

University of South Florida St. Petersburg

Digital USFSP

Academic Learning Compacts

Academic Learning Compacts & Supplemental
Documents

2017

Academic Learning Compact : Information Systems Management [Effective 2017]

University of South Florida St. Petersburg.

Follow this and additional works at: https://digital.stpetersburg.usf.edu/institutional_research_acl



ACADEMIC LEARNING COMPACTS (ALCs)

ISM - AY2017-18

Academic Learning Compacts, Updates: 2017-2018

“... to ensure student achievement in undergraduate and graduate degree programs ...”

Academic Program:

Person Responsible:

<p>Mission of Academic Program (include URL): The IS major focuses on the intersection of business and technology, developing graduates who are well-versed in the language of business, have strong communication skills, and know how to select, develop, implement, and manage new and emerging information technologies. Additionally, the IS major provides students seeking more general business careers with a set of highly marketable skills they can apply in any facet of business. A variety of electives enable students to choose an area of specialization, learn about global information systems, or further develop their technical skills. http://www.usfsp.edu/cob/undergraduate_studies/information_systems.htm</p>				
<p>List Program Goal(s) / Objective(s):</p>				
<p><u>IS Major</u></p> <p>1. “developing graduates who are well-versed in the language of business, have strong communication skills...”</p> <p>2. “...know how to select, develop, implement, and manage new and emerging information technologies...”</p> <p>3. “...variety of electives enable students to choose an area of specialization, learn about global information systems.”</p>		<p><u>College of Business</u></p> <p>1. “to educate current and future professionals in the effective management and ethical leadership of organizations”</p> <p>2. “We engage in theoretical and practical research as well as provide service ...”</p> <p>3. “We meet the demands of our diverse student population by preparing them for an increasingly global environment ...”</p>		
<p>1. Content/Discipline Skills</p>				
Goals/Objectives	Means of Assessment/ Corroborating Evidence*	Criteria for Success	Findings	Plan for Use of Findings in 2018-19
1. Plan and develop a computer program using an object-	(1)Students wrote assignments each week in C#, an object	(a) 80% will score 70/100 or above (b) 80% will score	Measured in Spring 2018 in ISM3232 (a)The average	1. Last year I introduced the guided quiz to the course,

<p>oriented programming language.</p> <p>(a) Identify, differentiate and implement conditional expressions</p> <p>(b) Evaluate functionality of programs by execution and debugging</p>	<p>oriented programming language.</p> <p>(a) In weeks 5 and 6, students were introduced to conditional statements and they continued to use them for the remainder of the semester.</p> <p>(b) In week 3 students were instructed on the debugging process and learned how it functioned within a program. I am basing my assessment on assignment 12 which is a culmination of a semester of executing and debugging code.</p>	<p>70/100 or above</p>	<p>score for this assignment was 79, only 4 did not complete the assignments.</p> <p>(b) The average for this assignment was 68 but 8 students stopped attending, removing these students the average was 95.</p>	<p>which combined learning modules within the quiz. I feel this has been quite successful. Moving the due dates so the quiz comes two days before the assignment has also meant they are busy all week and don't rush as much.</p> <p>2. I will do some further evaluations of the projects in the class and put more emphasis on the weekly work to form the basis of a larger project as opposed to having a separation. This may help more with the evaluation of functionality.</p>
<p>2. Demonstrate understanding in database design and administration</p> <p>(a) Formulate Entity Relationship</p>	<p>a) Exam1</p> <p>b) Exam2</p>	<p>a) 70% will score 70/100 or above</p> <p>b) 70% will score 70/100 or above</p>	<p>Measured in ISM4212 in Spring 2018.</p> <p>a) 90% of students scored 70/100 or above on Exam 1</p>	<p>a) The success rate is above the threshold, and much higher than previous year (it was 81% the previous year). This is because I</p>

<p>Diagrams from a business scenario</p> <p>(b) Write effective SQL queries to answer business questions</p>			<p>b) 85% of students scored 70/100 or above on Exam 2</p>	<p>have a more comprehensive exam guide. It shows good and bad answers for sample questions. It also signals the difficulty of questions on the exam. This prepares students better for the exam. Also, students take the exam more seriously after the new study guide.</p> <p>b) The success rate for this learning goal is also above the threshold (and also higher than the previous year). Similar to Exam 1, there is a more comprehensive study guide for Exam 2. Also, the course has a mandatory face-to-face first meeting. This is preparing students better for the course materials and enabling them to take the exams more seriously.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

<p>3. Explain basic data communication concepts and internet technologies</p> <p>(a) Identify the layers of the OSI model</p> <p>(b) Analyze Internet protocols and be able to interpret Internet packets</p>	<p>Students were required to use network packet sniffing tool to analyze TCP/IP protocol stack, two labs were setup, using a combination of essay questions and fill in the blank.</p>	<p>(a) 80% will score 70/100 or above</p> <p>(b) 80% will score 70/100</p>	<p>Measured in spring 2018 in ISM4220 average score for lab 1 was 94%</p> <p>Lab 2 part 1 essay average score was .87%</p> <p>Lab 2 part 2 average score was .80%</p>	<p>a) The success rate for this learning goal was above the threshold. Students were provided with details via lecture and notes on how to use the tool as well as a packet file to analyze.</p> <p>b) The success rate for this learning goal was above the threshold. Students responded well to the lectures and the preparation for the labs.</p>
<p>4. Demonstrate understanding of systems development using appropriate analytical techniques</p> <p>(a) Formulate business</p>	<p>(a) Students were required to complete a case and create four Visio diagrams</p> <p>(b) Students were required to complete a quiz</p>	<p>(a) 80% will score 70/100 or above</p> <p>(b) 80% will score 70/100</p>	<p>Measured in spring 2018 in ISM3113 average score for case was .80%</p> <p>Quiz average score was .97%</p>	<p>(a) The success rate for this learning goal was met.</p> <p>(b) The success rate for this learning goal was above the</p>

<p>processes using Activity Diagrams</p> <p>(b) Design data storage requirements of an Information System using a Class Diagram</p>				<p>threshold.</p>
<p>5. Demonstrate the ability to critically discuss the impact of current IT and IS issues</p> <p>(a) Identify and explain current IS and/or technical issues from multiple sources</p> <p>(b) Discuss the potential impact on organizational policies, procedures and standards for managing distributed computing resources.</p>	<p>(a) Students were provided with a technical case to install virtual software on their PC and then create a virtual server.</p> <p>(b) Students were required right a research paper.</p>	<p>(a) 80% will score 70/100 or above</p> <p>(b) 80% will score 70/100</p>		<p>(a) The success rate for this learning goal was above the threshold. Students were provided with a detailed video with step by step instructions on how to complete the case.</p> <p>(b) The success rate for this learning goal was above the threshold. Students were provided with three reference papers and one video to watch to aid them in preparing their</p>

				paper.
--	--	--	--	--------

**Please include multiple assessments. For example: students perform well on classroom assignments, norm-referenced tests/surveys, and they get accepted to graduate school or are employed.*

Communication Skills and Critical Thinking Skills were measured for Kate Tiedemann College of Business students in our required capstone course (GEB 4890) as follows:

Communication Skills:

Learning Goal: Students will be effective communicators.

Objective 1: Students will write professional documents.

MEASURE: Students will produce a written analysis of an assignment in selected sections of GEB 4890. The assignment was scored using a written communication rubric.

ADMINISTERED: Spring 2018

OUTCOME: Twenty six essays/assignments were evaluated using our new Written Communication Analytic Rubric which was developed as part of a revamping of the assurance of learning process in the College. As in past years we hired a consultant/external reviewer (English professor and head of our USFSP Student Success Center) to score the assignments. The rubric used addressed twelve traits spread across 4 categories: content, grammar/mechanics, appearance and organization, and document integrity. There were three levels of proficiency for each trait: does not meet expectations, meets expectations, and exceeds expectations.

The results of the scoring are as follows:

Learning Goal 1, Objective 1:

Student will write professional documents.

Analytic Rubric

Performance Dimensions	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Content			
Student completes assignment per instructions.	26.92%	53.85%	19.23%
Student uses content/material learned in the course.	11.54%	73.08%	15.38%
Student employs logical reasoning.	26.92%	50.00%	23.08%
Grammar/Mechanics			
Document is grammatically correct.	26.92%	53.85%	19.23%
Sentence structure is sound.	38.46%	42.31%	19.23%
Student writes efficiently (without redundancy).	42.31%	34.62%	23.08%
Appearance and Organization			

Document is formatted appropriately	19.23%	61.54%	19.23%
Paragraphs are used appropriately to delineate concepts.	7.69%	69.23%	23.08%
Sentences are connected so that thoughts flow seamlessly together.	46.15%	30.77%	23.08%
Topics are introduced and concluded.	11.54%	69.23%	19.23%
Document Integrity			
Student uses his or her own words.	3.85%	76.92%	19.23%
Student references and cites work properly.	n/a	n/a	n/a

Students scored poorly (greater than 38% did not meet expectations) on 3 traits: sentence structure is sound, student writes efficiently, and sentences are connected so that thoughts flow seamlessly together. Conversely, students scored well (less than 12% did not meet expectations) on 4 traits: student uses content/material learned in course, paragraphs are use appropriately to delineate concepts, topics are introduced and concluded, and student uses his or her own words. One trait could not be measured since it was not a required part of the assignment.

This was first time that we used the rubric to score written communication in the College and the rubric was not provided to students when they were given and completing the assignment. Thus, the above results will be used as a benchmark for future assessment activities in this area. More specifically, another sample of students will be assessed in the Fall 2018 semester and in the process they will be provided with the rubric along with the assignment.

The consultant/external reviewer also noted that we may want to (1) provide the students some flexibility in meeting the rubric criteria by using the term report versus essay in the instructions, and (2) provide more guidance for the assessor if they are outside of the discipline area. This would make it easier for him/her to score some of the traits.

ACTION TAKEN: As described above this was the first time using our new analytic (versus our old holistic) written communication rubric. The above assessments will be used as a benchmark for future assessment activities. We will measure written communication using our new rubric again in Fall 2018.

Critical Thinking Skills:

Learning Goal 2: Students will have critical thinking skills.

Objective 1: Students will develop solutions to business problems..

MEASURE: Students were given a writing assignment in Dr. Marlin's GEB 4890 class. The assignment was scored using a critical thinking rubric.

DATE ADMINISTERED: Spring 2018

OUTCOMES: Twenty six essays/assignments were evaluated using our new Critical Thinking Analytic Rubric which was developed as part of a revamping of the assurance of learning process in the College. The course professor scored the assignments. The rubric used addressed thirteen traits spread across 3 categories: problem identification, problem analysis and solution generation, and problem solution. There were three levels of proficiency for each trait: does not meet expectations, meets expectations, and exceeds expectations.

The results of the scoring are as follows:

Learning Goal 2, Objective 1:

Students will develop solutions to business problems.

Analytic Rubric

Performance Dimensions	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Problem Identification			
Student recognizes business needs to be met/problem to be solved.	3.85%	69.23%	26.92%
Student is able to identify the root cause of the problem.	7.69%	65.38%	26.92%
Student is able to completely define the problem.	15.38%	61.54%	23.08%
Student is able to accurately define the problem.	19.23%	61.54%	19.23%
Problem Analysis and Solution Generation			
Student breaks down problem into its component parts.	15.38%	65.38%	19.23%
Student uses appropriate tools and techniques to analyze relevant data.	26.92%	57.69%	15.38%
Student uses supporting information.	26.92%	57.69%	15.38%
Student identifies alternative viable solutions.	11.54%	61.54%	26.92%
Student evaluates alternative viable solutions.	26.92%	50.00%	23.08%
Problem Solution			
Solution is optimal.	34.62%	50.00%	15.38%
Solution is appropriately documented.	38.64%	46.15%	15.38%
Solution is appropriately defended.	38.64%	46.15%	15.38%
Student considers limitations of solution.	38.64%	50.00%	11.54%

Students scored poorly (greater than 34% did not meet expectations) on all the four traits associated with problem solution. The assignment asked about choice of international strategy but many students discussed competitive/business-level strategy or international entry mode instead. This suggest that the assignment needs some clarification. Areas where students scored well (less than 12% did not meet expectations) included: student recognizes business needs to be met/problem to be solved, student is able to identify the root cause of the problem, and student identifies alternative viable solutions.

This was first time that we used the rubric to score critical thinking in the College and the rubric was not provided to students when they were given and completing the assignment. Thus, the above results will be used as a benchmark for future assessment activities in this area. More specifically, another sample of students will be assessed in the Fall 2018 semester and in the process they will be provided with the rubric along with the assignment.

ACTION TAKEN: As described above this was the first time using our new analytic (versus our old holistic) critical thinking rubric. The above assessments will be used as a benchmark for future assessment activities. We will measure critical thinking using our new rubric again in Fall 2018.