

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
- **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.

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

Assessment Report

Program - CEC Information Technology SLO (BS)

① Is this 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.

Outcomes	Assessment Method	Results	Use of Results for Improvement
<p>Practical proficiency in state-of-the-art software systems - Students will demonstrate practical proficiency in selection, installation, customizing and maintenance of the state-of-the-art software systems.</p> <p>Outcome Status: Active</p> <p>Competency Category: Content Knowledge and Skills (including Technology)</p> <p>Outcome Start Date: 08/01/2019</p> <p>Outcome End Date: 08/01/2030</p> <p>Sub-competency: Technology</p>	<p>Rubric - A sample of students' responses (all students in one section) to embedded exam questions (designed by the faculty as appropriate) in the final examination of CGS 3767 is evaluated to assess the level of student achievement.</p> <p>Sampling: All students' responses in one section of CGS 3767.</p> <p>Minimum Criteria for Success: Students will demonstrate proficiency or better based on the following scoring rubric:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Novice, - Apprentice, - Proficient, - Expert. <p>Method Status: Active</p> <p>Course Assessed: CGS 3767</p>	<p>Reporting Period: 2018 - 2019</p> <p>Criterion Status: G. 40% to 49% Met</p> <p>Of 23 students in Spring 2019:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of students who scored expert- 3 # of students who scored proficient- 8 # of students who scored apprentice- 2 # of students who scored novice- 4 # of students who failed- 6 <p>(10/14/2019)</p> <p>Attach Follow-up Evidence or Related Documents: Exam- CGS 3767.txt</p>	<p>Use of Results for Improvement: Spring 2019, I offered one Extra Credit assignment worth max of 5 points, 6 students out of 23 students did the extra credit assignment, partial credit was given to the extra credit assignment. I started offering more extra credit assignments and I am using multiple choice questions on all quizzes and exams. (10/14/2019)</p> <p>Follow-Up: The questions on exams and quizzes were changed from essay type to multiple choice questions</p> <p>All Quizzes were created with 10 choices per question (a-j) with multiple possible answers, giving partial credit to each answer, and the amount of questions were extended from 5 to 10.</p> <p>Exams were created with 5</p>

* Explain how these improve content knowledge

cat. Imp to Ass.

Outcomes	Assessment Method	Results	Use of Results for Improvement
			<p>choices per question (a-e) with multiple possible answers, giving partial credit to each answer, and the amount of questions were extended from 15 to 30.</p> <p>Because students had more opportunities to earn more points, and therefore a higher grade, we were able to obtain higher grades and more students pass the class (03/11/2020)</p>
		<p>Reporting Period: 2017 - 2018 Criterion Status: B. 90% to 99% Met In three sections of CGS3767 (n=79) assessed in Fall 2017: 42 students performed at the Expert level 31 students performed at the Proficient level 6 students performed at the Apprentice level 0 students performed at the Novice level 0 students Failed (09/19/2018)</p>	<p>Use of Results for Improvement: This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. No Use of Results required. (09/19/2018)</p>
		<p>Reporting Period: 2016 - 2017 Criterion Status: D. 70% to 79% Met 96 students (in three sections of CGS 3767) were assessed with a sample of embedded questions. 75 students were judged as performing at or above <u>proficient level</u> (out of this group, 39 students performed at the expert level). 15 of the students were judged as apprentice and 6 performed at the novice level. (09/05/2017)</p> <p>Attach Follow-up Evidence or Related Documents: image002.jpg</p>	<p>Use of Results for Improvement: A new lab under the Hardware Lab and Services name, will be added to our program in The Tech Station PG6 #102 to enhance student's Hardware Hands-on training complementing the theoretical in class learning, and to increase our tutoring efforts, with space for up to 32 students.</p> <p>Extra credit work will be added to students who attended the Hardware Hands-on classes as well as the A+ 901 and A+ 902 Certification classes. (10/08/2018) 9/5/17</p> <p>Follow-Up: We will start offering the following Special FREE Projects to our students:</p>

Cat
Curr.

Outcomes	Assessment Method	Results	Use of Results for Improvement
----------	-------------------	---------	--------------------------------

- Tutoring: OS, Web, Java
- A+ 901 Classes for Certifications
- A+ 902 Classes for Certifications
- Hands On Hardware Training
- Girls Who Code
- Cyber Security Training Level 1
- Cyber Security Training Level 2
- Developing above classes for students with Autism

Extra credit work was added to students who attended the Hardware Hands-on classes as well as the A+ 901 and A+ 902 Certification classes. During the 2017 Spring Semester we were part of The Miami Maker Faire, presenting to the public, for 2 days, the knowledge acquired by our students, giving 5% extra credit to the students who volunteered.
(09/06/2018)

Reporting Period: 2015 - 2016

Criterion Status: A. 100% Met 90-99

161 students (in five sections of CGS 3767) were assessed with a sample of embedded questions. 150 students were judged as performing at or above proficient level. 118 students performed at the expert level. Eleven of the students were judged as apprentice and none performed at the novice level. (08/09/2016)

Use of Results for Improvement:

We hope to add new labs in Tech Station to enhance student software ability and are increasing tutoring efforts. (08/09/2016) **Cat: Curr.**
Follow-Up: The questions on exams and quizzes were changed from essay type to multiple choice questions

~~All Quizzes were created with 10 choices per question (a-j) with multiple possible answers, giving partial credit to each answer, and the amount of questions were extended from 5 to 10.~~

Outcomes	Assessment Method	Results	Use of Results for Improvement
----------	-------------------	---------	--------------------------------

Rubric - A sample of students' responses (all students in one section) to embedded multiple-choice questions (designed by the faculty as appropriate) in the final examination of CGS 3767 is evaluated to assess the level of student achievement.

Sampling: All students' responses in one section of CGS 3767.

Minimum Criteria for Success:

Students will demonstrate proficiency or better based on the following scoring rubric:

- Novice,
- Apprentice,

Reporting Period: 2014 - 2015

Criterion Status: Not met 90 - 99
 92 students (in three sections of CGS 3767, all spring) were assessed with a sample of four embedded questions. 84 students were judged as performing at or above proficient level. 72 students performed at the expert level. Seven of the students were judged as apprentice and one performed at the novice level. (09/19/2015)

Exams were created with 5 choices per question (a-e) with multiple possible answers, giving partial credit to each answer, and the amount of questions were extended from 15 to 30.

Because students had more opportunities to earn more points, and therefore a higher grade, we were able to obtain higher grades and more students pass the class. (09/11/2017)

Use of Results for Improvement:

This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. No Use of Results required. (07/17/2015)

9/19/15

Outcomes	Assessment Method	Results	Use of Results for Improvement
----------	-------------------	---------	--------------------------------

Tech

- Proficient,
 - Expert.
Method Status: ARCHIVED
Course Assessed: CGS 3767

Proficiency in state-of-the-art computing

Infrastructure/Technology - Students will demonstrate proficiency in selection, installation, customizing and maintenance of the state-of-the-art computing infrastructure.
Outcome Status: Active
Competency Category: Content Knowledge and Skills (including Technology)
Outcome Start Date: 08/01/2019
Outcome End Date: 08/01/2030
Sub-competency: Technology

Rubric - A sample of students' responses (all students in one section) to embedded exam questions (designed by the faculty as appropriate) in the final examination of CGS 3767 is evaluated to assess the level of student achievement.
Sampling: All students' responses in one section of CGS 3767.
Minimum Criteria for Success: Students will demonstrate proficiency or better based on the following scoring rubric:
 - Novice,
 - Apprentice,
 - Proficient,
 - Expert.
Method Status: Active
Course Assessed: CGS 3767

Reporting Period: 2018 - 2019
Criterion Status: G. 40% to 49% Met
 In Spring 2019, of 23 students:
 # of students who scored expert- 3
 # of students who scored proficient- 8
 # of students who scored apprentice- 2
 # of students who scored novice- 4
 # of students who failed- 6 (10/14/2019)
Attach Follow-up Evidence or Related Documents:
[Exam-CGS 3767.txt](#)

*How would this improve content knowledge?

Use of Results for Improvement:
 Spring 2019, I offered one Extra Credit assignment worth max of 5 points, 6 students out of 23 students did the extra credit assignment, partial credit was given to the extra credit assignment. I started offering more extra credit assignments and I am using multiple choice questions on all quizzes and exams. (10/14/2019) **Cat: Imp to Assess**
Follow-Up: The questions on exams and quizzes were changed from essay type to multiple choice questions

All Quizzes were created with 10 choices per question (a-j) with multiple possible answers, giving partial credit to each answer, and the amount of questions were extended from 5 to 10.

Exams were created with 5 choices per question (a-e) with multiple possible answers, giving partial credit to each answer, and the amount of questions were extended from 15 to 30.

Because students had more opportunities to earn more points, and therefore a higher grade, we

②
 This outcome is no longer required. Please let us know if you would like to archive.

Outcomes	Assessment Method	Results	Use of Results for Improvement
		<p>were able to obtain higher grades and more students pass the class (03/11/2020)</p> <hr/> <p>Reporting Period: 2017 - 2018 Criterion Status: C. 80% to 89% Met In three sections of CGS3767 (n=79) assessed in Fall 2017: 34 students performed at the Expert level 34 students performed at the Proficient level 11 students performed at the Apprentice level 0 students performed at the Novice level 0 students Failed (09/19/2018)</p> <hr/> <p>Reporting Period: 2016 - 2017 Criterion Status: E. 60% to 69% Met 96 students (in three sections of CGS 3767) were assessed with a sample of embedded questions. 61 students were judged as performing at or above proficient level (Out of this group, 22 students performed at the expert level). 23 of the students were judged as apprentice and 12 performed at the novice level. (09/05/2017) Attach Follow-up Evidence or Related Documents: image002.jpg</p>	<p>Use of Results for Improvement: This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. No Use of Results required. (09/19/2018)</p> <hr/> <p>Use of Results for Improvement: A new lab under the Hardware Lab and Services name, will be added to our program in The Tech Station PG6 #102 to enhance student's Hardware Hands-on training complementing the theoretical in class learning, and to increase our tutoring efforts, with space for up to 32 students.</p> <p>Extra credit work will be added to students who attended the Hardware Hands-on classes as well as the A+ 901 and A+ 902 Certification classes. (07/05/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: We started offering the following Special FREE Projects to our students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tutoring: OS, Web, Java - A+ 901 Classes for Certifications - A+ 902 Classes for Certifications - Hands On Hardware Training - Girls Who Code - Cyber Security Training Level 1 - Cyber Security Training Level 2 - Developed above classes for

Cat.
 Conn.

Outcomes	Assessment Method	Results	Use of Results for Improvement
----------	-------------------	---------	--------------------------------

students with Autism

Extra credit work was added to students who attended the Hardware Hands-on classes as well as the A+ 901 and A+ 902 Certification classes. During the 2017 Spring Semester we were part of The Miami Maker Faire, presenting to the public, for 2 days, the knowledge acquired by our students, giving 5% extra credit to the students who volunteered (10/05/2018)

Reporting Period: 2015 - 2016

Criterion Status: A. 100% Met

161 students (in five sections of CGS 3767) were assessed with a sample of embedded questions. 151 students were judged as performing at or above proficient level. 101 students performed at the expert level. 10 of the students were judged as apprentice and none performed at the novice level. (08/09/2016)

Use of Results for Improvement:

We are creating a new hardware lab in Tech Station to increase student competency, though it is unlikely to reflect in future assessments as there is little room to improve the raw numbers. (08/09/2016) *Cat: Curriculum*

Reporting Period: 2014 - 2015

Criterion Status: ~~Not met~~ *60-69*

92 students (in three sections of CGS 3767, all spring) were assessed with a sample of two embedded questions. 62 students were judged as performing at or above proficient level. 15 students performed at the expert level. 22 of the students were judged as apprentice and 8 performed at the novice level. (09/19/2015)

Use of Results for Improvement:

This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. No Use of Results required. (07/17/2015)

9/19/15

Rubric - A sample of students' responses (all students in one section) to embedded multiple-choice questions (designed by the faculty as appropriate) in the final examination of CDA 3003 (formerly numbered COP-3643) is evaluated to assess the level of student achievement.

Outcomes

Assessment Method

Results

Use of Results for Improvement

Sampling: All students' responses in one section of CDA 3003

Minimum Criteria for Success: Students will demonstrate proficiency or better based on the following scoring rubric:

- Novice,
- Apprentice,
- Proficient,
- Expert.

Method Status: ARCHIVED
Course Assessed: CDA 3003

* what is the total meeting the minimum criteria (all classes)?

Proficiency in one area of specialization/Critical Thinking

Students will demonstrate proficiency in at least one area of specialization within the field of Information Technology including:-
System Administration (CTS4348)
Applied Network administration (CNT4504),
Databases (COP4722),
Application Development (COP4813 and/or COP4005)

Outcome Status: Active
Competency Category: Critical Thinking

Outcome Start Date: 08/01/2019
Outcome End Date: 08/01/2030

Sub-competency: Technology

3

Are these considered electives?
(electives assessed in curriculum map)

Rubric - A random sample of (a minimum of 10) students' responses to embedded exam questions (designed by the faculty as appropriate) in the final examination of appropriate courses is evaluated to assess the level of student achievement.

Sampling: At least 10 students or 10%, whichever is greater.

Minimum Criteria for Success: Students will demonstrate proficiency or better based on the following scoring rubric:

- Novice,
- Apprentice,
- Proficient,
- Expert.

If multiple choice questions are used the students will correctly answer the multiple-choice questions.

Method Status: Active

* Are the results (1-4) based on this #?

Reporting Period: 2018 - 2019

Criterion Status: 6.90% to 99% Met CTS 4348:

During 2018-2019, SCIS offered CTS4348-U04. Most of the students achieved a score of proficient or higher on the short answer regarding high level troubleshooting of DNS services. The question encompasses the configuration, management and network setup understanding of a client/server in regard to DNS. Based on the 31 assessed students we gathered the following:

1. For students who only pointed at the obvious issue received novice with a total of 5 students.
2. For students who dove deeper into the client/server relationship issue received apprentice with a total of 7 students.
3. For students with a clear definition of the issue and understanding of the bigger picture received proficient with a total of 5 students.
4. For students who understood the problem to the point of postulating multiple fixes to the issue received expert with a total of 7 students.

CNT 4504: Applied Network Administration (CNT4504): During Spring 2019, SCIS offered two sections of CNT 4504 that included embedded questions to measure student achievement for BS-IT Students in the area of Advanced

Use of Results for Improvement:

CNT 4504: Provide more feedback to students earlier in the semester. This will help those who need extra help get the resources needed to succeed. Add more hands on configuration examples so that students don't just repeat the material from the book, but rather speak authoritatively from experience on the subject matter.

COP 4722: To improve student performance on the embedded questions, the necessary educational video resources will be shared with all enrolled students (from Panther class roster) three weeks before the start of the term (as in the attached email). Hopefully this will enable them to review the basic database concepts well before answering the embedded questions at the start of the term.

COP 4005: Moving this course to

Outcomes	Assessment Method	Results	Use of Results for Improvement
		<p>Network Management. Among 24 assessed students (all passing students enrolled in one section of CNT 4504), 22 of them (92%) have performed at or above proficient level.</p> <p># of students who scored novice - 0 # of students who scored apprentice - 2 # of students who scored proficient - 14 # of students who scored expert - 8 # of students who failed - 0</p> <p>COP 4722: During Spring 2019, SCIS offered two sections of COP 4722 that included embedded questions to measure student achievement in the area of Databases. Among 25 assessed students (all passing students enrolled in two sections of COP 4722), 20 of them (80%) have performed at or above proficient level.</p> <p>Number of students scored at the following levels: Novice: 0 Apprentice: 5 Proficient: 8 Expert: 12 Number of students Dropped/Failed: 15</p> <p>COP4005: In Spring 2019, 14 Students were given a real-world Visual Studio application project consisting of a designed screen, class code, and a database with stored procedures. They were required to write the code for multiple event procedures to validate user input, add and update records in a database table, in order to make the screen fully functional.</p> <p>12 assessed students (all students enrolled in one section of COP 4005) performed at or above expert level (85.7%) 2 performed at the Proficient level (14.3%) 0 at the Apprentice level (0.0%) 0 at the Novice level (0.0%)</p>	<p>hybrid format required additional scaffolding in the form of annotated, searchable video lectures with transcripts. GitHub will be used to provide students with a verifiable means to show their work progressively in each assignment. With the ability to review all lectures via the videos, students will be able to ensure that they have successfully mastered the concepts. Use of GitHub will ensure that all students were completing all of the required work correctly.</p> <p>COP 4813: The instructor will focus more on building the understanding of browser and server interaction which will allow such a question to be better interpreted. (10/10/2019)</p> <p>Student Learning Improvement Category: Course Activities, Student Resources</p> <p>Follow-Up: COP 4005: The use of GitHub individual repositories for each student's programming work ensures that they are working through each provided sample program. The Momentos videos demonstrate every programming technique needed for the sample programs and the assignments.</p> <p>COP 4722: An email was sent to all students enrolled in COP-4722-UHA on 8/4/2019 through Panthersoft class roster (all students email addresses were</p>

Cat.
Fact
stu;
course
res.

Outcomes	Assessment Method	Results	Use of Results for Improvement
----------	-------------------	---------	--------------------------------

(10/10/2019)

Attach Follow-up Evidence or Related Documents:

- [SACS Evidence - Use of Results- COP 4005.docx](#)
- [COP 4722 Fall-2019_Welcome_Email.pdf](#)
- [CNT4504 - Canvas Posting Evidence.docx](#)
- [CNT 4504- Lab- Evidence.pdf](#)
- [COP 4813 evidence.docx](#)

same comment as above.

included in BCC field). This email was sent more than three weeks before the Fall'19 start date so that students can review all 13 videos of Module-1 (basic database concepts) to answer well on the embedded questions on 9/3/19.

CNT 4504: Canvas was used to relay information to students using Announcements and expanded explanations as to why something was incorrect on lab reports.

COP 4813: The professor created and shared individual white board style videos for various topics, in particular the understanding of browser and server interactions, to help the students build a solid underpinning understanding of this topic. (03/10/2020)

Reporting Period: 2017 - 2018

Criterion Status: C. 80% to 89% Met

(1) System Administration (CTS4348): During 2017-2018, SCIS offered CTS4348-U04. Most of the students achieved a score of proficient or higher on the short answer regarding high level troubleshooting of DNS services. The question encompasses the configuration, management and network setup understanding of a client/server in regard to DNS. Based on the 31 assessed students we gathered the following: 1. For students who only pointed at the obvious issue received novice with a total of 4 students. 2. For students who dove deeper into the client/server relationship issue received apprentice with a total of 6 students. 3. For students with a clear definition of the issue and understanding of the bigger

Use of Results for Improvement:

This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. No Use of Results required. (10/08/2018)

10/18/18

<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Assessment Method</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Use of Results for Improvement</i>
		<p>picture received proficient with a total of 12 students. 4. For students who understood the problem to the point of postulating multiple fixes to the issue received expert with a total of 9 students.</p>	
		<hr/> <p>(2) Applied Network Administration (CNT4504): During Spring 2018, SCIS offered two sections of CNT 4504 that included embedded questions to measure student achievement for BS-IT Students in the area of Advanced Network Management. Among 34 assessed students (all passing students enrolled in one section of CNT 4504), 28 of them (82%) have performed at or above proficient level.</p>	
		<hr/> <p>(3) Databases (COP4722): During Spring 2018, SCIS offered two sections of COP 4722 that included embedded questions to measure student achievement in the area of Databases. Among 16 assessed students (all passing students enrolled in two sections of COP 4722). 13 of them (81%) have performed at or above proficient level.</p>	
		<hr/> <p>(4) Application Development (COP4813 and/or COP4005): - COP4813: Total students assessed: 14 Expert: 5 Proficient: 7 Apprentice: 2 Novice: 0 - COP4005: Students were given a real-world Visual Studio application project consisting of a designed screen, class code, a database with stored procedures. They were required to write the code for multiple event procedures to validate user input, add and update records in a database table, in order to make the screen fully functional. 10 out of 19 assessed students (all students enrolled in one section of COP 4005) performed at or above expert level (52.5%), 8 performed at the Proficient level (42.1%), and 1 at the Novice level (5.2%). (09/18/2018)</p>	
		<p>Reporting Period: 2016 - 2017 Criterion Status: C. 80% to 89% Met During 2016-2017, SCIS offered CTS 4348, CNT 4504, COP-4722, COP 4005 that include embedded questions to</p>	<p>Use of Results for Improvement: (1) CTS4348- Use of results not collected from this course for this</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Method	Results	Use of Results for Improvement
		<p>measure student achievement of this outcome. The embedded questions in these courses assess Outcome 3 in the areas of System Administration, Networking, Databases, and Application Development, respectively. <u>32 out of 40</u> assessed students (all students enrolled in two fall sections of CTS 4348) performed at or above proficient level. <u>11 out of 24</u> assessed students (all students enrolled in one spring section of CNT-4504) performed at or above proficient level. <u>39 out of 42</u> assessed students (all passing students enrolled in two sections of COP 4722) performed at or above proficient level. <u>22 out of 25</u> assessed students (all students enrolled in two sections of COP 4005 and one section of COP 4813) performed at or above proficient level. (09/05/2017)</p>	<p>area</p> <p>(2) CNT4504 - Improvement of student learning can be enhanced by perhaps setting up workshops based on the content of CNT 4504.</p> <p>(3) COP4722- Use of results not collected from this course for this area</p> <p>(4) COP4005 - Students will be informed prior to start of term of the programming skills that would be needed, and that the course was totally hands-on programming. Students who do not enjoy programming will be advised that this course is inappropriate for them. This “pre-qualification” resulted in students having clearer understanding and expectations for the course, and only those who strongly preferred programming activities remained enrolled. (10/08/2018) 9/15/17</p> <p>Follow-Up: (1) CTS4348 - Follow up data was not collected from this course for this area</p> <p>(2) CNT4504 - Follow up data was not collected from this course for this area</p> <p>(3) COP4722 - Follow up data was not collected from this course for this area</p> <p>(4) COP4005 - This “pre-</p>
		<p>Attach Follow-up Evidence or Related Documents: COP_4005.pdf</p>	

*Cat. Diss
of into
Imp to
Ass*

Outcomes	Assessment Method	Results	Use of Results for Improvement
----------	-------------------	---------	--------------------------------

qualification” resulted in students having clearer understanding and expectations for the course, and only those who strongly preferred programming activities remained enrolled. (09/27/2018)

Reporting Period: 2015 - 2016
Criterion Status: ~~D: 70% to 79% Met~~ 80 - 89
 During 2015-2016, SCIS offered CNT 4348, CNT 4504, COP-4722, COP 4005, and COP 4813 that include embedded questions to measure student achievement of this outcome. The embedded questions in these courses assess Outcome 3 in the areas of System Administration, Networking, Databases, and Application Development, respectively. 34 out of 53 assessed students (all students enrolled in that fall sections of CNT 4348) performed at or above proficient level 18 out of 29 assessed students (all students enrolled in one fall section of CNT-4504) performed at or above proficient level 84 out of 90 assessed students (all passing students enrolled in three sections of COP 4722) performed at or above proficient level. 54 out of 58 assessed students (all students enrolled in two sections of COP 4005 and one section of COP 4813) performed at or above proficient level. (08/09/2016)

Use of Results for Improvement:
 A curriculum review of the IT program was initiated in 2015-16 and is ongoing. We will also experiment with online learning in these courses. (08/09/2016)

Cqt: Course Res.

Reporting Period: 2014 - 2015
Criterion Status: ~~Not met~~ 60 - 69%
 During 2014-2015, SCIS offered CNT 4348, CNT 4504, COP-4722, and COP 4813 that include embedded questions to measure student achievement of this outcome. The embedded questions in these courses assess Outcome 3 in the areas of System Administration, Networking, Databases, and Application Development, respectively. 72 out of 123 assessed students (all students enrolled in four sections of CNT 4348) performed at or above proficient level 41 out of 69 assessed students (all students enrolled in two sections of CNT-4504) performed at or above proficient level 63 out of 87 assessed students (all passing students enrolled in two sections of COP 4722) performed at or above proficient level. 36 out of 53 assessed students (all students enrolled

Use of Results for Improvement:
 This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. No Use of Results required. (07/17/2015)

9/19

Outcomes	Assessment Method	Results	Use of Results for Improvement
----------	-------------------	---------	--------------------------------

in the Fall section of COP 4813) performed at or above proficient level. (09/19/2015)

Oral
Communication Skills in IT—Oral—
 Students will demonstrate effective oral communication skills in information technology.
Outcome Status: Active
Competency Category: Communication (Oral or Written)
Outcome Start Date: 08/01/2017
Outcome End Date: 08/01/2030
Sub-competency: Oral

Rubric - Students presentations in CGS 3095 are evaluated to assess student achievement in effective oral communication skills
Sampling: All students in CGS 3095.
Minimum Criteria for Success: All students will demonstrate Proficient (3) of better in oral communications skills on the following scoring rubric:
 1= Novice
 2 = Apprentice
 3 = Proficient
 4 = Expert
Method Status: Active
Course Assessed: CGS 3095

Reporting Period: 2018 - 2019
Criterion Status: B. 90% to 99% Met
 28 of 71 students were **involved as informational tech BS students.**
 23 students earned a rating of Expert
 4 students earned a rating of Proficient
 One student failed (11/04/2019)

Use of Results for Improvement:
 Just prior to the 2017-2018 year, to give students more practical experience, **changed the assignment for individual presentations/significantly. The new assignment was changed** required students to choose one of the source articles they'd found to use in their individual paper research and to summarize it in two written forms – a discussion form post and a single "quad chart"-style powerpoint slide – and then to orally present their work in class while their "quad chart" was being displayed. Each student was required to evaluate every other student's in-class presentation, giving them the chance to reflect on what made a good presentation, seeing a wide variety of recent source articles, and potentially finding articles that would help in their own research.

→ Please be more specific.
 (4)

(5) Are there specific indicators?

* Missing follow-up and evidence

cat. Course Act
 This process worked well in 2017-2018 (compared to previous years), so only minor tweaks to the repeated discussions and instructions given in class were made in 2018-2019. By Spring 2019, most students were compliant in all aspects of the semester-long assignment. (11/04/2019)

Outcomes	Assessment Method	Results	Use of Results for Improvement
----------	-------------------	---------	--------------------------------

Reporting Period: 2017 - 2018
Criterion Status: F. 50% to 59% Met
 Out of 50 students assessed in Summer 2017, 0 students scored a 3 and 28 students scored a 4. The average score from this sample is 3.32. (10/06/2018)

Use of Results for Improvement:
 This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. No Use of Results required. (02/09/2019)

10/6/18

Written

Communication Skills in IT - Written
 Students will demonstrate effective written communication skills in information technology.
Outcome Status: Active
Competency Category: Communication (Oral or Written)
Outcome Start Date: 08/01/2018
Outcome End Date: 08/01/2030
Sub-competency: Written

Rubric - Students final papers in CGS 3095 are evaluated to assess student achievement in effective written communication skills

Sampling: All students in CGS 3095.
Minimum Criteria for Success: All students will demonstrate Proficient (3) or better in oral communications skills on the following scoring rubric:

- 1= Novice
- 2 = Apprentice
- 3 = Proficient
- 4 = Expert

Method Status: Active
Course Assessed: CGS 3095

Reporting Period: 2018 - 2019
Criterion Status: C. 80% to 89% Met
 Spring 2019: 28 of 71 students were IT:BS. 10 earned a rating of Expert 11 students earned a rating of Proficient 4 students earned a rating of Apprentice 2 students earned a rating of Novice 1 student failed. (11/04/2019)

Use of Results for Improvement:
 Just prior to the 2017-2018 year, to give students more practical experience, I changed the assignment for individual presentations significantly. The new assignment required students to choose one of the source articles they'd found to use in their individual paper research and to summarize it in two written forms – a discussion form post and a single "quad chart"-style powerpoint slide – and then to orally present their work in class while their "quad chart" was being displayed. Each student was required to evaluate every other student's in-class presentation, giving them the chance to reflect on what made a good presentation, seeing a wide variety of recent source articles, and potentially finding articles that would help in their own research. **cat. Course Act**

→ Add more details

⑦ Any specific indicators?

Outcomes	Assessment Method	Results	Use of Results for Improvement
----------	-------------------	---------	--------------------------------

8 Please be specific at the proficient level

* Missing follow-up and evidence

2019, most students were compliant in all aspects of the semester-long assignment. (11/04/2019)

Reporting Period: 2017 - 2018
Criterion Status: E. 60% to 69% Met
 Out of 50 students assessed in Summer 2017, 12 students scored 3 and 18 students scored 4. The average score from this sample is 2.99. (10/06/2018)

Use of Results for Improvement:
 This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. No Use of Results required. (03/08/2019)

10/4/18

Reporting Period: 2016 - 2017
Criterion Status: B. 90% to 99% Met
 During Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 student presentations and papers in two on-campus sections (total of 124 students) were evaluated for effective communication Skills. *oral

Use of Results for Improvement:
 Use of results data was not collected. (08/28/2019)

9/5/19 cat: No imp plan

The evaluation of comprehensive communication skills using student term papers and presentations indicated that 117 out of 124 students performed at or above adequate levels. *written (09/05/2017)

Attach Follow-up Evidence or Related Documents:
[COP_4005.pdf](#)
[SACS-Assessment-Report-Audit-Response-Memo.docx](#)

Reporting Period: 2015 - 2016
Criterion Status: Partially met 70-79%
 During Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 student presentations and papers in three sections (total of 181 students) were evaluated for effective communication Skills. The evaluation of comprehensive communication skills using student term papers and presentations indicated that 132 out of 181 students performed at or above adequate levels. However, the data in one section had students who were not fully assessed and were scored as deficient. (08/09/2016)

Use of Results for Improvement:
 We will monitor this course; the evaluations include 10 students who did not present and are thus rated deficient. (08/09/2016)

Cat: No imp plan

so they were scored as *not meeting the criteria?

Reporting Period: 2014 - 2015
Criterion Status: Not met 90-99%
 During Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 student presentations and papers in two sections (total of 132 students) were

Use of Results for Improvement:
 This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. No Use of

Communication Skills in IT - Students will demonstrate effective communication skills in information technology.
Outcome Status: ARCHIVED
Competency Category: Communication (Oral or Written)
Sub-competency: Written

Rubric - Combined Student achievements in Term papers and presentations in CGS 3095 (originally "Professional Ethics and Social Issues in Computer Science", now "Technology in the Global Arena") are evaluated to assess student achievement in effective communication skills

The evaluation is done by a panel of at least two faculty members.
Sampling: All students in CGS 3092/5.
Minimum Criteria for Success: All student will demonstrate adequate communications skills on the following scoring rubric:

- Deficient,
- Adequate,
- Superb.

Method Status: ARCHIVED
Course Assessed: CGS 3092

* Scored the same for oral & written?

9 Separate into oral and written.

Outcomes	Assessment Method	Results	Use of Results for Improvement
----------	-------------------	---------	--------------------------------

* Same comment as above

Rubric - A sample of students' responses (all students in one section) to embedded multiple-choice questions (designed by the faculty as appropriate) in the final examination of CGS 3767 is evaluated to assess the level of student achievement.

Sampling: All students' responses in one section of CGS 3767.

Minimum Criteria for Success: Students will demonstrate proficiency or better based on the following scoring rubric:

- Novice,
- Apprentice,
- Proficient,
- Expert.

Method Status: ARCHIVED

Course Assessed: CGS 3767

evaluated for effective communication Skills. The evaluation of comprehensive communication skills using student term papers and presentations indicated that 123 out of 132 students performed at or above adequate levels. (09/19/2015)

Results required. (07/17/2015)

9/19

Metric of Assessment Performance

	Developing - 1	Satisfactory - 2	Exemplary - 3	Score
Outcomes				
Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack specificity, measurability and/or relevance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses SMART (specific, measurable, reliable, timely) criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses SMART (specific, measurable, reliable, timely) criteria Depth and breadth are evident 	2
Alignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	2

Metric of Assessment Performance

Methods				
Relationship to Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No alignment between outcome(s) and method(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is clear alignment between outcome(s) and method(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is clear alignment between outcome(s) and method(s) <u>and</u> explanation of alignment is provided (i.e., <i>why</i> is this the best method to assess the outcome?) 	2
Instruments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No direct measure used Instrument and/or data collection method not described 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct measure used Instrument and/or data collection method described 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct measure(s) used with complementary secondary measure(s) Thoroughly described: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scale Competencies/items assessed Collection methods (e.g., source) 	2
Who, When & Where	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target population and sampling strategy are clearly specified <u>and</u> 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 	2

Metric of Assessment Performance

Minimum Criteria for Success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum desired result not specified or appropriate • If below 70%, justification is not provided • Does not account for all students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum desired result specified and aligned to the scale • Justification for criteria selection not provided or limited • Accounts for all students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data reported is not aligned with outcome and method • Reporting period (defined by academic year: Summer, Fall, Spring <i>or</i> 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data reported is aligned with outcome and method • Reporting period (defined by academic year: Summer, Fall, Spring <i>or</i> 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data reported is directly aligned with outcome and method • Reporting period (defined by academic year: Summer, Fall, Spring <i>or</i> 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.)	2
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).	2
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, <i>including</i> 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	1.5
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	1.5