Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences Computer Information Technology (ADC)

Learning Outcome:

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

GELO 1a: Written: Students will be able to effectively express ideas and information to others through 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 Information Technology Project (CIT4081). 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: • Structure

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

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.

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 At or Above 2.5					
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Bibliography and Support	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Organization	83%	100%	100%	100%	100%	96%

Grammar and Spelling	100%	100%	100%	100%	97%	100%
Depth of Information	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Clarity of Writing	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Conclusions Drawn from Data: Our students are meeting

our standards. Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Continue to monitor student results. Rubrics: MICS Writing

Rubric: Next page.

MICS Written Presentation Rubric (12/31/22)

4

Crite ria	Outstanding	High Satisfactory	Low Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
d n a	☐ 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
Bad	☐ 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
n o i t	□ Clear introduction, body (with sections), and conclusion includes summary and	□ Includes introduction, body and conclusion	 □ Introduction, body, conclusion detectable but not clear 	□ Introduction, body or conclusion absent □ No abstract or table of
z i n a 9 r	closure ☐ Includes both an abstract and table of contents	□ Includes abstract and table of contents (one partial and one complete)	 ☐ Includes partial abstract and partial table of contents 	contents

0	 □ No use of first-person tense □ No grammatical or spelling errors 	□ Few uses of the first-person tense□ Few grammatical and spelling errors	 □ Several uses of the first-person tense □ Some grammatical and spelling errors 	 □ Written in first-person tense □ Many grammatical and spelling errors
	 ☐ Highly accurate and substantive content ☐ Appropriately synthesizes information from multiple distinct sources ☐ Draws conclusions and personal insights from synthesis ☐ Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is excellent 	□ Content is accurate, though key concepts are missing □ Synthesis of information from at least three distinct sources □ At least two personal insights or conclusions stated □ Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is good	□ Content is flawed, and/or a significant number of key concepts are missing □ Synthesis of information from at least two distinct sources □ At least one personal insight or conclusion stated □ Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is adequate	 □ Content is significantly flawed and/or content is trivial □ Summary reporting of information without synthesis □ No personal insights □ Does not have the minimum number of pages including penalty pages
0	 □ Sentences flow □ Smooth transitions between paragraphs □ Any and all terms and acronyms are defined □ Provides evidence to support points 	 □ Good sentence structure □ Adequate transitions between paragraphs □ Most terms and acronyms are defined □ Lacks support for some points 	 □ Occasional poor sentence structure □ Transitions between paragraphs unclear □ Some terms and acronyms are defined □ Provides minimal support for points 	 □ Frequent poor sentence structure □ Lacked transitions between paragraphs □ Many terms and acronyms are undefined □ Ideas not supported