graduate School.

**Data Collection and Analysis:**

Annual performance reviews were received from 42 students. Performance reviews were expected from 58 students.

**Assessment:**

The annual performance review serves its intended purpose of identifying performance issues as well as differences in performance perception between the student and their major professor. These differences can be used to facilitate a useful discussion during the review meeting.

Given the lack of full participation, more attention will need to be given to this process by the microEP graduate program management and the importance re-emphasized with the students and faculty.

- 6. Formal Exit Interviews with all graduates (Indirect): This process addresses all outcomes. Assessment of the report year will begin on January 15<sup>th</sup> of the following year and results will be reported by May 31<sup>st</sup>.**

While the microEP program receives student feedback through many channels, as a result of feedback from external reviewers during the first program review a formal exit interview policy was implemented and a script was created to help guide the interview. Associate Director Roper performs these exit interviews; then the forms are scanned and stored in both hardcopy and electronic forms.

**Data Collection and Analysis:**

Exit interviews were performed with 11 of 15 students who graduated from the program during the 2016 calendar year (although, with increased focus on this assessment, 9/9 exit interviews were performed with December 2016 graduates). No exit interviews are performed for students who

complete their Master's and continue on in the program for their PhD. Participating in the exit interview has now been formalized as a requirement before final sign-off of the student's record of progress.

**Assessment:**

The students generally reflect positively on the unique and interdisciplinary nature of the microEP program. Students appreciated the belonging to a cohort and participating in the community culture of the program, e.g., the summer camp, seminars, presentations to peers and service activities. Many students report getting positions in the microelectronics industry. Students suggested providing a framework that supports incoming and matriculating students in meeting all requirements of the program, graduate school and university on the way to graduation.

- 7. M.S. and early stage Ph.D. Research Document (Direct): This process addresses outcomes 1 and 3. Assessment of the report year will begin on January 15<sup>th</sup> of the following year and results will be reported by May 31<sup>st</sup>.**

All early stage microEP students are required to create a research description document to both help them fully understand their proposed research and to assist in communicating the goals and limits of their proposed research with their committee members. It is updated each semester with progress made and current issues hampering progress. When a Ph.D. student completes the Ph.D. Candidacy Research Proposal, this document is no longer required.

**Data Collection and Analysis:**

Research documents and updates were received from 26 MS and early stage PhD students during the 2016 calendar year.

**Assessment:**

The initial research documents were reviewed and signed by the student's major professor, committee, and a member of the microEP management team. Subsequent updates, submitted each fall and spring semester, are reviewed and signed by the major professor and the microEP management team. This helps document the student's progress on their intended research – through completion for MS students and, for PhD students, until the candidacy research proposal is approved by their committee.

- 8. Research Commercialization course MEPH 5383 (Indirect): This course addresses outcomes 3, 4, 5, and 7. Assessment of the report year will begin on January 15<sup>th</sup> of the following year and results will be reported by May 31<sup>st</sup>.**

This course is a core requirement of both the microEP M.S. and Ph.D. curricula, and leads the student through the full process of commercialization of research. It is a team based course that requires development of a commercialization plan for an on-campus professor's research and extensive presentations on that work to the class.

**Data Collection and Analysis:**

Research Commercialization (MEPH 5383) was taken by 10 microEP students during the 2016 calendar year (offered in spring semester). A patent by Dr. Kartik Balachandran (BMEG) entitled "Engineering Biphasic Janus-type Polymer-Protein Nanofibers via Centrifugal Jet Spinning" was used for the commercialization project for the class. Teams were formed to cover: 1) Intellectual Property and Technology Space, 2) Market Space: Competitor Analysis / Methods & Strategy, 3) Production & Manufacturing / Financials, and 4) Business Plan.

**Assessment:**

The course gives students an exposure to the entrepreneurial process of commercializing research. This helps prepare the students for the microEP PhD written candidacy exam as well as providing insight into the research commercialization process for those who may consider an entrepreneurial career path. Several local entrepreneurial ventures have been started by graduates of the microEP program.

- 9. Operations Management seminar courses MEPH 5811/5911/6811/6911 and Proposal Writing course MEPH 5832 (Indirect): This five semester course sequence addresses outcomes 6 and 7. Assessment of the report year will begin on January 15<sup>th</sup> of the following year and results will be reported by May 31<sup>st</sup>.**

This is a required core course sequence for every microEP student, and is designed to introduce aspects of management of a technical group in a high tech workplace.

**Data Collection and Analysis:**

MEPH 5811 (Operations Mgmt: Infrastructure Management) Fall 2016: 14 students enrolled.

MEPH 5911 (Operations Mgmt: Personnel Management) Spring 2016: 9 students enrolled.

MEPH 6811 (Operations Mgmt: Management&Leadership I) Fall 2016: 8 students enrolled.

MEPH 6911 (Operations Mgmt: Management&Leadership II) Spring 2016: 12 students enrolled.

**Assessment:**

These seminars provide students in the interdisciplinary microEP graduate program with an insight into organizational, personnel, and management topics and issues typically encountered in the corporate world which most STEM graduates receive no, or little, exposure to until they make the sudden and rather dramatic change to an engineer or scientist hired into industry. These seminars help prepare the graduates for this transition and improve the likelihood of making a favorable impression as they start their new careers. A portion of the seminars is also allocated to improving the students' resumes using resources brought in from the UA Career Development Center. The students also present the MS Project plan for completing their degree requirements as a means of 'best practices' sharing.

**10. Ethics course MEPH 5821 (Indirect): This course addresses outcome 7. Assessment of the report year will begin on January 15<sup>th</sup> of the following year and results will be reported by May 31<sup>st</sup>.**

This is a required core course for every microEP student, and is designed to prepare microEP graduates with discussions of alternative actions that may be taken in many typical ethically uncomfortable positions that may arise in the technology workplace.

**Data Collection and Analysis:**

Fourteen microEP graduate students were enrolled in MEPH 5821 – Ethics for Scientist and Engineers. Fourteen students from the MicroEP and Physics NSF REU (Research Experience for Undergraduates) also participated in the class during their 10-week summer program.

**Assessment:**

In this class, the students learned about famous examples of unethical practices and decisions which led to engineering catastrophes such as the Challenger disaster, about understanding what plagiarism is and how to avoid it, and about appropriate and ethical authorship of research papers.

**11. Use of Microsoft Project software (Indirect): This software usage addresses outcomes 4 and 6. Assessment of the report year will begin on January 15<sup>th</sup> of the following year and results will be reported by May 31<sup>st</sup>.**

One large predictor of professional success is the ability to plan your work such that you have no downtime during the day. All students in their first two years must use Microsoft Project software for their research planning to help them learn the time management and project management practices they will need in their early careers.

**Data Collection and Analysis:**

All microEP graduate students learn the use of Microsoft Project in their Small Group teams (see Student Learning Outcomes Process #3). 23 students learned use of MS Project in Small Group teams and how to develop their 'Degree Project Plan' in spring 2016 and 22 students in fall 2016. Except for their first full month in the program, students in their first two years in the program are required to submit their updated MS Project plan monthly to MicroEP program management. This submission is part of their grade for the Operations Management seminar grades.

**Assessment:**

This methodology is fully integrated into the MicroEP graduate program and helps the students understand what is needed to complete their graduate degree (and helps drive conversations with their major advisor or MicroEP program director when it is not). The students include their completed MS Project plan summary as an appendix in their thesis or dissertation. Program alumni and employers alike frequently provide feedback regarding how this skill clearly and positively distinguishes microEP graduates from most new hires from other STEM graduate degree programs.

**12. M.S. Thesis preparation and defense (Direct): This process addresses outcomes 1, 2, 3, and 5. Assessment of the report year will begin on January 15<sup>th</sup> of the following year and results will be reported by May 31<sup>st</sup>.**

The M.S. thesis work and documentation demonstrates both a student's skills and knowledge, and is often the first major professional work done by the student where he/she has the responsibility to both guide the work and overcome whatever obstacles arise. We see this as the demonstration vehicle of the student demonstrating through achievement that they are now professionals. The microEP program requires all Ph.D. path students that enter the microEP program after the B.S. degree to complete a thesis based M.S. microEP degree before being admitted as a Ph.D. student. The thesis is first used to assess a student's capability for independent work and analysis and then

used as a career guidance tool. In this sense the M.S. thesis is part of the Ph.D. candidacy process as well.

**Data Collection and Analysis:**

Spring 2016 – 1 MS thesis graduate, 1 MS non-thesis graduate

Summer 2016 – 3 MS thesis graduates

Fall 2016 – 5 MS thesis graduates, 1 professional path MS non-thesis graduate

**Assessment:**

Non-thesis graduates are now required to take the PhD candidacy exam as a course, MEPH 5393 Product Development Process. The course is a demonstration of the student's technical and management knowledge integration by creating a commercially viable product development process to meet a new societal need, with the technical solution based on micro to nanoscale technology. The final grade is based upon a detailed written report and oral presentation to a faculty panel.

Students who plan to enter the technical marketplace after MS completion, or who may already be working in industry, may find the professional path MS most beneficial as it requires independent graduate level research in collaboration with an external technical organization. The research may be submitted in the form of a traditional MS six-hour research topic and thesis or may instead be in the form of two three-hour independent research efforts resulting in written reports with the clarity, style, analysis, and conclusions expected of a journal paper submission.

**13. Ph.D. Dissertation preparation and defense (Direct): This process addresses outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7. Assessment of the report year will begin on January 15<sup>th</sup> of the following year and results will be reported by May 31<sup>st</sup>.**

A student completing a Ph.D. dissertation has a responsibility to have created a new field of investigation, performed a meaningful investigation, performed analysis to tie current work to prior theory, examined the societal and commercial potential of their work, and found a way to communicate deep level knowledge in an understandable fashion to their committee and public.

**Data Collection and Analysis:**

Spring 2016 – 1 PhD graduate

Summer 2016 – 0 PhD graduates

Fall 2016 – 3 PhD graduates

**Assessment:**

N/A

- 14. Industrial Advisory Board (IAB) (Indirect): This board meets annually and addresses outcomes 2, 3, and 7. Assessment of the report year will begin on January 15<sup>th</sup> of the following year and results will be reported by May 31<sup>st</sup>.**

The IAB is comprised of proven professionals in companies that have a strong interest in the microEP fields of research, including several early graduates from the microEP program. During its annual meeting it reviews program attributes and gives feedback on proposed changes, as well as having the authority to propose changes to the program from their own intuitions or observations. During the annual meeting selected students present their research in progress to the IAB and discuss the societal implications of their work with this group of outside professionals.

**Data Collection and Analysis:**

The Industrial Advisory Board meeting was held October 23-24, 2016 in Fayetteville with seven board members from industry attending. Approximately 40 board, faculty, and students (along with two guest faculty members from Missouri State University) attended the IAB dinner and poster contest on Sunday evening, October 23<sup>rd</sup>. In addition to a review of the program on Monday morning, the board member held breakout meetings with microEP faculty and students. Mike Seacrist, Senior Fellow from SundEdison Semiconductor, was selected as the new board chair. Rick Wise gave an overview of the MicroEP program metrics. Professor Greg Salamo gave an update on the proposal for the formation of a School of Materials Science and Engineering (SMSE) which would span both the College of Engineering and the College of Arts and Sciences. Three recent entrepreneurial successes founded or co-founded by MicroEP PhD graduates were highlighted: 1) SurfTec (Samuel Beckford); 2) WattGlass (Corey Thompson); and, 3) PicaSolar (Doug Hutchings and Seth Shumate). A three-minute thesis competition was also held during the IAB/faculty lunch meeting. The board discussed the ongoing question of whether the name of the program should be changed to reflect the strong emphasis on materials research. The board understood the value of a possible name change but recommended that the program keep a microEP track if it was done. The board members also expressed interest in setting up an industrial mentoring system for the students, placing more emphasis on internships, and hosting field trips for students to their company locations.

**Assessment:**

The Industrial Advisory Board continues to provide a valued service to the microEP graduate program in assessing the academic coursework, research, and processes used to prepare the students to compete and contribute in the high tech industry. The board members provide the program with good contacts to industry and serve as role models for the students.

Key feedback from the IAB for consideration by the MicroEP Management team:

(From breakout meeting with students)

- Students expressed concern about marketability of MicroEP degree compared to more traditional degree titles. Students encouraged to clearly state on resume items such as key coursework, thesis title, and other keywords which help resume reviewers understand MicroEP. The breadth of the MicroEP program is viewed as a significant benefit but also a challenge to explain on the resume. There was interest among students in progress toward program reconfiguration to MSE.
- Students close to graduation were interested in resume help and interview preparation. Topics such as resume format/review, university resources, web resources, and practice interviews were discussed. Networking in all forms was encouraged including at conferences, on-line, and through contact with industry and recruiters. Timelines to start job search process were discussed, ~ 9 months for MS and ~ 12 months for PhD.
- Funding was also discussed. Students desire more engagement with industry through company funded projects and internships. Internships were recommended to be earlier such as undergrad and MS level. More TA positions and GA lines are strongly desired.

(From breakout meeting with faculty)

- The SMSE initiative was discussed. It is supported by faculty and the prospects for the transition are seen as a success story for MicroEP. The school can be supported by existing faculty with just a few new faculty required and only incremental additional funding. It is not viewed as competitor to existing departments.
- There are several examples of the MicroEP research connection to industry including in solar with Prof Naseem and power packaging with Prof Huitink. The POETS consortium is another example where the research output has strong relevancy to industry. There is ~ 20% success rate on funding proposals. Currently there is not much direct industry funding of individual projects.
- The group acknowledged that research topics are evolving into less traditional semiconductor and optoelectronic areas. Industrial roadmaps and other “hot topic” sources are used to align research. Topics such as IoT could be an emerging area are well-aligned and suited with MicroEP’s strengths.

- Approximately half of the MicroEP students are working with professors of different academic backgrounds. This provides strong evidence that faculty is embracing the interdisciplinary strengths of MicroEP program.

(Summary Review with MicroEP management)

- The 3 minute presentations were viewed very favorably and the IAB encourage expanding that format to more students / topics. The short presentation format challenges the presenter to distill a large amount of information into a concise summary. It also encourages the presenter to speak directly to the audience and not read from the slides.
- It is important to emphasize the student concerns about getting a job when they complete MS or PhD. The program name is part of this, as is support in the resume/job interview process. Students need to take advantage of the variety resources available to them and plan for this process while in their degree program. Students also need to be encouraged to pursue internships where possible.
- The entrepreneurial / intrapreneurial aspects of MicroEP are a strength and really differentiate the program. The coursework covering commercialization and business plans are excellent industrial preparation. The success of recent companies founded MicroEP graduates are strong validation of the program's strength in combining technology and commercialization.
- The discussion about MicroEP evolution to MSE is well received by the IAB. The plan to have MSE with multiple tracks such as microelectronics, photonics, bio materials, etc... helps allay concerns about losing the existing value of MicroEP. The Board looks forward to learning the progress being made by MicroEP management and faculty to make this happen, recognizing this is not an easy process and will take time.
- The existing two-day meeting format is viewed favorably. It was suggested to give consideration for 3 minute presentations Sunday night as supplement or replacement for the poster presentations. The lab tour to the NCREPT and HiDEC facilities was much appreciated. The group suggests tour something new each year (perhaps labs of current graduate students).

### **Timeline for Data Collection and Analysis**

<b>Collection, Analysis, and Reporting of Assessment Data</b>	<b>(Program Director)</b>	<b>May 15</b>
<b>Document Key Findings</b>		<b>May 15</b>

### **Use of Results**

- **Actions for microEP Management Team Approval** **June 30**
- **Actions for microEP Graduate Studies Committee Approval** **July 31**

- **Actions for microEP Graduate Faculty Approval**
- **Program review with Industrial Advisory Board**

**September 15**  
**November 15**

In addition to the actions taken by these groups in response to the Academic Assessment report, other issues will be addressed as appropriate in a timely manner.