

Information Systems Program

Evidence of Student Learning

Use of Evidence of Student Learning

2018-19

Information Systems Program Learning Outcomes

- Write correct and robust software.
- Analyze the interaction between hardware and software.
- Demonstrate general knowledge of theories and practices in the core areas of business.
- Critically analyze and apply business knowledge to solve complex business situations.
- Apply critical thinking, technical and information systems knowledge to solve problems.
- Demonstrate effective business communication through both written and verbal means.
 - *Students will be able to speak about their work with precision, clarity and organization*
 - *Students will be able to write about their work with precision, clarity and organization*
 - *Students will be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and cite information for the task at hand.*
- Formulate decisions informed by ethical attitudes and values.
- Understand and create arguments supported by quantitative evidence
- Students will collaborate effectively in teams.
- Graduates will demonstrate knowledge of information systems and be prepared for careers that use information systems, and graduate study in fields related to information systems.

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Students will be able to write correct and robust software.

Outcome Measure: Annual: CSC254 Signature Assignment

Criteria for Success: 80% of the students should have an average score of at least 2 in each of the major areas.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Class at 2 or Higher							
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Compilation	100%	100%	92%	75%	100%	94%	90%	75%
Runtime Correctness	86%	58%	85%	100%	62%	72%	95%	60%
Problem Solving	100%	100%	100%	75%	92%	83%	80%	85%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The students find the run-time correctness the most challenging. This is because this is the area of programming that is the most detailed oriented.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Continue to emphasize the need to carefully de-bug computer code during development. The rubric was modified to clarify the definition of run-time correctness which has made scoring simpler (Fall 2017).

CSC 254 Signature assignment

	Unsatisfactory (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Good (3)	Excellent (4)
Compilation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Compiles with errors	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Compiles with no errors, but has linking errors	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Compiles with no syntax errors or linking errors, but has warnings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Compiles and links with no errors
Runtime correctness	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Less than 60% correct	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Between 60% – 79% correctness	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 80% - 89%	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 90% – 100%
Problem solving	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analysis of program source code indicates that program is NOT close to working, and could NOT easily be modified to work given additional time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analysis of program source code indicates that the student partially understands the problem solution or understands the solution but could not efficiently translate the solution to C++ code	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analysis of program source code indicates that program is close to working, and could be modified to work given additional time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All tasks execute correctly indicating that the code is both correct and robust (can catch user input errors)

Criterion: 80% of students will average 2 in Runtime, correctness and Problem solving.

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Students will analyze the interaction between hardware and software.

Outcome Measure:

Annual (CS and IS): CSC314 Signature Assignment

Annual (CS): ETS CS Exam Computer Organization, Architecture and Operating Systems Subscore.

Criteria for Success:

CSC314 Assignment: 80% of the students should have an average score of at least 7.

ETS: The department subscore will be at the 65th percentile or higher.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Class at 7 or Higher							
	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Hardware/software interaction understanding	85%	89%	82%	92%	88%	75%	69%	100%

ETS Subscore:

Here are the most recent 10 years of data:

Year	Percentile
2009-10	90
2010-11	65
2011-12	89
2012-13	*
2013-14	82
2014-15	94
2015-16	86
2016-17	61
2017-18	53
2018-19	74

* Sample size too small to be given indicator scores.
ETS changed the CS exam in 2011-12.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Students have been able to successfully master the material in the CSC314 assessment. The variations appear to be related to sample size.

This data from the ETS subscore is a challenge to interpret for several reasons: some years our sample size is too small for ETS to provide the subscore and in all years our sample size is sufficiently small that the standard deviation is relatively large. The last few years we have not had as much success. This could be changes in the exam, the particular problems selected or variations in the students.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Continue to require operating systems (CSC314) of all CS and IS students.

We need to evaluate the ETS test questions to determine if this remains a valid measurement tool that is aligned with our curriculum. We have noticed that there may be a correlation between this data and our curricular cycle. We teach several key classes in alternating years and it appears that students are more successful in an alternating year cycle. We need to investigate this further as part of our upcoming program review. We will be also be evaluating whether or not the ETS MFT is the best way to measure this learning objective.

Rubric Used (CSC314)

The scoring for this assignment is purely points based.

	Unsatisfactory (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Good (3)	Excellent (4)
Points gained by showing understanding of software/hardware interaction in answering question	6 and below	7	8	9-10

Rubric Used (ETS)

Scoring done by ETS on the Major Field Test.

Fermanian School of Business
PLO #1 Assessment
2018-2019

Learning Outcome:

PLO #1: Exhibit general knowledge of theories and practices in the core areas of business.

Outcome Measure:

Peregrine Comprehensive Exit Exam Results

Criteria for Success:

Score at or above the following:

Peregrine Undergraduate Comprehensive Exit Exam Criteria for Success	
Disciplinary Area	Score
Accounting	50
Business Ethics	50
Business Finance	45
Strategic Management	55
Business Leadership	50
Economics (Macro/Micro)	50
Global Dimensions of Business	45
Information Mgt Systems	50
Legal Environment of Business	50
Management (OPS, HR, OB)	55
Marketing	50
Quantitative Techniques/Stats	45

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Undergraduate Total Accounting Business Ethics Business Finance Strategic Management Business Leadership Economics (Macro/Micro) Global Dimensions of Business Information Mgt Systems Legal Environment of Business Management (Ops, HR, OB) Marketing Quantitative Techniques/Stats												
Criteria for Success	50	50	45	55	50	50	45	50	50	55	50	45	
2015-2016	50.9	57.2	48.5	49.8	56.3	49.0	55.1	46.0	54.0	49.2	52.6	48.8	44.6
2016-2017	50.2	54.6	48.3	48.5	54.9	47.9	52.2	44.8	53.6	49.1	51.0	49.6	47.1
2017-2018	49.8	53.9	47.1	49.8	51.5	48.9	50.1	45.6	51.9	51.5	50.9	53.3	43.5
2018-2019	51.1	50.9	48.6	46.4	54.9	54.0	52.3	48.0	50.1	55.2	50.3	55.2	47.4

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

It is important to note that PLNU's methodology of administering the Peregrine Comprehensive Exam is delivered in a face-to-face format, proctored and students are given a two-hour time limit to complete the test. According to Peregrine, a majority of the schools who administer the Peregrine Comprehensive Exam do so in an un-proctored online format with time limits up to 48 hours. Therefore, criteria for success were determined considering: (a) average total score and average disciplinary area scores of National and Region 7 ACBSP schools, (b) the FSB's undergraduate curriculum and (c) the FSB's historical disciplinary area scores.

During AY 15-16, the criteria for success were exceeded for six of the twelve disciplinary areas. Scores in the areas of Quantitative Techniques and Statistics were slightly below (within 0.4 points) the criteria for success. Scores in the remaining five areas were below the criteria for success, including Business Ethics, Business Leadership, Legal Environment of Business, Management and Marketing as indicated in the table above.

During AY 16-17, the criteria for success were exceeded for five of the twelve disciplinary areas. Scores in the areas of Strategic Management and Global Dimensions of Business were slightly below (within 0.2 points) the criteria for success. Scores in the remaining five areas were below the criteria for success, including Business Ethics, Business Leadership, Legal Environment of Business, Management and Marketing as indicated in the table above.

During AY 17-18, the criteria for success were exceeded for seven of the twelve disciplinary areas. Scores in the areas of Business Leadership and Quantitative Techniques and Statistics were slightly below (within 1.5 points) the criteria for success. Scores in the remaining three areas were below the criteria for success, including Business Ethics, Strategic Management, and Management.

During AY 18-19, the criteria for success were exceeded for nine of the twelve disciplinary areas. The average score in the area of Strategic Management was 0.1 points below the criteria for success. The average score in the area of Business Ethics was slightly below (within 1.4 points) the criteria for success. The average score in the area of Management was 4.7 points below the criteria for success.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Management has been recognized as an area needing improvement. Scores in this area have been consistently below the criteria for success and a downward trend in the data is noted. Content in operations management was added to MGT212 Principles of Management beginning Fall 2017. Students taking this improved MGT212 course will begin graduating in Spring 2020, so increased scores in this area may be delayed.

Business Ethics has been recognized as an area needing improvement. There was an increase in the average score in the area of Business Ethics from AY 17-18 to AY 18-19. Beginning in Fall 2017, content relating to the study of various ethical models was included in MGT 212 Principles of Management. Students taking MGT212 with this new content will begin graduating in Spring 2020, so increased scores in this area may be delayed.

The areas of Strategic Management, Business Leadership and Quantitative Techniques/Statistics are being closely monitored. All three areas showed increases in scores from AY 17-18 to AY 18-19. Scores in the areas of Business Leadership and Quantitative Techniques/Statistics exceeded the criteria for success in AY 18-19. All three areas will continue to be monitored over the next several academic years.

A positive trend is noted in the area of Marketing. Beginning Fall 2017, MKT332 Principles of Marketing was redesigned to improve content. This content shift, in addition to course re-design in the 400-level marketing courses, has resulted in the positive trend.

The criteria for success will be revisited in Spring 2020. With nine of twelve scores above the criteria for success in Spring 2019, the FSB will consider increasing the criteria for success in areas deemed appropriate.

Fermanian School of Business
PLO #2 Assessment
2018-2019

Learning Outcome:

PLO #2: Critically analyze and apply business knowledge to solve complex business situations.

Outcome Measure:

The CAPSIM COMP-XM Management Simulation provides comparative data on how each student (and class) performs against all other students taking the simulation and exam at the same time nationally.

Two results are used:

1. CAPSIM COMP-XM Balanced Score Card Results – Application-based
2. CAPSIM COMP-XM Simulation Board Query Results – Knowledge-based

Criteria for Success:

1. Average score of all students will be above 70th percentile on the national COMP-XM Balanced Score Card Results
2. Average score of all students will be above 55th percentile on the national COMP-XM Board Query Results

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

Semester	N ¹	Balanced Score Card Results	Board Query Results
Fall 2015	51	82	70
Spring 2016	59	71	60
Fall 2016	60	80	86
Spring 2017	68	80	71
Fall 2017	81	60	53
Spring 2018	56	82	64
Fall 2018	64	65	72
Spring 2019	70	53	-
Summer 2019	13	24.5	41.5

¹ Number of Students Completing Module

Note: Board Query results not collected in Spring 2019

Approved by Assessment Committee 10.02.19
Approved by FSB Full Faculty 10.09.19

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Scores on the COMP-XM Balanced Score Card exceeded the criteria for success in five of the nine semesters. A downward trend has been noted beginning Fall 2018, with students averaging in the 65th percentile in Fall 2018, 53rd percentile in Spring 2019 and 24th percentile in Summer 2019.

Between Fall 2015 and Fall 2018, scores on the COMP-XM Board Query exceeded the criteria for success, ranging from 60 to 86, with an outlier in Fall 2017 when students averaged in the 53rd percentile. Data was not collected in Spring 2019 due to a miscommunication with the instructor. The average score fell below the criteria for success in Summer 2019 with students averaging in the 41st percentile.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

It is important to note that the professor that had been teaching MGT488 Strategic Management retired in December 2018. Work was done prior to the professor's retirement to institutionalize the instruction of the simulation; however, there is a learning curve to teaching this simulation. The new faculty members teaching Strategic Management in the traditional undergraduate and BBA programs attended specialized training on the simulation in Spring and Summer 2019. The faculty members will participate in additional training in AY 19-20 to ensure they are better prepared to teach MGT488 with the simulation. Data will be collected and monitored in AY 19-20.

¹ Number of Students Completing Module

Note: Board Query results not collected in Spring 2019

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Students will be able to apply their technical knowledge and critical thinking to solve problems.

Outcome Measure:

Alternating Year: ISS414 Signature Assignment using data bases.

ETS Proficiency Profile: Critical Thinking/Reading Portion

Criteria for Success:

80% of the students should have an average score of at least 2.5 in each of the major areas.

ETS PP: 85% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Reading/Critical Thinking.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Class at 2.5 or Higher			
	2011-12	2013-14	2015-16	17-18
Relevant Information Chosen	100%	100%	88%	89%
Query Correctness	25%	100%	48%	41%

ETS Proficiency Profile	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient						
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Critical Thinking	80%	92%	100%	84%	92%	76%	80%

*ETS is for the full department.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

ISS414 Assignment: The 2012 class was relatively small and that led to a fairly large standard deviation. 75% of the class would have passed query correctness if the benchmark had been 2.3. We once again saw some problems with query correctness in 2015-16 and in 17-18. In both cases, had the threshold for success be lowered slightly (2 vs 2.5), many more students would have succeeded.

ETS: The students are generally hitting our benchmark in this area, with small sample sizes hitting or missing the benchmark can be a matter of a single person's score.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Spend more time in class emphasizing queries. This class is being revised in light of some new curricular changes. In 2015-16 the class was changed significantly. It focused on both data bases and website construction. Less time is being spend on data bases. In 2017-18 the course content was adjusted again. We need to continue to review this signature assignment in light of the changed course content.

Rubric Used

	Unsatisfactory (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Good (3)	Excellent (4)
Recognition of relevant information	3 errors (an error is defined as missing a relevant database field or listing an irrelevant field)	2 errors (an error is defined as missing a relevant database field or listing an irrelevant field)	1 error (an error is defined as missing a relevant database field or listing an irrelevant field)	All relevant database fields are listed and no irrelevant fields are listed for both queries
Query correctness	3 mistakes in the 2 queries	2 mistakes in the 2 queries	1 mistake in the 2 queries	No mistakes in the two queries

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Students will be able to speak about their work with precision, clarity and organization (Oral Communication).

Outcome Measure: Annual: Each student will be required to give an oral presentation on a topic in their field as a part of their participation in the Senior Seminar. The audience for this talk will include department faculty, fellow students and possibly some alumni. The students will be given the evaluation criteria in advance of their presentation and will be rated by the faculty using a rubric with a scale of 4 (outstanding) to 1 (unsatisfactory) in the following areas:

- Command of background material
- Organization
- Oral presentation skills (added as part of the new rubric in the spring of 2010)
- Use of presentation tools
- Ability to field questions from the audience

Note that the department has a mapping between its rubric and the AAC&U Oral Communication Value Rubric.

Criteria for Success: 80% of the students should have an average score of at least 2.5 in each of the major areas in the department rubric. This translates to 80% of the students being above a 3.5 in the AAC&U rubric.

Our translation from our data to the AAC&U is included. Our department continues to provide the students with our departmental rubric because it has been developed over many years and works effectively with our majors.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

Oral Presentation	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Background	100%	95%	100%	100%	92%	100%	95%	100%	100%	95%
Organization	100%	85%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	94%	100%
Oral Presentation Skills	100%	90%	100%	100%	92%	100%	95%	100%	100%	95%
Presentation Tools	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Ability to Field Questions	100%	100%	83%	100%	100%	89%	100%	100%	100%	94%

AAC&U “translation” (we have only done this for the years that PLNU has been making use of the DQP)

Oral AAC&U	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Organization	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	94%	100%
Language	100%	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%	95%
Delivery	100%	92%	100%	95%	100%	100%	95%
Supporting Material	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Central Message	100%	100%	89%	100%	100%	100%	94%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

In general, the students have been performing reasonably well in the area of giving oral presentations. We attribute this to the fact that we intentionally have students presenting technical material in front of others starting in their freshman year.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Over time we have increased our standards and expanded the rubric to increase clarity for students and to push them to speak at a professional level. Looking at the scores, it is possible to see the times when alterations have been made:

- 2008-09 Standards tightened
- 2009-10 Rubric expanded to include more detailed instructions

Oral Presentation Rubric Update (4/12/17)

Criteria	Outstanding	High Satisfactory	Low Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Command of background material	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly knows material and key facts by memory <input type="checkbox"/> Expands on PPT slides <input type="checkbox"/> Content appropriate for audience	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly knows key facts with a few memory slips <input type="checkbox"/> Some expansion on PPT slides <input type="checkbox"/> Partial audience adaptation of content	<input type="checkbox"/> Reads some information; knows some facts from memory <input type="checkbox"/> No expansion of PPT slide content <input type="checkbox"/> Little audience adaptation of content	<input type="checkbox"/> Reads sentences from slides <input type="checkbox"/> Dependent on notes <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks audience adaptation of content
Organization	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear and concise outline <input type="checkbox"/> Relevant graphics and key text items on slides <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation is between 10-15 minutes	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear outline <input type="checkbox"/> Too much information on slides (not concise) <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation 1 minute outside of the range (10-15 minutes)	<input type="checkbox"/> Some sense of outline <input type="checkbox"/> Too much detailed information on slides <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation 2 minutes outside of the range (10-15 minutes)	<input type="checkbox"/> No clear outline <input type="checkbox"/> Slides are in paragraphed; too much detailed information on one slide <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation 3 minutes outside of the range (10-15 minutes)
Oral Presentation skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly has practiced several times; smooth transitions <input type="checkbox"/> Engages audience in content multiple time and engagement is well connected to talk (questions, examples, etc) <input type="checkbox"/> Free of disfluencies (ah, umh) <input type="checkbox"/> Is clearly heard in the room and makes an uses inflection for emphasis <input type="checkbox"/> Engaged audience through eye contact <input type="checkbox"/> Engaged audience through gestures	<input type="checkbox"/> Has practiced but transitions are not smooth <input type="checkbox"/> Engages audience at least twice in content (questions, examples, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> A few disfluencies (ah, umh, er) <input type="checkbox"/> Can be understood most of the time and uses some inflection <input type="checkbox"/> Some engagement of audience through eye contact <input type="checkbox"/> Some engagement of audience through gestures	<input type="checkbox"/> Has practiced presentation but cannot verbally make transitions between slides <input type="checkbox"/> Audience engagement at least once with content (questions, examples, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Many disfluencies (ah, umh, er) <input type="checkbox"/> Can sometimes be understood and uses little inflection <input type="checkbox"/> Infrequent eye contact <input type="checkbox"/> Distracting gestures or mannerisms	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly did not practice presentation; Does not anticipate content of next slide <input type="checkbox"/> No audience involvement <input type="checkbox"/> Disfluencies (ah, umh, er) detract from presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Can not be heard and/or speaks in a monotone <input type="checkbox"/> Little audience awareness or eye contact <input type="checkbox"/> Frequent distracting gestures or mannerisms
Use of Presentation Tools	<input type="checkbox"/> PPT background is matched to content, legible font, seamless transitions <input type="checkbox"/> Graphics imbedded and matched to topic, necessary hyperlinks work	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate PPT slide backgrounds, transitions & font <input type="checkbox"/> Most graphics imbedded and matched to topic, most necessary hyperlinks work	<input type="checkbox"/> Distracting PPT slide backgrounds and transitions, font hard to read <input type="checkbox"/> Some inappropriate graphics or use of PPT embellishments, necessary hyperlinks don't work	<input type="checkbox"/> No attention given to PPT slide backgrounds and transitions, font illegible <input type="checkbox"/> Distracting use of embellishments, graphics not connected to topic
Ability to field questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Able to answer questions clearly and without hesitation and prepared material to answer anticipated questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Can answer all questions with some hesitation	<input type="checkbox"/> Able to answer half of the questions with hesitation	<input type="checkbox"/> Unable to answer any questions

Translation between MICS and AAC&U Rubric

MICS Category	MICS Item Position in Rubric	AAC&U Category
Clear and concise outline	4	Organization
Relevant graphics and key text items on slides	5	Organization
Presentation length is +/- 30 seconds of time limit	6	Organization
Expands on PPT slides	2	Language
Content appropriate for audience	3	Language
Engages audience	8	Language
Transitions	7	Delivery
Free of disfluencies (ah, uhm)	9	Delivery
Is clearly heard in the room and uses inflection for emphasis	10	Delivery
Engaged audience through eye contact	11	Delivery
Engaged audience through gestures	12	Delivery
PPT background is matched to content, legible font, seamless transitions	13	Delivery
Relevant graphics and key text items on slides	5	Supporting
Graphics imbedded and matched to topic, necessary hyperlinks work	14	Supporting
Clearly knows material and key facts by memory	1	Central Message
Able to answer questions clearly and without hesitation	15	Central Message

AAC&U Value Rubric

	Capstone 4	Milestones 3	Milestones 2	Benchmark 1
Organization	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the presentation.
Language	Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is not appropriate to audience.
Delivery	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable.
Supporting Material	A variety of types of supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that partially supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Insufficient supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make reference to information or analysis that minimally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.
Central Message	Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.)	Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material.	Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable.	Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation.

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Students will be able to write about their work with precision, clarity and organization (Written Communication).

Outcome Measure:

Annual: Each student will be required to write a paper on a topic in their field as a part of their participation in the Senior Seminar. The audience for this talk will include department faculty, fellow students and possibly some alumni. The students will be given the evaluation criteria in advance of their presentation and will be rated by the faculty using a rubric with a scale of 4 (outstanding) to 1 (unsatisfactory) in the following areas:

- Bibliography and other supporting documentation
- Organization
- Grammar and spelling
- Depth of information
- Clarity of writing

Note that the department has a mapping between its rubric and the AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric.

Annual: ETS Proficiency Profile.

Criteria for Success: 80% of the students should have an average score of at least 2.5 in each of the major areas in the department rubric. This translates to 80% of the students being above a 3.5 in the AAC&U rubric.

ETS: 85% of our students will be marginal or proficient on the Level 2 Writing test.

Our translation from our data to the AAC&U is included. Our department continues to provide the students with our departmental rubric because it has been developed over many years and works effectively with our majors

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

Written Report	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Bibliography and Support	88%	55%	93%	100%	100%	100%	89%	100%	76%	89%
Organization	63%	65%	93%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	94%	100%
Grammar and Spelling	81%	60%	79%	100%	92%	89%	84%	100%	88%	94%
Depth of Information	88%	50%	93%	91%	77%	78%	89%	85%	76%	83%
Clarity of Writing	81%	70%	79%	91%	77%	78%	89%	85%	88%	94%

AAC&U “translation” (we have only done this for the years that PLNU has been making use of the DQP)

Written AAC&U	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Organization	100%	100%	100%	89%	92%	94%	100%
Language	100%	92%	100%	89%	85%	76%	83%
Delivery	100%	92%	100%	100%	85%	94%	100%
Supporting Material	100%	100%	100%	89%	100%	76%	89%
Central Message	100%	100%	89%	84%	85%	88%	94%

Written ETS	Percentage at Marginal or Proficient						
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
ETS Proficiency Profile Writing Level 2	60%	85%	100%	89%	85%	76%	85%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

In general, the students have been performing reasonably well in writing technical reports. We still have some weaknesses in the quality of their writing and the use of their source material. The sample size for ETS in the first year was extremely small so we are not particularly concerned about the fact that the score was below the benchmark. The balance of the ETS scores are at or near benchmark (due to small sample sizes, the difference can often be a single person).

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Over time we have increased our standards and expanded the rubric to increase clarity for students and to push them to speak at a professional level. Looking at the scores, it is possible to see the times when alterations have been made:

- 2008-09 Standards tightened
- 2009-10 Rubric expanded to include more detailed instructions
- In 2014-15 we instituted a literature review assignment to strengthen the students' capacity for using resources and identifying why the resources are relevant. This assignment needs to be adjusted, but seems to have helped students to understand their work.

In addition, the university has just changed general education requirements so that students will take an upper division literature class. We hope that this further exposure to formal writing later in their academic career will help to strengthen our students' writing.

MICS Written Presentation Rubric

Criteria	Outstanding	High Satisfactory	Low Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Bibliography and supporting documents	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple references from distinct reputable sources <input type="checkbox"/> References cited in the body of the document	<input type="checkbox"/> Most references from distinct reputable sources <input type="checkbox"/> Some citation of references in the body of the document	<input type="checkbox"/> Some references from reputable sources <input type="checkbox"/> Limited citation of references in the body of the document	<input type="checkbox"/> No bibliography or all references from untrusted sites on the internet <input type="checkbox"/> No citation of references in the body of the document
Organization	<input type="checkbox"/> Conveys a central theme with all ideas connected, arrangement of ideas clearly related to topic <input type="checkbox"/> Clear introduction, body (with sections), and conclusion includes summary and closure <input type="checkbox"/> Includes both an abstract and table of contents	<input type="checkbox"/> Conveys a central idea or topic with some ideas connected to the topic <input type="checkbox"/> Includes introduction, body and conclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Includes abstract and table of contents (one partial and one complete)	<input type="checkbox"/> Attempts to focus on an idea or topic with many ideas not connected to the topic <input type="checkbox"/> Introduction, body, conclusion detectable but not clear <input type="checkbox"/> Includes partial abstract and partial table of contents	<input type="checkbox"/> Has little or no focus on central idea or topic <input type="checkbox"/> Introduction, body or conclusion absent <input type="checkbox"/> No abstract or table of contents
Grammar and spelling	<input type="checkbox"/> No use of first- person tense <input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical or spelling errors	<input type="checkbox"/> Few uses of the first-person tense <input type="checkbox"/> Few grammatical and spelling errors	<input type="checkbox"/> Several uses of the first- person tense <input type="checkbox"/> Some grammatical and spelling errors	<input type="checkbox"/> Written in first-person tense <input type="checkbox"/> Many grammatical and spelling errors
Depth of information	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriately synthesizes information from multiple distinct sources <input type="checkbox"/> Draws conclusions and personal insights from synthesis <input type="checkbox"/> Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Synthesis of information from at least three distinct sources <input type="checkbox"/> At least two personal insights or conclusions stated <input type="checkbox"/> Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is good	<input type="checkbox"/> Synthesis of information from at least two distinct sources <input type="checkbox"/> At least one personal insight or conclusion stated <input type="checkbox"/> Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is adequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Summary reporting of information without synthesis <input type="checkbox"/> No personal insights <input type="checkbox"/> Does not have the minimum number of pages including penalty pages
Clarity of writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Sentences flow <input type="checkbox"/> Smooth transitions between paragraphs <input type="checkbox"/> Any and all terms and acronyms are defined <input type="checkbox"/> Provides evidence to support points	<input type="checkbox"/> Good sentence structure <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate transitions between paragraphs <input type="checkbox"/> Most terms and acronyms are defined <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks support for some points	<input type="checkbox"/> Occasional poor sentence structure <input type="checkbox"/> Transitions between paragraphs unclear <input type="checkbox"/> Some terms and acronyms are defined <input type="checkbox"/> Provides minimal support for points	<input type="checkbox"/> Frequent poor sentence structure <input type="checkbox"/> Lacked transitions between paragraphs <input type="checkbox"/> Many terms and acronyms are undefined <input type="checkbox"/> Ideas not supported

Translation between MICS and AAC&U Rubric

MICS Category	MICS Item Position in Rubric	AAC&U Category
Conveys a central theme with all ideas connected, arrangement of ideas clearly related to topic	3	Purpose
Appropriately synthesizes information from multiple distinct sources	8	Development
Draws conclusions and personal insights from synthesis	9	Development
Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is excellent	10	Development
Provides evidence to support points	14	Development
Clear introduction, body (with sections), and conclusion includes summary and closure	4	Genre
Includes both an abstract and table of contents	5	Genre
Multiple references from distinct reputable sources	1	Source
References cited in the body of the document	2	Source
No use of first- person tense	6	Syntax
No grammatical or spelling errors	7	Syntax
Sentences flow	11	Syntax
Smooth transitions between paragraphs	12	Syntax
Any and all terms and acronyms are defined	13	Syntax

AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric

	Capstone 4	Milestones 3	Milestones 2	Benchmark 1
Context of and Purpose for Writing <i>Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).</i>	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).
Content Development	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.
Genre and Disciplinary Conventions <i>Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields (please see glossary).</i>	Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task (s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices	Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices	Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation	Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation.
Sources and Evidence	Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing	Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.	Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Students will be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and cite information for the task at hand (Information Literacy).

Outcome Measure: Annual: Each student will be required to write a paper on a topic in their field as a part of their participation in the Senior Seminar. The audience for this talk will include department faculty, fellow students and possibly some alumni. The students will be given the evaluation criteria in advance and their paper will be rated by the faculty using a rubric with a scale of 4 (capstone) to 1 (benchmark) in the following areas:

- References: Multiple references from distinct reputable sources
- Citation: References cited in the body of the document
- Synthesis: Appropriately synthesizes information from multiple distinct sources.

Criteria for Success: 80% of the students should have an average score of at least 3 in each of the major areas.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Students at 2.5 or Higher						
Information Literacy	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16*	2016-17	2017-18	2017-18
References				95%	100%	71%	89%
Citation				84%	92%	76%	89%
Synthesis				84%	85%	82%	78%
Determine the Extent of Information Needed	100%	62%	78%				
Access the Needed Information	91%	69%	100%				
Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose	91%	85%	89%				
Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally	91%	77%	100%				

Note that in 2015-16 we returned to gathering information literacy data from our writing rubric. The AAC&U rubric was not working well for our purposes.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The students are meeting our expectations. For the first two years we applied the AAC&U rubric to the student's final senior paper to measure their use of information. The quality of the use of information was uneven and we had not made our expectations clear. The students much more clearly understand the expectations regarding information literacy that are embedded in our writing rubric. However, there was some weakness in 2017-18.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

We have tried a variety of approaches, using the AAC&U IL rubric and expanding on that rubric. After looking at the AAC&U results in parallel with the departmental writing rubric, it was clear that the difference in results were insignificant. It is a great deal less work for the department and clearer for the students to simply use the departmental writing rubrics IL components to assess students' IL. We will need to emphasize IL more strongly next year in senior seminar.

Rubric

Next Page

Bibliography and supporting documents	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple references from distinct reputable sources <input type="checkbox"/> References cited in the body of the document	<input type="checkbox"/> Most references from distinct reputable sources <input type="checkbox"/> Some citation of references in the body of the document	<input type="checkbox"/> Some references from reputable sources <input type="checkbox"/> Limited citation of references in the body of the document	<input type="checkbox"/> No bibliography or all references from untrusted sites on the internet <input type="checkbox"/> No citation of references in the body of the document
Organization	<input type="checkbox"/> Conveys a central theme with all ideas connected, arrangement of ideas clearly related to topic <input type="checkbox"/> Clear introduction, body (with sections), and conclusion includes summary and closure <input type="checkbox"/> Includes both an abstract and table of contents	<input type="checkbox"/> Conveys a central idea or topic with some ideas connected to the topic <input type="checkbox"/> Includes introduction, body and conclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Includes abstract and table of contents (one partial and one complete)	<input type="checkbox"/> Attempts to focus on an idea or topic with many ideas not connected to the topic <input type="checkbox"/> Introduction, body, conclusion detectable but not clear <input type="checkbox"/> Includes partial abstract and partial table of contents	<input type="checkbox"/> Has little or no focus on central idea or topic <input type="checkbox"/> Introduction, body or conclusion absent <input type="checkbox"/> No abstract or table of contents
Grammar and spelling	<input type="checkbox"/> No use of first- person tense <input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical or spelling errors	<input type="checkbox"/> Few uses of the first-person tense <input type="checkbox"/> Few grammatical and spelling errors	<input type="checkbox"/> Several uses of the first- person tense <input type="checkbox"/> Some grammatical and spelling errors	<input type="checkbox"/> Written in first-person tense <input type="checkbox"/> Many grammatical and spelling errors
Depth of information	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriately synthesizes information from multiple distinct sources <input type="checkbox"/> Draws conclusions and personal insights from synthesis <input type="checkbox"/> Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Synthesis of information from at least three distinct sources <input type="checkbox"/> At least two personal insights or conclusions stated <input type="checkbox"/> Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is good	<input type="checkbox"/> Synthesis of information from at least two distinct sources <input type="checkbox"/> At least one personal insight or conclusion stated <input type="checkbox"/> Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is adequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Summary reporting of information without synthesis <input type="checkbox"/> No personal insights <input type="checkbox"/> Does not have the minimum number of pages including penalty pages
Clarity of writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Sentences flow <input type="checkbox"/> Smooth transitions between paragraphs <input type="checkbox"/> Any and all terms and acronyms are defined <input type="checkbox"/> Provides evidence to support points	<input type="checkbox"/> Good sentence structure <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate transitions between paragraphs <input type="checkbox"/> Most terms and acronyms are defined <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks support for some points	<input type="checkbox"/> Occasional poor sentence structure <input type="checkbox"/> Transitions between paragraphs unclear <input type="checkbox"/> Some terms and acronyms are defined <input type="checkbox"/> Provides minimal support for points	<input type="checkbox"/> Frequent poor sentence structure <input type="checkbox"/> Lacked transitions between paragraphs <input type="checkbox"/> Many terms and acronyms are undefined <input type="checkbox"/> Ideas not supported

Fermanian School of Business
PLO #4 Assessment
2018-2019

Learning Outcome:

PLO #4: Formulate decisions informed by ethical values.

Outcome Measure:

The CAPSIM COMP-XM Management Ethics Simulation provides comparative data on how each student (and class) performs against all other students in the nation taking the applied simulation at the same time.

Criteria for Success:

Average score of all students will be above the 70th percentile on the national COMP-XM Ethics Module Results

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

Semester	N ¹	Ethics Module Results
Spring 2016	59	54
Fall 2016	60	80
Spring 2017	68	83
Fall 2017	81	74
Spring 2018	56	77
Fall 2018	N/A	N/A
Spring 2019	N/A	N/A
Summer 2019	13	72

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The COMP-XM Ethics Module was implemented in Spring 2016. With an average score in the 54th percentile, the criteria for success was initially set at the 55th percentile. The criteria for success was raised to the 70th percentile beginning in Fall 2017 due to strong results in AY 2016-2017. Students exceeded the revised criteria for success in all semesters beginning Fall 2016. Data was not collected in Fall 2018 or Spring 2019 due to miscommunications regarding the simulation set-up.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

FSB students scored high in business ethics application through the COMP-XM Ethics Module from Spring 2016 thru Spring 2018. Business ethics knowledge has been recognized as an area needing improvement through the Peregrine comprehensive exit exam, although a positive trend has been noted (see Undergraduate Core PLO #1 Assessment Report). Beginning in Fall 2017, content relating to the study of various ethical models was introduced and developed in MGT 212 Principles of Management. Students taking MGT212 with this new content will begin taking MGT488 Strategic

¹ Number of Students Completing Module

Management in Fall 2019; therefore, positive impacts due to this added content may be reflected beginning Fall 2019. Data will continue to be collected.

¹ Number of Students Completing Module

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Students will be able to understand and create arguments supported by quantitative evidence, and they can clearly communicate those arguments in a variety of formats (Quantitative Reasoning).

Outcome Measure: Annual: Each student will participate in the ETS Proficiency Profile exam.

Criteria for Success: 90% of the students will be Marginal or Proficient at Level 2. Note that we dropped the criteria of success so that it is possible for the department to pass even if a single student misses the criteria.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient						
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Math	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	82%	95%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Students are in general meeting our criteria. The variation often comes down to a single student because of small sample sizes.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

None at this time. We will continue to monitor the results.

Rubrics

ETS Proficiency Profile (no rubric involved)

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Students will collaborate effectively in teams.

Outcome Measure:

Annual: CSC324 Signature Assignment – evaluation of group while working on a project (before 2015-16) and ISS342 Project Management – evaluation of group while working on a project (2016-17 and beyond)

Annual: MTH352 Signature Assignment – evaluation of group while working on a project

Criteria for Success: 80% of the students should have an average score of at least 2.5 in each of the major areas.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Percent of students with average at least 2.5			
	Fall 2012 CSC324	Fall 2014 CSC324	Fall 2016 ISS342*	Fall 2016 ISS342
Contributes to team meetings	86%	80%	90%	100%
Encourages team members	93%	84%	N/A	100%
Contributes individually outside of team meetings	93%	88%	86%	100%
Attitude	100%	96%	N/A	100%
Fosters constructive team climate	100%	92%	N/A	100%
Responds to conflict	100%	100%	90%	100%

*Note that the full group work rubric will be used in future years.

	MTH352 Percent of students with average at least 2.5			
	Spring 2013	Spring 2015	Spring 2017	Spring 2019
Contributes to team meetings	91%	86%	100%	100%
Encourages team members	91%	93%	100%	100%
Contributes individually outside of team meetings	82%	93%	100%	100%
Attitude	100%	100%	100%	100%
Fosters constructive team climate	91%	100%	100%	100%
Responds to conflict	91%	100%	100%	100%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The students are performing well as member of teams.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Continue to make use of group activities throughout the curriculum.

MICS Teamwork Rubric

Definition

Teamwork is behaviors under the control of individual team members (effort they put into team tasks, their manner of interacting with others on team, and the quantity and quality of contributions they make to team discussions.)

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet unsatisfactory (cell one) level performance.

The purpose of this is to evaluate individual team members. Although no team member will ever see your evaluation of them, please take it seriously.

Directions:

- Do not put your own name anywhere on this form, the evaluations are to be anonymous.
- Please write the name of the person you are evaluating here_____
- Please fill out one copy of this form for every person who was on your team, including one for yourself.
- For each row, place a checkmark in the box that best describes your teammate's performance.

	Outstanding	High Satisfactory	Low Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Contributes to team meetings	<input type="checkbox"/> Helps the team move forward by articulating the merits of alternative ideas or proposals.	<input type="checkbox"/> Offers new suggestions to advance the work of the group.	<input type="checkbox"/> Shares ideas but does not advance the work of the group.	<input type="checkbox"/> Sits quietly in team meetings and does not contribute
Encourages members of the team	<input type="checkbox"/> Actively seeks to find opportunities to encourage all members of the team.	<input type="checkbox"/> Offers encouragement to all members of the team	<input type="checkbox"/> Offers words of encouragement to friends	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not offer word of encouragement to anyone
Individual contributions outside of team meetings	<input type="checkbox"/> Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough. Proactively helps other team members complete their assigned tasks.	<input type="checkbox"/> Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough.	<input type="checkbox"/> Completes all assigned tasks by deadline.	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not complete all assigned tasks by deadline.
Attitude	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates (comments, facial expressions, etc.) a negative attitude rarely and helps others to become more positive.	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates (comments, facial expressions, etc.) a negative attitude rarely .	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates (comments, facial expressions, etc.) a negative attitude less often than a positive attitude.	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates (comments, facial expressions, etc.) a negative attitude more often than a positive attitude.

Fosters constructive team climate	<input type="checkbox"/> Supports a constructive team climate by doing <u>all of the following</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication. • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work. • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Supports a constructive team climate by doing <u>any two of the following</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication. • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work. • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Supports a constructive team climate by doing <u>any one of the following</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication. • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work. • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Supports a constructive team climate by doing <u>none of the following</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication. • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work. • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.
Responds to conflict	<input type="checkbox"/> Identifies and acknowledges conflict and acknowledges that relationships can be damaged. Seeks to restore relationships.	<input type="checkbox"/> Identifies and acknowledges conflict and acknowledges that relationships can be damaged.	<input type="checkbox"/> Identifies and acknowledges conflict but will not acknowledge that relationships can be damaged.	<input type="checkbox"/> Will not acknowledge that conflict has occurred or that relationships can be damaged.

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Information Systems graduates will be adequately prepared for entry into graduate school or jobs in the computing profession.

Outcome Measure:

Annual: Require students to take the ETS Major Field Test in Computer Science as the mid-term exam for the capstone course, Information Systems 481, Senior Seminar in Information Systems. Note that we are in the process of changing this to the Peregrin Test and in 2017-18 piloted a collection of questions.

Annual: Internship supervisor evaluations

Every 5 Years: Alumni will be surveyed every five years. They will be asked at least the following questions:

1. If you have a job in Computer Science: On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being outstanding and 5 being poor, how well do you think that the undergraduate Computer Science curriculum at PLNU prepared you for your work in the field?
2. If you are going to graduate school or went to graduate school: On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being outstanding and 5 being poor, how well do you think that the undergraduate Computer Science curriculum at PLNU prepared you for graduate school?

Criteria for Success:

ETS MFT: 50% of our students achieve above the 25th percentile on the exam.

Peregrine Test: 70% of students will score a 70% or higher on the exam (when there are national norms, this will be adjusted).

Internship Supervisor Evaluation: 80% of the students will score an average score of 4 or more in the following areas:

- Ability to learn
- Ability to problem solve
- Quality of work
- Initiative
- Responsibility
- Ability to work with others
- Relations with others
- Ability to use computing to solve problems

Alumni Survey: 75% of the respondents say they were well prepared or higher.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

ETS Major Field Test:

Most recent 10 years of data.

	Overall Benchmark
Year	
2007-08	N
2008-09	Y
2009-10	N
2010-11	Y
2011-12	N
2012-13	N
2013-14	Y
2014-15	N/A
2015-16	N
2016-17	Y

* Sample size too small to be given indicator scores.

ETS changed the CS exam in 2011-12.

Peregrine Exam:

	2017-18	2018-19
Percentage of students scoring 70% or higher	100%	N/A

Note that there were no Information Systems majors in Senior Seminar in 2018-19.

Internship Supervisor Evaluation:

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Percentage of students with an average of 4 or more	100%	N/A*	100%

* Supervisors for small sample of students (2) didn't return reports

Alumni Data:

In the spring of 2017, the department surveyed alumni who had graduated in the last 15 years. The survey is data used to inform the department's program review. Below are the components of the survey relevant to our assessment plan for information systems.

How well did the undergraduate curriculum prepare you for:

	Well or higher	OK	Poorly
Work in the field (if went into the field)	61.5%	23.1%	15.4%
Graduate school	100%	0%	0%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:**ETS Results:**

We continue to evaluate if the ETS exam in computer science is the best measure of ability for computer information systems/information systems students. We are considering moving to the Peregrine exam in Business for these students since our newly adopted IS curriculum has a larger business component and Peregrine will work with us to design IS questions.

Peregrine Results:

The students met the benchmark in 2018, the year that we tested the first round of questions that were designed. There were no information systems students in senior seminar in 2019 so we have not revalidated the questions.

Internship Supervisor Survey:

We have just begun using this survey, but the preliminary results indicate that the supervisors believe that our student interns are well prepared.

Alumni Survey:

The program met the benchmark for those who went to graduate schools but missed the benchmark for those who went into industry. The majority of these students earned their degree before the Information Systems curriculum was significantly changed to include a more cohesive set of business coursework. It is expected that those changes will be reflected in an improvement in the next round of survey data.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:**ETS Results:**

We have made curricular changes in the last few years to update our department coursework to align with new standards from the Association of Computing Machinery as well as to respond to assessment data. As part of this process we did a complete overhaul in the curriculum in this area. Starting in 2015-16 we will be launching a newer IS curriculum in partnership with the School of Business. This will increase the amount of business course work completed by these majors. We will need to evaluate if the CS MFT test is reasonable to use for our IS majors, or if the MFT in business is more suitable, or if we should use a different measure. See our APC proposals for the specific descriptions of curricular changes made.

Survey:

We expect to see changes in alumni survey results due to the significant changes made in the Information Systems curriculum.

Rubric:

ETS: The ETS provides the data.

Peregrine: We are currently developing questions for Peregrine so scoring the exam by hand.

Internship Supervisor Evaluation:

This is a survey instrument so there is no rubric.

Alumni Survey:

This is not rubric scored, but the data is tabulated.