FIU Institutional Effectiveness

Assessment Report Qualitative Feedback Checklist

Please read this form in its entirety; it will answer many of your questions.

Program: _____ Date: _____

Addressing Feedback

How to decode feedback provided:

- Red Text: needs to be addressed on your end; items are numbered or starred
- Orange Highlight: will be addressed by our team
- Blue Text: for future reference
- Purple Text: best practice considerations (optional)

Step 1: Outcomes and Methods

This is feedback that needs to be addressed in the first two columns (Outcomes and Methods) of the report. Once submitted via the chart below, the IE team will make these changes in the system.

Instructions: If **red numbered text** feedback was provided for the Outcomes and Methods columns, please **type the corrective actions/changes below in its corresponding number**.

Assessment Report – Outcomes and Methods		
Comment Number	Changes for Outcomes and Methods (Type changes you'd like to make below)	Need Help (X)
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		

Continue to next page for Step 2: Results, Use of Results & Follow-ups.

Please email this completed form (**one per report**) to your reviewer.

FIU | Institutional Effectiveness

Step 2: Results, Use of Results for Improvement & Follow-Ups

This is feedback that needs to be addressed in the second two columns (Results and Use of Results) of the report. Once submitted via TracDat, the IE team will review these changes in the system.

Instructions: If **starred red text** feedback was provided for these areas, **please log-in to TracDat to make the necessary corrections to each starred item.**

If you need assistance with TracDat, please visit our website for video tutorials and guides. If you need further assistance, please request an appointment.

Have you addressed all starred feedback in the Results, Use of Results and Follow-up/Evidence sections of the report?

Yes ☐
- Thank you for completing all revisions, the IE team will review your changes.

No ☐
- Contact reviewer for assistance

Does the assessment report state "data not collected" or "data not available"?
Note: "Data not available" has been entered by IE staff when there were blanks under the RESULTS column.

☐ Yes, and I do **not** have data to report or my data were not collected.

☐ Yes, and I do have data to enter. (**If so, then enter data in related results.**)

☐ No, I do not have "data not collected" or "data not available" in the results column.

Step 3: Future Assessment Plans

Assessment Plan for Next Cycle

Do you have new or modified outcomes and/or methods for the next academic year? (Please check below). This is **not** related to the feedback provided on your redlined report.

Yes ☐
- Find appropriate template on our website and complete new plan
- Use this form to submit new plan

No ☐
- No further action required

Please email this completed form (**one per report**) to your reviewer.

Assessment Report

FIU Institutional Effectiveness
Florida International University

Program - CEC Information Technology PO (BS)

① is the mission statement current?

Mission: The degree program in Information Technology provides graduates (1) a quality technical education to prepare them for a productive career, (2) a broad-based education that will form the basis for personal growth and lifelong learning, (3) the communication skills and social and ethical awareness necessary for the effective and responsible practice of the profession, and (4) an environment in which students from all groups, including the traditionally underrepresented, may successfully pursue the study of Information Technology. The degree program maintains a diverse student population and a dedicated and qualified faculty who actively pursue excellence in teaching.

Add categories

Outcomes	*Assessment Method*	*Results*	*Use of Results for Improvement*
Program Enrollment - Increase the number of students in the program. **Outcome Status:** Active **Outcome Start Date:** 08/01/2019 **Outcome End Date:** 08/01/2030	**Database -** Using the aim dashboards, faculty will review the number of students enrolling in the program within the current year and compare it to the previous year. **Minimum Criteria for Success:** # of students enrolled in the program will increase from the previous year **Method Status:** Active	**Reporting Period:** 2018 - 2019 **Criterion Status:** A. 100% Met In 2016-2017, 871 were enrolled in the program. In 2017-2018, 908 were enrolled in the program. In 2018-2019, 922 were enrolled in the program. The number of students enrolled in fall increased by 14 from the previous year for the program. (09/10/2019) **Attach Follow-up Evidence or Related Documents:** events.pdf	**Use of Results for Improvement:** We will continue to increase enrollment by incorporating flowcharts that have embedded syllabi links for student seamless access to course descriptions. This will be effective January 2020. (09/21/2019) **Follow-Up:** The Program Outcomes Follow-up and Evidence information for IT-BS program are as follows: * SCIS redesigned course flow chart for IT-BS program with embedded hyperlinks to course syllabi. * A town hall meeting was conducted on 10/17/19 to notify all undergraduate students about the curriculum flowchart redesign. (03/20/2020)

Spell out "number"

Sampling: N/A
Match method to Standard PO verbiage.

revise doc title "Flow chart & town hall"

Explain how each action relates to increasing enrollment.

Outcomes	*Assessment Method*	*Results*	*Use of Results for Improvement*
		Reporting Period: 2017 - 2018 **Criterion Status:** A. 100% Met The number of students enrolled in Fall increased by 13 from the previous year for the program. (2016-2017: 871 to 2017-2018: 884) (10/11/2018)	**Use of Results for Improvement:** This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. No Use of Results required. (03/11/2019)
Programs Degrees Awarded - Increase the number of degrees awarded. **Outcome Status:** Active **Outcome Start Date:** 08/01/2019 **Outcome End Date:** 08/01/2030	**Database -** Using the aim dashboards, faculty will review the number of degrees awarded within the current year and compare it to the previous year. **Minimum Criteria for Success:** # of degrees awarded in the program will increase from the previous year. **Method Status:** Active Match to standard PO language.	**Reporting Period:** 2018 - 2019 **Criterion Status:** Not met In 2016-2017, 236 degrees awarded. In 2017-2018, 229 degrees were awarded. In 2018-2019, 226 degrees were awarded. The total degrees awarded in the program has decreased by 1.3% over the past 2 years. (09/10/2019) **Attach Follow-up Evidence or Related Documents:** events.pdf **These are things that have already happened and anything that can be attributed to an increase of degrees awarded from this can be added to your results section.** **What strategies were employed in 19-20 to increase degrees awarded?** **In the Use of Results you can discuss the flow chart redesign plans and plans for it to be distributed starting in 19-20.**	**Use of Results for Improvement:** COT 3100 (Discrete Structures) course syllabus was revised with a detailed list of learning outcomes in November 2017 and was effective Fall 2018. Since this revised syllabus gives clear guidelines for all instructors teaching this course, over time it will improve the number of students who pass the math requirement for the IT-BS online program. Furthermore, A new concentration on Security was created for the IT-BS program in March 2017 and became effective Spring 2018. This will add options for students to expand their interests. (09/21/2019) **Follow-Up:** The Program Outcomes Follow-Up and Evidence information for IT-BS program are as follows: SCIS redesigned course flow chart for IT-BS program with embedded hyperlinks to course syllabi. **Explain how each action relates to increasing degrees awarded.** A town hall meeting was conducted on 10/17/19 to notify all undergraduate students about

Outcomes	Assessment Method	Results	Use of Results for Improvement
			the curriculum flowchart redesign. (03/20/2020)
		Reporting Period: 2017 - 2018 **Criterion Status:** Not met The total degrees awarded [illegible] program has decreased by 2% this year. (2016-2017: 236 to 2017-2018: 229) (10/11/2018)	**Use of Results for Improvement:** This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. No Use of Results required. (03/11/2019)
Exit Survey - Students will be satisfied with their preparedness for employment in the field. **Outcome Status:** Active **Outcome Start Date:** 08/01/2019 **Outcome End Date:** 08/01/2030	**Survey (Describe in Detail Below) -** AIM Dashboards: Question # 7: Please indicate the extent of your agreement with the statement as it describes your experience at the University: Within my undergraduate degree program or because of my experiences at FIU I: felt prepared to assume the responsibilities of my chosen profession. The rating scale is: 5 - Strongly Agree 4 - Agree 3 - Neutral 2 - Disagree 1 - Strongly Disagree **Sampling:** All graduating students **Minimum Criteria for Success:** Students will be satisfied with their preparedness for employment in the field as demonstrated by a mean rating of agree or higher (4 or higher). **Method Status:** Active	**Reporting Period:** 2018 - 2019 **Criterion Status:** C. 80% to 89% Met Within my undergraduate degree program or because of my experiences at FIU I: (Sub-question) felt prepared to assume the responsibilities of my chosen profession. Of the 36 students who responded: 38.89%/14 students strongly agree 44.44%/16 students agree 11.11%/4 students are neutral 5.56%/2 students disagree (09/10/2019) **Attach Follow-up Evidence or Related Documents:** events.pdf Follow-up on this part of the plan & add documentation How do these actions relate to employment preparedness?	**Use of Results for Improvement:** A new concentration on Security was created for the IT-BS program in March 2017 and became effective from Spring 2018. This will improve breadth of knowledge for students in computer security and enhance job placement. Furthermore, we are planning a capstone course specifically tailored to IT majors through the Vertically Integrated Project. (09/21/2019) **Follow-Up:** The Program Outcomes Follow-Up and Evidence information for IT-BS program are as follows: SCIS redesigned course flow chart for IT-BS program with embedded hyperlinks to course syllabi. A town hall meeting was conducted on 10/17/19 to notify all undergraduate students about the curriculum flowchart redesign. (03/20/2020)
		Reporting Period: 2017 - 2018	**Use of Results for Improvement:**

Outcomes	Assessment Method	Results	Use of Results for Improvement
		Criterion Status: C. 80% to 89% Met Of 210 students who responded: 99 (47.14%) strongly agree; 74 (35.24%) agree; 23 (10.95%) remain neutral; 8 (3.81%) disagree; 3 (1.43%) strongly disagree; 3 (1.43%) N/A (10/11/2018)	This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. No Use of Results required. (03/11/2019)
Instruction - Students will be satisfied with program faculty instruction **Outcome Status:** ARCHIVED	**Survey (Describe in Detail Below) -** Student Assessment of Instruction form is administered at the end of each course. A 3.0 or higher average of student responses to questions on "consistency in following the syllabus", "preparation for class", "use and management of class time", "knowledge of course content", "stimulation of interest in course", "availability to assist students in or out class" and "overall assessment of instructor" indicates a satisfactory or better rating. **Sampling:** All completed "Student Assessment of Instruction" forms. **Minimum Criteria for Success:** All faculty members will achieve a rating of "satisfactory" (3.0 on a scale of 1-5) or better in their student teaching evaluation. **Method Status:** ARCHIVED	**Reporting Period:** 2016 - 2017 **Criterion Status:** B. 90% to 99% Met A review of student ratings for the Academic Year 2016-2017 (Summer '16, Fall '16, and Spring '17) semesters indicate that with one exception ALL faculty members, including adjunct faculty, achieved a rating of 3.0 or higher, with 84% receiving a rating of 4.0 or higher. (07/03/2017) **Attach Follow-up Evidence or Related Documents:** SACS-Assessment-Report-Audit-Response-Memo.docx unlink **Reporting Period:** 2015 - 2016 **Criterion Status:** Met A review of student ratings for the Academic Year 2015-2016 (Summer '15, Fall '15, and Spring '16) semesters indicate that ALL faculty members, including adjunct faculty, achieved a rating of 3.0 or higher, with 86% receiving a rating of 4.0 or higher. (06/21/2016) **Reporting Period:** 2014 - 2015 **Criterion Status:** Met A review of student ratings for the Academic Year 2014-2015 (Summer '14, Fall '14, and Spring '15) semesters indicate that ALL faculty members achieved a rating of 3.0 or higher, with 87% receiving a rating of 4.0 or higher. (07/06/2015)	**Use of Results for Improvement:** REVISE TO: This outcome will be changed to align to University metrics and to streamline data collection process. **Use of Results for Improvement:** For 2016-2017, if there are faculty who do not achieve at least a satisfactory rating, they will be advised on ways to improve their teaching by the School's Associate Director and/or Director in a one-on-one meeting. (06/21/2016) **Use of Results for Improvement:** This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. No Use of Results required. (07/06/2015)
Faculty Productivity - The program's tenured/tenure track faculty will maintain active research programs **Outcome Status:** ARCHIVED	**Tracking Log -** Faculty annual reports will be reviewed to assess the quality and quantity of their research activities.	**Reporting Period:** 2016 - 2017 **Criterion Status:** C. 80% to 89% Met Most tenured/tenure track faculty members had at least one publication, and those with Dissertation Advisor status How many?	**Use of Results for Improvement:** REVISE TO: This outcome will be changed to align to University metrics and to streamline data collection process.

Outcomes	Assessment Method	Results	Use of Results for Improvement
	Sampling: The program's tenured/tenure track faculty . **Minimum Criteria for Success:** All tenured/tenure track faculty will have at least one publication per year in computing conferences, journals, book chapters, or books, and all faculty with Dissertation Advisor status will obtain external funding to support their research work. (except faculty in their first year). **Method Status:** ARCHIVED	had numerous publications in the form of books, book chapters, computing conferences and journals. The faculty published 106 conference papers, 63 journal papers, 13 book chapters and 9 books. In 2016-2017, the School received $4.0 million in direct external funding. Including Foundation and Auxiliary funds, the School received $4.8 million in 2016-17, marking the ninth straight year of funding revenue exceeding $4 million. All but two faculty members with Dissertation Advisor Status are either PI or co-PI of a grant; several other tenure- and non-tenure-track faculty and staff members are also co-PIs of grants. All but three faculty with Dissertation Advisor status submitted a competitive federal grant proposal as PI or co-PI in 2016-2017. (07/06/2017) **Attach Follow-up Evidence or Related Documents:** SACS-Assessment-Report-Audit-Response-Memo.docx unlink	
		Reporting Period: 2015 - 2016 **Criterion Status:** Met How many? Most tenured/tenure track faculty members had at least one publication, and those with Dissertation Advisor status had numerous publications in the form of books, book chapters, computing conferences and journals. The faculty published 96 conference papers, 55 journal papers, 13 book chapters and 8 books. In 2015-2016, the School received $3.7 million in direct external funding. Including Foundation and Auxiliary funds, the School received $4.2 million in 2015-16, marking the eighth straight year of funding revenue exceeding $4 million. All but two faculty members with Dissertation Advisor status are either PI or co-PI of a grant; several other tenure- and non-tenure-track faculty and staff members are also co-PIs of grants. All faculty with Dissertation Advisor status submitted a competitive federal grant proposal as PI or co-PI in 2015-2016. (06/21/2016)	**Use of Results for Improvement:** Faculty members continue to write successful grant proposals and both the College of Engineering and the School have been active in making faculty aware of funding opportunities and in providing grant-writing workshops. We are writing even larger grant proposals, several of which are pending. (06/21/2016)
		Reporting Period: 2014 - 2015 **Criterion Status:** Met	**Use of Results for Improvement:** This is the first year of a two-year

Outcomes	Assessment Method	Results	Use of Results for Improvement
		How many? Most tenured/tenure track faculty members had at least one publication, and those with Dissertation Advisor status had numerous publications in the form of books, book chapters, computing conferences and journals. The faculty published 121 conference papers, 63 journal papers, 13 book chapters and 5 books. In 2014-2015, the School received $4.1 million in direct external funding, marking our seventh consecutive year above $4 million. Including Foundation and Auxiliary funds, the School received $4.7 million in 2014-15. ALL faculty with Dissertation Advisor status are either PI or co-PI of a grant, except for faculty members who are in their first year. All faculty with Dissertation Advisor status submitted a competitive federal grant proposal as PI or co-PI. (07/06/2015)	cycle of data collection. No Use of Results required. (07/06/2015)
Computing Facilities Satisfaction - The program students will be satisfied with the School's computing facilities **Outcome Status:** ARCHIVED	**Survey (Describe in Detail Below) -** Once a semester online survey of all students using the program's computing facilities will provide feedback as to the quality the facilities. The survey and the results are archived at: www.aul.fiu.edu. **Sampling:** All program students. **Minimum Criteria for Success:** Students rate the overall performance of computing facilities as either Excellent or Very Good (on a scale of: "Excellent", "Very Good", "Fair", "Poor", "Unsatisfactory"). **Method Status:** ARCHIVED	**Reporting Period:** 2016 - 2017 **Criterion Status:** C. 80% to 89% Met The survey results show that 92%, 81% and 81% of students respectively in Summer 2016, Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 semesters rated the program's computing facilities as either Excellent or Very Good. In all there were 193 responses. The surveys were administered online to all students who used School's laboratories and did not differentiate students' degree programs. Although the surveys can be refined by asking the students to identify their degree programs, we have no reason to believe that these results would have any statistical difference if broken down by group and we are concerned that students would feel that their anonymity might be compromised by providing answers to too many identifying questions, which would lead to a less reliable survey instrument. (07/03/2017) **Attach Follow-up Evidence or Related Documents:** SACS-Assessment-Report-Audit-Response-Memo.docx unlink	**Use of Results for Improvement:** **REVISE TO: This outcome will be changed to align to University metrics and to streamline data collection process.**
		Reporting Period: 2015 - 2016 **Criterion Status:** Met	**Use of Results for Improvement:** Although we have created an

Outcomes	Assessment Method	Results	Use of Results for Improvement
		The survey results show that 85%, 80% and 82% of students respectively in Summer 2015, Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 semesters rated the program's computing facilities as either Excellent or Very Good. In all there were 323 responses. The surveys were administered online to all students who used School's laboratories and did not differentiate students' degree programs. Although the surveys can be refined by asking the students to identify their degree programs, we have no reason to believe that these results would have any statistical difference if broken down by group and we are concerned that students would feel that their anonymity might be compromised by providing answers to too many identifying questions, which would lead to a less reliable survey instrument. (06/21/2016)	additional lab, student demand continues to exceed our available space. We have recently received additional funding from the state for our IT performance, and thus have funds to create an additional lab and add more equipment and services. We are asking the university for additional space to accomplish this. (06/21/2016)
		Reporting Period: 2014 - 2015 **Criterion Status:** Not met The survey results show that 80% of students in Summer 2014-Spring 2015 semesters rated the program's computing facilities as either Excellent or Very Good. In all there were 118 responses. The surveys were administered online to all students who used School's laboratories and did not differentiate students' degree programs. Although the surveys can be refined by asking the students to identify their degree programs, we have no reason to believe that these results would have any statistical difference if broken down by group and we are concerned that students would feel that their anonymity might be compromised by providing answers to too many identifying questions, which would lead to a less reliable survey instrument. (07/06/2015)	**Use of Results for Improvement:** This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. No Use of Results required. (07/06/2015)

Metric of Assessment Performance

	Developing - 1	Satisfactory - 2	Exemplary - 3	Score
Outcomes				
Requirements	• Minimum quantity required not met • Not written in correct formula (Who + Verb + What) • When applicable, no apparent difference between degree level outcomes (e.g., BS and MS)	• Meets minimum number required • Written in correct formula (Who + Verb + What) • When applicable, little or no apparent difference between degree level outcomes (e.g., BS and MS)	• Exceeds required quantity • Written in correct formula (Who + Verb + What) • When applicable, distinguishable between degree levels (e.g., BS and MS) and progressively advanced	2
SMARTER	• Lack specificity, measurability and/or relevance	• Uses SMART (specific, measurable, reliable, timely) criteria	• Uses SMART (specific, measurable, reliable, timely) criteria • Depth and breadth are evident	2
Alignment	• Not aligned to category • No mission statement provided to determine alignment • Not aligned with discipline-specific/program-specific competencies/metrics • Alignment with specialized accreditation requirements and/or industry standards not evident	• Aligns with selected category (e.g., content knowledge) • Mission statement provided but outcomes are not aligned • Aligns with discipline-specific/program-specific competencies/metrics • Alignment with specialized accreditation requirements and/or industry standards not evident	• Aligns with selected category (e.g., content knowledge) • Aligned with program/unit mission • Specifies discipline-specific/program-specific competencies/metrics • When applicable, aligned with specialized accreditation requirements and/or industry standards	2
Mapping (Only applicable for academic program SLO reports)	Curriculum map is not available	Curriculum map is available but does not clearly indicate where competencies are introduced, reinforced, and assessed	Curriculum map is available and clearly indicates where competencies are introduced, reinforced, and assessed	N/A

Metric of Assessment Performance

Methods				
Relationship to Outcomes	• No alignment between outcome(s) and method(s)	• There is clear alignment between outcome(s) and method(s)	• There is clear alignment between outcome(s) and method(s) and explanation of alignment is provided (i.e., *why* is this the best method to assess the outcome?)	2

Instruments	• No direct measure used
	• Instrument and/or data collection method not described
		• Direct measure used
		• Instrument and/or data collection method described
			• Direct measure(s) used with complementary secondary measure(s)
			• Thoroughly described:
			  ○ Scale
			  ○ Competencies/items assessed
			  ○ Collection methods (e.g., source)
				2

Who, When & Where	• Target population and sampling strategy not specified and/or appropriate • Timeframe for data collection is not explained • Course/location/modality where data are collected not specified • When applicable, no description of evaluators/raters	• Target population and sampling strategy is specified • Timeframe for data collection is explained • Course/location/modality where data are collected is specified • Description of evaluators/raters, if applicable	• Target population and sampling strategy are clearly specified and justification for selection provided • Timeframe for data collection is clearly explained, including repetitions within the academic/fiscal year • Course/location/modality where data are collected is clearly specified • Thorough description of evaluators/raters, if applicable	1.5

Metric of Assessment Performance

Minimum Criteria for Success	• Minimum desired result not specified or appropriate • If below 70%, justification is not provided • Does not account for all students	• Minimum desired result specified and aligned to the scale • Justification for criteria selection not provided or limited • Accounts for all students	• Minimum desired result specified and aligned to the scale • Justification provided for criteria selection (e.g., baseline data, licensure exam results, pre-post data) • Accounts for all students	2
Results				
Data	• Data reported is not aligned with outcome and method • Reporting period (defined by academic year: Summer, Fall, Spring *or* Fiscal Year) is not provided • Semester assessed (for UCC courses only) is not provided • Number of students/artifacts not included • Does not address the minimum criteria • Average score(s) across the sample not provided • No breakdown of scores by competency • No breakdown of scores by rating	• Data reported is aligned with outcome and method • Reporting period (defined by academic year: Summer, Fall, Spring *or* Fiscal Year) is provided • Semester assessed (for UCC courses only) is provided • Number of students/artifacts included • Addresses the minimum criteria • Average score(s) across the sample <u>not</u> provided • No breakdown of scores by competency • No breakdown of scores by rating	• Data reported is directly aligned with outcome and method • Reporting period (defined by academic year: Summer, Fall, Spring *or* Fiscal Year) • Semester assessed (for UCC courses only) • Number of students/artifacts included • Address the minimum criteria (was it met and by how much?) • Average score(s) across the sample • Breakdown of scores by competency (e.g., in a rubric indicate the average score for each competency addressed) • Breakdown of scores by rating (e.g., In a three-point rubric, indicate how many	2

Metric of Assessment Performance

			students score at each of the three ratings)	
Analysis	No analysis of the data provided	Limited analysis of the data provided (e.g., minimal comparison, no analysis of trends, etc.)	Analysis of what the data mean (e.g., compare to previous results, analyze trends, describe strengths and weaknesses, etc.)	1
Improvement Actions				
Communication with stakeholders	No description of how data gathered were shared with stakeholders provided	Limited description of how data gathered were shared with stakeholders provided	Description of how data gathered were shared with stakeholders is provided (e.g., date, time, attendees, etc).	1
Use of Results for Improvement	No improvement actions provided *or* improvement actions provided do not directly impact outcome attainment	At least one improvement action directly related to outcomes is clearly described	At least one improvement action directly related to outcome is clearly described, *including* timeframe for implementation, individual(s) responsible for implementation of actions), and integration to teaching and learning research-based practices	2
Follow-Ups	No description of the implementation of the improvement action planned is provided	Limited description of the implementation of the improvement action planned is provided	A detailed description of the implementation (or status of) of the improvement action planned is provided	2
Evidence of Implementation	No documentation of implementation of improvement strategies is provided or is not relevant	Relevant documentation of implementation of improvement strategies is provided, per outcome	Relevant documentation of implementation of improvement strategies is provided, per outcome	2