

Degree Program Student Learning Report

Revised August 2017

Department of Technology and Justice Studies

BS in Business Information Technology

For 2017-2018 Academic Year

PART 1

Degree Program Mission and Student Learning Outcomes

A. State the school, department, and degree program missions.

University Mission	School Mission	Department Mission	Degree Program Mission
Our mission is to ensure students develop the skills and knowledge required to achieve professional and personal goals in dynamic local and global communities.	<p>The mission of the School of Professional Studies (SPS) to develop students' skills and knowledge so they can successfully perform in their professional career of choice, and to prepare them to be lifelong learners in a diverse society. This is accomplished in a positive academic climate which is supported by academic and intellectual freedom, and faculty who are dedicated to a quality educational experience.</p> <p>Curricula for the associate, bachelors and graduate degrees are developed by expert faculty who are dedicated to an excellence in teaching, research and university service. The programs in the SPS are dynamic,</p>	The mission of the Department of Technology and Justice Studies is to support the SPS and RSU in their mission to prepare students to achieve professional and personal goals in dynamic local and global communities.	The Bachelor of Science in Business Information Technology is designed to meet the growing demand for information technology specialists who are able to communicate effectively and are knowledgeable of business needs. Students may choose from options in Computer Network Administration or Software Development and Multimedia.

University Mission	School Mission	Department Mission	Degree Program Mission
	and foster student achievement of their personal and professional goals reflective of their field of study. Innovative teaching strategies are used across diverse educational platforms to facilitate student learning outcomes.		

B. Align school purposes, department purposes, and program student learning outcomes with their appropriate University commitments.

University Commitments	School Purposes	Department Purposes	Student Learning Outcomes
To provide quality associate, baccalaureate, and graduate degree opportunities and educational experiences which foster student excellence in oral and written communications, scientific reasoning and critical and creative thinking.	<p>The SPS provides this support by providing two-year and four-year educational opportunities in business, sport management, technology, justice studies, nursing, and emergency medical services. The SPS accomplishes its mission through traditional and innovative learning opportunities including one graduate program, nine bachelor's programs and seven associate degrees.</p> <p>The baccalaureate degrees are taught using a large array of innovative methods.</p>	<p>The Department of Technology and Justice Studies provides the technology course support for the Associate in Science and Associate in Applied Science degrees, as well as the Bachelor of Science in Business Information Technology, the Bachelor of Science in Game Development, and the Bachelor of Technology in Applied Technology. The department also offers a Bachelor of Science in Justice Administration and an Associate in Arts degree in Criminal Justice with options in Law/Justice and the Collegiate Officer Program (COP). As indicated, many of the programs offered by the Department of Technology and Justice Studies are available online.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students will demonstrate competence in analyzing problems, designing, and implementing programs to solve the problems using computer programming languages. 2. Students will integrate the design, implementation and administration of computer networks. 3. Students will demonstrate knowledge and practical technology and business oriented skills to compete in the modern business environment. 4. Students will be able to integrate the entire software life cycle including analysis, design, implementation, and maintenance.

University Commitments	School Purposes	Department Purposes	Student Learning Outcomes
To promote an atmosphere of academic and intellectual freedom and respect for diverse expression in an environment of physical safety that is supportive of teaching and learning.			
To provide a general liberal arts education that supports specialized academic program sand prepares students for lifelong learning and service in a diverse society.			
To provide students with a diverse, innovative faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarly pursuits and continuous improvement of programs.			
To provide university-wide student services, activities and resources that complement academic programs.			
To support and strengthen student, faculty and administrative structures that promote shared governance of the institution.			
To promote and encourage student, faculty, staff and community interaction in a positive academic climate that creates opportunities for cultural, intellectual and personal enrichment for the University and the communities it serves.			

PART 2

Revisit Proposed Changes Made in Previous Assessment Cycle

Revisit each instructional/assessment change proposed in Part 5 of the degree program SLR for the preceding year. Indicate whether the proposed change was implemented and comment accordingly. Any changes the department implemented for this academic year, but which were not specifically proposed in the preceding report, should also be reported and discussed here. Please note if no changes were either proposed or implemented or this academic year.

Proposed Change	Implemented? (Y/N)	Comments
We will replace Computer Science MFT with an in-house exit exam.	Y	Exit exam consisting of 100 questions were given to all BIT Capstone students. This may be a better instrument to measure the SLO#1. Initially, the standard was met but we will track the results annually to see if this instrument would be a viable alternative to Computer Science MFT.

PART 3

Response to University Assessment Committee Peer Review

The University Assessment Committee provides written feedback on departmental assessment plans through a regular peer review process. This faculty-led oversight is integral to RSU's commitment to the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional effectiveness. UAC recommendations are not compulsory and departments may implement them at their discretion. Nevertheless, respond below to each UAC recommendations from last year's peer review report. Indicate whether the recommendation was implemented and comment accordingly. Please indicate either if the UAC had no recommendations or if the program was not subject to review in the previous cycle.

Peer Review Feedback	Implemented (Y/N)	Comments
1. SLO 1: a. Part C: Rework as "50 percent of the students who take the MFT will score above the 50th percentile on the national scale."	Y	Changed the wording to fit the new instrument Exit Exam.

<p>b. Part F: The narrative indicates that 148 is the national median (i.e., the 50th percentile), but the list of student scores shows one student who attained a score of 148 being at the 47th percentile. Some correction is needed.</p>	N	<p>This was taken directly from the table provided by ETS. On the detailed table 148 corresponds to 47 percentile but the national median is given as 148. Each year, we noticed that the median and the 50th percentile numbers are slightly different.</p>
<p>2. SLO 2: a. The assessment measure is based on a project assignment while course grades were used to present the results. The degree of correspondence between the project assignment and the course grades should be indicated. For example, the number of points allocated to the project relative to the total number of points possible for the course could be provided.</p>	N	<p>This SLO may be revised or more specific data pertaining to the project may be obtained from the adjunct instructor who teaches this course.</p>
<p>b. The results need to distinguish BIT majors from other students taking IT 2153.</p>	N	<p>An attempt to extract data for BIT majors in the class was made but the roster which contains this information disappears after the semester is over.</p>
<p>3. SLO 3: In the conclusions, it is unclear why there are two lines of comparative data presented for 2015-16, since the assessment measure pertains to a standardized test administered to BIT majors. Some clarification in terms of the presentation is needed.</p>	Y	<p>Comparative data is now presented in the standard format.</p>
<p>4. SLO 4: a. The assessment measure addresses a “series of assignments’ while final exam scores are used for the results. Although Part F includes a notation that the “final exam grades were tabulated for the assessment measures since this SLO practically covers the entire course,” it is still unclear how final exam scores reflect performance on a series of assignments. Therefore, some clarification is needed as to how the series of assignments and the final examination correspond. This could be delivered by expanding the explanation provided in Part H. For example, the narrative could indicate the percentage of the final examination that explicitly tests the content of the series of assignments.</p>	N	<p>We feel that will be too much work for an adjunct to classify each question with corresponding assignments and segregate computations of total scores. We feel the final exam is a good representation of this SLO rather than picking specific assignments. Perhaps, we should consider modifying this SLO.</p>
<p>b. In part F, to avoid confusion over the results measure, “Final Exam Scores” should be used as the descriptor rather than “Final Exam Grades.”</p>	N	<p>The total score for the final is 200. We feel grade is more appropriate word for the table as it is expressed in terms of percentage. We did change the word “grade” to “score” for the explanation in F.</p>
<p>5. PART 5: The rationale for the proposed change states that the “BIT is not a standard computer science program.” Additional explanation should be provided that perhaps addresses the</p>	Y	<p>Our program includes 24 hours of standard business course such as accounting, management, marketing, and economics. Our students typically lack quantitative skills. We do not require calculus nor discrete math which are pretty much the standard in</p>

disparity of program content with that of the MFT being used or other reasons why the MFT is not an appropriate measure. 6. PART 6: The number of different assessment measures presented in part A does not agree with the sum of the direct and indirect measures from parts B and C. A correction appears to be needed.	Y	CS curricula. On the other hand, BIT students perform as well as business majors on the Business MFT. It should be 4 not 3. It is corrected in this report.
---	---	--

PART 4
Evidence of Student Learning

Evidence and analyze student progress for each of the student learning outcomes (same as listed in Part I B above) for the degree program. See the *Appendix* for a detailed description of each component. Note: The table below is for the first program learning outcome. Copy the table and insert it below for each additional outcome. SLO numbers should be updated accordingly.

A. Student Learning Outcome					
SLO #1: Students will demonstrate competence in analyzing problems, designing, and implementing programs to solve the problems using computer programming languages.					
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
Exit exam consisting of 100 questions is given to all IT capstone students.	At least 50 percent of the students who take the exam will score above 50.	All students in IT 4504 BIT Capstone in Spring 2018. All classes are online.	7	Score 80/100 71/100 61/100 59/100 45/100 1/100 0/100 4 out of 7 students (57.1%) exceeded 50.	Y

**A.
Student Learning Outcome**

SLO #1: Students will demonstrate competence in analyzing problems, designing, and implementing programs to solve the problems using computer programming languages.

B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
				Mean: 41.29% Median: 59% The results were better than those from the Computer Science MFT in the previous years.	

**H.
Conclusions**

MFT Computer Science Comparative Data:
 2013-2014:
 1 out of 6 students (17%) exceeding the 50 percentile.
 2014-2015
 0 out of 8 students (0%) exceeded 50 percentile (national median score 149.5).
 2015-2016
 0 out of 9 students (0%) exceeded 50 percentile (national median score 147).
 2016-2017
 0 out of 5 students (0%) exceeded 50 percentile (national median score 148).

 Exit Exam:
 2017-2018
 4 out of 7 students (57.1%) exceeded 50 percentile

**A.
Student Learning Outcome**

SLO #2: Students will integrate the design, implementation and administration of computer networks.

B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
An IT 2153 hands-on project will be assigned that examines the students' knowledge and ability to set up a minimal Local Area Network (LAN) involving a server and two or more clients.	70% of the students will be able to design a Local Area Network (LAN) upon completing the IT 2153 Network Operating Systems I course with an accuracy of 70%	All BIT students taking IT 2153. Class is online.	12	Course Grades: 90-100 8 80-89 2 70-79 1 60-69 1 0-59 0 Course grades were tabulated to make the performance assumption. 11 out of 12 (91.7%) met the performance measure.	Y

**H.
Conclusions**

Comparative Data:
 2015-2016 6 out of 7(85.7%) met the performance measure.
 2016-2017 19 out of 21 (90.5%) met the performance measure.
 2017-2018 11 out of 12 (91.7%) met the performance measure.

**A.
Student Learning Outcome**

SLO #3: Students will demonstrate knowledge and practical technology and business oriented skills to compete in the modern business environment.

B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
The Major Field Test (MFT) in Business administered by the Educational Testing Service in the areas of Accounting, Economics, Management, Marketing, and Management Information Systems.	At least 70 percent of the students will demonstrate their knowledge of the Business Support core through their average performance at or above the 50th percentile on the MFT.	All students taking IT 4504 Capstone in Spring 2018. All classes are online.	9	Percentile # of students 90-100 80-89 1 70-79 1 60-69 50-59 4 40-49 30-39 20-29 2 10-19 Below 10 1 6 out of 9 (66.7%) scored at or above the 50 percentile.	N

**H.
Conclusions**

The sample size is too small to make a definitive conclusion; getting close to meeting the standard.
 Comparison Data:
 2014-2015
 2 out of 8 (25%) scored at or above the 50 percentile.
 2015-2016
 5 out of 9 (56%) scored at or above the 50 percentile.
 2016-2017
 2 out of 5 (40%) scored at or above the 50 percentile.
 2017-2018
 6 out of 9 (40%) scored at or above the 50 percentile.

**A.
Student Learning Outcome**

SLO #4: Students will be able to integrate the entire software life cycle including analysis, design, implementation, and maintenance.

B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
<p>In CS 3413, the instructor will make a series of assignments allowing students to demonstrate their ability to analyze problems and design complete software solutions for given problems. As the course progresses from analysis to design of software (and other systems), the students will use the Software Development Life Cycle (SDLC) and rapid prototyping software development methodologies to investigate and describe problem solutions.</p>	<p>In CS 3413, Systems Analysis and Design, 70% of the students will be able to analyze and design various software projects representing the requirements of a complete software design upon completing the course with an accuracy of 70%.</p>	<p>All BIT students taking CS 3413 in Fall 2017. Class is online.</p>	<p align="center">17</p>	<p>Final Exam Grades: 90-100 % 15 80-89 % 2 70-79 % 0 60-69 % 0 Below 60 % 0</p> <p>Final exam scores were tabulated for the assessment measures since this SLO practically covers the entire course.</p> <p>17 out of 17 (100%) met the performance standard. Two students did not take the exam.</p>	<p align="center">Y</p>

H.

A. Student Learning Outcome					
SLO #4: Students will be able to integrate the entire software life cycle including analysis, design, implementation, and maintenance.					
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
Conclusions					
<p>This year we used the final exam results rather than the course grades which should reflect better measurement since the exam covers more closely the material in the description of assessment measure.</p> <p>Comparative Data:</p> <p>2013-2014 16 out of 24 (67%) met the performance standard.</p> <p>2014-2015 12 out of 12 (100%) met the performance standard.</p> <p>2015-2016 8 out of 9 (89%) met the performance standard.</p> <p>2016-2017 19 out of 21 (90%) met the performance standard.</p> <p>2017-2018 17 out of 17 (100%) met the performance standard.</p>					

PART 5

Proposed Instructional or Assessment Changes

Learning outcomes assessment can generate actionable evidence of student performance that can be used to improve student success and institutional effectiveness. Knowledge of student strengths and weakness gained through assessment can inform faculty efforts to improve course instruction and program curriculum. Below discuss potential changes the department is considering which are aimed at improving student learning or the assessment process. Indicate which student learning outcome(s) will be affected and provide a rationale for each proposed change. These proposals will be revisited in next assessment cycle.

Proposed Change	Applicable Learning Outcomes	Rationale and Impact
No changes		

PART 6
Summary of Assessment Measures

- A. How many different assessment measures were used? 4
- B. List the direct measures (see appendix): Exit Exam, Business MFT, final exam grades.
- C. List the indirect measures (see appendix): course grades

PART 7
Faculty Participation and Signatures

- A. Provide the names and signatures of all full time and adjunct faculty who contributed to this report.

Faculty Name	Assessment Role	Signature
Roy Gardner	Prepare report, collect, analyze data for IT 2153	On separate sheet
Susan Oliver	Collect, analyze data for CS 3413	On separate sheet
Curtis Sparling	Collect, analyze data for IT 4504, administered CS and Business MFT exams	On separate sheet

- B. Reviewed by:

Titles	Name	Signature	Date
Department Head	Roy Gardner	On separate sheet	
Dean	Susan Willis	On separate sheet	

Appendix

Student Learning Outcome

Student learning outcomes are the observable or measurable results that are expected of a student following a learning experience. Learning outcomes may address knowledge, skills, attitudes, or values that provide evidence that learning has occurred. They can apply to a specific course, a program of study, or an institution. Outcomes should be worded in language that clearly implies a measurable behavior or quality of student work. Outcomes should also include Bloom's action verbs appropriate to the skill level of learning expected of students.

Examples:

Students will be able to apply principles of evidence-based medicine to determine clinical diagnoses and implement acceptable treatment modalities.

Students will be able to articulate cultural and socioeconomic differences and the significance of these differences for instructional planning.

Assessment Measure

An assessment measure is a tool or instrument used to gather evidence of student progress toward an established learning outcome. Every program learning outcome should have at least one appropriate assessment measure. Learning outcomes are frequently complex, however, and may require multiple measures to accurately assess student performance. Assessment plans should try to incorporate a combination of direct and indirect assessment measures. Direct provide concrete evidence of whether a student has command of a specific subject or content area, can perform a certain task, exhibits a particular skill, demonstrates a certain quality in their work, or holds a particular value. Because direct measures tap into actual student learning, it is often viewed as the preferred measure type. Indirect measures assess opinions or thoughts about the extent of a student's knowledge, skills, or attitudes. They reveal characteristics associated with learning, but they only imply that learning has occurred. Both types of measures can provide useful insight into student learning and experiences in a program. Each also has unique advantages and disadvantages in terms of the type of data and information it can provide. Examples of common direct and indirect measures are listed below.

Direct Measures

- Comprehensive exams
- Class assignments
- Juried review of performances and exhibitions
- Internship or clinical evaluations
- Portfolio evaluation
- Pre/post exams
- Third-party exams such as field tests, certification exams, or licensure exams
- Senior thesis or capstone projects

Indirect Measures

- Graduate exit interviews
- Focus group responses
- Job placement statistics
- Graduate school placement statistics
- Graduation and retention rates
- Student and alumni surveys that assess perceptions of the program
- Employer surveys that assess perceptions of graduates
- Honors and awards earned by students and alumni.

Performance Standard

A performance standard is a clearly-defined benchmark that establishes the minimally-acceptable level of performance expected of students for a particular measure.

Examples:

At least 70% of students will score 70% or higher on a comprehensive final exam.

At least 75% of students will earn score a “Proficient” or higher rating on the Communicate Effectively rubric.

Sampling Method

Sampling method describes the methodology used for selecting the students that were assessed for a given measure. In some cases, such as most course-embedded measures, it is possible to assess all active enrolled students. In other cases, however, it is not feasible to measure the population of all potential students. In these cases, it is important that a well-designed sampling scheme be used to ensure the sample of students measured is an unbiased representation of the overall population. Where multiple instructors teach a particular course, care should be taken to assess students across all instructors, including adjuncts.

Examples:

All students enrolled in BIOL 4801 Biology Research Methods II

All majors graduating in the 2016-17 academic year.

Sample Size

Sample size is the number of students from which evidence of student learning was obtained for a given assessment measure.

Results

Results are an analytical summary of the findings arising from the assessment of student performance for a particular assessment measure. Typical presentation includes descriptive statistics (mean, median, range) and score frequency distributions.

Standard Met?

This is a simple yes/no response that indicates whether the observed level of student performance for a particular measure meets or exceeds the established standard. An N/A may be used where circumstances prevented the department from accurately assessing a measure.

Conclusion

The conclusion is a reflective summary and determination of the assessment results obtained for a specific learning outcome. Questions to consider in this section include the following:

- Does the assessment evidence indicate the learning outcome is being satisfactorily met?
- Where multiple measures are used for a single outcome, do the results present a consistent or contradictory pattern?
- What are the most valuable insights gained from the assessment results?
- What strengths and weaknesses in student learning do the results indicate?
- What implications are there for enhancing teaching and learning?
- How can the assessment process be improved?