Factor and Question Analysis: Select 6 Comparison for Engineering Major: Chemical **University of Wisconsin-Madison**

		Ϋ́οι	Your Data				There a	You There are 6 institu	ur Se	r Select 6 Data	r Select 6 Data	on group	ŗ		Comparison to Select 6	to Sele	# 6
		z	Mean		Sel 1	Sel 2	Sel 3	Sel 4	Sel 5	Sel 6	Range of Means	Means	¥ŧ	Std		Arrow	Rank
				Dev							Min	Max	Mean	Dev	in Means		Among /
	Comment of the state of the sta		10 m	0.00		200			(4.6)°			300			is description.		10.4
2	Quality of Instruction and Faculty in Major Course Work: Teaching	51	5.24	1.09	4.83	5.53	4.33	4.90	5.00	4.50	4.33	5.53	4.72	1.15	0.52	•	Ю
Q ?	Quality of Instruction and Faculty in Major Course Work: Feedback on assignments (other than grades)	51	4.08	1.25	4.50	4.79	ა 83	4.30	4.14	4.57	3.83	4.79	4.18	1.15	-0.10	4	თ
Q 3	Quality of Instruction and Faculty in Major Course Work: Student/faculty interaction	51	4.55	1.21	5.00	5.47	4.29	4.80	5.43	5.38	4.29	5.47	4.77	1.38	-0.22	4	თ
			07/10			010	ole Andrews		10 Km	15000		1. A. S. B.	Section 1	100			100
8	Satisfaction with: Grades in major courses accurately reflecting students' level of performance	51	4.88	1.66	6.20	5.26	4.49	4.83	4.57	5.21	4.49	6.20	4.79	1.61	0.09	٠	4
Q	Satisfaction with: Accessibility of major course instructors outside of class	50	5.60	1.12	5.83	6.09	4.97	5.53	5.64	5.93	4.97	6.09	5.41	1.22	0.19	•	ហ
Q10.	Satisfaction with: Responsiveness to major course instructors to student concerns	51	5.31	1.17	5.50	5.85	4.92	4.90	5.69	6.07	4.90	6.07	5.25	1.20	0.06	٠	ហ
Ω11.	Satisfaction with: Amount of work required of in major courses	51	3.98	1.58	5.33	4.38	4.12	4.17	4.62	4.64	4.12	5.33	4.29	1.45	-0.31	4	7
Q18.	Satisfaction with: Average size of major courses	51	5.96	1. 04	5.67	5.94	5.06	6.10	6.43	6.57	5.06	6.57	5.62	1.29	0.34	•	4 (
Q19.	Satisfaction with: Availability of courses in major	2	5.84	1.38	6.00	6.06	4.82	5.70	5.64	5.43	4.82	6.06	5.33	1.53	0.51	>	ы
10000		1 H 2		3				326		A SECTION					S. T. SHIP.	**	C
Q12.	Satisfaction with: Engineering curriculum instructors presentation of technology issues		5.10	1.15	5.50	5.09	4.46	4.90	5.07	5.07	4.46	5.50	4.76	1.25	0.34	>	2
Q13.	Satisfaction with: Opportunities for practical experiences within Undergraduate curriculum	51	4.49	1.68	5.17	5.06	4.08	4.53	5.07	4.57	4.08	5.17	4.47	1.55	0.02	•	o
Q14.	Satisfaction with: Opportunities for Interaction with practitioners	49	4.27	1.44	4.33	4.53	3.67	3.93	4.30	4.79	3.67	4.79	4.02	1.38	0.25	•	Cri
Ω 21.	Satisfaction with: Amount of work in relationship to what was learned	51	4.88	1.67	6.00	5.06	4.24	5.17	4.86	5.00	4.24	6.00	4.70	1.48	0.18	•	CH
			Steel By										10 mg		A STATE OF		3
Q15.	Satisfaction with: Value derived from team experiences	49	5.51	1.26	4.83	6.00	5.24	5.67	5.57	6.08	4.83	6.08	5.52	1.30	-0.01	4	
Q16.	. Satisfaction with: Value of Engineering program student organization activities	40	5.13	1.40	4.50	4.26	5.11	4.57	5.09	5.21	4.26	5.21	4.86	1.52	0.27	•	
Q17.	. Satisfaction with: Leadership opportunities in Engineering program's extracurricular activities	39	5.15	1.41	4.50	4.24	5.17	4.80	5.38	5.43	4.24	5.43	4.95	1.46	0.20	•	4

▼: Wisc has a lower mean than the mean of the comparative group ▲: Wisc has a higher mean than the mean of the comparative group

Factor and Question Analysis: Select 6 Comparison for Engineering Major: Chemical

	Q35. (Q34. 0	Q33.	032.	Q31.		Q30. S	Q29. \$	Q28.		Q27. /	Q26. /	Q25. /	Q24. /	1000			
recturing on campus	Career Services - Satisfaction with: Quality of companies	Career Services - Satisfaction with: Number of companies recruiting on campus	Career Services - Satisfaction with: Access to school's alumni to cultivate career opportunities	Career Services - Satisfaction with: Geographic distribution of companies recruiting on campus	Career Services - Satisfaction with: Assistance in preparation for permanent job search		Satisfaction with characteristics of your fellow students': Level of camaradene	Satisfaction with characteristics of your fellow students': Ability to work in teams	Satisfaction with characteristics of your fellow students': Academic quality		Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Training to utilize Engineering School's computing resources	Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Remote access to Engineering School's computer network	Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Availability of computers in the Engineering School	Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Quality of computing resources				
	45	45	35	4	41		51	51	51	li e	46	46	51	51			z	You
	5.80 1	5.04 1	4.29 1	5.39 1	5.56 1		5.57 1	5.71 1	5.88	The Market	4.59 1	5.37 1	5.57 1	6.00 1		_	Mean S	Your Data
_	1.31	1.74	1.41	1.42	_		1.49 6	1.22	0.93		1.50	1.76	1.53	1.30		O O	_	
	5.00	4.33	5.33	4.50		San Contraction	6.17	5.33	5.83	Sept.	5.50	6.00	5.83	5.33			Sel 1	
	5.82	5.29	5.12				6.32	5.74	6.35		5.24	5.10	5.82	5.56			Sel 2	1
_	4.92	4.31	3.73	4.42	4.48	10)	5.73	5.58	5.71	2/15/16	4.04	4.17	5.20	5.70			Sel 3	There a
	4.41	3.11	3.23	3.74	3.14	ale le	6.10	5.53	5.80		4.61	4.95	5.77	5.13			Sel 4	You There are 6 institu
_	2.77	2.07	3.69	2.67	3.25	(1) (1) (1) (1) (1)	5.64	5.36	6.00	100,000	5.40	5.55	5.93	5.50	(30-)(-)(-)		Sel 5	Your Se
_	5.25	4.46	4.45	4.31	5.25		5.93	5.86	6.29		4.79	3.17	5.86	5.79	70(0,00		Sel 6	r Select 6 Data
	2.77	2.07	3.23	2.67	3.14		5.64	5.33	5.71		4.04	3.17	5.20	5.13	100	Min	Range c	Data compari
	5.82	5.29	5.33	5.00	5,88		6.32	5.86	6.35		5.50	6.00	5.93	5.79	Control Control	Max	Range of Means	r Select 6 Data itons in this comparison group
_	4.88	4.16	4.02	4.30	4.50		5.92	5.60	5.91		4.55	4.53	5.53	5.56		iviedii		Þ
_	1.67	1.81	1.69	1.75	1.88	100	1.17	1.24	1.03		1.43	1.87	1.49	1.41	1.65	Dev	Std	
_	0.92	0.88	0.27	1.09	1.06		-0.35	0.11	-0.03	T. Oronic	0.04	0.84	0.04	0.44		III WEELS	Difference	Comparison to Select 6
	•	•	•	•	•		•	٠	4		•	٠	•	•			Arrow	to Sel
	8	N	4		. 12	725	7	ω	4	5-3-2	თ	ω	თ	_	4) 	Rank	ect 6

^{▼:} Wisc has a lower mean than the mean of the comparative group ▲: Wisc has a higher mean than the mean of the comparative group

Factor and Question Analysis: Select 6 Comparison for Engineering Major: Chemical

Q48. Skill De enhanc design	Q47. Skill De enhanc implem	Q46. Skill De enhanc reports	Q45. Skill De enhanc	Q44. Skill De enhanc		Q43. Skill De enhanc solution	Q42. Skill De enhanc	10.101	Q40. Skill De enhano	Q39. Skill De enhance to meet	Q38. Skill De enhanc	Q37. Skill De enhance	Q36. Skill De enhano	Try of		
Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Use text materials to support project design	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Pilot test a component prior to implementation	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Communicate using written progress reports	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Communicate using oral progress reports	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Use modern engineering tools	A Committee of the Comm	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Understand the impact of engineering solutions in a global/societal context	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Understand ethical responsibilities	A STATE OF THE STA	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Function on multidisciplinary teams	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Design a system, component, or process to meet desired needs	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Analyze and interpret data	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Conduct experiments	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Design experiments	The state of the s		
51	49	50		51		51			51	50	51	51	51		2	<u>ر</u> و
5.45	3.65	5.76		5.39		4.88			5.55	5.60	6.35	5.98	5.49	S. S.	Mean	. =
1.08	1.60	1.19		0.98	1	1.54			1.30	1.21		0.84	1.21		Dev	
5.17	4.33	5.33	5.17	5.00		5.83	5.33		5.33	5.17	5.83	5.33	5.33		9	_
5,47	4.07	5.62	5.12	5.59	6,220	4.85	4.91		5.94	5.38	6.09	5.65	5.59		7 190	
5.09	3.64	5.27	4.89	5.21		4.61	4.46		5.25	5.20	5.84	5.41	5.04		Sel S	There a
5.53	4.25	5.87	5.80	4.93		4.87	4.76	(4.0 mg/s)	5.67	5,83	6.03	6.07	5.40	ionale.	4	re 6 ing
5.00	4.18	5.64	5.64	5.14		4.57	4.64	West In	5.69	5.86	6.07	6.00	5.71	10 (0 Ex #)	Ciac	titution:
6.00	3.22	5.69	6.00	5.43	200	4.50	4.21	300	5.46	5.71	5.93	5.36	5.07		Ogi	Your Select 6 Data institutions in this compa
5.00	3.22	5.27	4.89	4.93		4.50	4.21	ાં હોત	5.25	5.17	5.83	5,33	5.04		Min Max	Your Select 6 Data There are 6 institutions in this comparison group
6.00	4.33	5.87	6.00	5.59		5.83	5.33		5.94	5,86	6.09	6.07	5.71		Max	on grou
5.30	3.86	5.49	5.22	5.24	530 000	4./2	4.61	1,012	5.50	5.42	5.94	5.59	5.26		Mean	1.
1.22	1.59	1.30	1.47	1.34	(9)63	1.43	1.58	1.00	1.44	1.15	1.03	1.14	1.29	2	Dev	2
0.15	-0.21	0.27	0.08	0.15	100 M	0.16	0.15		0.05	0.18	0.41	0.39	0.23		in Means	Comparison to Select 6
•	•	•	•	•	·	-	• •		>	•	•	•	•		2	n to Se
4		ı . N	4 (. ω		^) င		4	4.		. ຜ	. .		Among 7	lect 6

▼: Wisc has a lower mean than the mean of the comparative group ▲: Wisc has a higher mean than the mean of the comparative group

Factor and Question Analysis: Select 6 Comparison for Engineering Major: Chemical **University of Wisconsin-Madison**

		ర్జ	Your Data	2			You There are 6 institu	You re 6 institu	ur Sel	r Select 6 Data utions in this compa	Data comparis	r Select 6 Data utions in this comparison group			Comparison to Select 6	ő	Selec
	-	z	Mean		Sel 1	Sel 2	Sel 3	Sel 4 Sel 5	_	Sel 6	≀ange o	Sel 6 Range of Means	۷ŧ	Std	Difference	8	Arrow
.				Dev							Min	Max	Mean	Dev	in Means	S	s Among 7
								3.5				197	1	0,7%	(C) (C)		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Q41.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Solve engineering problems	2	6.20	0.80	5.17	6.32	5.66	5.97	6.00	6.36	5.17	6.36	5.89	1.18	0.31		>
Q50.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Apply knowledge of mathematics	51	6.22	0.90	6.00	6.15	5.63	5.97	5.93	6.36	5.63	6.36	5.87	1.14	0.35		•
Q51.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Apply knowledge of science	51	6.22	1.03	6.67	6.12	5.69	5.90	6.00	6.21	5.69	6.67	5.89	1.04	0.33		•
Q52.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Apply knowledge of engineering	51	6.14	0.89	6.33	6.12	5.53	5.73	6.00	6.07	5.53	6.33	5.77	1.15	0.37		>
Q53.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Identify engineering problems	51	6.00	0.92	6.33	6.12	5.47	5.83	5.86	6.07	5.47	6.33	5.75	1.06	0.25		>
Q54	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Formulate engineering problems	5	5.86	0.85	6.33	5.82	5.04	5.67	5.14	5.50	5.04	6.33	5.37	1.22	0.49		•
Q55.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Understand contemporary issues	2	5.12	1.26	6.33	5.24	4.73	5.00	46.	4.86	4.64	6.33	4.92	1.36	0.20		•
10.1					1000		3.5	18616	33	533				(A) (A)			
Q56.	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Built on knowledge from previous course work	5	5.92	0.80	6.17	5.59	5.46	5.80	5.57	6.14	5.46	6.17	5.62	1.23	0.30		•
Q57.	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Built on skills from previous course work	2	5.82	0.79	6.17	5.74	5.43	5.80	5.36	6.21	5.36	6.21	5.62	1.14	0.20		•
Q58.	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Incorporated engineering standards	50	5.24	1.04	6.50	4.82	5.16	5.28	5.14	5.29	4.82	6.50	5.17	1.32	0.07		•

Factor and Question Analysis: Select 6 Comparison for Engineering Major: Chemical

		You	Your Data				There are 6	re 6 ins	ur Se	Your Select 6 Data	Data comparis	Your Select 6 Data institutions in this comparison group	Þ		Comparison to Select 6	to Sele	ct 6
		z	Mean S	-	Sel 1	Sel 2	Sel 3	Sel 4	Sel 5	Sel 6	Range of Means	f Means	Ų.	Std	Difference	Arrow	Rank
				Dev							Min	Max	Mean	Dev	in Means		Among /
101.0	And the second s		100		(A)							000		The second	1976		
Q59.	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Economic Issues	51	5.63 1	1.20	6.00	5.44	5.29	5.73	6.00	5.79	5.29	6.00	5.50	1.34	0.13	•	G
Q60.	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Environmental Issues	2	4.92 1	1.52	5.67	4.21	4.72	4.50	5.00	4.79	4.21	5.67	4.65	1.57	0.27	>	ω
Q61.	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Sustainability issues	51	4.73 1	1.28	5.33	4.38	4.33	4.36	5.00	4.86	4.33	5.33	4.47	1.62	0.26	>	4
Q62.	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Manufacturability Issues	51	4.61 1	1.40	5.33	4.67	4.66	4.96	5.43	4.36	4.36	5.43	4.77	1.54	-0.16	4	თ
Q63.	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Ethical issues	50	4.04 1	1.43	5.67	3.94	4.15	4.30	3.85	3.71	3.71	5.67	4.13	1.64	-0.09	4	4
Q64	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Health and Safety issues	<u>.</u>	4.45 1	1.50	5.50	4.62	4.62	4.83	5.07	5.14	4.62	5.50	4.75	1.49	-0.30	4	7
Q65.	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Social issues	50	3.88 1	1.60	5.50	3.79	4.00	4.00	4.43	3.71	3.71	5.50	4.02	1.61	-0.14	4	Oi
Q66.	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Political issues	49	3.24 1	1.77	5.00	3.18	3.36	3.43	3.25	3.43	3.18	5.00	3.39	1.72	-0.15	4	, ,
1000					7.018	100 m	1184	57.77	15 //c	1605	991	100	Transport		70.0	\\ \ \	6
Q67.	Laboratory Facilities - Degree that laboratory facilities: Established an atmosphere conducive to learning	51	5.27 1	1.28	5.00	5.53	5.00	5.43	5.86	5.36	5.00	5.86	5.26	1.31	0.01	>	C I
Q68.	Laboratory Facilities - Degree that laboratory facilities: Fostered student/faculty interaction	50	5.08 1	1.44	4.83	6.06	4.71	5.50	5.93	5.43	4.71	6.06	5.24	1.48	-0.16	4	U1
Q69.	Laboratory Facilities - Degree that laboratory facilities: Allowed use of modern engineering tools	51	4.86 1	1.40	5.00	5.21	4.85	4.66	5.57	4.93	4.66	5.57	4.95	1.51	-0.09	•	51
		S. C.	A STATE OF THE STA		or the Section		Selvice.	Service Contract					Section 1		(010 e.m.		23.
Q71.	Expectations: Extent that the Undergraduate Engineering program experience fulfill expectations	5	5.04 1	1.41	5.17	5.41	4.83	5.03	4.57	4.79	4.57	5.41	4.96	1.38	0.08	>	ယ
Q72.	Overall Value: Comparing the expense to the quality of education, rate the value of the investment made in Undergraduate Engineering program	51	5.27 1	1.71	5.00	4.74	5.18	4.67	4.21	5.14	4.21	5.18	4.94	1.37	0.33	•	_
Q73.	Recommendations: How inclined are you to recommend your Undergraduate Engineering Major to a close friend	51	4.63 1	1.93	4.50	5.50	4.88	5.23	4.93	4.50	4.50	5.50	5.01	1.68	-0.38	4	cı
Q74.	Recommendations: How inclined are you to recommend your Undergraduate Engineering School to a close friend	51	5.75 1	1.34	5.67	5.47	5.41	5.37	4.86	5.36	4.86	5.67	5.38	1,41	0.37	>	_

▼: Wisc has a lower mean than the mean of the comparative group ▲: Wisc has a higher mean than the mean of the comparative group

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Factor and Question Analysis: Select 6 Comparison for Engineering Major: Chemical

Q70.	Q49.	Q23.	Q22.	Q20.	Q7.	<u></u>	ည္	2					
	 Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Recognize need to engage in lifelong learning 	 Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Academic advising by non-faculty 	Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Academic advising by faculty	. Satisfaction with: Quality of Engineering classrooms	Sattsfaction with quality of teaching in required course work: Chemistry	Satisfaction with quality of teaching in required course work: Physics	Satisfaction with quality of teaching in required course work: Differential Equations	Satisfaction with quality of teaching in required course work: Calculus					
51	5	39	50	51	5	48	50	47	1		z	You	•
5.29	5.73	5.41	4.14	4.96	5.86	3.31	4.50	5.09			Mean	Your Data	
1.55	1.39	1.27	2.11	1.50	1.15	1.93	1.79	1.72		Dev	_		
4.50	5.50	5.17	6.00	5.67	5.50	5.50	4.67	5.50		_	Sel 1 Sel 2		
5.47	5.82	5.10	5.24	5.41	5.63	4.44	6.16	5.30	-				
4.73	5.02	3.86	3.14	5.23	5.60	4.09	4.85	4.88			Sel 3	There a	•
4.79	5.70	5.00	5.00	5.37	4.90	4.14	5.66	4.76			Sel 4 Sel 5	You re 6 institu	
5.14	5.07	3.80	4.92	5.86	4.67	4.33	5.40	4.58				our Se	
4.36	5.36	4.63	4.64	4.43	5.67	5.18	4.86	5.78			Sel 6	r Select 6 Data	
4.36	5.02	3.80	3.14	4.43	4.67	4.09	4.67	4.58		Min	Range	Data compan	•
5.47	5.82	5.17	6.00	5.86	5.67	5.50	6.16	5.78		Max	Range of Means	Your Select 6 Data There are 6 institutions in this comparison group	•
4.87	5.32	4.35	4.15	5.29	5.42	4.31	5.24	4.99		Mean		Þ	•
1.45	1.35	1.73	2.04	1.38	1.32	1.80	1.62	1.54		₽ev	bts		
0.42	0.41	1.06	-0.01	-0.33	0.44	-1.00	-0.74	0.10		in Means	Difference	Comparison to Select 6	
•	•	•	◄	4	•	4	4	•			Arrow	to Sei	
N	N		თ	6	_	7	7	4		Among 7	Rank	ect 6	

▼: Wisc has a lower mean than the mean of the comparative group ▲: Wisc has a higher mean than the mean of the comparative group

				Q21. Satisfaction with learned	Q14. Satisfaction with practitioners	Q13. Satisfaction with within Undergra	Q12. Satisfaction with presentation of	Contract the same	Q19. Satisfaction with	Q18. Satisfaction with	Q11. Satisfaction with courses		Q10. Satisfaction with	Q9. Satisfaction with outside of class	Q8. Satisfaction with reflecting studer		Q3. Quality of Instruction and I Student/faculty interaction	Q2. Quality of Instru Feedback on as			10,000		
Satisfaction economics Satisfaction with: Leadership opportunities in Engineering	Satisfaction with: Value of Engineering program student	Satisfaction with: Value derived from team experiences	A Company of the Comp	Satisfaction with: Amount of work in relationship to what was learned	Satisfaction with: Opportunities for interaction with practitioners	Satisfaction with: Opportunities for practical experiences within Undergraduate curriculum	Satisfaction with: Engineering curriculum instructors presentation of technology issues	and the second s	Satisfaction with: Availability of courses in major	Satisfaction with: Average size of major courses	Satisfaction with: Amount of work required of in major courses	udent concerns	Satisfaction with: Responsiveness to major course	Satisfaction with: Accessibility of major course instructors outside of class	Satisfaction with: Grades in major courses accurately reflecting students' level of performance	A CONTRACT TO THE PARTY OF THE	Quality of Instruction and Faculty in Major Course Work: Student/faculty interaction	Quality of Instruction and Faculty in Major Course Work: Feedback on assignments (other than grades)		Quality of Instruction and Faculty in Major Course Work:) who are too in the low one is		
39	40	49		51	49	51	50		51	51	01	2	5	50	51		51	ō	2	51		z	٠ ٢
5.15	5.13	5.51		4.88	4.27	4.49	5.10	10.00	5.84	5.96	3.90		5.31	5.60	4.88		4.55	00.4		5.24		Mean (Your Data
1.41	1.40	1.26		1.67	1.44	1.68	1.15		1.38	1.04			1.17	1.12	1.66		1.21			1.09		Std Dev N	
4.84	4.85	5.41	31010	4.89	4.13	4.60	4.91	AMPLE.	5.35	5.78	4.52	n O	5.24	5.55	4.83		4.81	4.00	0	4.78		Wt Mean*	∄ ೧೭
1.41	1.45	1.38		1.46	1.48	1.56	1.30		1.67	1.22	- Q	n	1.31	1.25	1.66		1.45	į	<u>.</u>	1.17		Std Dev*	ı rnegie ere are 2
4.19	3.86	4.69	10.1	3.85	3.36	3.71	4.12	(10)	3.69	4.86	0.08	ა ი	3.93	4.59	3.68		3.53	0.0	ນ ກ ນ	3.59		Range of Means Min Max	Carnegie Class Data a There are 23 institutions in
5.43	5.33	6.44		6.11	5.36	5.89	5.56	95.00	6.33	6.89	24.0	n 3	6.78	6.56	6.20	67.5	6.33		, S	5.53	S-16		
0.31	0.28	0.10	(e) (e)	-0.0 1	0.14	-0.11	0.19	Totare	0.49	0.18	,	o n	0.07	0.05	0.05	(e) (e)	-0.26	-	0 17	0.46	1006	Difference in Means	nd Comparisons this Carnegle Class
•	>	>	2000		>	4	>		>	>	•	•	>	>	>	Control of the Contro	∢	•	•	•	T. View	Arrow Rank	isons Class.
O1	ω	12		, o	3	ವೆ	6		<u></u>	14		<u> </u>	15	17	12		19	-	47	6			
4.90	4.91	5.43		4.96	4.17	4.69	4.97	A A A	5.39	5.85		83	5.33	5.65	4.90		4.98	į	A 37	4.83		Wt Mean*	. ≱ (
1.41	1.41	1.38		1.44	1.47	1.53	1.29	elin.	1.64	1.20	<u> </u>	<u>л</u>	1.28	1.23	1.63	40/02	1.44	į	3	1.14	, i.e.	Std Dev*	II Institu
4.19	3.86	4.69		3.75	3.36	3.71	4.12	3/90	3.69	4.86		2 D	3.93	4.59	3.68	100	3.53	Ċ	n n	3.59	. 35 %	Range of Means Min Max	ution Da
5.90	5.60	6.50		6.11	6.00	7.00	6.50	6.38	6.50	6.89	9 6	ກ ນ	6.78	6.80	6.20	1000	6.50		5 5 0	6.00		f Means Max	ata and participa
0.25	0.22	0.08	40.14	-0.08	0.10	-0.20	0.13	0.02	0.45	0.11	9 6	ם ה ה	-0.02	-0.05	-0.02	s.e. 49[0](s)	-0.43	i	0 20	0.41	M. O.	Difference in Means	All institution Data and Comparisons There are 32 total participating institutions
•	>	>	A	-	>	•	>	V	>	>		◀	4	4	4		-		∢	>		Arrow	sons lions
±	9	17	13	24	2 4	20	17	1 24	14	9	5 8	3	23	25	20	25	28) 6	10	24	Rank	

^{▼:} Wisc has a lower mean than the mean of the comparative group ▲: Wisc has a higher mean than the mean of the comparative group •NOTE: Weighted Mean and Standard Deviation is calculated with University of Wisconsin-Madison's data included

Q35. C	Q34.	Q33. C	Q32. C	Q31. G		Q30. S	Q29. S	Q28. S	200	Q27. A	Q26. A	Q25. A	Q24. A			
Career Services - Satisfaction with: Quality of companies recruiting on campus	Career Services - Satisfaction with: Number of companies recruiting on campus	Career Services - Satisfaction with: Access to school's alumni to cultivate career opportunities	Career Services - Satisfaction with: Geographic distribution of companies recruiting on campus	Career Services - Satisfaction with: Assistance in preparation for permanent job search		Satisfaction with characteristics of your fellow students': Level of camaraderie	Satisfaction with characteristics of your fellow students': Ability to work in teams	Satisfaction with characteristics of your fellow students': Academic quality	Property of the Control of the Contr	Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Training to utilize Engineering School's computing resources	Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Remote access to Engineering School's computer network	Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Availability of computers in the Engineering School	Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Quality of computing resources	Figure President Standard Control of the Control of		
45 5	45 5	35 4	44	41 5		51 5	5 <u>1</u>	51		46 4	46 5	51	51 6		z	You
5.80 1.31	5.04 1.74	4.29 1.41	5.39 1.42	5.56 1.29		5.57 1.49	5.71 1.22	5.88 0.93	(A)	4.59 1.50	5.37 1.76	5.57 1.53	6.00 1.30	影響器	Mean Std Dev	Your Data
4.64	3.88	3.81	4.07	29 4.49		19 5.70	5.50	5.70	(XeVe = 184	0 4.54	6 4.80	5.55	5.52		wt Wean*	
4 1.77	8 1.91	1 1.71	7 1.79	9 1.83		l	0 1.33	0 1.14		4 1.49	0 1.79	5 1.52	2 1.50		Std n* Dev*	Carne There a
77 2.77	2.07	71 2.60	79 2.60	33 2.10	11 15 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		4.64	4.81	1000	3.20	79 3.17	3.80	3.40	9		Carnegie Class Data and Comparisons There are 23 institutions in this Camegie Class
									(A)					2	e of I	stitutions
5.82	5.29	5.50	5.39	5.88		6.56	6.22	6.35	00	5.82	6.26	6.78	6.56	Sec. 1.		a and C
1.16	1.16	0.48	1.32	1.07	0);	-0.13	0.21	0.18	- (0) (0)e	0.05	0.57	0.02	0.48	1800	Difference in Means	nd Comparisons this Camegie Class
•	•	•	•	•	A STATE OF THE STA	▲	•	•	1	•	•	•	•		Arrow Rank	isons Class.
2	Ν	00	_	N		15	თ	7		1	თ	<u></u>	σ	(6)		
4.59	3.83	3.83	3.98	4.46		5.74	5.52	5.70		4.61	4.84	5.57	5.55		Wt Mean*	. ≥
1.76	1.87	1.69	1.79	1.81		1.36	1.33	1.15		1.50	1.79	1.51	1.46		Std Dev*	I Institu
2.77	2.00	2.20	1.40	2.10		4.66	4.64	4.81	177	3.20	3.17	3.80	3.40	14. CM	Range c	ution D e 32 tota
6.00	5.29	5.50	5.39	5.88	語を	6.80	6.50	7.00	Me New	5.82	6.50	7.00	6.56	0.25	Range of Means Min Max	ata and
1.21	1.21	0.46	1.41	1.10		-0.17	0.19	0.18	1007	-0.02	0.53	0.00	0.45	2024	Difference in Means	All Institution Data and Comparisons There are 32 total participating institutions
۶	•	•	>	•		•	•	•	TO SERVICE SER		•		•		Arrow Rank	sons tions
ω.	8	10		2	200	21	10	12	16	18	σ.	19	3	13	Rank	

^{▼;} Wisc has a lower mean than the mean of the comparative group ▲: Wisc has a higher mean than the mean of the comparative group *NOTE: Weighted Mean and Standard Deviation is calculated with University of Wisconsin-Madison's data included

		THE STATE OF	Q36. Skill De	Q37. Skill De enhance	Q38. Skill De enhance	Q39. Skill De enhance process	Q40. Skill De enhance	100	enhance	Q43. Skill De enhance solution	4 7 10 1 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Q44. Skill De enhance	Q45. Skill De enhance reports	Q46. Skill De enhance reports	Q47. Skill De enhance impleme	Q48. Skill De enhanc design
•		CACO DEDONACIONEDIO DE COMO	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Design experiments	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Conduct experiments	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Analyze and interpret data	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Design a system, component, or process to meet desired needs	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Function on multidisciplinary teams	on a constant and the solution of the solution	enhanced ability to: Understand ethical responsibilities	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Understand the impact of engineering solutions in a global/societal context		Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Use modem engineering tools	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Communicate using oral progress reports	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Communicate using written progress reports	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Pilot test a component prior to implementation	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Use text materials to support project design
₹ (z		51	51	51	50	51		8	51		2	50	50	49	51
Your Data	Mean		5.49	5.98	6.35	5.60	5,55			4.88		5.39	5.30	5.76	3.65	5.45
ta	Std Dev		1.21	0.84	0.69	1.21	1.30		. 1	1.54		0.98	1.1	1.19	1.60	1.08
C ₂	Wt Mean*	(a) (a)	5.26	5.59	5.91	5.45	5.27	建		4.95	101	5.27	5.37	5.62	3.95	5.39
ırnegie əre are 2	Std Dev*	19.48	1.26	1.11	1.00	1.23	1.54	1000	į	1.44		1.25	1.33	1.21	1.58	1.22
Carnegie Class Data a There are 23 institutions in	Range of Means Min Max	1.07	3.60	4.60	5.20	4.00	3.60		į	3.90		4.20	4.52	5.05	3.00	4.83
			5.75	6.07	6.35	6,11	6.56	5 70		5.83		6.00	6.33	6.22	4.82	6.44
nd Comparisons this Carnegie Class	Difference in Means	10/2/0	0.23	0.39	0.44	0.15	0.28		i	-0.07	2.4.2.7.6k?**	0.12	-0.07	0.14	-0.30	0.06
isons Class.	Arrow Rank		•	•	•	•	•	1 <				۲	4	>	4	•
	Rank		00	ω		9	o		7	4		ω	5	6	17	12
_, ≥ (Wt Mean*		5.33	5.63	5.94	5.51	5.30	5 06		5.02		5.30	5.41	5.67	4.01	5.40
I institu	Std Dev*		1.25	1.10	0.97	1.20	1.52			1.45	10,50	1.24	1.32	1.19	1.60	1.23
ition Da 32 total	Range of Min	70	3.60	4.60	5.20	4.00	3.60	4 20	į	3.90		4.20	4.52	5.05	3.00	4.83
ta and (Means [6.50	6.50	7.00	6.50	6.56	200		6.50		6.00	7.00	7.00	5.30	6.44
All Institution Data and Comparisons There are 32 total participating institutions	Range of Means Difference Min Max in Means	101/25	0.16	0.35	0.41	0.09	0.25	0.20		-0.14	10.0	0,09	-0.11	0.09	-0.36	0.05
sons tions	Arrow Rank	•	>	•	•	•	•			•		>	•	•	. •	•
	Rank	0.0	15	œ	4	6	⇉	26		23	21	: i	21	17	25	6

^{▼:} Wisc has a lower mean than the mean of the comparative group ▲: Wisc has a higher mean than the mean of the comparative group *NOTE: Weighted Mean and Standard Deviation is calculated with University of Wisconsin-Madison's data included

Que.		Q56. N	Topical Commence	Q55. S	Q54. S	Q53. S	Q52. S	Q51. S	Q50. S	Q41. S	* 1			
wajor Design Expenence - Degree that the major design experience: Incorporated engineering standards	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Built on skills from previous course work	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Built on knowledge from previous course work		Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Understand contemporary issues	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Formulate engineering problems	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Identify engineering problems	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Apply knowledge of engineering	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Apply knowledge of science	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Apply knowledge of mathematics	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Solve engineering problems				
ģ		51		51	51	51	51	51	51	51			z	You
0.24			September 1	5.12 1	5.86 0	6.00 0	6.14 0	6.22 1	6.22 0	6.20 0	Section of the sectio		Mean S	Your Data
				1.26	0.85	0.92	0.89	1.03	0.90	0.80	18.5	Dev	Std	
٠. 4	5.66	5.74	The latest of	5.04	5.46	5.79	5.86	5.93	5.90	5.94	100	Mean*	٧ŧ	C _a
	1.14	1.16		1.33	1.18	1.02	1.04	0.97	1.06	1.04		Dev*	Std	rnegie ere are 2
4.7	4.8	4.60	Water State of State	3.60	4.40	5.20	5.29	5.00	4.80	5.17	10	Min	Range c	Carnegie Class Data a There are 23 institutions in
0.07	6.89	6.89		6.33	6.33	6.56	6.44	6.67	6.45	6.56		Max	Range of Means	
	0.16	0.18	() () () () () () () () () () () () ()	0.08	0.40	0.21	0.28	0.29	0.32	0.26	METANOL	in Means	Difference	nd Comparisons this Carnegie Class
•	•	•	a series anno	•	•	•	•	•	•	•			Arrow Rank	Isons Class.
	7	9		13	ω	9	O	ი	G	00			Rank	
0.07	5.70	5.77	Special	5.10	5.51	5.83	5.89	5.95	5.92	5.97		Mean*	Wt	> (
	1.13	1.15		1.32	1.15	1.00	1.03	0.97	1.06	1.02	1866	Dev*		II Institu
4:00	4.80	4.60	24.0 E	3.60	4.40	5.20	5.29	5.00	4.80	5.17		Min	Range o	ution Da
0.07	7.00	7.00	1200	6.33	6.33	6.56	6.67	6.83	7.00	6.83	Top Social	Max	f Means	ata and participa
	0.12	0.15	10.40.00	0.02	0.35	0.17	0.25	0.27	0.30	0.23	0.22	in Means	Range of Means Difference	All Institution Data and Comparisons There are 32 total participating institutions
•	€	•		•	•	>	•	•	•	•			Arrow Rank	sons lions
4	2 ಪ	14	15.5	. 20	7	15	œ	9	7	12	0		Rank	

^{▼:} Wisc has a lower mean than the mean of the comparative group ▲: Wisc has a higher mean than the mean of the comparative group
*NOTE: Weighted Mean and Standard Deviation is calculated with University of Wisconsin-Madison's data included

Factor and Question Analysis: Carnegie Class and All Institution Comparison for Engineering Major: Chemical

Q74.	Q73.	Q72.	Q71.		Q69.	Q68.	Q67.	7	Q66.	Q65.	Q64.	Q63.	Q62.	Ω61.	Q60.	Q59.	76.0		
Recommendations: How inclined are you to recommend your Undergraduate Engineering School to a close friend	Recommendations: How inclined are you to recommend your Undergraduate Engineering Major to a close friend	Overall Value: Comparing the expense to the quality of education, rate the value of the investment made in Undergraduate Engineering program	Expectations: Extent that the Undergraduate Engineering program experience fulfill expectations		Laboratory Facilities - Degree that laboratory facilities: Allowed use of modem engineering tools	Laboratory Facilities - Degree that laboratory facilities: Fostered student/faculty interaction	Laboratory Facilities - Degree that laboratory facilities: Established an atmosphere conducive to learning	The The American States of the American States of the Stat	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Political issues	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Social issues	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Health and Safety issues	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Ethical issues	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Manufacturability issues	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Sustainability issues	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Environmental Issues	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Economic issues	9-16020 - 1012 - 300 1010 18201 - 30		
2	51	51	51	(1/2) (1/2)	51	50	51		49	50	51	50	51	51	51	2		z	Υου
5.75 1	4.63 1	5.27 1	5.04 1		4.86 1	5.08 1	5.27 1		3.24 1	3.88 1	4,45 1	4.04 1	4.61 1	4.73 1	4.92 1	5.63 1	6	Mean S	Your Data
1.34	1.93	1.71			1.40	1.44	1.28		1.77		1.50	1.43				1.20		Std Dev N	
5.21	4.96	4.92	4.90	1000	4.91	5.17	5.25		3.72	4.23	5.00	4.43	4.79	4.73	4.95	5.52		Wt Mean*	Ca The
1.52	1.69	1.48	1.38		1.53	1.43	1.35	*	1.74	1.61	1.47	1.60	1.48	1.46	1.49	1.29		Std Dev*	rnegie re are 2
4.25	3.90	3.80	3.93	- Line	2.20	3.60	3.40		3.18	3.35	4.00	3.30	4.06	4.15	4.19	4.28	Test	Range of Mean Min Max	Carnegie Class Data a There are 23 institutions in
6.17	6.39	5.91	5.65		5.78	6.11	6.04		5.00	5.50	6.22	5.67	5.55	5.67	6.22	6.67	-eGi-	of Means Max	Data an
0.54	-0.33	0.35	0.14		-0.05	-0.09	0.02	13. TOTAL	-0.48	-0.35	-0.55	-0.39	-0.18	0.00	-0.03	0.11	1917	Difference in Means	Carnegie Class Data and Comparisons There are 23 institutions in this Carnegie Class
>	4	>	>			4	•		4	4	4	4	4		4	•		Arrow	risons e Class
ω	17	თ	10		12	4	12	10 A	21	18	20	17	19	15	4	15		Rank	
5.22	5.01	4.89	4.95	12 S 12 S	4.96	5.28	5.32		3.76	4.29	5.07	4.53	4.84	4.78	5.00	5.52		Wt Mean*	,
1.51	1.65	1.45	1.35	(E.C.)2/0)	1.51	1.41	1.32		1.73	1.59	1.45	1.59	1.47	1.46	1.49	1.30		Std Dev*	VII Instit
4.25	3.90	3.80	3.93	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2.20	3.60	3.40	7/10/2	2.64	3.35	4.00	3.30	4.06	4.15	4.19	4.28		Range o	ution D e 32 tota
6.50	6.39	5.91	6.00		6.00	6.50	6.10	(6)0)	6.00	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.00	7.00	6.50	6.67		Range of Means Min Max	ata and
0.53	-0.38	0.38	0.09		-0.10	-0.20	-0.05		-0.52	-0.41	-0.62	-0.49	-0.23	-0.05	-0.08	0.11	Q-29	Difference in Means	All Institution Data and Comparisons There are 32 total participating institutions
•	4	•	•		4	4	4		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	•		Arrow	sons tions
Ch	26	œ	17		19	22	20	20	28	26	29	26	27	22	21	19	26	Rank	

^{▼:} Wisc has a lower mean than the mean of the comparative group ▲: Wisc has a higher mean than the mean of the comparative group *NOTE: Weighted Mean and Standard Deviation is calculated with University of Wisconsin-Madison's data included

Factor and Question Analysis: Carnegie Class and All Institution Comparison for Engineering Major: Chemical

•		Your	Your Data	.	Car Ther	negie (Carnegie Class Data a There are 23 Institutions in		nd Comparisons this Carnegie Class	sons Class.		, AI	Institu here are	tion Da 32 total	ta and (All Institution Data and Comparisons There are 32 total participating institutions	ons ons	
		Z M	Mean Std		1		Range of Mean	Means	٠.	Arrow Rank			Std.	lange of	Means [Range of Means Difference A	Arrow Rank	Rank
			D	Dev N	Mean*	Dev*	Min	Max	in Means		L	Mean.	Dev	Min	Max	III WEATS		
6															ř			
Q 4	Satisfaction with quality of teaching in required course work:	47 5	5.09 1	1.72	5.11	1.53	4.55	6.00	-0.02	◄	14	5.14	1.51	4.50	6.50	-0.05	•	18
Q.	Cardinus Satisfaction with quality of teaching in required course work: Differential Equations	50 4	4.50 1	1.79	4.90	1.69	4.00	6.16	-0.40	◀	20	4.94	1.67	4.00	6.17	0.44	• •	29
Q	Satisfaction with quality of teaching in required course work: Physics	48 3	3.31 1		4.30	1.79	3.06	5.50	-0.99	•	· 1	4.37	3 0	3 O	9 0	0 1.00	•	n 6
Q 7.	Satisfaction with quality of teaching in required course work: Chemistry	5 <u>1</u>	5.86 1	1.15	5.40	1.35	4.67	5.86	0.46	•		0.09))	8 8	9 4	()	ું દ
Q20.		51 4	4.96 1	1.50	5.16	1.39	3.80	6.16	-0.20	•	15	5.22	1.40	3.80	0.00	0.20	•	2 1
Q22.	Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Academic advising by faculty				4.74	1.93	3.14	6.13	0.60	• •	- 22	4.86	1.87	3 3 3 14	s s.	0.65	•	7
023	 Advising/Computing - Sattsfaction with: Academic advising by non-faculty 	39			4.73	1.59	3.38	5 6	2 0	• •	.	F F 6	3 5	9 0	n 9	0 0	·)	<u>.</u>
Q49.	 Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Recognize need to engage in lifelong learning 	51	5.73 1	1.39	5.50	1.33	4.80	6.05	0.23	•	ď	5.55		2 5	9 9	2 - 6	.)	3 8
Q70.		51	5.29 1	1.55	5.21	1.49	3.89	6.27	0.08	•	12	5.28	1.46	3.89	ō.50	0.01	•	6

^{▼:} Wisc has a lower mean than the mean of the comparative group ▲: Wisc has a higher mean than the mean of the comparative group
*NOTE: Weighted Mean and Standard Deviation is calculated with University of Wisconsin-Madison's data included

ABET Questions: All Comparative Groups for Engineering Major: Chemical

Question Means Sorted from Highest Mean to	Your Data		∌	ere are 6	Select (Select 6 Compari	Select 6 Comparison There are 6 institutions in this comparison group	son grou	Þ		Car	Carnegie Class	Class		All Ins	All Institution	ž
		Sel 1	Sel 2	Sel 3	Sel 4	Sel 5	Sel 6	Mean [Mean Difference	e Rank	Mean	Difference	ce Rank	nk Mean		Difference	Rank
	Landon Company																
Develop	6.22	6.67	6.12	5.69	5.90	6.00	6.21	5.89	0.33	8	5.93	0.29	▶			27	· ω
Q50. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Apply knowledge of mathematics	6.22	6.00	6.15	5.63	5.97	5.93	6.36	5.87	0.35	2	5.90	0.32	▶	5.92		30 ▶	7
Q52. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Apply knowledge of engineering	6.14	6.33	6.12	5.53	5.73	6.00	6.07	5.77	0.37	N	5.86	0.28	ب	5.89	89 0.25	25 ▶	œ
											1						
Q38. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Analyze and interpret data	6.35	5.83	6.09	5.84	6.03	6.07	5.93	5.94	0.41	_	5.91	0.44	>	5.94		41	4
Q37. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Conduct experiments	5.98	5.33	5.65	5.41	6.07	6.00	5.36	5.59	0.39	ω	5.59	0.39	▶			35 ▶	- α
Q36. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Design experiments	5.49	5.33	5.59	5.04	5.40	5.71	5.07	5.26	0.23	ω	5.26	0.23	δ	5.33	33 0.16	16 •	15
Denotes Control of the Control of th																	
Q39. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Design a system, component, or process to meet desired needs	5.60	5.17	5.38	5.20	5.83	5.86	5.71	5.42	0.18	4	5,45	0.15	9	5.51	51 0.09	09 •	16
And the state of t		SERVICE CO.	Section 1				100 mm 200 mm						Section 1				
Q40. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Function on multidisciplinary teams	5.55	5.33	5.94	5.25	5.67	5.69	5,46	5.50	0.05	4	5.27	0.28	▶	5.30	30 0.25	25 ▶	

^{▼;} Wisc has a lower mean than the mean of the comparative group ▲: Wisc has a higher mean than the mean of the comparative group

NOTE: Carnegie Class and All Institution Means are weighted are calculated without University of Wisconsin-Madison's data included NOTE: There are 23 institutions in this Carnegie Class. There are 32 total participating institutions.

ABET Questions: All Comparative Groups for Engineering Major: Chemical

Question Means Sorted from Highest Mean to Lowest Mean	Your Data		Th	ere are 6	Select 6 Comparison There are 6 institutions in this comparison group	6 Comp	arison compari	son grou	Þ		Car	Carnegie Class	Class		All ins	All Institution	3
		Sel 1	Sel 2	Sel 3	Sel 4	Sel 5	Sel 6	Mean Difference)ifferenc	e Rank	Mean	Difference	ce Rank	ık Mean		Difference	Rank
And the Market of the Market of the Control of the																	
Q41. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Solve engineering problems	6.20	5.17	6.32	5.66	5.97	6.00	6.36	5.89	0.31	ω	5.94	0.26	∞	5.97	7 0.23	ω ▶	12
Q53. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Identify engineering problems	6.00	6.33	6.12	5.47	5.83	5.86	6.07	5.75	0.25	4	5.79	0.21	9	5.83	3 0.17	7	15
Q54. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Formulate engineering problems	5.86	6.33	5.82	5.04	5.67	5.14	5.50	5.37	0.49	N	5.46	0.40	▶	5.51	1 0.35	⊳	7
The State and Compact of the particular																1	
Q42. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Understand ethical responsibilities	4.76	5.33	4.91	4.46	4.76	4.64	4.21	4.61	0.15	3	4.96	-0.20	▼ 16	5.06	6 -0.30	•	25
								A section of the sect								J	
Q46. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Communicate using written progress reports	5.76	5.33	5.62	5.27	5.87	5.64	5.69		0.27	10		0.14	10			9 ▶	17
Q45. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Communicate using oral progress reports	5.30	5.17	5.12	4,89	5.80	5.64	6.00	5.22	0.08	4	5.37	-0.07	▼ 15	5.41	1 -0.11	- 4	21
Aldering state and the property of the state																	4.8.
Q43. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Understand the impact of engineering solutions in a global/societal context	4.88	5.83	4.85	4.61	4.87	4.57	4.50	4.72	0.16	10	4.95	-0.07	▼	5.02	2 -0.14	4 ▶	22

Copyright EBI 2004: May Not Be Reproduced Without Permission

^{▼:} Wisc has a lower mean than the mean of the comparative group ▲: Wisc has a higher mean than the mean of the comparative group

NOTE: Carnegie Class and All Institution Means are weighted are calculated without University of Wisconsin-Madison's data included NOTE: There are 23 institutions in this Carnegie Class. There are 32 total participating institutions.

ABET Questions: All Comparative Groups for Engineering Major: Chemical

Que:	Question Means Sorted from Highest Mean to	Your Data		Ţ,	e are 6	Select 6 Comparison There are 6 institutions in this comparison group.	Compo	arison comparis	son grou	ġ			Carne	Carnegie Class	lass		All Ir	All Institution	tion	
			Sel 1	Sel 2	Sel 3	Sel 4	Sel 5	Sel 6	Mean Difference Rank	Differen	ce Ra		Mean Difference	ferenc	e Rank		Mean Di	Difference	e Rank	¥
				in the second se	- 5													I		
Q49.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Recognize need to engage in lifelong learning	5.73	5.50	5.82	5.02	5.70	5.07	5.36	5.32	0.41	•		5.50 0	0.23	0	φ σ	5.55 0	0.18	16	о
	The Manager of the American Section (Manager of the American Section)		3		1 73	F 00	4 64	4 86	4 03	0.20	>	and the same of		08	1	3133	22,300	.02	2	0
Q55.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Understand contemporary issues	5.12	6.33	5.24	4.73	5.00	4.64	4.86	4.92	0.20	•	3	5.04 0	0.08		13	5.10 0	0.02	20	°
	TO A THE TOTAL CONTROL OF A THE PROPERTY OF A DEFINE AND A THE PROPERTY OF A DEFINE AND A DEFINE				700															
Q25.	Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Availability of computers in the Engineering School	5.57	5.83	5.82	5.20	5.77	5.93	5.86	5.53	0.04	•			0.02				0.00		6 6
Q44.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Use modem engineering tools	5.39	5.00	5.59	5.21	4.93	5.14	5.43	5.24	0.15	•			0.12				0.09	· •	, <u>,</u>
Q26.	Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Remote access to Engineering School's computer network	5.37	6.00	5.10	4.17	4.95	5.55	3.17		0.84	•			0.57				0.53	•	; α
Q69.		4.86	5.00	5.21	4.85	4.66	5.57	4.93	4.95	-0.09	4	4	4.91 -0	-0.05		12 —		-0.10	4	19
Q27.		4.59	5.50	5.24	4.04	4.61	5.40	4.79	4,55	0.04	•		4.54 (0.05	_	<u>+</u>	4.61 -0	-0.02	∢	18

^{▼:} Wisc has a lower mean than the mean of the comparative group ▲: Wisc has a higher mean than the mean of the comparative group

NOTE: Carnegle Class and All Institution Means are weighted are calculated without University of Wisconsin-Madison's data included NOTE: There are 23 institutions in this Carnegie Class. There are 32 total participating institutions.

Highest and Lowest Mean Questions for Engineering Major: Chemical

1.50	4.59	46	. •
, i		; -	Q3. Quality of Instruction and Faculty in Major Course Work: Student/faculty Interaction
1.21	4.55	77	Q5. Satisfaction with quality of teaching in required course work. Differential Expensions
1.79	4.50	50	•
1.68	4.49	51	
1.50	4.45	2	
1,41	4.29	35	
.44	4.27	2 49	Q14. Satisfaction with: Opportunities for interaction with practitioners
	1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	; e	Q22. Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Academic advising by faculty
	4.00	5 <u>0</u>	Q2. Quality of Instruction and Faculty in Major Course Work: Feedback on assignments (other than grades)
1	4 4 00 4	n 20	Q63. Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Ethical issues
1 43	2 9	n C	Q11. Satisfaction with: Amount of work required of in major courses
1 58	3 08	7 (Q65. Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design expenence: Addressed Social Issues
1.60	3.88	50	Q47. Skill Development - Degree that enighteening education enhanced ability to a line test a compension prior to improve the second
1.60	3.65	49	
1.93	3.31	48	
1.77	3.24	49	Q66. Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Political issues
7.V.(a) [0] [2]	Walter The Control of		
0.7	26.6	9	Q57. Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Built on skills from previous course work
20 0	9 6	2 5	Q19. Satisfaction with: Availability of courses in major
32 6	л (C	<u>n</u> (Q7. Satisfaction with quality of teaching in required course work: Chemistry
1.15	5 28 G	J. (1	Q54. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Formulate engineering provering
0.85	5.86	51 .	Q28. Satisfaction with characteristics of your fellow students: Academic quality
0.93	5.88	51	
0.80	5.92	51	
1.04	5.96	51	
0.84	5.98	51	
0.92	6.00	51	
1.30	6.00	51	
0.89	6.14	51	
0.80	6.20	51	
0.90	6.22	51	
1.03	6.22	51	
0.69	6.35	5	Q38. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Analyze and interpret data
Sid Dev	- Magne	A THEORY OF THE PARTY OF	TO SEE OF THE TELEPHONE STREET, THE SECRETARY OF THE SECR
	The state of the s		AND THE PARTY OF T

Question Competitive Analysis: Select 6 Comparison for Engineering Major: Chemical

Q63. Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Ethical issues				Q68. Laboratory Facilities - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Manufacturability Issues			•	Q11. Saustaction with Amount of work lequilled of infinitely courses. Addressed Health and Safety issues				Q5. Satisfaction with quality of reaching in requise course from Empirical Regimeering Major to a close friend		Os Satisfaction with quality of teaching in required course work: Physics	The second secon	Q37. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education ennanced ability to: Conduct experiments	Q38. Skill Development - Deglies und engineering successor contents and the second sec			O. Saustaction with quality of teaching in required courses compare to the quality of teaching in Non-Engineering courses on this campus	·		Q19. Satisfaction with: Availability of cookses in finator enhanced ability to: Formulate engineering problems		•						O32 Career Services - Satisfaction with: Geographic distribution of companies recruiting on campus	
4.04	4.08	3.88	3.24	4.61	5.08	3.65	4.55	4.45	3.98	4.96	5.57	4.63	4.50	3.31		A LANG AND STREET STORY AND	5.98	6.35	5.73	5.29	5.86	6.00	5.86	5.84	5.24	5.37	5.04	5.80	5.56	5.41	5.39	ANTONIO CONTRACTOR
4.13	4.18	4.02	3.39	4.77	5.24	3.86	4.77	4.75	4.29	5.29	5.92	5.01	5.24	4.31	SOLD SERVICES	一年 一年の日の日の日の日の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日	5.59	5.94	5.32	4.87	5.42	5.56	5.37	5.33	4.72	4.53	4.16	4.88	4.50	4.35	4.30	SHORE
-0.09	-0.10	-0.14	-0.15	-0.16	-0.16	-0.21	-0.22	-0.30	-0.31	-0.33	-0.35	-0.38	-0.74	-1.00	(a) is (a) is (a)		0.39	0.41	0.41	0.42	0.44	0.44	0.49	0.51	0.52	0.84	0.88	0.92	1.06	1.06	1.09	Difference

NOTE: If a section is blank, this means that there were no questions that met those conditions.

Copyright EBI 2004: May Not Be Reproduced Without Permission

Question Competitive Analysis: Longitudinal Comparison for Engineering Major: Chemical

		720/07	41(1K) [0]	grence.
ລ64.	. Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Health and Safety issues	4.45	3.16	1.29
ມ 60.	. Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Environmental issues	4.92	3.77	1.15
<u>ച</u> 63.		4.04	2.91	1.13
24 3.		4.88	3.93	0.95
ရ 61	. Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Sustainability issues	4.73	3.84	0.89
Q65.	. Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Social issues	3.88	3.00	0.88
<u>Ω</u>	. Career Services - Satisfaction with: Assistance in preparation for permanent job search	5.56	4.68	0.88
Q ?	. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Understand ethical responsibilities	4.76	3.89	0.87
Q45.	. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Communicate using oral progress reports	5.30	4.44	0.86
Q56.	. Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Built on knowledge from previous course work	5.92	5.09	0.83
Q59.	. Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Economic Issues	5.63	4.81	0.82
Q58.	. Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Incorporated engineering standards	5.24	4.42	0.82
Ω 4.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Use modern engineering tools	5.39	4.64	0.75
Q55.	i. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Understand contemporary issues	5.12	4.39	0.73
Q57.	. Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Built on skills from previous course work	5.82	5.12	0.70
H. A.	A COMPANY OF THE PROPERTY OF T		West 100	enence:
ဝ	Satisfaction with quality of teaching in required course work: Physics	3.31		-0.74
Q23.	Q23. Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Academic advising by non-faculty	5.41	5.94	-0.53
Q 30.	Q30. Satisfaction with characteristics of your fellow students': Level of camaraderle	5.57		-0.27
Q 24	Q24. Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Quality of computing resources	6.00		-0.20

1				osuere,
Q6.	Satisfaction with quality of teaching in required course work: Physics	3.31	4.05	-0.74
Q23.	. Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Academic advising by non-faculty	5.41	5.94	-0.53
Q30.	Q30. Satisfaction with characteristics of your fellow students': Level of camaraderle	5.57	5.84	-0.27
Q24.	Q24. Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Quality of computing resources	6.00	6.20	-0.20
Q72.	Q72. Overall Value: Comparing the expense to the quality of education, rate the value of the investment made in Undergraduate Engineering program	5.27	5.36	-0.09
Q29.	. Satisfaction with characteristics of your fellow students': Ability to work in teams	5.71	5.80	-0.09
Ω11.	Q11. Satisfaction with: Amount of work required of in major courses	3.98	4.05	-0.07
Q5.	Satisfaction with quality of teaching in required course work: Differential Equations	4.50	4.56	-0.06
Q28.	. Satisfaction with characteristics of your fellow students': Academic quality	5.88	5.93	-0.05

NOTE: If a section is blank, this means that there were no questions that met those conditions.

Copyright EBI 2004: May Not Be Reproduced Without Permission

Longitudinal: Five-Year Comparison for Engineering Major: Chemical

	Q21.	Q1 4 .	Q13.)	Q12.		Q19.	Q18.	Q11.	Q10.	Q9.	ë	1	g g	ģ	Ö	1000				
	Satisfaction with: Amount of work in relationship to what was learned	Satisfaction with: Opportunities for Interaction with practitioners	saustraction with: Opportunities for practical experiences within Undergraduate curriculum	instructors presentation of technology issues	Satisfaction with: Engineering curriculum	A Control of the Cont	Satisfaction with: Availability of courses in major	Satisfaction with: Average size of major courses	Satisfaction with: Amount of work required of in major courses	Satisfaction with: Responsiveness to major course instructors to student concerns	Satisfaction with: Accessibility of major course instructors outside of class	Sattsfaction with: Grades in major courses accurately reflecting students' level of performance		Quality of Instruction and Faculty in Major Course Work: Student/faculty interaction	Quality of Instruction and Faculty in Major Course Work: Feedback on assignments (other than grades)	Quality of Instruction and Faculty in Major Course Work: Teaching	om ventalisme nomen om in the for				(
	51	49	2	?	50		51	51	51	51	50	51		51	51	5		z		N	
	4.88	4.27	4.49	5	5.10		5.84	5.96	3.98	5.31	5.60	4.88		4.55	4.08	5.24		Mean	Data	2004's	
	1.67	<u>1</u> .	1.00	3	1.15		1.38	1.04	1.58	1.17	1.12	1.66		1.21	1.25	1.09	3. (c)	Std			
,	45	41	4	ì	45		45	45	44	43	43	45		45	45	45		z			
	4.49	4.00	4.29	3	4.76		5.62	5.42	4.05	4.81	5.05	4.84		4.07	3.67	4.76	7)	Mean	Data	2003's	
	1.63	1.47	1./1		1.17		1.30	1.25	1.55	1.44	1.21	1.58	10 TO	1.42	1.22	1.1		Std Dev		-	
,	0.39	0.27	0.2.0	3	0.34	(A) (A) (A)	0.22	0.54	-0.07	0.50	0.55	0.04		0.48	0.41	0.48		Difference		Comparison	
	→	→	-	•	→		→	→		→	→			→	→	→		Arrow		son	(
	4.87	3.81	4./9	,	4.30		5.87	5.30	3.83	4.90	5.53	4.80	100	3.93	4.20	4.77	¥	Mean	20		
	0.01	0.46	٠.30	3	0.80	(Tecle)	-0.03	0.66	0.15	0.41	0.07	0.08		0.62	-0.12	0.47		Difference	2002's Data		(
		→	·	-	→			→	→	→				→	←	→			ıta		•
	4.52	4.33		2	4.91	(1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)	5.32	5.86	4.66	5.36	5.50	5.36		4.73	4.61	5.57		Mean	200		
	0.36	-0.06	Ċ.	5	0.19	13/19	0.52	0.10	-0.68	-0.05	0.10	-0.48		-0.18	-0.53	-0.33		Difference	2001's Data	Previous Year's Data	
	→		+	-	→		→	→	+		→	←		+	←	←			a	us Ye	
	4.70	4.48	4./1		5.00		5.72	5.52	4.34	5.13	5.30	4.97		4.56	4.39	5.06		Mean	200	ar's D	
	0.18	-0.21	77.0	3	0.10	Je Wall	0.12	0.44	-0.36	0.18	0.30	-0.09		-0.01	-0.31	0.18	0,400	Difference	2000's Data	ata	
	→ 	<u>-</u>			→		→	→	<u></u>	→	→			·	+	- -			_		
	Š	Š	3	>	Š		Š	Š	Š	Š	Š	ž		Ä	×	×		Mean	1999		
														-				Difference	1999's Data		

6
ğ
itu
₫
na
-
₹
e-}
ea
=
0
큠
ar
SO
ž
Q
П
<u>@</u>
De
eri
g
Ž
ijО
2
Longitudinal: Five-Year Comparison for Engineering Major: Chemical
EC
=

		(5)(2)	Q15. Satisfaction experiences	Q16. Satisfa studen	Q17. Satisfa Engine	The Control of the Co	Q24. Advisir of com	Q25. Advisir Availat School	Q26. Advising access in network	Q27. Advising/(to utilize E resources		Q28. Satisfa studen		Q29. Satisfa studen
		The state of the s	Satisfaction with: Value derived from team experiences	Satisfaction with: Value of Engineering program student organization activities	Satisfaction with: Leadership opportunities in Engineering program's extracurricular activities	Scientification of the second	Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Quality of computing resources	Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Availability of computers in the Engineering School	Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Remote access to Engineering School's computer network	Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Training to utilize Engineering School's computing resources	A Company of the Comp	Satisfaction with characteristics of your fellow students': Academic quality	Satisfaction with characteristics of your fellow students': Ability to work in teams	Satisfaction with characteristics of your fellow
	z		49	40	39	A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR	2	51	46	46	*	51	2	51
2004's Data	Mean		5.51	5.13	5.15		6.00	5.57	5.37	4.59		5.88	5.71	5.57
	Std Dev	Section 1	1.26	1.40	1.41		1.30	1.53	1.76	1.50		0.93	1.22	1.49
	z		44	37	33		4	4	35	43		44	4	4
2003's Data	Mean		5.41	4.92	4.85		6.20	5.23	4.80	4.53		5.93	5.80	5.84
	Std Dev	1000	1.1	1.01	1.00		0.70	1.76	1.68	1.39		0.97	1.00	1.46
Comparison	Difference		0.10	0.21	0.30	2000	-0.20	0.34	0.57	0.06		-0.05	-0.09	-0.27
ison	Arrow		→	→	→		←	. →	→					←
200	Mean	AC7.	5.30	5.21	5.43	() ()	6.13	5.07	5.10	4.43	1000	6.00	5.73	5.59
2002's Data	Difference	1000	0.21	-0.08	-0.28		-0.13	0.50	0.27	0.16	70 G/-	-0.12	-0.02	-0.02
			→		←		←	→	→	→		←		
2001	Mean I		5.58 -	5.31	5.39		6.43	5.34	5.22	4.97 -	7	6.09 -	5.75 -	5.70 -
Previous Year's Data 2001's Data 2000's	Difference		-0.07		-0.24		-0.43	0.23	0.15	-0.38			-0.04	-0.13
— Year			5.57	5.23	5.44	200	5.94	↑ 4.89	4.51	4.69		5.93	5.79	5.86
's Data 2000's Data	an Di									39 -0.10			79 -0.08	36 -0.29
a Data	Mean Difference		-0.06	-0.10 ↓	-0.29 ↓	10.2	0.06	0.68 →	0.86	10 ↓		05	08	29 ↓
190	Mean	A.V.	×	Š	× ×	NA.	¥	₹	Z	Š	ANG	¥	Z	Σ
1999's Data	Difference	Á												

Longitudinal: Five-Year Comparison for Engineering Major: Chemical

									•			•							
			2004's			2003's		Comparison	ison			,	70	reviou	ıs Yea	Previous Year's Data	ta		
			Data			Data				200	2002's Data	a	200	2001's Data		2000	2000's Data	19	1999's Data
		z	Mean	Std	z	Mean	Std	Difference	Arrow	Mean	Difference		Mean	Difference		Mean	Difference	Mean	Difference
3	O LONG THE REPORT OF THE STATE				, K	(1014)		0			10.15			(6)	± .		0 02	N/M	
Q31.	Career Services - Satisfaction with: Assistance in preparation for permanent job search	41	5.56	1.29	41	4.68	1.71	0.88	→	5.84	-0.28	<u></u>	6.10	-0.54	←	5.48	0.08	₹	
Q32.	Career Services - Satisfaction with: Geographic distribution of companies recruiting on campus	44	5.39	1.42	40	4.75	1.45	0.64	→	4.42	0.97	→	4.93	0.46	→	5.09	0.30 →	Ž	
Q33.	Career Services - Satisfaction with: Access to school's alumni to cultivate career opportunities	35	4.29	1.41	35	3.91	1.79	0.38	→	4.00	0.29	→	4.18	0.11	→	4.15	0.14 ↑	Š	
Q34.	Career Services - Satisfaction with: Number of companies recruiting on campus	45	5.04	1.74	41	4.71	1.57	0.33	→	5.37	-0.33	←	5.80	-0.76	←	5.50 -	-0,46 ↓	Š	
Q35.	Career Services - Satisfaction with: Quality of companies recruiting on campus	45	5.80	1.31	41	5.12	1.19	0.68	→	5.78	0.02		6.00	-0.20	←	5.84	-0.04	Z Ž	
						1 00		0.60	,	500	90.00	>	5 34	0 15	38/1				
Q36.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Design experiments	2	0.49	i.	4	4.00	4	0.08	-	5.23	0.2.0	_	4			5.23	0.20	5	
Q37.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Conduct experiments	5	5.98	0.84	4	5.30	1.27	0.68	→	5.87	0.11	→	5.82	0.16	→	5.76	0.22 →	<u> </u>	
Q38.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Analyze and interpret data	51	6.35	0.69	44	6. <u>1</u> 1	0.92	0.24	→	6.27	0.08			-0.06			0.28 ↑	3	
Q39.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Design a system, component, or process to meet desired needs	50	5.60	1.21	4	5.18	1.28	0.42	→	5.40	0.20	→	5.39	0.21	→		0.09	\$	
Q40.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Function on multidisciplinary teams	51	5.55	1.30	43	5.05	1.62	0.50	→	5.17	0.38	→	5.14	0.41	→	5.31	0.24 →	₹	
			The second second					W. Well.			nie plasia		13.3						
Q42.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Understand ethical responsibilities	50	4.76	1.42	44	3.89	1.62	0.87	→	4.47	0.29			0.21				Z	
Q43.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Understand the impact of engineering solutions in a global/societal context	51	4.88	1.54	4	3.93	1.63	0.95	→	3.87	1.01	→	4.64	0.24		4.22	0.66	Z	

Longitudinal: Five-Year Comparison for Engineering Major: Chemical

		2004's			2003's		Comparison	son					Previous Year's Data	ear's l)ata			
		Data			Data				200	2002's Data	ata	200	2001's Data	20	2000's Data	ata	1995	1999's Data
	z	Mean	Std	z	Mean	Std Dev	Difference	Arrow	Mean Difference	Diffe		Mean	Mean Difference	Mean Difference	Diffe		Mean	Mean Difference
		0.4	Section 2		200	7.016				40.00V	Sie				[GF 5]		T.	
Q44. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Use modern	51	5.39	0.98	44	4.64	1.64	0.75	→	5.37	0.02		5.39	0.00	5.32	0.07	7	×	
engineering tools Q45. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Communicate	50	5.30	1.11	43	4.44	1.64	0.86	→	5.03	0.27	→	5.02	0.28 ↑	5.02	0.28	æ →	N N	
using oral progress reports Q46. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Communicate	50	5.76	1.19	43	5.23	1.63	0.53	→	5.90	-0.14	←	5.95	-0.19 ↓	5.67	0.09	ω	Ŋ	
using written progress reports Q47. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Pilot test a	49	3.65	1.60	42	3.52	1.71	0.13	→	3.74	-0.09		3.63	0.02	4.02	-0.37	7 +	Ä	
component prior to implementation Q48. Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Use text materials to support project design	51	5.45	1.08	4	5.09	1.24	0.36	→	5.50	-0.05	.	5,45	0.00	5.45	0.00		N	
ì																		
1																		

Longitudinal: Five-Year Comparison for Engineering Major: Chemical

						-					(•			i			
			2004's			2003's		Comparison	son			_		Previous Year's Data	ar's D	ata	-	
			Data			Data				200	2002's Data	ta	200	2001's Data	200	2000's Data		1999's Data
		z	Mean	Std	z	Mean	Std	Difference	Arrow	Mean	Difference		Mean	Difference	Mean	Difference	Mean	an Difference
	ប្រជាព្រះ ប្រជាព្រះ		Ļ							A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH	ġ.							
241.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Solve engineering problems	51	6.20	0.80	44	5.86	1.07	0.34	→	6.33	-0.13	←	6.36	-0.16 t	6.02	0.18 ↑	Z	,
250.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Apply knowledge of mathematics	51	6.22	0. 9 0	4	6.00	0.91	0.22	→	6.40	-0.18	-	Z		Z			,
251.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Apply knowledge of science	51	6.22	1.03	4	5.77	1.14	0.45	→	6.03	0.19	→	Ž		Z			
1 52.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Apply knowledge of engineering	51	6.14	0.89	4	5.48	1.07	0.66	→	5.97	0.17	→	ž		N N		Z	,
2 53.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Identify engineering problems	51	6.00	0.92	44	5. 55	1.04	0.45	→	5.77	0.23	→	Z	· ·	Z			,
254.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Formulate engineering problems	51	5.86	0.85	4	5.25	1.30	0.61	→	5.47	0.39	→	Z		Z			,
255.	Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Understand contemporary issues	51	5.12	1.26	44	4.39	1.59	0.73	→	4.67	0.45	→	Σ		N N		Z P	
		11 m		A0 (A)	1				Ī	6.5						9 70 6	2	
Q56.	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Built on knowledge from previous course work	51	5.92	0.80	43	5.09	1.31	0.83	→	5.67	0.25	→	5.86	0.06	5.68	0.24 ↑	₹	
Q57.	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Built on skills from previous course work	51	5.82	0.79	43	5.12	1.35	0.70	→	5.77	0.05		5.81	0.01	5.64	0.18 →		
Q58.	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Incorporated engineering standards	50	5.24	1.04	43	4.42	1.56	0.82	→	5.13	0.11	→	5.24	0.00	5.04	0.20 ↑		

Longitudinal: Five-Year Comparison for Engineering Major: Chemical

	Longitudinal five-	<u>a</u>	7176	-1001			21120	ביווים מוויסנו וטו בו			N N	2		Citellical	מ				
			2004's		N	2003's		ъ				•		reviou	ıs Yez	Previous Year's Data	ដ		
			Data			Data				200	2002's Data	a	2001	2001's Data	_	2000	2000's Data	-	1999's Data
		z	Mean	Std Dev	z	Mean	Std	Difference	Аггом	Mean	Difference		Mean	Difference		lean l	Mean Difference	Mean	an Difference
					N. S.			0.00	100		181					013			
259.	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Economic	51	5.63	1.20	43	4.81	1.58	0.82	→	5.53	0.10	→	5.56	0.07		5.21	0.42 ↑	Z >	Þ
Q60.	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Environmental issues	51	4.92	1.52	43	3.77	1.56	1.15	→	4.23	0.69	→	4.14	0.78	→	4.45	0.47 ↑		Þ
Q61.	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Sustainability issues	51	4.73	1.28	43	3.84	1.51	0.89	→	4.30	0.43	→	4.33	0.40	→	4.32	0.41 ↑	×	Þ
Q62.	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Manufacturability issues	51	4.61	1.40	43	4.16	1.59	0.45	→	4.93	-0.32	←	4.79	-0. 18	←		0.06	Z S	Þ
Q63.	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Ethical issues	50	4.04	1.43	43	2.91	1.54	1.13	→	4.10	-0.06		4.38	-0.34	←	3.52	0.52 ↑	×	Þ
Q64.	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Health and Safety issues	51	4.45	1.50	43	3.16	1.45	1.29	→	4.23	0.22	→		0.21	→		0.40 ↑		P
Q65.	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Social issues	50	ა. 88	1.60	43	3.00	1.69	0.88	→	3.53	0.35	→		0.28	→		0.62 →		Þ
Q66.	Major Design Experience - Degree that the major design experience: Addressed Political issues	49	3.24	1.77	43	2.74	1.48	0.50	→	3.10	0.14	→	3.07	0.17	→	2.70	0.54 →	Z A	P
		R	E 07	1 20		5 00	3	0.49	,	5.47	0.00			0 93		1.0 %		N NA	
Q67.	Laboratory Facilities - Degree that laboratory facilities: Established an atmosphere conducive to learning	2	5.27	1.28	4	5.09	1.22	0.18	→	5.47	-0.20			-0.23					P
Q68.	Laboratory Facilities - Degree that laboratory facilities: Fostered student/faculty interaction	50	5.08	4	44	5.00	1.43	0.08		5.53	-0.45	←	5.48	-0.40	÷	5.22	-0.14 ↓		P
Q69.	Laboratory Facilities - Degree that laboratory facilities: Allowed use of modern engineering tools	51	4.86	1.40	43	4.35	1.54	0.51	→	4.77	0.09		4.64	0.22	<u>→</u>	4.60	0.26 ↑		P

Longitudinal: Five-Year Comparison for Engineering Major: Chemical

	Follymanian interior companior in First		1146	-100		7	1		9		9	3							
			2004's	_		2003's		Comparison	ison				70	reviou	S Ye	Previous Year's Data	ıta		
			Data			Data				200;	2002's Data	_	2001	2001's Data		2000	2000's Data		1999's Data
		z	Mean	Std	z	Mean	Std	Difference	Аггом	Mean Difference	Differe	3	Wean	Mean Difference		Mean	Mean Difference		Mean Difference
American State of the State of			1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	100	Total Section	The second	Andrew Control of the		A Section of the second		4	Anglista.		of the same	A Contraction			
Q71.	Q71. Expectations: Extent that the Undergraduate Engineering program experience fulfill	51	5.04	1.41	44	4.70	1.62	0.34	→	4.97	0.07		5.27 -0.23	-0.23	←	5.03 0.01	0.01	Z Z	P
Q72.	expectations Overall Value: Comparing the expense to the quality of education, rate the value of the investment made in Undergraduate Engineering	51	5.27	1.71	4	5.36	1.42	-0.09		5.57	-0.30	+	5.89	-0.62	←	5.51 -0.24	-0.24 ↓	₹	Þ
Q73.		51	4.63	1.93	4	4.32	1.91	0.31	→	4.13	0.50	→	5.41	-0.78	←	5.16	-0.53 ↓	₹	Þ
Q74.	Major to a close mend Recommendations: How inclined are you to recommend your Undergraduate Engineering School to a close friend	7	5.75	1.34	4	5.52	1.65	0.23	→	6.00	-0.25	←	6.02	-0.27	<u> </u>	6.03	-0.28 ↓		Þ

Longitudinal: Five-Year Comparison for Engineering Major: Chemical

				(1			(Ć	•								
		2004's			2003's		Comparison	son					Previo	us Ye	Previous Year's Data	ata			
	-	Data			Data				20	2002's Data	ata	200	2001's Data	89	200	2000's Data	20	199	1999's Data
	z	Mean	Std	z	Mean	Std	Difference	Arrow	Mean	Mean Difference		Mean	Mean Difference		Mean Difference	Differ		Mean	Mean Difference
	e e standarde				The state of the s				Name .					r. Saza					
Satisfaction with quality of teaching in required	47	5.09	1.72	37	4.59	1.61	0.50	→	5.12	-0.03		5.46	-0.37	+	5.36	-0.27	6 -	Ä	
Satisfaction with quality of teaching in required course work: Differential Equations	50	4.50	1.79	45	4.56	1.82	-0.06		4.93	-0.43	←	4.85	-0.35	←	4.76	-0.26	←	×	
Satisfaction with quality of teaching in required course work: Physics	48	3.31	1.93	38	4.05	1.47	-0.74	←	3.50	-0.19	←	2.88	0.43	→	3. 9 5	-0.64	←	¥	
Satisfaction with quality of teaching in required course work: Chemistry	2	5.86	1.15	42	5.36	1.12	0.50	→	5.76		- →	5.83	0.03		5.75	0.11	→	×	
Satisfaction with: Quality of Engineering classrooms	51	4.96	1.50	45	4.84	1.48	0.12	→	4.67		→	4.59	0.37	→	4.90	0.06		Z	
Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Academic advising by faculty	55	4.14	2.11	44	3.98	1.81	0.16	→	4.53		←	4.95	-0.81	+	4.22	-0.08		\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	
Advising/Computing - Satisfaction with: Academic advising by non-faculty	39	5.41	1.27	34	5.94	1.41	-0.53	←	6.17		←	5.79	-0.38	-	5,57	-0.16	-	\ \frac{1}{2}	
Skill Development - Degree that engineering education enhanced ability to: Recognize need to engage in lifelong learning	51	5.73	1.39	4	5.09	1.60	0.64	→	5.27	0.46	→	5.81	-0.08		5.20	0.53	-	Ş	
Course Companson: Quality of teaching in your Engineering courses compare to the quality of teaching in Non-Engineering courses on this campus	51	5.29	1.55	44	5.23	1.33	0.06		5.03	0.26	→	5.44	-0.15	· ←	5.30	-0.01		₹	

⊇70.

249.

223.

222.

220.

<u>ي</u>ر

ġ

Ř