Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16

Degree Program Name: <u>Management Information Systems</u>

Due to your dean by June 1
Due from dean to assessment office by June 15
Contact Name and Email: <u>Joe Harder,   jtharder@indstate.edu</u>

Part One

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?	b. (1) What method(s)s did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?	d. What were the actual results?	e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?
1.3: Manage a Team Manage a team to successful project or sub-project completion	(1) Observation of instructor and peer evaluation. (2) MIS 450 – Project Management	80% of individuals in class will be rated as "Contributed Exceptionally" or "Contributed" using set rubric	Cont. Exceptionally – 10% Contributed – 80% Did Not Contribute – 10%* (* - This student stopped coming mid-semester)	Joe Harder – Instructor Shared on Department Blackboard Site
2.3: Respond to Change Modify implementation plan appropriately in response to unexpected change	(1) Scoring of class assignment by pre-set rubric in 2015-16 assessment plan. (2) MIS 450 – Project Management	80% of individuals in class will be rated as "Exceptional" or "Satisfactory" using set rubric	Exceptional – 0% Satisfactory – 70% Needs Improvement – 20% Unsatisfactory – 10%*	Joe Harder – Instructor Shared on Department Blackboard Site
3.2: Design Specifications Design specifications for a program which conforms to stated user requirements	(1) Scoring of mid-term exam essay question by pre-set rubric in 2015-16 assessment plan. (2) MIS 420 – Data and Knowledge Management	80% of class will be rated as "Exceptional" or "Satisfactory" using set rubric	Exceptional – 20% Satisfactory – 60% Needs Improvement – 10% Unsatisfactory – 10%	Joe Harder – Instructor Shared on Department Blackboard Site

Part Two

(1) & (2)

1.3 – Manage a Team: The goal of 80% was exceeded. Both observation of teamwork by instructor and confidential peer evaluations supported the assignment of performance categories. Students selected projects themselves with external stakeholders, and performed well in working together. This group project will be continued in MIS 450. Group projects do have a collective outcome, but mechanisms such as peer evaluation and individual task accountability allow student –level observations to be made and assessed.

2.3 – Respond to Change: Performance on this assignment did not meet the goal. Students were not able to creatively apply principles of problem identification and response according to pre-set contingency plans as well as was expected. In the future, more group work and in-class mini cases will be used

to practice these skills. Responding to change is a key indicator of whether students can apply analytical skills to real world situations. Students must evaluate the project mission and be able to devise an action that will be move the project toward completion while meeting multiple stakeholder needs. It is important to improve our methodology so that students have more opportunity to learn and practice this skill.

2.4 – Design Specifications: Performance met expectations on this learning goal.   No changes are planned to this aspect of the class. This particular exercise in this particular class has been targeted for evaluation in many cycles. The course does emphasize this skill now. In the next cycle a different aspect of the course will be evaluated.

(3)

 The current cycle (2015 – 2016) focused on one outcome from each of the three competencies identified in the Outcomes Library.
    1) Managerial (1.3 – Manage a Team)
    2) Analytical (2.3 – Respond to Change)
    3) Technical (2.4 – Design Specifications)

In the coming year (2016 – 2017) The following learning outcomes will be assessed:
    1) Managerial (1.2 – Identify Solution Steps)
    2) Analytical (2.1 – Develop Logical Model)
    4) Technical (3.1 – Apply Program Structures)

Degree Program: BS in Management Information Systems Date: 7.11.16

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	☐ No outcomes are identified.	☐ An Outcomes Library was provided. ☐ Some of the outcomes are specific and measurable. ☐ Some of the outcomes are student-centered. ☐ A Curriculum Map was provided.	☐ Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, and student-centered. ☒ Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☐ The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. ☐ At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	☒ Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, student-centered, and span multiple learning domains. ☐ Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☒ Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). ☐ Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) ☐ Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. ☒ The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.

				☒ Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
2. Measures & Performance Goals	☐ No measures are provided. ☐ No goals for student performance are identified.	☒ Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. ☐ Measures are primarily indirect. ☒ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Performance goals are identified, but they are not specific.	☒ At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. ☐ Sufficient information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☒ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.	☐ Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. ☐ Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. ☐ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. ☐ Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) ☐ Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. ☐ Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided to demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what

				students know/can do.
				☐ If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.
3. Results	☐ No data are being collected. ☐ No information is provided about the data collection process. ☐ No results are provided. ☐ Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	☐ Some data are being collected. ☐ Some data are being analyzed. ☐ Some results are provided. ☐ Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. ☐ Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	☒ Data are being collected and analyzed. ☒ Results are provided. ☒ Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. ☒ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	☐ Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity of the assessment process. ☐ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve. ☐ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
4. Engagement & Improvement	☐ No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. ☐ Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. ☐ No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. ☐ No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	☒ The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. ☐ It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. ☐ Plans for improvement are provided, but they are too vague to connect clearly to the results or to implement. ☐ Little reflection is offered	☐ Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☒ Results regularly are shared with the faculty. ☒ The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. ☒ These discussions lead to the development of specific plans for improvement.	☐ All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☐ Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. ☐ Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the

		about previous results or plans.	☐ Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. ☐ Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. ☐ Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. ☒ Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	☐ **Level 0 – Undeveloped**	☐ **Level 1 - Developing**	☒ **Level 2 – Mature**	☐ **Level 3 – Exemplary**

COMMENTS
Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

1. **Learning Outcomes**
   The outcomes you assessed this cycle are clear, measurable, student-centered, and reflective of the most important kinds of knowledge and skills graduates should possess. Your curriculum map shows that all are well covered.

2. **Measures & Performance Goals**
   Two of the three measures are unclear: What is it that students must do for 1.3 and 2.3? I also would be more certain that they are geared to the outcomes if I had access to rubrics, keys, checklists, etc. Your performance goals are set reasonably high, which suggests students have a history of performing well. Please include the Ns the next time so that I know how many students performed at each level. Any ideas as to why no one earned an exceptional score on 2.3? Last, I really like the idea of having students work with external stakeholders on the group project.

3. **Results**
   Students achieved standards set for two of the 3 outcomes. You mention that results are shared on the BB site. In addition to providing more detail about what the results mean (who do students know/do well and less well?), I would love to have access to the site next time so that I have a better understanding of the data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes.

4. **Engagement & Improvement**
   All of the work of collecting, analyzing, and sharing the results fell to one faculty member. Does that mean that assessment occurs only in his classes? Will I see more faculty involvement in future iterations of this report? In any case, it is clear that the results are scrutinized and appropriate interventions are planned. I look forward to seeing their impact in future plans. And speaking of impact, is there evidence that previous changes have made a positive impact? Is learning continuously improving?

   Thank you!