

Arizona Sun Corridor - Get Into Energy Consortium
 TAACCCT Round 2 Grant (TC-23759-12-60-A-4)
 Third Party Review of Curriculum and Related Educational Resources

| | |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| College | Pima |
| Course Number | EUT104 |
| Course Title | Overhead and Underground Construction |
| Item Description | Syllabus |
| Reviewed by | BP |
| Review Date(s) | February 2016 |

| | | |
|--------------------|-----|-------------|
| Course Number | Yes | |
| Course Title | Yes | |
| Course Description | Yes | |
| Pre-requisites | Yes | |
| Co Requisites | No | None needed |

| | | |
|---|-----|---|
| Student learning outcomes and competencies are clearly identified | Yes | Course objectives, Outline and calendar are all aligned description |
|---|-----|---|

| | | |
|---|-----|--|
| Required and recommended texts and other materials are clearly identified | Yes | It appears this course is entirely classroom based. There is no credit designation or lecture lab configuration included so the reviewer is not able to evaluate that aspect of this course. |
|---|-----|--|

| | | |
|---|-------------------|--|
| Description of strategies for student success or available assistance | No | None are provided. This reviewer encourages the syllabus writer to look to Yavapai for a strong example that outlines the services available for student support. |
| Description of how course prepares student for a certificate or degree | Yes | Course provides knowledge about systems to distribute electricity. Distribution systems is the heart of the linework field. In review of the outline information, this reviewer encourages that the outline be better aligned with the course calendar. It seems the order should begin with Safety as the first item, then be woven into all other course outline areas. |
| Description of how course/item is relevant or applicable to occupation or industry | Yes | |
| Description of assessments, evaluation, exams and grading process | Needs improvement | Many acronyms are used without explanation. This reviewer encourages the writer to use full words at least on the first time of use. The presented information on grading is very general and provides very little clarity to the student. |
| Evidence of industry input, review and approval process | Yes | Use of the NCCER textbook demonstrates the course is based on the national skill standards giving the content industry validity. |
| Evidence of college review and approval process | No | None provided in submitted materials. |
| For items not directly related to a course, any evidence of quality control process | NA | |

The overall quality is a sufficient representation of college and industry standards

Yes

This reviewer believe this course may meet minimal expectations of the college. However, the writer should consider how better to convey the performance expectations to the students. Providing answers to the comments above will greatly improve the guidance to the students.

Other notes

Nearly all criteria in this course conveys a negative message to the student. The scripting mostly speaks to penalties. Messaging can be strengthened by expressing what good performance looks like and how the student can earn the points versus deductions. There is no credit designation provided and no information if this is all lecture or some lab performance. The required materials includes work gloves yet there is no information on lab performance as part of the assessment plan. This needs to be clarified to send a consistent message to the student.