

Annual Assessment Report to the University 2007-2008

Academic Year: 2007-2008

Liaison: Leah Marcal

Department: Information Systems

College: Business and Economics

Program of this report: B.S. in Information Systems

Note: If you have multiple programs for which it is difficult to compile one report, submit a separate report for each.

Answer each question for which you have information; otherwise leave blank. Be concise! The form fields are limited to 3000 characters (roughly half a single-spaced page). Please use 10 point type.

1. Give a brief overview of the significant assessment-related activities for the program this year. Particularly focus on relevant information that is not captured in any of the questions below (e.g., unanticipated turns, refining assessment tools, why changes to SLOs were needed, etc.).
All of the program learning goals were assessed (with the exception of "life-long learning in the field") with course embedded measures in the upper-division business core and in two required IS courses (i.e., IS 431 and 435).
2. If you have made any changes to your SLOs this year, please paste in the entire list here. This information will be used to update the SLO webpage on the Assessment website. If you have made no changes, skip this question.

3. Fill in the chart. Please list the SLO or SLOs that you evaluated this year, the tool or tools that you used to evaluate each SLO (e.g, embedded questions, rubric), and a brief summary of the results, focusing on how they met your expectations of student learning for this SLO.

SLO	Tool or tools	Results
Recognize and analyze ethical problems	<p>BUS 302: (fall only) Students' understanding of ethics was assessed with an ethics case analysis wherein students must apply ethical theories and recommend a course of action.</p> <p>FIN 303: Multiple-choice exam questions covered students' knowledge of financial ethics and regulatory requirements.</p>	<p>BUS 302: Some 78% of students demonstrated a good or very good understanding of ethics in their case analysis.</p> <p>FIN 303: In fall (spring), 92% (91%) of students correctly answered questions covering ethics and regulatory requirements.</p>
Effectively communicate orally and in writing	<p>BUS 302: (fall only) Students' writing skills were assessed with case analysis and students' oral presentation skills were assessed with a formal oral presentation of their written case analysis. Students received all grading rubrics (e.g., for written work and presentations) at the start of the semester so they understood what was expected.</p> <p>MKT 304: (spring only) Students' writing skills were assessed with a situation audit.</p> <p>SOM 306: Case analysis or essay exam questions were used to assess students' ability to clearly communicate and interpret results from operations management problems.</p> <p>CLA: (spring only) Captone students (from eight sections) took the Collegiate Learning Assessment. Students' writing skills were assessed with two analytical writing tasks.</p>	<p>BUS 302: Roughly 84% of students' written work was deemed good or very good. And 95% of students' oral presentations were good or very good.</p> <p>MKT 304: Some 66% of the students' writing was deemed acceptable, good, or outstanding; and 35% was deemed unacceptable or marginally unacceptable.</p> <p>SOM 306: In fall (spring), some 88% (81%) of students demonstrated good or very good writing skills; while 12% (19%) demonstrated writing skills that were considered not good enough.</p> <p>CLA: Results are pending. Bettina Huber (Head of IR) has promised results in fall 2008.</p>

<p>Apply critical thinking and problem solving skills</p>	<p>BUS 302: (fall only) Students' ability to think critically was assessed with written case analysis. Students must clearly state the problem; clarify key ideas; use a strategic perspective; separate advocacy statements from fact; and make a clear decision.</p> <p>MKT 304: (spring only) Students' critical thinking skills were assessed within a situation audit.</p> <p>CLA: (spring only) Captone students (from eight sections) took the Collegiate Learning Assessment. Students' critical thinking skills were assessed with a performance task.</p> <p>FIN 303: Multiple-choice exam questions were used to assess students' knowledge of investment decisions, finance decisions, and the use of financial data. All questions require students to have strong problem solving skills.</p> <p>MKT 304: (spring only) Students' problem solving skills are assessed within a situation audit.</p> <p>SOM 306: Students' problem solving skills were assessed with multiple-choice exam questions which require careful analysis of operations management problems.</p>	<p>BUS 302: Most students (93%) demonstrated good or very good critical thinking skills when writing up their case analysis.</p> <p>MKT 304: Some 52% of the students' work was deemed good or outstanding; 14% was acceptable; and 35% was unacceptable or marginally unacceptable.</p> <p>CLA: Results are pending. Bettina Huber (Head of IR) has promised results in fall 2008.</p> <p>FIN 303: In fall (spring), 81% (85%) of students correctly answered questions covering investment decisions; 70% (76%) answered questions covering financing decisions; and 70% (67%) answered questions covering the use of financial data.</p> <p>MKT 304: 34% of the students' work was good or outstanding; 35% was acceptable, and 31% was unacceptable or marginally unacceptable.</p> <p>SOM 306: Students' success in solving operations problems varies (little) from 17% deemed not good enough in fall to 16% deemed not good enough in spring.</p>
<p>Understand individual and group dynamics of project teams</p>	<p>IS 431: (spring only) Students' understanding of the individual and group dynamics of teams was assessed with a class project.</p>	<p>IS 431: 28% of the students' work was considered outstanding; 36% was very good; and 36% was good.</p>

<p>Understand individual and group dynamics of project teams (cont.)</p>	<p>BUS 302: Every student filled out an online team evaluation form for each teammate for every assignment that required group work. The online form contains 10 attributes that characterize good teamwork (e.g., attended meetings; came prepared; completed tasks on time; improved final product, etc.) The ten attributes are scored from 0 (strongly disagree) to 10 (strongly agree).</p>	<p>BUS 302: Students cannot determine how an individual teammate rated their performance. However, they are allowed to view their own average scores. Despite this anonymity, students are often reluctant to give teammates low scores. Mean scores on all 10 attributes ranged from a low of only 8.8 (improved the final product or encouraged innovation) to a high of 9.1 (listened and showed respect or followed team rules). Moreover, the overall mean total score (out of 100 points) was 89.1.</p>
<p>Knowledge of IS technology components and their interrelations</p>	<p>IS 435: (fall only) Students' knowledge of IS technology components and their interrelations were assessed with 30 multiple-choice, final exam questions: 10 covered knowledge of network components; 10 covered characteristics of network architectures; and 10 covered systems design and management issues.</p>	<p>Roughly 78% of students correctly answered 7 or more questions (out of 10) covering network components and this was considered good enough or very good performance. Some 65% of the students correctly answered 7 or more questions covering network architectures and this was considered good enough or very good. Lastly, 89% of students correctly answered 7 or more questions covering systems design and this was considered good enough or very good.</p>
<p>Knowledge to implement information systems</p>	<p>IS 431 (spring only) Students' knowledge of systems analysis and design was assessed with two case studies and 60 multiple-choice exam questions. The case studies were used to evaluate students' understanding of specific analysis and design tools, whereas the multiple-choice questions were used to evaluate students' understanding of theoretical concepts.</p>	<p>Some 41% of students' work on the case studies was outstanding; 23% was very good; 18% was good; and 17% was not good. Alternatively, only 8% of students' answers to theoretical questions were outstanding; 10% were very good; 44% were good; and 39% were not good.</p>

4. **Completing the assessment loop.** *If this year's activities included assessment of programmatic changes that were made based upon previous assessment of this SLO, answer this question. Otherwise, skip to the next question.* Fill in the chart to show how the programmatic changes based on assessment data have impacted student learning.

SLO	Semester/year change was implemented	Brief description of change	Impact of change based on new assessment results from this year

5. Based on faculty discussion of the assessment results of **this year's activities**, what changes are being considered to improve student learning in the program?

6. Describe resource needs to improve and support student learning that you have identified based on your assessment evidence.

7. If anyone in your program has submitted a manuscript this year that includes assessment data from the program or information about program assessment activities, please check the box and someone will contact you for further information. You can also add information about publications in the form field if you wish.