Information Systems Assessment Report

2025-26

Information Systems Program Learning Outcomes

1. Students will be able to write correct and robust software.
2. Students will analyze the interaction between hardware and software.
3. Students will be able to apply their technical knowledge and critical thinking to solve problems.
4. Students will be able to speak about their work with precision, clarity and organization.
5. Students will be able to write about their work with precision, clarity and organization.
6. Students will be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and cite information for the task at hand.
7. Students will collaborate effectively in teams.
8. Students will be able to understand and create arguments supported by quantitative evidence.
9. Students will understand the professional, ethical and social issues and responsibilities with the implementation and use of technology.

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

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

Outcome Measure: Annual: CSC2052 Signature Assignment. Starting in 2025-26 this will be assessed in alternating years.

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

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Class at 2 or Higher						
	2019-20*	2020-21**	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Runtime Correctness	45%	42%	19%	61%	37%	71%	67%
Problem Solving	70%	78%	69%	96%	91%	88%	89%

*Note that the instrument was changed in 2019.
**Note that 2020 was a fully remote semester due to COVID.

Conclusions Drawn from Data: We are still seeing challenges with runtime correctness, though in 2024 and 2025 the students came closer to meeting the benchmark.

Changes to be Made Based on Data: Continue to emphasize the need to carefully de-bug computer code during development. While the scores improved as we moved past the pandemic, we are still seeing challenges. We have made some curricular changes and we hope that is part of what is contributing to the improved scores in 2024-25 and 2025-26. We will continue to monitor the scores.

CSC 2052 Signature Assignment

	Unsatisfactory (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Good (3)	Excellent (4)
Runtime Correctness	● Less than 60% correct	● Between 60% – 79% correctness	● 80% - 89% correct	● 90% – 100% correct
Problem Solving	● Analysis of program source code indicates that program is NOT close to working, and could NOT easily be modified to work given additional time.	● 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.	● Analysis of program source code indicates that program is close to working, and could be modified to work given additional time.	● 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: CSC3014 Signature Assignment. Starting in 2025-26 this will be measured in odd numbered springs)

Criteria for Success: 75% of the students should have an average score of at least 7.

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Class at 7 or Higher							
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Hardware/software interaction	69%	100%	92%	44%	62%	59%	64%	76%

Conclusions Drawn from Data: There is some variation in the data and some of it appears to be related to sample size. However, in 2020-21 the score dropped significantly. This could be due to this assessment being part of a final exam given in the Spring of 2021 during the COVID pandemic. Students were very tired, and this score may be an indication of that fact as much as an indication of their knowledge. The scores have improved since 2021. In 2024-25, we would have hit our benchmark if a single student had answered one more question correctly. historical values.

Changes to be Made Based on Data: Continue to require operating systems (CSC3014) of all CS and IS students. The 2022-23 assessment was changed, and we analyzed the assignment by question for both spring 2023 and spring 2024. This provided some insight into what is being missed. In spring 2023 there were two questions that were missed by at least 75% of the students, the 2024 data is not showing the same pattern. By spring of 2025 we were close to meeting the benchmark. We will continue to monitor progress.

Rubric Used (CSC3014): The scoring for this assignment is purely points based.

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

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

Outcome Measure: ISS4014 Database and Web Signature Assignment (Computer Science, Information Systems and Data Science Majors). Assessed in odd numbered falls.

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

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Class at 2.5 or Higher						
	2015-16	2017-18	2019-20	2021-22	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Relevant Information Chosen	88%	89%	88%	76%	88%	80%	85%
Query Correctness	48%	41%	83%	82%	79%	80%	60%

Conclusions Drawn from Data: ISS4014 Assignment: The students are typically meeting our benchmarks. In 2019-20 the assignment was modified a bit to be clearer for students and we saw a marked improvement in scores since that year, however students are still struggling a bit with query correctness.

Changes to be Made Based on Data: We have been spending more time in class emphasizing queries.

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

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.

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Students at 2.5 or Higher							
Oral Presentation	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Background	95%	100%	100%	95%	100%	100%	96%	100%
Organization	100%	100%	94%	100%	94%	100%	100%	100%
Depth of Information							96%	
Bibliography							96%	
Oral Presentation Skills	95%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Presentation Tools	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	97%
Ability to Field Questions	94%	94%	100%	100%	100%	100%	96%	100%

Note that we tried using a different rubric in 2024-25.

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. We changed the expectations for this presentation and the rubric in 2025. The main changes were to move some elements about depth of information and the use of references to the oral presentation. We didn't find this change satisfactory and returned to our previous rubric.

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.

Oral Presentation Rubric

Criteria	Outstanding	High Satisfactory	Low Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Command of background material	☐ Clearly knows material and key facts by memory ☐ Expands on PPT slides ☐ Content appropriate for audience	☐ Clearly knows key facts with a few memory slips ☐ Some expansion on PPT slides ☐ Partial audience adaptation of content	☐ Reads some information; knows some facts from memory ☐ No expansion on PPT slide content ☐ Little audience adaptation of content	☐ Reads sentences from slides ☐ Dependent on notes ☐ Lacks audience adaptation of content
Organization	☐ Clear and concise outline ☐ Relevant graphics and key text items on slides ☐ Presentation is between 10-15 minutes	☐ Clear outline ☐ Too much information on slides (not concise) ☐ Presentation 1 minute outside of the range (10-15 minutes)	☐ Some sense of outline ☐ Too much detailed information on slides ☐ Presentation 2 minutes outside of the range (10-15 minutes)	☐ No clear outline ☐ Slides are in paragraphs; too much detailed information on one slide ☐ Presentation 3 minutes outside of the range (10-15 minutes)
Oral presentation skills	☐ Clearly has practiced several times; smooth transitions ☐ Engages audience in content multiple times and engagement is well connected to talk (questions, examples, etc.) ☐ Free of disfluencies (ah, uhm) ☐ Is clearly heard in the room and uses inflection for emphasis ☐ Engages audience through eye contact ☐ Engages audience through gestures	☐ Has practiced but transitions are not smooth ☐ Engages audience at least twice in content (questions, examples, etc.) ☐ A few disfluencies (ah, umh, er) ☐ Can be understood most of the time and uses some inflection ☐ Some engagement of audience through eye contact ☐ Some engagement of audience through gestures	☐ Has practiced presentation but cannot verbally make transitions between slides ☐ Audience engagement at least once with content (questions, examples, etc.) ☐ Many disfluencies (ah, umh, er) ☐ Can sometimes be understood and uses little inflection ☐ Infrequent eye contact ☐ Distracting gestures or mannerisms	☐ Clearly did not practice presentation; Does not anticipate content of next slide ☐ No audience involvement ☐ Disfluencies (ah, umh, er) detract from presentation ☐ Can not be heard and/or speaks in a monotone ☐ Little audience awareness or eye contact ☐ Frequent distracting gestures or mannerisms
Use of presentation tools	☐ PPT background is matched to content, legible font, seamless transitions ☐ Graphics imbedded and matched to topic, necessary hyperlinks work	☐ Appropriate PPT slide backgrounds, transitions & font ☐ Most graphics imbedded and matched to topic, most necessary hyperlinks work	☐ Distracting PPT slide backgrounds and transitions, font hard to read ☐ Some inappropriate graphics or use of PPT embellishments, necessary hyperlinks don't work	☐ No attention given to PPT slide backgrounds and transitions, font illegible ☐ Distracting use of embellishments, graphics not connected to topic

Ability to field questions	☐ Able to answer questions clearly and without hesitation and prepared material to answer anticipated questions	☐ Can answer all questions with some hesitation	☐ Able to answer half of the questions with hesitation	☐ Unable to answer any questions

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

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.

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Students at 2.5 or Higher							
Written Report	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Bibliography and Support	89%	81%	88%	58%	81%	69%	70%	100%
Organization	100%	100%	100%	100%	88%	85%	93%	100%
Grammar and Spelling	94%	94%	94%	89%	88%	92%	56%	93%
Depth of Information	83%	94%	94%	95%	94%	62%		100%
Clarity of Writing	94%	88%	100%	89%	94%	85%	85%	93%

Note that we experimented with a different rubric in 2024-25.

Conclusions Drawn from Data: In general, the students have been performing reasonably well in writing technical reports. We saw some weakness in both references/support and depth of the information in the papers this year. However, the sample size was 13, so the “miss” of the benchmark is the performance of 2-3 students. We made significant changes in the prompt during the 2024-25 academic year. The assignment was changed to having the students write a shorter paper and also to describe the use of AI in the preparation of both their oral presentation and their paper. That assignment did not produce the desired outcome, so the assignment was modified again for the 2025-26 year. The updated assignment seems to have worked more effectively.

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 write at a professional level. The current rubric has been in use for the last 11 years. We have instituted more formal faculty reviews of their draft papers and are trying to give more specific feedback, particularly about the use of references and that seems to be helping with the quality of the papers. In the 2024-25 year the significant changes in the prompt were probably part of the reason that the scores were lower. We did not have student work through our usual three phases to write the paper (outline, draft and final paper) and not having those steps clearly led to weakness in the area of grammar and spelling. In 2025-26 we returned to the multistage process of paper preparation while still incorporating a structured use of AI. This assignment produced papers that we found more consistent with our expectations.

MICS Written Presentation Rubric (4/23/26)

Criteria	Outstanding	High Satisfactory	Low Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Bibliography and supporting documents	☐ Multiple references from distinct reputable sources	☐ Most references from distinct reputable sources	☐ Some references from reputable sources	☐ No bibliography or all references from untrusted sites on the internet
	☐ References cited in the body of the document	☐ Some citation of references in the body of the document	☐ Limited citation of references in the body of the document	☐ No citation of references in the body of the document
Organization	☐ Conveys a central theme with all ideas connected, arrangement of ideas clearly related to topic	☐ Conveys a central idea or topic with some ideas connected to the topic	☐ Attempts to focus on an idea or topic with many ideas not connected to the topic	☐ Has little or no focus on central idea or topic
	☐ Clear introduction, body (with sections), and conclusion includes summary and closure	☐ Includes introduction, body and conclusion	☐ Introduction, body, conclusion detectable but not clear	☐ Introduction, body or conclusion absent
Grammar and spelling	☐ No use of first-person tense	☐ Few uses of the first-person tense	☐ Several uses of the first-person tense	☐ Written in first-person tense
	☐ No grammatical or spelling errors	☐ Few grammatical and spelling errors	☐ Some grammatical and spelling errors	☐ Many grammatical and spelling errors
Depth of information	☐ Highly accurate and substantive content	☐ Content is accurate, though key concepts are missing	☐ Content is flawed, and/or a significant amount of key concepts are missing	☐ Content is significantly flawed and/or content is trivial
	☐ Appropriately synthesizes information from 3 or more distinct sources	☐ Synthesis of information from two distinct sources	☐ Synthesis of information from one distinct sources	☐ Summary reporting of information without synthesis
	☐ Draws conclusions insights from synthesis	☐ At least two insights or conclusions stated	☐ At least one insight or conclusion stated	☐ No personal insights
	☐ Subject coverage is excellent	☐ Subject coverage is good	☐ Subject coverage is adequate	☐ Subject coverage is poor.
Clarity of writing	☐ Sentences flow	☐ Good sentence structure	☐ Occasional poor sentence structure	☐ Frequent poor sentence structure
	☐ Smooth transitions between paragraphs	☐ Adequate transitions between paragraphs	☐ Transitions between paragraphs unclear	☐ Lacked transitions between paragraphs
	☐ Any and all terms and acronyms are defined	☐ Most terms and acronyms are defined	☐ Some terms and acronyms are defined	☐ Many terms and acronyms are undefined

	☐ Provides evidence to support points	☐ Lacks support for some points	☐ Provides minimal support for points	☐ Ideas not supported

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 (outstanding) to 1 (unsatisfactory) 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 2.5 in each of the major areas.

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Students at 2.5 or Higher							
Information Literacy	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
References (Paper)	89%	81%	94%	74%	81%	69%	92%	100%
Citation (Paper)	89%	81%	88%	74%	75%	69%	72%	100%
Synthesis	78%	81%	94%	95%	81%	92%	96%	100%
References (Talk)							96%	
Citation (Talk)							85%	

Conclusions Drawn from Data: The students are generally meeting our expectations. This is still one of the areas with which the students have some challenges particularly with citation. In 2025 we expanded the information literacy assessment to also gather data on the depth of information and the use of references in the students' oral presentations. This is because we reduced the length of the required paper and because we are trying to find new ways to assess students given the proliferation of the use of AI. In 2025-26 we returned to a more structured paper assignment that made use of AI. This seems to have been effective in helping students meet out standards.

Changes to be Made Based on Data: We found that we needed to be very specific about our expectations for the use and citation of information in both papers and their talk. We continue to work with students in giving them clear feedback about the need to do a better job with references in technical papers. Our 2025-26 approach to written and oral presentations leveraging AI, seems to have been more effective than the assignment used in the previous year.

Rubric:
Data is taken for the Written Rubric above.

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Students will collaborate effectively in teams.

Outcome Measure: CSC324 Signature Assignment – evaluation of group while working on a project (before 2015-16) and ISS3042 Project Management – evaluation of group while working on a project (2016-17 and beyond).This is assessed in even numbered falls.

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

Longitudinal Data:

	Percent of students with average at least 2.5					
	Fall 2014 CSC324	Fall 2016 ISS3042	Fall 2018 ISS3042	Fall 2020 ISS3042	Fall 2022 ISS3042	Fall 2024 ISS3042
Contributes to team meetings	80%	90%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Encourages team members	84%	N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%
Contributes individually outside of team meetings	88%	86%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Attitude	96%	N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%
Fosters constructive team climate	92%	N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%
Responds to conflict	100%	90%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Conclusions Drawn from Data: The students are performing well as members of teams. The next evaluation will take place in the fall of 2026.

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

Fosters constructive team climate	☐ Supports a constructive team climate by doing **all** of the following: • 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.	☐ Supports a constructive team climate by doing any **two** of the following: • 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.	☐ Supports a constructive team climate by doing any **one** of the following: • 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.	☐ Supports a constructive team climate by doing **none** of the following: • 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	☐ Identifies and acknowledges conflict and acknowledges that relationships can be damaged. Seeks to restore relationships.	☐ Identifies and acknowledges conflict and acknowledges that relationships can be damaged.	☐ Identifies and acknowledges conflict but will not acknowledge that relationships can be damaged.	☐ Will not acknowledge that conflict has occurred or that relationships can be damaged.

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Students will be able to understand and create arguments supported by quantitative evidence (Quantitative Reasoning).

Outcome Measure:
MTH3083 Mathematical Probability and Statistics Signature Assignment (Mathematics, Applied Mathematics, and Data Science Majors). Assessed in even numbered springs.

ISS4014 Database and Web Signature Assignment (Computer Science, Information Systems and Data Science Majors). Assessed in odd numbered falls.

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

Criteria for Success: 80% of the students will score a 2.5 or higher on the 5-point rubric for MTH3083 and 2.5 or higher on the 4-point rubric for ISS4014

Previous: 90% of the students will be Marginal or Proficient at Level 2.

Longitudinal Data:

ISS4014:

	Percentage of Class at 2.5 or Higher						
	2015-16	2017-18	2019-20	2021-22	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Relevant Information Chosen	88%	89%	88%	76%	88%	80%	85%
Query Correctness	48%	41%	83%	82%	79%	80%	60%

This class became annual in 2024.

MTH3083:

	MTH3083 Percentage of the Class with Average Score of 2 or Higher		
	2022-23	2023-24	2025-26
Students will be able to formulate a mathematical model from a verbal description of a problem.	100%	75%	89%
Students will be able to construct solutions to problems using computational techniques.	100%	67%	78%
Students will be able to interpret visual data.	20%	50%	67%

Due to low enrollment, this class was not taught in 2024-25.

Previous:

	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient									
ETS Proficiency Profile	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Mathematics	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	82%	95%	93%	81%	90%

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. The Spring of 2021 was during COVID and students were exhausted by the time that they took the ETS exam, so this may explain the lower score for that year. In spring of 2023 we pilot tested the new assessment in MTH3083 and the results were mixed. We repeated it in 2024 and 2025 and still have mixed results. We have moved to using an assessment in ISS4014 to assess quantitative reasoning. Students in that class often have some challenges with query correctness. The student scores are improving but there are still some challenges.

Changes to be Made Based on Data: We do not believe that the ETS exam was accurately measuring student quantitative ability in the department disciplines. In the 2022-23 academic year we began measuring quantitative reasoning in the following classes:
Computer Science, Information Systems and Data Science: ISS4014 Data Base Systems and Web Integration. We are making use of an ongoing assessment so have past values that have been inserted here. For Mathematics, Applied Mathematics and Data Science: MTH3083 Mathematical Probability and Statistics. We are monitoring the new assessment to see what adjustments we need to make in either the assessment or the curriculum. We need to evaluate the MTH3083 assessment to determine if the scores are the result of a poorly worded assignment or if there is an issue with students quantitative reasoning, particularly when it comes to interpreting visual data. We suspect that the problem may be how the question is being asked.

Rubrics:

ETS Proficiency Profile (no rubric involved)
ISS4014: Rubric below
MTH3083: Rubric below

ISS4014 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

MTH3083 Rubric

	Unsatisfactory (0)	Low Satisfactory (1)	Satisfactory (2)	High Satisfactory (3)	Outstanding (4)
Students will be able to formulate a mathematical model from a verbal description of a problem.	Completely incorrect	Missed more than one key step or concept	Missed one key step or concept	Made a minor error	Completely correct
Students will be able to construct solutions to problems using computational techniques.	Completely incorrect	Missed more than one key step or concept	Missed one key step or concept	Made a minor error	Completely correct
Students will be able to interpret visual data.	Completely incorrect	Missed more than one key step or concept	Missed one key step or concept	Made a minor error	Completely correct

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Students will understand the professional, ethical and social issues and responsibilities with the implementation and use of technology.

Outcome Measure:
CSC4133 Signature Assignment (measured in odd falls)
ISS4072 Signature Assignment (measured in the academic year that has an odd numbered fall)

Note that this list is long because there is no single class that captures all CS and IS majors.

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

Longitudinal Data:

	ISS4072 Percent of Students at or Above 2.5			
	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Can identify an ethical issue in a problem or scenario.	100%	78%	86%	92%
Can apply an ethical framework to ethical issue (virtue, utilitarianism, deontology, analogies) to scenario.	67%	67%	71%	85%
Can make and support plausible ethical decision(s).	100%	67%	86%	85%

	CSC-ISS-MTH4133 Percent of Students at or Above 2.5			
	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Can identify an ethical issue in a problem or scenario.	73%	82%	100%	100%
Can apply an ethical framework to ethical issue (virtue, utilitarianism, deontology, analogies) to scenario.	67%	73%	81%	100%
Can make and support plausible ethical decision(s).	100%	91%	94%	100%

Conclusions Drawn from Data: The students did not meet our standards in the early assessments. But have shown improvement. We saw improvement in our 2024-25 and 2025-26 assessments.

Changes to be Made Based on Data: We are in the process of constructing a set of modules that will be embedded in several MICS classes with the intent that students will have multiple exposures to ethics-related issues and case studies. Our hope is that this scaffolding will ultimately support well-developed ethical responses in the classes where we gather data. We have streamlined our data gathering and are using a single rubric which should help with consistency in assessment.

For MICS: Student will understand the professional, ethical and social issues and responsibilities with implementation and use of technology.

MTH4151, MTH4072, ISS4072, CSC/ISS/ MTH4133

	Unsatisfactory (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Good (3)	Excellent (4)
Can identify an ethical issue in a problem or scenario. (Ethical Issue Recognition)	Student is unable to identify the core ethical issue of the scenario.	Student identifies a concern of the scenario, but not a core ethical issue.	Student identifies a core ethical issue, but not a secondary concern.	Student identifies a core ethical issue along with secondary concerns.
Can apply an ethical framework to an ethical issue (virtue, utilitarianism, deontology, analogies) to scenario. (Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts)	Student is unable to state an ethical framework.	Student states an ethical framework and makes an attempt to apply it to the scenario.	Student states an ethical framework and is mostly correct in applying it to the scenario.	Student states an ethical framework and can correctly apply it to the scenario.
Can make and support plausible ethical decision(s). (Informed Judgement)	Student is unable to form and support a plausible ethical decision.	Student forms a plausible ethical decision, however no support is given.	Student forms a plausible ethical decision and provides minimum support.	Student forms a plausible ethical decision and provides strong support.