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**PART ONE**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| What are the learning objectives? | How, where, and when are they assessed? | What are the expectations? | What are the results? | Committee/ person responsible? How are results shared? |
| 1. Comprehend the role of networking in a business environment, and develop technical solutions to the information needs of an organization using networks, including configuration and management activities. | **MIS 3200 Lab Projects.**  Spring 2018  Assessed in MIS 3200 – Networking Fundamentals.  Assessed by multi-part comprehensive networking lab project.  See the attached rubric. | At least 70% of students will achieve a 3.0 or better (out of 4.0 scale) on all categories on the Assessment Rubric for MIS 3200 Lab Projects. | **MIS 3200, Lab Projects Rubric, Spring 2018**  Rubric Criteria n Average Students  achieving  level 3 or  better  Installing and 20 3.55 x=17  configuring 85.0%  network OS  Disk management 20 3.65 x=18  90.0%  Managing 20 3.70 x=18  user/group 90.0%  accounts  Implementing 20 3.70 x=18  directory services 90.0%  Implementing 20 3.80 x=19  group policies 95.0%  Configuring 20 3.80 x=19  Web services 95.0% | Data collected by Dr. Abdou Illia.  The Management Information Systems/Operation Management discipline unit acts as an assessment committee of the whole. Results are shared during discipline unit meetings and the Summary Form is distributed to all faculty in the discipline unit. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **MIS 3200 Final Exam.**  Spring 2018.  Assessed in MIS 3200 – Networking Fundamentals.  Assessed by scores on a comprehensive final examination. See the attached rubric. | At least 70% of students will achieve a 3.0 or better (out of 4.0 scale) on all categories on the Assessment Rubric for the MIS 3200 final exam. | **MIS 3200, Final Exam Rubric, Spring 2018**  Rubric Criteria n Average Students  achieving  level 3 or  better  Understanding of 20 3.40 x=16  the OSI and the 80.0%  TCP/IP models  including  encapsulation  Knowledge of 20 3.45 x=16  internetworking 80.0%  devices  Understanding of 20 3.70 x=18  data and signal 90.0%  transmission  Knowledge of 20 3.65 x=18  physical and 90.0%  wireless media Understanding of 20 3.65 x=18  the Internet 90.0%  operation and  IP addressing |  |
|  | **Senior Survey Question 2.5.**  Fall 2017, Spring 2018.  Student satisfaction with knowledge of networking as measured by Senior Survey question 28 (I am able to apply networking principles, and design and manage a computer network for a small business.) See attached Senior Survey results | Students will average at least 6 out of 7 on this question. | **Senior Survey Question 2.5, Fall 2017 Results**  Average = 6.00, Std Dev. = 0.00, n = 2  Note the fall 2017 data contains only two students as only the final section that was administered included results for MIS students.  **Senior Survey Question 2.5, Spring 2018 Results**  Average = 6.14, Std Dev. = 1.46, n = 7 | Data collected by School of Business Senior Survey. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Demonstrate critical thinking through competent problem-solving and logic skills. | **MIS 2000 Homework.**  Fall 2017.  Assessed in MIS 2000 - Introduction to Business Logic and Programming Skills.  Assessed by series of 4 homework assignments, each of which test different criteria on the Assessment Rubric. See the attached rubric. | At least 70% of students will achieve a 3.0 or better (out of 4.0 scale) on all categories on the Assessment Rubric for MIS 2000—Homework Assignments 1-4. | **MIS 2000, Homework Rubric, Fall 2017**  Rubric Criteria n Average Students  achieving  level 3 or  better  Logical Reasoning 26 3.54 x = 22  84.6%  Problem solving 26 3.50 x = 22  84.6%  Logic development 26 3.42 x = 23  88.5%  Program 26 3.38 x = 22  documentation 84.6%  Program 26 3.31 x = 23  requirements 88.5%  Identify user 26 3.23 x = 21  decisions 80.8%  Record processing 26 3.08 x = 16  61.5%  Looping constructs 26 3.15 x = 20  76.9%  Modularization 26 3.27 x = 22  techniques 84.6% | Data collected by Paul Brown.  The Management Information Systems/Operations Management discipline unit acts as an assessment committee of the whole. Results are shared during discipline unit meetings and the Summary Form is distributed to all faculty in the discipline unit. |
|  | **Senior Survey Question 2.4.**  Fall 2017, Spring 2018.  Student satisfaction with ability to solve business problems as measured by Senior Survey Question 27 (I am able to logically develop a solution to a business problem.). See attached Senior Survey results. | Students will average at least 6 out of 7 on this question. | **Senior Survey Question 2.4, Fall 2017 Results**  Average = 5.00, Std Dev. = 0.00, n = 2  Note the fall 2017 data contains only two students as only the final section that was administered included results for MIS students.  **Senior Survey Question 2.4, Spring 2018 Results**  Average = 7.00, Std Dev. = 0.00, n = 7 | Data collected by School of Business Senior Survey. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Analyze, design, develop and implement a business information system by using system development methodologies and enterprise databases. | **MIS 4200 Systems & Database Project.**  Fall 2017, Spring 2018.  Assessed in MIS 4200 - Systems and Database Analysis, Design, and Development.  Assessment by a comprehensive multi-part systems and database project which runs throughout the semester. See the attached rubric from Dr. Tina Wang. | At least 70% of the students will achieve an 80 or better (out of 100 possible) on all categories on the Assessment Rubric for MIS 4200 Database Project. | **MIS 4200, Database Project Rubric, Fall 2017**  Rubric Criteria n Average Students  achieving  80 or  better  Apply activities 14 72.14 x = 11  in the SDLC to 78.6%  produce  appropriate  deliverables  Creates appropriate 14 80.38 x = 11  systems process 78.6%  diagrams  Creates complete 14 66.50 x = 4  logical data models 28.6%  Application of 14 72.50 x = 11  Relational Principles 78.6%  and SQL  Application of 14 56.86 x = 7  Principles of 50.0%  Human Interface  Design  Use of 14 56.86 x = 11  Programming 78.6%  Logic Constructs  Integration of 14 56.86 x = 7  Multiple Programs 50.0%  from within  main application  Creates complete 14 80.00 x = 10  systems and user 71.4%  documentation | Data collected by Tina Wang.  The Management Information Systems/Operations Management discipline unit acts as an assessment committee of the whole. Results are shared during discipline unit meetings and the Summary Form is distributed to all faculty in the discipline unit. |
|  |  |  | **MIS 4200, Database Project Rubric, Spring 2018**  Rubric Criteria n Average Students  achieving  80 or  better Apply activities 13 81.15 x = 11  in the SDLC to 84.6%  produce  appropriate  deliverables  Creates appropriate 13 94.23 x = 12  systems process 92.3%  diagrams  Creates complete 13 89.23 x = 12  logical data models 92.3%  Application of 13 81.92 x = 11  Relational Principles 84.6%  and SQL  Application of 13 66.54 x = 10  Principles of 76.9%  Human Interface  Design  Use of 13 81.92 x = 11  Programming 84.6%  Logic Constructs  Integration of 13 66.54 x = 10  Multiple Programs 76.9%  from within  main application  Creates complete 13 82.67 x = 12  systems and user 92.3%  documentation |  |
|  | **Senior Survey Question 2.1.**  Fall 2017, Spring 2018.  Student satisfaction with knowledge of systems development as measured by Senior Survey question 2,1 (I am prepared to use the systems development life cycle to evaluate and implement solutions to business information needs.) | Students will average at least 6 out of 7 on this question. | **Senior Survey Question 2.1, Fall 2017 Results**  Average = 5.50, Std Dev. = 0.71, n = 2  Note the fall 2017 data contains only two students as only the final section that was administered included results for MIS students.  **Senior Survey Question 2.1, Spring 2018 Results**  Average = 6.57, Std Dev. = 0.53, n = 7 | Data collected by School of Business Senior Survey. |
|  | **Senior Survey Question 2.2.**  Fall 2017, Spring 2018.  Student satisfaction with knowledge of systems development as measured by Senior Survey question 2.2 (I am prepared to use appropriate hardware and software as productivity tools for gathering, processing, storing, and retrieving information. | Students will average at least 6 out of 7 on this question. | **Senior Survey Question 2.2, Fall 2017 Results**  Average = 6.00, Std Dev. = 0.00, n = 2  Note the fall 2017 data contains only two students as only the final section that was administered included results for MIS students.  **Senior Survey Question 2.2, Spring 2018 Results**  Average = 6.43, Std Dev. = 0.53, n = 7 | Data collected by School of Business Senior Survey. |
|  | **Senior Survey Question 2.3.**  Fall 2017, Spring 2018.  Student satisfaction with knowledge of data base application development as measured by Senior Survey question 2.3 (I am prepared to design, model and develop data base applications using appropriate program logic and constructs.) | Students will average at least 6 out of 7 on this question. | **Senior Survey Question 2.3, Fall 2017 Results**  Average = 6.00, Std Dev. = 1.41, n = 2  Note the fall 2017 data contains only two students as only the final section that was administered included results for MIS students.  **Senior Survey Question 2.3 Results, Spring 2018**  Average = 6.43, Std Dev. = 0.53, n = 7 | Data collected by School of Business Senior Survey. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Design and develop effective business web sites in compliance with usability standards for the variety of devices and with appropriate information architecture using HTML, Cascading Style Sheets, server/client-side scripts, interactive design, and web application software.  Objective 4 was formally adopted in Fall 2015 with data collection beginning in 2016-17. This reflects the incorporation of MIS 3530 – Business Web Site Design into the MIS core curriculum beginning with the 2015-16 catalog. | **MIS 3530.**  Fall 2017, Spring 2018  Assessed in MIS 3530 – Business Web Site Design. See the attached rubric. | At least 70% of the students will achieve a 3.0 or better (out of 4.0 scale) on all categories on the Assessment Rubric for MIS 3530 website design project. | **MIS 3530, Business Website Design Project Rubric, Fall 2017**  Data not collected in fall 2017.  **MIS 3530, Business Website Design Project Rubric, Spring 2018**  Rubric Criteria n Average Students  achieving  level 3 or  better  Layout/Design 19 3.05 x = 16  84.2%  Navigation/Links 19 2.68 x = 16  84.2%  Content 19 2.84 x = 16  84.2%  Graphics 19 2.74 x = 10  52.6%  Fonts 19 3.05 x = 16  84.2% | Data collected by Simon Lee.  The Management Information Systems/Operations Management discipline unit acts as an assessment committee of the whole. Results are shared during discipline unit meetings and the Summary Form is distributed to all faculty in the discipline unit. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5. Integrate the various functions of a business using an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system.  Objective 5 was formally adopted in Fall 2015 with data collection beginning in 2016-17. This reflects the incorporation of OSC 3430 – Enterprise Resource Planning Systems into the MIS core curriculum beginning with the 2015-16 catalog. | **OSC 3430 Final Exam.**  Spring 2017.  Assessed in OSC 3430 – Enterprise Resource Planning Systems.  Assessed on the Final Exam by means of questions targeted to 6 of the 7 Course Learning Objectives. See attached Course Learning Objectives and results. | At least 70% of the students will achieve an 8 or better (out of 10 possible) on the Final Exam questions directed toward the various course Learning Objectives. | **OSC 3430, Final Exam Questions on Course Learning Objectives, Spring 2017**  Course n Average Students  Learning achieving 8  Objective or better  Differentiate 17 9.1 x = 13  organizational 76.5%  structure and  processes. (Concept)  Differentiate 17 7.8 x = 9  organizational 52.9%  structure and  processes. (Application)  Identify 17 8.3 x = 11  structural 64.7%  problems.  Integrate 17 9.8 x = 16  business 94.1%  processes.  Model, analyze, 17 7.2 x = 6  and improve 35.3%  processes.  Impact of ERP 17 9.5 x = 15  systems. 88.2%  Coordinate 17 9.6 x = 16  processes. 94.1% | Data collected by Larry White.  The Management Information Systems/Operations Management discipline unit acts as an assessment committee of the whole. Results are shared during discipline unit meetings and the Summary Form is distributed to all faculty in the discipline unit. |
|  | **OSC 3430 Homework Assignments and Final Exam.**  Spring 2018.  Assessed in OSC 3430 – Enterprise Resource Planning Systems.  Assessed by series of homework assignments and exams, each of which test different criteria on the Assessment Rubric for OSC 3430. See the attached rubric from Paul Brown. | At least 70% of students will achieve a 3.0 or better (out of 4.0 scale) on all categories on the Assessment Rubric for OSC 3430—Homework Assignments and Exams. | **OSC 3430, Homework Assignments and Final Exam Rubric, Spring 2018**  Rubric Criteria n Average Students  achieving  level 3 or  betterFunctional 25 3.12 x = 20  structure 80.0% versus business  processes.  Inf. Systems 25 2.72 x = 16  that focus on 64.0%  functional  departments  and not processes.  Impact of 25 2.72 x = 16  enterprise 64.0%  system  implementation  on organization  structures  and business  processes.  Analyze and 25 2.44 x = 13  utilize information 52.0%  from an ERP system  to make business  decisions. | Data collected by Paul Brown. |
| 6. Demonstrate proficient communication skills. | This is a learning goal. Look below for the learning objectives. |  |  |  |
| 6.1. Create effective written communications. | **EWP Submissions.**  Summer 2017, Fall 2017, Spring 2018  Assessed by EWP submissions from MIS students.  Students submit written assignments as part of the EWP. The submissions are evaluated by the faculty. | At least 95% of the student submissions will score at the Satisfactory level (3 out of a possible 4) or above.  The average rating will be 3.0 or above. | **Summer 2017 EWP Results**  7/7 = 100.0% scored at 3 or above.  MIS Average Rating = 3.50; n = 7.  University Average Rating = 3.32; n = 223.  **Fall 2017 EWP Results**  18/20 = 90.0% scored at 3 or above.  MIS Average Rating = 3.20; n = 20.  University Average Rating = 3.40; n = 1681.  **Spring 2018 EWP Results**  27/28 = 96.4% scored at 3 or above.  MIS Average Rating = 3.38; n = 28.  University Average Rating = 3.40; n = 1686  **AY 2017- 2018 EWP Results**  52/55 = 94.55% scored at 3 or above.  MIS Average Rating = 3.33; n = 55  University Average Rating = 3.40; n = 3590 | Data collected by CASL.  The Management Information Systems/Operations Management discipline unit acts as an assessment committee of the whole. Results are shared during discipline unit meetings and the Summary Form is distributed to all faculty in the discipline unit. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Senior Survey Question 1.2.**  Fall 2017, Spring 2018.  Student satisfaction with ability to write effectively as measured by Senior Survey question 1.2 (I can communicate effectively in writing about business matters.) | Students will average at least 6 out of 7 on this question. | **Senior Survey Question 1.2 Results, Fall 2017**  Average = 6.00, Std Dev. = 0.00, n = 2  **Senior Survey Question 1.2 Results, Spring 2018**  Average = 6.71, Std Dev. = 0.49, n = 7 | Data collected by School of Business Senior Survey. |
| 6.2. Make effective business presentations. | **MIS 4200 Group Project Presentations.**  Fall 2017, Spring 2018.  Assessed in MIS 4200 – Systems and Database Analysis, Design, and Development.  Assessed by peer evaluations of team oral presentations for a comprehensive group project. See attached rubric. | At least 70% of the groups will achieve an 8 or better (out of 10 possible) on the each of the components of the MIS 4200 Group Project Presentation Peer Evaluations. | **MIS 4200, Group Database Project Presentations Rubric, Fall 2017**  Component n Average Groups  achieving  8 or better  Visuals 3 8.19 x = 2  66.7%  Content 3 8.79 x = 3  100.0%  Style 3 8.51 x = 2  66.7%  Q&A 3 9.16 x = 3  100.0%  Overall 3 8.79 x = 3  100.0% | Data collected by Tina Wang.  The Management Information Systems/Operations Management discipline unit acts as an assessment committee of the whole. Results are shared during discipline unit meetings and the Summary Form is distributed to all faculty in the discipline unit. |
|  |  |  | **MIS 4200, Group Database Project Presentations Rubric, Spring 2018**  Component n Average Groups  achieving  8 or better  Visuals 3 8.51 x = 3  100.0%  Content 3 8.88 x = 3  100.0%  Style 3 8.63 x = 3  100.0%  Q&A 3 8.82 x = 3  100.0%  Overall 3 8.82 x = 3  100.0% |  |
|  | **Senior Seminar.**  Summer 2017, Fall 2017, Spring 2018. Assessed in Senior Seminar using the university Speaking Rubric (Primary Trait Analysis for Speaking Matrix for Assessment of Oral Presentations). | At least 95% of the students will score at the Competent level (3 out of a possible 4) or above on all categories and the overall score of the university Speaking Rubric (Primary Trait Analysis for Speaking Matrix for Assessment of Oral Presentations).  The average rating on the Overall score will be 3.0 or above. | **Summer 2017 Senior Seminar Speaking Results**  Rubric Criteria n Average Students  achieving  level 3 or  better  Organization 5 3.8 x = 5  100.0%  Language 5 3.8 x = 5  100.0%  Material 5 3.6 x = 4  80.0%  Analysis 5 3.8 x = 5  100.0%  Non-verbal 5 3.4 x = 4  80.0%  Verbal 5 3.4 x = 5  100.0%  Overall 5 3.6 x = 5  100.0% | Assessed by the Senior Seminar instructor and reported by CASL. |
|  |  |  | **Fall 2017 Senior Seminar Speaking Results**  Rubric Criteria n Average Students  achieving  level 3 or  better  Organization 6 3.67 x = 5  83.3%  Language 6 3.67 x = 6  100.0%  Material 6 3.67 x = 6  100.0%  Analysis 6 3.33 x = 5  83.3%  Non-verbal 6 3.67 x = 6  100.0%  Verbal 6 3.67 x = 6  100.0%  Overall 6 3.67 x = 6  100.0% |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | **Spring 2018 Senior Seminar Speaking Results**  Rubric Criteria n Average Students  achieving  level 3 or  better  Organization 7 3.71 x = 7  100.0%  Language 7 3.57 x = 7  100.0%  Material 7 3.57 x = 7  100.0%  Analysis 7 3.71 x = 7  100.0%  Non-verbal 7 3.57 x = 7  100.0%  Verbal 7 3.42 x = 7  100.0%  Overall 7 3.57 x = 7  100.0% |  |
|  |  |  | **AY 2017- 2018 Senior Seminar Speaking Results**  Rubric Criteria n Average Students  achieving  level 3 or  better  Organization 18 3.72 x = 17  94.4%  Language 18 3.67 x = 18  100.0%  Material 18 3.61 x = 17  94.4.%  Analysis 18 3.61 x = 17  94.4%  Non-verbal 18 3.55 x = 17  94.4.%  Verbal 18 3.50 x = 18  100.0%  Overall 18 3.61 x = 18  100.0% |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The following are not formally part of the MIS Assessment Plan. They are included here to begin tracking the performance of MIS students on the University Learning Goals. |  |  |  |  |
| Critical Thinking | **Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal.**  Given to all Seniors in Senior Seminar.  Multiple choice standardized test with a possible score of 40. |  | **Watson-Glaser AY 2016-2017 Results:**  MIS Students: Average = 27.41/40,  Percentage = 68.5%, n = 17.  All EIU Seniors: Average = 25.40/40; Percentage = 63.5%, n = 1120. |  |

(Continue objectives as needed. Cells will expand to accommodate your text.)

**PART TWO**

Describe your program’s assessment accomplishments since your last report was submitted. Discuss ways in which you have responded to the CASA Director’s comments on last year’s report or simply describe what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed.

Based on curriculum changes that took effect in fall 2012 and fall 2015, Learning Objectives 4 and 5 were updated in fall 2015 to reflect the latest curriculum. Final collection of data for the former Learning Objectives 4 and 5 was completed in 2014-15, and initial collection of data for the new Learning Objectives 4 and 5 occurred in 2016-17. No data for Learning Objectives 4 and 5 was collected during 2015-16 as this was a transition year.

In the spring 2018 a new rubric to assess the new Learning Objective number 4 was created and approved by the MIS/OM faculty. Assessment data was collected using the newly approved rubric in the MIS 3530 Business Web Site Design class during in spring 2018. The MIS/OM area will meet in the fall 2018 and look at this initial data for learning objective 4.

The MIS Assessment Plan called for the new Learning Objective 5 to be assessed in OSC 3430 Enterprise Resource Planning Systems by a comprehensive series of business process and ERP system computer exercises. However, budgetary constraints did not allow for implementation of the planned ERP software and the envisioned computer exercises were not conducted. In the spring 2017 the instructor wrote the final exam such that six of the seven course learning objectives were addressed by specific exam questions, each of which required a short written response. Results are included herein. In the spring 2018, the instructor of the OSC 3430 class developed a preliminary rubric to assess the new Learning Objective 5. These results are also included in this report. This preliminary rubric will be updated based on faculty input so that we have an approved rubric in place before the class is taught again in spring 2019.

With the transition in MIS curricula and MIS Learning Objectives, we have not formally expanded our coverage of the EIU undergraduate learning goals of critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, and responsible citizenship yet. We are in the process of doing so and expect make substantial progress during the next assessment cycle.

We have made substantial progress recruiting new MIS students by meeting with local community colleges and high schools. During the past year, faculty in the MIS/OM area met with students, faculty and administrators at Lake Land College and Parkland College, and high school students in the Douglas County CEO’s group. Another benefit of these meetings has been discussing emerging trends in the MIS area. In particular, the MIS/OM faculty confirmed our commitment to continue to offer and update our elective classes in the systems security (including

MIS 4850: Systems Security, and MIS 4860: Ethical Hacking and Network Defense) and data analytics (including OSC 4820: Business Analytics and Data Mining) areas at these meetings.

We have made substantial progress toward splitting our existing combined systems and database course, MIS 4200: Systems and Database Analysis, Design, and Development into separate System Analysis and Design, and Database classes. We expect to have two new classes, MIS 4760: Systems Analysis, Design, and Development, and MIS 4770: Database and Data Management in place for the 2019-2020 academic year. This was partially in response to recent assessment data collected in the MIS 4200 class that suggested that students were having difficulty in mastering some of the systems and database concepts in the combined course. Having separate systems and database classes is common in most MIS majors and we are moving to return to doing this again in our program ,so that our students can more fully master the important content in these two areas.

Other components of this year’s assessment program continued elements that have proven effective from prior years.

**PART THREE**

Summarize changes and improvements in **curriculum, instruction, and learning** that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program. How have you used the data? What have you learned? In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the future?

During the 2014-15 academic year we revised the MIS major based on analysis of industry trends, offerings at other universities, and assessment data. Changes that were made in our revised MIS curriculum as a result of our assessment data and our environmental scan include the addition of significant coverage of enterprise resource planning systems and increased emphasis on web applications. We also revised our introductory MIS 2000 course to increase the emphasis on business logic and programming skills, and added electives in operations and supply chain management including OSC 3800 (Spreadsheet Modeling & Analysis), OSC 4810 (Supply Chain and Logistics Management) and OSC 4820 (Business Analytics and Data Mining).

The Provost directed the three areas with computer degrees, Management Information Systems, Math and Computer Science, and Technology to meet during the spring 2018 to discuss sharing classes. These meetings led to an agreement to share classes as follows. The Math and Computer Science Department would likely be sharing the following two programming classes: CSM 2670 (Computer Science II) and CSM 3870 (Data Structures). CIT would likely be sharing the following two classes: Mobile Programming and CIT 3153 (Data Communications II). In addition, MIS would likely be sharing MIS 4200 (Systems and Database Analysis, Design, and Development) broken into two classes, and MIS 3200 (Networking Fundamentals). This initiative from the Provost, which led to an agreement to share the MIS 4200 class after breaking it into separate Systems Analysis, and Database classes, was as mentioned above, supported by several years of assessment data that suggested that topics like systems development and database queries needed additional coverage that would be possible in separate classes.

Our revised the MIS curriculum became effective with the 2015-16 Catalog. We will continue to use our assessment program to monitor classes in the new curriculum and will incorporate assessments into future course and curriculum revisions.

Due to the continually changing nature of the MIS area, our course content and curriculum are continually progressing. Our assessment data continues to remain strong and is a valuable input to our decision making.

**The following pages include the assessment rubrics used in the computations of the data for 2017-18.**

Assessment Rubric for MIS 3200 Lab Projects – Spring 2018

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Level of Comprehensiveness | | | | |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| **Installing and configuring a network operating system (NOS).** | Demonstrates no or little skills for installing and configuring a NOS. | Demonstrates limited skills for installing and configuring a NOS.  **1** | Demonstrates basic skills for installing and configuring a NOS.  **2** | Demonstrates good skills for installing and configuring a NOS.  **2** | Demonstrates extensive skills for installing and configuring a NOS.  **15** |
| **Disk management including partitioning, de-fragmenting, quotas.** | Demonstrates no or little skills for managing disks. | Demonstrates limited skills for managing disks.  **1** | Demonstrates basic skills for managing disks.  **1** | Demonstrates good skills for managing disks.  **2** | Demonstrates extensive skills for managing disks.  **16** |
| **Managing user and group accounts. Assigning access rights.** | Demonstrates no or little skills for managing user and group accounts, and assigning rights. | Demonstrates limited skills for managing user and group accounts, and assigning rights.  **1** | Demonstrates basic skills for managing user and group accounts, and assigning rights.  **1** | Demonstrates good skills for managing user and group accounts, and assigning rights.  **1** | Demonstrates extensive skills for managing user and group accounts, and assigning rights.  **17** |
| **Implementing directory services and managing domain users.** | Demonstrates no or little skills for implementing directory services and managing domain users. | Demonstrates limited skills for implementing directory services and managing domain users. | Demonstrates basic skills for implementing directory services and managing domain users.  **2** | Demonstrates good skills for implementing directory services and managing domain users.  **2** | Demonstrates extensive skills for implementing directory services and managing domain users.  **16** |
| **Implementing group policies.** | Demonstrates no or little skills for implementing group policies. | Demonstrates limited skills for implementing group policies. | Demonstrates basic skills for implementing group policies.  **1** | Demonstrates good skills for implementing group policies.  **2** | Demonstrates extensive skills for implementing group policies.  **17** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Configuring Web services.** | Demonstrates no or little skills for configuring Web services. | Demonstrates limited skills for configuring Web services. | Demonstrates basic skills for configuring Web services.  **1** | Demonstrates good skills for configuring Web services.  **2** | Demonstrates extensive skills for configuring Web services.  **17** |

Assessment Rubric for MIS 3200 Final Exam – Spring 2018

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Level of Comprehensiveness | | | | |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| **Understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models including encapsulation.** | No understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP model. | Limited understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models.  **2** | Basic understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models.  **2** | Good understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models.  **2** | Complete understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models.  **14** |
| **Knowledge of internetworking devices (switch, bridge, routers)** | No knowledge of internetworking device. | Limited knowledge of internetworking devices.  **1** | Basic knowledge of internetworking devices.  **3** | Good knowledge of internetworking devices.  **2** | Complete knowledge of internetworking devices.  **14** |
| **Understanding of data and signal transmission.** | No understanding of data and signal transmission. | Limited understanding of data and signal transmission. | Basic understanding of data and signal transmission.  **2** | Good understanding of data and signal transmission.  **2** | Complete understanding of data and signal transmission.  **16** |
| **Knowledge of physical and wireless media.** | No knowledge of physical and wireless media. | Limited knowledge of physical and wireless media. | Basic knowledge of physical and wireless media.  **2** | Good knowledge of physical and wireless media.  **3** | Complete knowledge of physical and wireless media.  **15** |
| **Understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing.** | No understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing. | Limited understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing. | Basic understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing.  **2** | Good understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing.  **3** | Complete understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing.  **15** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SCHOOL OF BUSINESS** | | **Fall 2017** | | **Spring 2018** | |
| **SENIOR SURVEYS RESULTS** | | **n=2** | | **n=7** | |
| **Information Systems Majors** | | **Mean** | **Std Dev** | **Mean** | **Std Dev** |
| Answer the following questions on a scale of 1-7 where 1=Strongly Disagree and 7=Strongly Agree. | |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **1.1** | **I can make effective business presentations.** | **5.00** | **1.41** | **6.57** | **0.53** |
| **1.2** | **I can communicate effectively in writing about business matters.** | **6.00** | **0.00** | **6.71** | **0.49** |
| **1.3** | **I can communicate effectively orally about business matters.** | **4.50** | **2.12** | **6.71** | **0.49** |
| **1.4** | **I understand the interactions between the global environment and individual businesses.** | **5.50** | **0.71** | **6.00** | **1.00** |
| 1.5 | I understand the processes for developing organizational policies, strategies, and objectives. | 5.00 | 0.00 | 6.29 | 0.49 |
| **1.6** | **I understand the effects of laws and regulations on business decision-making.** | **3.50** | **0.71** | **6.33** | **0.95** |
| **1.7** | **I can recognize and analyze ethical issues as part of business decision-making.** | **6.50** | **1.00** | **6.86** | **0.38** |
| **1.8** | **I understand the implications of diversity in the business environment.** | **6.00** | **0.00** | **6.43** | **0.79** |
| 1.9 | I can analyze financial statements of business organizations. | 4.50 | 0.71 | 5.86 | 1.07 |
| 1.10 | I understand the finance functions within business organizations. | 4.50 | 0.71 | 5.57 | 1.13 |
| 1.11 | I understand the role of the customer in meeting organizational objectives. | 5.50 | 0.71 | 6.57 | 0.53 |
| 1.12 | I understand pricing, distribution, and promotion of goods and services. | 5.00 | 0.00 | 6.29 | 0.76 |
| 1.13 | I understand the functions of managers in planning, organizing, leading, and controlling organizations. | 5.50 | 0.71 | 6.57 | 0.79 |
| 1.14 | I understand the role of human interactions in successful organizations. | 6.50 | 0.71 | 6.86 | 0.38 |
| 1.15 | I understand how operations, finance, and marketing function together to achieve organizational objectives. | 5.00 | 1.41 | 6.29 | 0.49 |
| 1.16 | I understand the uses of information systems in business decision-making. | 6.50 | 0.71 | 7.00 | 0.00 |
| 1.17 | I understand the role of technology in organizations. | 6.50 | 0.71 | 7.00 | 0.00 |
| 1.18 | I am able to work effectively as a member of a team. | 5.50 | 0.71 | 6.71 | 0.49 |
| **1.19** | **I can analyze and solve business problems.** | **5.00** | **0.00** | **6.71** | **0.49** |
| 1.20 | I can use the computer effectively for business applications. | 6.50 | 0.71 | 7.00 | 0.00 |
| **1.21** | **I am prepared to interpret statistical data for use in business decision-making.** | **6.00** | **0.00** | **6.43** | **0.79** |
| **1.22** | **I am prepared to interpret financial data for use in business decision-making.** | **5.00** | **1.41** | **6.14** | **1.21** |
| **1.23** | **I can effectively research businesses issues.** | **6.00** | **0.00** | **6.57** | **0.53** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SCHOOL OF BUSINESS** | | **Fall 2017** | | **Spring 2018** | |
| **SENIOR SURVEYS RESULTS (continued)** | | **n=2** | | **n=7** | |
| **Information Systems Majors** | | **Mean** | **Std Dev** | **Mean** | **Std Dev** |
| Answer the following questions on a scale of 1-7 where 1=Strongly Disagree and 7=Strongly Agree. Answer the following questions 1-23 based on your *information systems program*. | |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **2.1** | **I am prepared to use the systems development life cycle to evaluate and implement solutions to business information needs.** | **5.50** | **0.71** | **6.57** | **0.53** |
| **2.2** | **I am prepared to use appropriate hardware and software as productivity tools for gathering, processing, storing, and retrieving information.** | **6.00** | **0.00** | **6.43** | **0.53** |
| **2.3** | **I am prepared to design, model and develop data base applications using appropriate program logic and constructs.** | **6.00** | **1.41** | **6.43** | **0.53** |
| **2.4** | **I am able to logically develop a solution to a business problem.** | **5.00** | **0.00** | **7.00** | **0.00** |
| **2.5** | **I am able to apply networking principles, and design and manage a computer network for a small business.** | **6.00** | **0.00** | **6.14** | **1.46** |
|  | Using a scale of 7 to 1 where 7 = Very Satisfied and 1 = Very Dissatisfied, indicate your satisfaction with the following aspects of your program in information systems. |  |  |  |  |
| 3.1 | Availability of faculty outside of class. | 5.00 | 1.41 | 6.00 | 1.15 |
| 3.2 | Attitude of faculty toward students. | 5.50 | 0.71 | 5.86 | 1.07 |
| 3.3 | Class size in your major courses. | 6.50 | 0.71 | 6.71 | 0.76 |
| 3.4 | Concern shown to you as an individual. | 6.00 | 1.41 | 6.43 | 0.79 |
| 3.5 | Technology to support your class work. | 6.50 | 0.71 | 5.71 | 1.80 |
| 3.6 | Preparation to meet your professional goals. | 5.00 | 0.00 | 6.29 | 0.76 |
| 3.7 | Preparation to compete in job market. | 5.00 | 0.00 | 6.14 | 1.21 |

2. Demonstrate critical thinking through competent problem-solving and logic skills.

MIS 2000 Homework. Assessed by series of 4 homework assignments, each of which test different criteria on the Assessment Rubric for MIS 2000.

At least 70% of students will achieve a 3.0 or better (out of 4.0 scale) on all categories on the Assessment Rubric for MIS 2000—Homework Assignments 1-4.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Introduction to Business Logic and Programming Skills MIS2000 - Homework Assignments** | | | | **Fall 2017 (Brown)** |  |
|  | Level of Comprehensiveness | | | | |
| CRITERIA | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Logical Reasoning and Concepts | Explanation of problem shows no understanding of the underlying concepts needed to solve the problem(s) OR is not written. No evidence of logical reasoning. | Explanation of problem shows very limited understanding of the underlying concepts needed to solve the problem(s) OR is not written. Little evidence of logical reasoning. | Explanation of problem shows some understanding of the logical concepts needed to solve the problem(s). Some evidence of logical reasoning.  **4** | Explanation of problem shows substantial understanding of the logical concepts used to solve the problem(s). Uses effective logic reasoning.  **4** | Explanation of problem shows complete understanding of the logical concepts used to solve the problem(s). Uses complex and refined logical reasoning. **18** |
| Problem-Solving Strategies/ Procedures | Uses no effective strategy to solve problems. Does not try to solve problems or help others solve problems. | Rarely uses an effective strategy to solve problems. Does not try to solve problems or help others solve problems. | Sometimes uses an effective strategy to solve problems, but does not do it consistently.  **4** | Typically, uses an effective strategy to solve the problem(s).  **5** | Typically, uses an efficient and effective strategy to solve the problem(s).  **17** |
| Algorithm & Logic Development | The steps in pseudocode are wrong or no pseudocode was written. No logic was used in program. All steps are out of order. Either no steps developed, or the several steps bear no resemblance to the activity. All steps are unclear or contain multiple actions. | The steps in pseudocode are wrong or no pseudocode was written. Little or no logic was used in program. Most of the steps are out of order. Either no steps developed, or the several steps bear no resemblance to the activity. Most steps are unclear or contain multiple actions.  **1** | The steps in pseudocode are written partially. Pseudocode not followed and code was inefficient. Two or three steps are out of order or omitted. There is one step that does not appear to be related to the activity. Although each step is outlined, the action may not be clear on one or two; OR one or two obvious actions may be combined in one step.  **2** | The steps in pseudocode are written almost correctly. Pseudo code aided the development of logic significantly. However the code was efficient. One step may have been omitted or placed in the wrong order. Steps are written, but may have an ambiguous action; or they are not clear or could not be followed by a reasonable person.  **8** | The steps in pseudocode are written correctly. The use of pseudo code aided the development of logic in program substantially. The code was efficient. Order of steps allows completion of activity correctly. Each step is clearly written, related to the activity, can be followed by a reasonable person, and includes only one action leading to completion of the activity.  **15** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Introduction to Business Logic and Programming Skills MIS2000 - Homework Assignments** | | | | **Fall 2017 (Brown)** | (continued) |
|  | Level of Comprehensiveness | | | | |
| CRITERIA | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Program Documentation: Program Purpose, Explanations, Clarity of Coding, and Annotation | No documentation. | Descriptions for functions are missing or none are well written. Explanation is difficult to understand and is missing several components OR was not included. Student did not explain what any of the code did. Program contains no annotation. Documentation lacking in the program or difficult to follow. **1** | Descriptions for all functions are present, but many (more than 2) are not well written. Explanation is a little difficult to understand, but includes critical components. Student explained what parts of the code did. Program has occasional comments. Fair documentation in the program somewhat easy to follow.  **3** | Descriptions (purpose) for all functions are present and only 1 to 2 are not well written. Explanation is clear. Student explained what most of the code did. Program is annotated with a Heading and an occasional comment. Good documentation in the program and easy to follow.  **7** | Descriptions (purpose) for all functions are well written. Explanation is detailed and clear. Student explained what exactly the code did. Program is well annotated with both a heading section and comments that correctly describe each section. Excellent documentation in the program and very easy to follow.  **15** |
| Program Requirements and Specifications: Identifies important details and information | Student identifies no main requirements of the problem. No requirements for the program were met. | Student identifies limited to no main requirements of the problem inaccurately or many details are missing. Unimportant information is highlighted. More than two requirements for the program were not met. | Student identifies some main requirements of the problem accurately, but has some inaccuracies. Does not highlight unimportant information. Two requirements for the program were not met. **3** | Student identifies most main requirements of the problem accurately, but may have some inaccuracies. One requirement for the program was not met.  **12** | Student identifies all main requirements of the problem accurately. All requirements for the program are met.  **11** |
| Identify user decisions; determine implications on logic; use design techniques to implement user decisions | Student cannot identify user decisions and cannot determine the implications on logic. Cannot use proper design techniques to implement requirements. | Student can identify very few user decisions and cannot determine the implications on logic. Cannot use proper design techniques to implement requirements. | Student can identify most user decisions and determine the implication on logic. Typically uses proper design techniques to implement requirements but may have several that don't meet requirements. **5** | Student can identify all user decisions and determine the implication on logic. Uses proper design techniques to implement requirements but may have one that doesn't meet requirement.  **10** | Student can identify all user decisions and determine the implication on logic. Uses proper design techniques to implement requirements. All requirements for the program are met.  **11** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Introduction to Business Logic and Programming Skills MIS2000 - Homework Assignments** | | | | **Fall 2017 (Brown)** | (continued) |
|  | Level of Comprehensiveness | | | | |
| CRITERIA | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Record at a time processing | Student cannot design and code instructions. No requirements for the program were met. | Student cannot design and code instructions accurately; many inaccuracies. More than two requirements for the program were not met. | Student can design and code some instructions accurately but may have some inaccuracies. Two requirements for the program were not met. **10** | Student can design and code most instructions accurately but may have some inaccuracies. One requirement for the program was not met.  **4** | Student can design and code for single record or input from the screen. All requirements for the program are met.  **12** |
| Looping constructs | Student cannot design and code any loop constructs. No requirements for the program were met. | Student cannot design and code some loop constructs accurately; many inaccuracies. More than two requirements for the program were not met. | Student can design and code some loop constructs accurately but may have some inaccuracies. Two requirements for the program were not met.  **6** | Student can design and code most loop constructs accurately but may have some inaccuracies. One requirement for the program was not met.  **10** | Student can design and code loop constructs accurately. All requirements for the program are met.  **10** |
| Modularization techniques | Student cannot design or perform modularization techniques. None meet requirements. | Student can design and perform modularization techniques accurately, but has many to all that don't meet requirement. | Student can design and perform modularization techniques accurately, but may have several that don't meet requirement. **4** | Student can design and perform modularization techniques accurately, but may have one that doesn't meet requirement. **11** | Student can design and perform modularization techniques accurately. All requirements for the program are met.  **11** |

**MIS 4200 Systems & Database Project Assessment Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Rubric (out of 100)** | **Fall 2017  (n =14)** | **n = or  above 80%** | **% = or  above 80%** | **Spring 2018  (n = 13)** | **n = or  above 80%** | **% = or  above 80%** |  |
| Understand and apply activities in the systems development life cycle to produce appropriate deliverables | Avg: 72.14;  Std: 38.02;  Median: 90 | 11 | 78.57% | Avg:81.15;  Std:28.5;  Median: 90 | 11 | 84.62% |  |
| Creates appropriate systems process diagrams and documentation to support systems design and development | Avg:80.38;  Std:27.56;  Median: 90 | 11 | 78.57% | Avg: 94.23;  Std: 8.51;  Median: 95 | 12 | 92.31% |  |
| Creates complete logical data models and documentation to support systems design and development | Avg:66.5;  Std: 30.37;  Median: 70 | 4 | 28.57% | Avg: 89.23;  Std:26.01;  Median: 95 | 12 | 92.31% |  |
| Application of Relational Principles and Structured Query Language | Avg:72.5;  Std: 33.94;  Median: 84.5 | 11 | 78.57% | Avg:81.92;  Std: 35.11;  Median: 95 | 11 | 84.62% |  |
| Application of Principles of Human Interface Design | Avg:56.86;  Std: 37.43;  Median:75 | 7 | 50.00% | Avg:66.54;  Std: 36.92;  Median: 80 | 10 | 76.92% |  |
| Use of Programming Logic Constructs | Avg:56.86;  Std: 37.43;  Median:75 | 11 | 78.57% | Avg:81.92;  Std: 35.11;  Median: 95 | 11 | 84.62% |  |
| Integration of Multiple Programs from within main application; use of global program registries | Avg:56.86;  Std: 37.43;  Median:75 | 7 | 50.00% | Avg:66.54;  Std: 36.92;  Median: 80 | 10 | 76.92% |  |
| Creates complete systems and user documentation | Avg:80;  Std: 16.33;  Median: 80 | 10 | 71.43% | Avg: 82.67;  Std: 3.77;  Median: 80 | 12 | 92.31% |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Website Design Project Rubric for MIS 3530 (Spring 2018)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Level of Comprehensiveness** | | | | |
| **Topic** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| **Layout/Design**  Avg = 3.05 N = 19 | The web pages are cluttered looking or confusing. It is often difficult to locate important elements. | The web pages have a usable layout, but may appear busy or boring. It is easy to locate most of the important elements.  3 | The web pages have an attractive and usable layout. It is easy to locate all important elements.  12 | The site has an exceptionally attractive and usable layout. It is easy to locate all important elements. White space, graphic elements and/or alignment are used effectively to organize material.  4 |
| **Navigation/Links**  Avg = 2.68 N = 19 | Some links do not take the reader to the sites described.  A user typically feels lost.  3 | Links for navigation take the reader where s/he expects to go, but some needed links seem to be missing. A user sometimes gets lost. | Links for navigation are clearly labeled, allow the reader to easily move from a page to related pages (forward and back), and internal links take the reader where s/he expects to go.  16  4 | Links for navigation are clearly labeled, consistently placed, allow the reader to easily move from a page to related pages (forward and back), and take the reader where s/he expects to go. |
| **Content**  Avg = 2.84 N = 19 | The site lacks a purpose and theme.  There are several inaccuracies in the content  provided by the students  OR many of the requirements were not met. | The purpose and theme of the site is somewhat vague.  Almost all of the information provided on the Web site is accurate and almost all of the requirements have been met.  3 | The site has a clearly stated purpose and theme, but may have a few elements that do not seem to be related to it.  Almost all the information provided on the Web site is accurate and all requirements of the assignment have  16  been met. | The site has a well-stated clear purpose and theme that is carried out throughout the site.  All information provided on the Web site is accurate and all the requirements of the assignment have been met. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Graphics**  Avg = 2.74 N = 19 | Graphics seem randomly chosen, are of low quality, OR distract the reader. | Graphics are related to the theme/purpose of the site, and are of good quality.  9 | Graphics are related to the theme/purpose of the site, are of good quality and enhance reader interest or understanding.  6 | Graphics are related to the theme/purpose of the site, are thoughtfully cropped, are of high quality and enhance reader interest or understanding.  4 |
| **Fonts**  Avg = 3.05 N = 19 | A wide variety of fonts, styles and point sizes was used. | The fonts are consistent and point size varies appropriately for headings and text.  3 | The fonts are consistent, easy to read and point size varies appropriately for headings and text.  12 | The fonts are consistent, easy to read and point size varies appropriately for headings and text. Use of font styles is used consistently and improves readability.  4 |

Assessment of Student Learning in OSC 3430 (Enterprise Resource Planning Systems) – Spring 2017 (White)

Student achievement of the Learning Objectives for the course was assessed on a scale of 0-10 (with 10 being the best) based on responses to Final Examination questions for each of the following Course Learning Objectives:

*Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to:*

1. Explain the differences between an organization’s functional structure and its business processes.
2. Identify problems in organizational structures and information systems that focus on functional departments rather than on business processes that extend across functional boundaries. (CT-1)
3. Integrate an organization’s various business processes into a comprehensive enterprise-wide information system. (CT-1-3)
4. Model, analyze and improve business processes in conjunction with enterprise system implementation. (CT-1-6)
5. Explain the impact of enterprise system implementation on organization structures and business processes. (CT-1,3,5, WR-1-4)
6. Effectively coordinate the various business processes of an organization using an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system. (CT-1-5, QR-1-3,6)
7. Analyze information from an ERP system and utilize it effectively to make business decisions. (CT-1-5, QR-1-3,6) [Not assessed on Final Exam.]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Averages of Question Scores** | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  |  | **LO1 (Concept)** | **LO1 (Applied)** | **LO2** |  | **LO3** | **LO4** | **LO5** | **LO6** |
| **Count, n =** | **Q1** | **Q2** | **Q3** | **Q4** | **Q5** | **Q6** | **Q7** | **Q8** | **Q9** | **Q10** |
| **17** | 9.2 | 9.8 | 9.1 | 7.8 | 8.3 | 9.9 | 9.8 | 7.2 | 9.5 | 9.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Counts of Question Scores At or Above Value** | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  |  | **LO1 (Concept)** | **LO1 (Applied)** | **LO2** |  | **LO3** | **LO4** | **LO5** | **LO6** |
| **Value** | **Q1** | **Q2** | **Q3** | **Q4** | **Q5** | **Q6** | **Q7** | **Q8** | **Q9** | **Q10** |
| 4 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| 5 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 16 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| 6 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 13 | 13 | 17 | 17 | 15 | 17 | 17 |
| **7** | **15** | **16** | **13** | **9** | **11** | **17** | **16** | **6** | **15** | **16** |
| **8** | **15** | **16** | **13** | **9** | **11** | **17** | **16** | **6** | **15** | **16** |
| **9** | **12** | **16** | **13** | **9** | **11** | **16** | **16** | **5** | **15** | **15** |
| 10 | 12 | 16 | 13 | 9 | 11 | 16 | 16 | 5 | 15 | 15 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Percentage of Question Scores At or Above Value** | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  |  | **LO1 (Concept)** | **LO1 (Applied)** | **LO2** |  | **LO3** | **LO4** | **LO5** | **LO6** |
| **Value** | **Q1** | **Q2** | **Q3** | **Q4** | **Q5** | **Q6** | **Q7** | **Q8** | **Q9** | **Q10** |
| 4 | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| 5 | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 94.1% | 94.1% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| 6 | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 76.5% | 76.5% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 88.2% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| **7** | **88.2%** | **94.1%** | **76.5%** | **52.9%** | **64.7%** | **100.0%** | **94.1%** | **35.3%** | **88.2%** | **94.1%** |
| **8** | **88.2%** | **94.1%** | **76.5%** | **52.9%** | **64.7%** | **100.0%** | **94.1%** | **35.3%** | **88.2%** | **94.1%** |
| **9** | **70.6%** | **94.1%** | **76.5%** | **52.9%** | **64.7%** | **94.1%** | **94.1%** | **29.4%** | **88.2%** | **88.2%** |
| 10 | 70.6% | 94.1% | 76.5% | 52.9% | 64.7% | 94.1% | 94.1% | 29.4% | 88.2% | 88.2% |

5. Integrate the various functions of a business using an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system.

OSC3430 Homework and Exams. Assessed by series of homework assignments and exams, each of which test different criteria on the Assessment Rubric for OSC 3430.

At least 70% of students will achieve a 3.0 or better (out of 4.0 scale) on all categories on the Assessment Rubric for OSC 3430—Homework Assignments and Exams.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ERP Systems OSC3430 - Homework Assignments and Exams** | | | | **Spring 2018 (Brown)** | **N=25** |
|  | Level of Comprehensiveness | | | | |
| CRITERIA | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Explain the differences between and organization’s functional structure and its business processes | Explanation of differences shows no understanding of the underlying concepts.  **0** | Explanation of differences shows very limited understanding of the underlying concepts.  **2** | Explanation of differences shows some understanding of the underlying concepts.  **3** | Explanation of difference shows substantial understanding of the underlying concepts.  **10** | Explanation of differences shows complete understanding of the underlying concepts.  **10** |
| Identify Problems in organization structures and information systems that focus on functional departments rather than on business processes that extend across functional boundaries. | Uses no effective strategy to Identify problems in organizational structures and information systems.  **1** | Rarely uses an effective strategy to Identify problems in organizational structures and information systems.  **3** | Sometimes but not consistently uses an effective strategy to Identify problems in organizational structures and information systems.  **5** | Typically, uses an effective strategy to Identify problems in organizational structures and information systems.  **9** | Typically, uses an efficient and effective strategy to Identify problems in organizational structures and information systems.  **7** |
| Explain the impact of enterprise system implementation on organization structures and business processes. | Explanation of impact shows no understanding of the underlying concepts.  **1** | Explanation of impact shows very limited understanding of the underlying concepts.  4 | Explanation of impact shows some understanding of the underlying concepts.  4 | Explanation of difference shows substantial understanding of the underlying concepts.  **8** | Explanation of impact shows complete understanding of the underlying concepts.  **8** |
| Analyze information from and ERP system and utilize it effectively to make business decisions. | Student is unable to analyze and utilize information effectively to make business decisions.  **2** | Student has very limited ability to analyze and utilize information effectively to make business decisions.  **4** | Student has limited ability to analyze and utilize information effectively to make business decisions.  **6** | Student can analyze and utilize information effectively to make business decisions.  **7** | Student can analyze and utilize information effectively and efficiently to make business decisions.  **6** |

**Assessment of Presentations in MIS 4200 (Systems and Database Analysis, Design, and Development)**

**Fall 2017, and Spring 2018 (Wang)**

Groups of 3-4 students complete a semester-long database project resulting in a working prototype. Each group gives presentations during the semester. Presentations include technical diagrams and information about the database system the group is developing Presentations are about 25 minutes in length and are evaluated by peers.

Peer evaluations of group presentations are on a scale of 0-10 (with 10 being the best) for each of the following criteria:

* Visuals: Evaluate the quality of the visuals (PowerPoint or other) that the team used.
* Content: Evaluate the content they chose to present. Did they present what you wanted/expected?
* Style: Evaluate the overall style of the presentation. Was it engaging? Did the speakers speak clearly?
* Q&A: Evaluate how the team handled questions. Did they answer clearly? Were they defensive?
* Overall: Provide an overall evaluation of the team's presentation.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presentation Evaluation (out of 10)** | | | | | |  |
| Fall 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Visuals: Evaluate the quality of the visuals (powerpoint or other) that the team used. | Content: Evaluate the content they chose to present. Did they present what you wanted/expected? | Style: Evaluate the overall style of the presentation, “ was it engaging? Did the speakers speak clearly? | Q&A: Evaluate how the team handled questions. “ did they answer clearly? Were they defensive? | Overall: Provide an overall evaluation of the team's presentation |  |
| Team 1 | 8.285714286 | 8.571428571 | 8.714285714 | 9.142857143 | 8.571428571 |  |
| Team 2 | 7.285714286 | 8.285714286 | 7.428571429 | 8.714285714 | 8.428571429 |  |
| Team 3 | 9 | 9.5 | 9.375 | 9.625 | 9.375 |  |
| Avg | 8.19 | 8.79 | 8.51 | 9.16 | 8.79 |  |
| N | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |
| number >= 8 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |  |
| % >= 8 | 66.67% | 100.00% | 66.67% | 100.00% | 100.00% |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SP18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Visuals: Evaluate the quality of the visuals (powerpoint or other) that the team used. | Content: Evaluate the content they chose to present. Did they present what you wanted/expected? | Style: Evaluate the overall style of the presentation â€“ was it engaging? Did the speakers speak clearly? | Q&A: Evaluate how the team handled questions â€“ did they answer clearly? Were they defensive? | Overall: Provide an overall evaluation of the teamâ€™s presentation |  |
| Team 1 | 8.058823529 | 8.411764706 | 8.470588235 | 8.588235294 | 8.529411765 |  |
| Team 2 | 9.352941176 | 9.235294118 | 9.176470588 | 9.117647059 | 9.294117647 |  |
| Team 3 | 8.125 | 9 | 8.25 | 8.75 | 8.625 |  |
| Avg | 8.51 | 8.88 | 8.63 | 8.82 | 8.82 |  |
| N | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |
| number >= 8 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |
| % >= 8 | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |