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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.**  Fall 2014. Spring 2015, Fall 2015, Spring 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017.  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, Fall 2014** | | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Average for all students | Students achieving level 3 or better | | Installing and configuring network OS | 18 | 3.72 | x=17  94.4% | | Disk management | 18 | 3.72 | x=16  88.9% | | Managing user/group accounts | 18 | 3.83 | x=17  94.4% | | Implementing directory services | 18 | 3.83 | x=18  100.0% | | Implementing group policies | 18 | 3.83 | x=17  94.4% | | Configuring Web services | 18 | 3.83 | x=17  94.4% | | 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, Lab Projects, Spring 2015** | | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Average for all students | Students achieving level 3 or better | | Installing and configuring network OS | 15 | 3.80 | x=14  93.3% | | Disk management | 15 | 3.93 | x=15  100.0% | | Managing user/group accounts | 15 | 3.73 | x=14  93.3% | | Implementing directory services | 15 | 3.80 | x=14  93.3% | | Implementing group policies | 15 | 3.80 | x=14  93.3% | | Configuring Web services | 15 | 3.87 | x=15  100.0% | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **MIS 3200, Lab Projects, Fall 2015** | | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Average for all students | Students achieving level 3 or better | | Installing and configuring network OS | 14 | 3.57 | x=12  85.7% | | Disk management | 14 | 3.64 | x=13  92.9% | | Managing user/group accounts | 14 | 3.50 | x=12  85.7% | | Implementing directory services | 14 | 3.43 | x=12  85.7% | | Implementing group policies | 14 | 3.36 | x=11  78.6% | | Configuring Web services | 14 | 3.50 | x=13  92.9% | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **MIS 3200, Lab Projects, Spring 2016** | | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Average for all students | Students achieving level 3 or better | | Installing and configuring network OS | 16 | 3.50 | x=13  81.3% | | Disk management | 16 | 3.56 | x=14  87.5% | | Managing user/group accounts | 16 | 3.50 | x=14  87.5% | | Implementing directory services | 16 | 3.50 | x=14  87.5% | | Implementing group policies | 16 | 3.44 | x=13  81.3% | | Configuring Web services | 16 | 3.56 | x=15  93.8% | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **MIS 3200, Lab Projects, Fall 2016** | | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Average for all students | Students achieving level 3 or better | | Installing and configuring network OS | 23 | 3.43 | x=21  91.3% | | Disk management | 23 | 3.57 | x=22  95.7% | | Managing user/group accounts | 23 | 3.43 | x=20  87.0% | | Implementing directory services | 23 | 3.48 | x=21  91.3% | | Implementing group policies | 23 | 3.43 | x=20  87.0% | | Configuring Web services | 23 | 3.52 | x=22  95.7% | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **MIS 3200, Lab Projects, Spring 2017** | | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Average for all students | Students achieving level 3 or better | | Installing and configuring network OS | 21 | 3.43 | x=19  90.5% | | Disk management | 21 | 3.52 | x=20  95.2% | | Managing user/group accounts | 21 | 3.38 | x=18  85.7% | | Implementing directory services | 21 | 3.48 | x=19  90.5% | | Implementing group policies | 21 | 3.38 | x=18  85.7% | | Configuring Web services | 21 | 3.48 | x=20  95.2% | |  |
|  | **MIS 3200 Final Exam.**  Fall 2014. Spring 2015, Fall 2015, Spring 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017.  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, Fall 2014** | | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Average for all students | Students achieving level 3 or better | | Understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models including encapsulation | 18 | 3.72 | x=17  94.4% | | Knowledge of internetworking devices | 18 | 3.78 | x=18  100.0% | | Understanding of data and signal transmission | 18 | 3.83 | x=17  94.4% | | Knowledge of physical and wireless media | 18 | 3.78 | x=17  94.4% | | Understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing | 18 | 3.78 | x=17  94.4% | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **MIS 3200, Final Exam, Spring 2015** | | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Average for all students | Students achieving level 3 or better | | Understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models including encapsulation | 15 | 3.80 | x=14  93.3% | | Knowledge of internetworking devices | 15 | 3.87 | x=15  100.0% | | Understanding of data and signal transmission | 15 | 3.80 | x=14  93.3% | | Knowledge of physical and wireless media | 15 | 3.73 | x=14  93.3% | | Understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing | 15 | 3.80 | x=14  93.3% | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **MIS 3200, Final Exam, Fall 2015** | | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Average for all students | Students achieving level 3 or better | | Understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models including encapsulation | 14 | 3.57 | x=12  85.7% | | Knowledge of internetworking devices | 14 | 3.64 | x=12  85.7% | | Understanding of data and signal transmission | 14 | 3.71 | x=13  92.9% | | Knowledge of physical and wireless media | 14 | 3.71 | x=13  92.9% | | Understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing | 14 | 3.71 | x=13  92.9% | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **MIS 3200, Final Exam, Spring 2016** | | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Average for all students | Students achieving level 3 or better | | Understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models including encapsulation | 16 | 3.56 | x=14  87.5% | | Knowledge of internetworking devices | 16 | 3.50 | x=14  87.5% | | Understanding of data and signal transmission | 16 | 3.56 | x=14  87.5% | | Knowledge of physical and wireless media | 16 | 3.56 | x=14  87.5% | | Understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing | 16 | 3.56 | x=14  87.5% | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **MIS 3200, Final Exam, Fall 2016** | | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Average for all students | Students achieving level 3 or better | | Understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models including encapsulation | 23 | 3.39 | x=20  87.0% | | Knowledge of internetworking devices | 23 | 3.43 | x=21  91.3% | | Understanding of data and signal transmission | 23 | 3.35 | x=20  87.0% | | Knowledge of physical and wireless media | 23 | 3.61 | x=22  95.7% | | Understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing | 23 | 3.57 | x=22  95.7% | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **MIS 3200, Final Exam, Spring 2017** | | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Average for all students | Students achieving level 3 or better | | Understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models including encapsulation | 21 | 3.43 | x=19  90.5% | | Knowledge of internetworking devices | 21 | 3.48 | x=19  90.5% | | Understanding of data and signal transmission | 21 | 3.38 | x=18  85.7% | | Knowledge of physical and wireless media | 21 | 3.57 | x=20  95.2% | | Understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing | 21 | 3.52 | x=20  95.2% | |  |
|  | **Senior Survey Question 2.5.**  Fall 2015.  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. | **Fall 2015 Senior Survey Question 2.5 Results**  Average = 6.37, Std Dev. = 0.74, n = 8 | Data collected by School of Business Senior Survey. |
| 2. Demonstrate critical thinking through competent problem-solving and logic skills. | **MIS 2000 Homework.**  Fall 2014, Spring 2015. Assessed in MIS 2000 - Information Systems Careers and Logic Skills.  Assessed by series of 4 homework assignments, each of which test different criteria on the Assessment Rubric for MIS 2000—Homework Assignments 1-4. See the attached rubric for which homework assignments test which criteria. | 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, Fall 2014**  **Homework Rubrics** | | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Average for all students | Students achieving level 3 or better | | Logical Reasoning | 21 | 3.71 | x = 20  95.2% | | Problem solving | 21 | 3.71 | x = 20  95.2% | | Logic development | 21 | 3.90 | x = 21  100.0% | | Program documentation | 20 | 3.50 | x = 20  100.0% | | Program requirements | 21 | 3.62 | x = 19  90.5% | | Identify user decisions | 21 | 3.71 | x = 19  90.5% | | Record processing | 23 | 3.17 | x = 18  78.3% | | Looping constructs | 22 | 2.55 | x = 13  59.1% | | Modularization techniques | 23 | 3.17 | x = 18  78.3% | | Data collected by Vicki Hampton.  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 2000, Spring 2015**  **Homework Rubrics** | | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Average for all students | Students achieving level 3 or better | | Logical Reasoning | 10 | 3.70 | x = 9  90.0% | | Problem solving | 10 | 3.70 | x = 9  90.0% | | Logic development | 8 | 4.00 | x = 8  100.0% | | Program documentation | 9 | 2.78 | x = 6  66.7% | | Program requirements | 10 | 3.70 | x = 9  90.0% | | Identify user decisions | 1\* | NA\* | x = NA\*  NA\*% | | Record processing | 10 | 2.80 | x = 6  60.0% | | Looping constructs | 9 | 2.22 | x = 3  33.3% | | Modularization techniques | 10 | 3.20 | x = 8  80.0% |   \* Results Not Available due to recording error. |  |
|  | **MIS 2000 Homework.**  Fall 2015, Spring 2016. Assessed in MIS 2000 – Introduction to Business Logic and Programming Skills. (Note: This course was revised and renamed effective Fall 2015.)  Assessed by series of homework assignments, each of which test different criteria on the Assessment Rubric for MIS 2000—Homework Assignments. See the attached rubric for additional information. | 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. | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **MIS 2000, Fall 2015**  **Homework Rubrics** | | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Average for all students | Students achieving level 3 or better | | Logical Reasoning | 18 | 3.94 | x = 18  100.0% | | Problem solving | 18 | 3.89 | x = 18  100.0% | | Logic development | 18 | 3.78 | x = 17  94.4% | | Program documentation | 18 | 3.50 | x = 15  83.3% | | Program requirements | 18 | 3.94 | x = 18  100.0% | | Identify user decisions | 18 | 3.89 | x = 18  100.0% | | Record processing | 18 | 3.17 | x = 16  88.9% | | Looping constructs | 18 | 3.00 | x = 16  88.9% | | Modularization techniques | 18 | 3.06 | x = 14  77.8% | | Data collected by Dr. Simon Lee. |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **MIS 2000, Spring 2016**  **Homework Rubrics** | | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Average for all students | Students achieving level 3 or better | | Logical Reasoning | 20 | 3.90 | x = 20  100.0% | | Problem solving | 20 | 3.80 | x = 19  95.0% | | Logic development | 20 | 3.85 | x = 19  95.0% | | Program documentation | 20 | 3.40 | x = 17  85.0% | | Program requirements | 20 | 3.95 | x = 20  100.0% | | Identify user decisions | 20 | 3.70 | x = 19  95.0% | | Record processing | 20 | 3.00 | x = 17  85.0% | | Looping constructs | 20 | 3.25 | x = 17  85.0% | | Modularization techniques | 20 | 2.80 | x = 13  65.0% | |  |
|  | **MIS 2000 Homework.**  Fall 2016.  Assessed in MIS 2000 – Introduction to Business Logic and Programming Skills.  Assessed by series of homework assignments, each of which test different criteria on the Assessment Rubric for MIS 2000—Homework Assignments. See the attached rubric for additional information. | 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. | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **MIS 2000, Fall 2016**  **Homework Rubrics** | | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Average for all students | Students achieving level 3 or better | | Logical Reasoning | 15 | 3.07 | x = 13  86.7% | | Problem solving | 15 | 3.69 | x = 12  80.0% | | Logic development | 15 | 3.00 | x = 12  80.0% | | Program documentation | 15 | 3.40 | x = 12  80.0% | | Program requirements | 15 | 3.33 | x = 14  93.3% | | Identify user decisions | 15 | 3.07 | x = 12  80.0% | | Record processing | 15 | 3.47 | x = 12  80.0% | | Looping constructs | 15 | 3.27 | x = 13  86.7% | | Modularization techniques | 15 | 3.07 | x = 11  73.3% | | Data collected by Paul Brown. |
|  | **Senior Survey Question 2.4.**  Fall 2015.  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. | **Fall 2015 Senior Survey Question 2.4 Results**  Average = 6.62, Std Dev. = 0.52, n = 8 | 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 Database Project.**  Fall 2014, Spring 2015.  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. Abdou Illia. | 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 4200 Database Project from Dr. Abdou Illia. | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **MIS 4200, Fall 2014**  **Database Projects** | | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Average for all students | Students achieving level 3 or better | | SDLC Deliverables | 20 | 3.65 | x = 18  90.0% | | Process diagrams | 20 | 3.80 | x = 19  95.0% | | Logical data models | 20 | 3.70 | x = 18  90.0% | | Relational principles | 20 | 3.70 | x = 18  90.0% | | Human Interface Design | 20 | 3.60 | x = 18  90.0% | | Programming logic constructs | 20 | 3.70 | x = 18  90.0% | | Multiple program application | 20 | 3.75 | x = 19  95.0% | | Systems and user documentation | 20 | 3.70 | x = 18  90.0% | | Data collected by Dr. Abdou Illia.  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, Spring 2015**  **Database Projects** | | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Average for all students | Students achieving level 3 or better | | SDLC Deliverables | 13 | 3.77 | x = 12  92.3% | | Process diagrams | 13 | 3.85 | x = 13  100.0% | | Logical data models | 13 | 3.69 | x = 12  92.3% | | Relational principles | 13 | 3.77 | x = 12  92.3% | | Human Interface Design | 13 | 3.77 | x = 12  92.3% | | Programming logic constructs | 13 | 3.54 | x = 11  84.6% | | Multiple program application | 13 | 3.69 | x = 12  92.3% | | Systems and user documentation | 13 | 3.85 | x = 13  100.0% | |  |
|  | **MIS 4200 Database Project.**  Fall 2015, Spring 2016,  Fall 2016, Spring 2017.  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 the Total based on the Assessment Rubric for MIS 4200 Database Project from Dr. Tina Wang. | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **MIS 4200, Fall 2015-Spring 2017**  **Database Projects** | | | | | Semester | n | Average for all students | Students achieving 80 or better | | Fall 2015 | 8 | 88.2 | x = 8  100.0% | | Spring 2016 | 15 | 88.6 | x = 14  93.3% | | Fall 2016 | 15 | 86.1 | x = 11  73.3% | | Spring 2017 | 15 | 80.4 | x = 13  86.7% | | Data collected by Dr. Tina Wang. |
|  | **Senior Survey Question 2.1.**  Fall 2015.  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. | **Fall 2015 Senior Survey Question 2.1 Results**  Average = 6.25, Std Dev. = 0.71, n = 8 | Data collected by School of Business Senior Survey. |
|  | **Senior Survey Question 2.2.**  Fall 2015.  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. | **Fall 2015 Senior Survey Question 2.2 Results**  Average = 6.87, Std Dev. = 0.35, n = 8 |  |
|  | **Senior Survey Question 2.3.**  Fall 2015.  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. | **Fall 2015 Senior Survey Question 2.3 Results**  Average = 6.50, Std Dev. = 1.07, n = 8 |  |
| 4. (2014-15) Develop technical solutions to information system needs of an organization in a multi-platform environment  (This objective applies only to students who take an advanced course in programming, including those majoring in MIS in the Business Programming Concentration under a previous curriculum.) | MIS 4330.  Spring 2015.  Assessed in MIS 4330 – Advanced Java Programming.  See the attached Assessment Rubric for MIS 4330. | 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 4300—Advanced COBOL or the Assessment Rubric for MIS 4330—Advanced Java. (Note: MIS 4300 was not taught during the 2014-17 Assessment period.) | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **MIS 4330, Spring 2015** | | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Average for all students | Students achieving level 3 or better | | Syntax | 10 | 3.20 | x = 10  100.0% | | Object-oriented concepts | 10 | 3.70 | x = 10  100.0% | | User Interface | 10 | 3.90 | x = 10  100.0% | | File I/O & Serialization | 10 | 3.10 | x = 9  90.0% | | Multithreading | 10 | 3.00 | x = 7  70.0% | | Swing Components | 10 | 3.80 | x = 10  100.0% | | Database | 10 | 3.90 | x = 10  100.0% | | Web Programming | 10 | 3.30 | x = 10  100.0% | | Data collected by Dr. 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. |
| 4. (2015-2016)  Note: The Objective 4 above was officially discontinued. The MIS curriculum with the Business Programming Concentration was replaced by a curriculum with no Concentrations in 2012.  The Objective 4 below was formally adopted in Fall 2015 with data collection to begin 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. |  |  |  |  |
| 4. (2016-2017) 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. | **MIS 3530.**  Fall 2016, Spring 2017  Assessed in MIS 3530 – Business Web Site Design. |  | Due to a sabbatical leave by the faculty member who regularly teaches this course, and the lack of an established rubric for this new learning objective, no data for this learning objective was collected during 2016-17. | Data not collected for 2016-17.  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. (2014-2015) Analyze and design enterprise-level networks including security and network management.  (This objective applies only to students who take an advanced course in network security, including those majoring in MIS in the Network Technologies Concentration under a previous curriculum.) | **MIS 4850 Final Exam.**  Spring 2015.  Assessed in MIS 4850 – Systems Security.  The comprehensive final exam assesses 5 criteria. See the attached Assessment Rubric for MIS 4850 Final Exam. | 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 4850 Final Exam. | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **MIS 4850, Spring 2015** | | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Average for all students | Students achieving level 3 or better | | Understanding of various types of systems attacks | 20 | 3.80 | x = 19  95.0% | | Knowledge of defense systems, etc. | 20 | 3.85 | x = 19  95.0% | | Understanding of cryptographic systems | 20 | 3.80 | x = 19  95.0% | | Understanding of applications’ security | 20 | 3.70 | x = 18  90.0% | | Configuring defense tools | 20 | 3.85 | x = 19  95.0% | | Data collected by Dr. Abdou Illia.  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. (2015-2016)  Note: The Objective 5 above was officially discontinued. The MIS curriculum with the Network Technologies Concentration was replaced by a curriculum with no Concentrations in 2012.  The Objective 5 below was formally adopted in Fall 2015 with data collection to begin 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. |  |  |  |  |
| 5. (2016-2017) Integrate the various functions of a business using an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system. | **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, Spring 2017**  **Final Exam** | | | | | Course Learning Objective | n | Average for all students | Students achieving 8 or better | | Differentiate organizational structure and processes. (Concept) | 17 | 9.1 | x = 13  76.5% | | Differentiate organizational structure and processes. (Application) | 17 | 7.8 | x = 9  52.9% | | Identify structural problems. | 17 | 8.3 | x = 11  64.7% | | Integrate business processes. | 17 | 9.8 | x = 16  94.1% | | Model, analyze, and improve processes. | 17 | 7.2 | x = 6  35.3% | | Impact of ERP systems. | 17 | 9.5 | x = 15  88.2% | | Coordinate processes. | 17 | 9.6 | x = 16  94.1% | | Data collected by Dr. Larry White. |
| 6. Demonstrate proficient communication skills. | This is a learning goal. Look below for the learning objectives. |  |  |  |
| 6.1. Create effective written communications. | **MIS 3530 Group Project Reports.**  Fall 2014.  Assessed in MIS 3530 – Business Web Site Design.  Assessed using the School of Business Writing Rubric to evaluate a team report for a comprehensive multi-part web site design project. See attached rubric. | At least 70% of the groups will score at Proficient or above on each component of the Writing rubric. | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **MIS 3530, Fall 2014**  **Group Project Reports** | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Groups achieving Proficient or better | | Development and Purpose | 9 | x = 8  88.9% | | Organization | 9 | x = 7  77.8% | | Style | 9 | x = 9  100.0% | | Research/data information &  integration | 9 | x = 7  77.8% | | Managerial Response | 9 | x = 7  77.8% | | Mechanics | 9 | x = 9  100.0% | | Data collected by Dr. Simon Lee in MIS 3530.  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 3530 Individual Writing Assignment.**  Fall 2016.  Assessed in MIS 3530 – Business Web Site Design.  Assessed using the School of Business Writing Rubric to evaluate individual students on a writing assignment. See attached rubric. | At least 70% of the students will score at Proficient or above on each component of the Writing rubric. | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **MIS 3530, Fall 2016**  **Individual Writing Assignment** | | | | Rubric Criteria | n | Students achieving Proficient or better | | Development and Purpose | 29 | x = 23  79.3% | | Organization | 29 | x =25  86.2% | | Style | 29 | x = 29  100.0% | | Research/data information &  integration | 29 | x = 28  96.6% | | Managerial Response | 29 | x = 25  86.2% | | Mechanics | 29 | x = 27  93.1% | | Data collected by Paul Brown in MIS 3530. |
|  | **EWP Submissions.**  Spring 2013, Summer 2013, Fall 2013,  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 2014 EWP Results**  1/2 = 50.0% scored at 3 or above.  MIS Average Rating = 2.5; n = 2.  University Average Rating = 3.40; n = 286.  **Fall 2014 EWP Results**  18/18 = 100.0% scored at 3 or above.  MIS Average Rating = 3.17; n = 18.  University Average Rating = 3.31; n = 2876.  **Spring 2015 EWP Results**  10/10 = 100.0% scored at 3 or above.  MIS Average Rating = 3.50; n = 10.  University Average Rating = 3.36; n = 2413.  **Summer 2015 EWP Results**  1/1 = 100.0% scored at 3 or above.  MIS Average Rating = 3.5; n = 1.  University Average Rating = 3.36; n = 251.  **Fall 2015 EWP Results**  16/17 = 94.1% scored at 3 or above.  MIS Average Rating = 3.26; n = 17.  University Average Rating = 3.38; n = 2473.  **Spring 2016 EWP Results**  23/25 = 92.0% scored at 3 or above.  MIS Average Rating = 3.28; n = 25.  University Average Rating = 3.38; n = 2112.  **Summer 2016 EWP Results**  4/4 = 100.0% scored at 3 or above.  MIS Average Rating = 3.50; n = 4.  University Average Rating = 3.42; n = 243.  **Fall 2016 EWP Results**  19/19 = 100.0% scored at 3 or above.  MIS Average Rating = 3.34; n = 19.  University Average Rating = 3.38; n = 1849.  **Spring 2017 EWP Results**  19/21 = 90.5% scored at 3 or above.  MIS Average Rating = 3.29; n = 21.  University Average Rating = 3.38; n = 1822. | Data collected by CASL. |
|  | **Senior Survey Question 1.2.**  Fall 2015.  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. | **Fall 2015 Senior Survey Results**  Average = 6.37, Std Dev. = 0.92, n = 8 | Data collected by School of Business Senior Survey. |
| 6.2. Make effective business presentations. | **MIS 4200 Group Project Presentations.**  Spring 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017.  Assessed in MIS 4200 – Systems and Database Analysis, Design, and Development.  Assessed by peer evaluations of team oral presentations for two phases of 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, Spring 2016**  **Group Database Project Presentations** | | | | | **Phase 1** | | | | | Component | n | Average for all students | Groups achieving 8 or better | | Visuals | 4 | 8.1 | x = 2  50.0% | | Content | 4 | 8.6 | x = 4  100.0% | | Style | 4 | 8.3 | x = 3  75.0% | | Q&A | 4 | 8.3 | x = 3  75.0% | | Overall | 4 | 8.5 | x = 3  75.0% | | **Phase 2** | | | | | Visuals | 4 | 8.8 | x = 3  75.0% | | Content | 4 | 8.8 | x = 4  100.0% | | Style | 4 | 9.1 | x = 4  100.0% | | Q&A | 4 | 8.9 | x = 4  100.0% | | Overall | 4 | 8.9 | x = 4  100.0% | | Data collected by Dr. Tina Wang in MIS 4200.  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 4200, Fall 2016**  **Group Database Project Presentations** | | | | | **Phase 1** | | | | | Component | n | Average for all students | Groups achieving 8 or better | | Visuals | 4 | 8.2 | x = 3  75.0% | | Content | 4 | 8.8 | x = 3  75.0% | | Style | 4 | 8.9 | x = 4  100.0% | | Q&A | 4 | 9.0 | x = 4  100.0% | | Overall | 4 | 9.1 | x = 4  100.0% | | **Phase 2** | | | | | Visuals | 4 | 9.2 | x = 4  100.0% | | Content | 4 | 9.2 | x = 4  100.0% | | Style | 4 | 8.9 | x = 4  100.0% | | Q&A | 4 | 9.1 | x = 4  100.0% | | Overall | 4 | 9.3 | x = 4  100.0% | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **MIS 4200, Spring 2017**  **Group Database Project Presentations** | | | | | **Phase 1** | | | | | Component | n | Average for all students | Groups achieving 8 or better | | Visuals | 4 | 9.1 | x = 4  100.0% | | Content | 4 | 9.0 | x = 4  100.0% | | Style | 4 | 9.3 | x = 4  100.0% | | Q&A | 4 | 9.2 | x = 4  100.0% | | Overall | 4 | 9.0 | x = 4  100.0% | | **Phase 2** | | | | | Visuals | 4 | 9.6 | x = 4  100.0% | | Content | 4 | 9.2 | x = 4  100.0% | | Style | 4 | 9.4 | x = 4  100.0% | | Q&A | 4 | 9.6 | x = 4  100.0% | | Overall | 4 | 9.4 | x = 4  100.0% | |  |
|  | **Senior Seminar.**  Fall 2014, Spring 2015,  Fall 2015, Spring 2016,  Fall 2016, Spring 2017.  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 the Overall score.  The average rating on the Overall score will be 3.0 or above. | **Summer 2014 Senior Seminar Speaking Results**  5/5 = 100.0% scored at 3 or above.  Average Rating = 3.60; n = 5.  **Fall 2014 Senior Seminar Speaking Results**  8/8 = 100.0% scored at 3 or above.  Average Rating = 3.50; n = 8.  **Spring 2015 Senior Seminar Speaking Results**  8/8 = 100.0% scored at 3 or above.  Average Rating = 3.75; n = 8.  **Summer 2015 Senior Seminar Speaking Results**  3/3 = 100.0% scored at 3 or above.  Average Rating = 3.67; n = 3.  **Fall 2015 Senior Seminar Speaking Results**  8/8 = 100.0% scored at 3 or above.  Average Rating = 3.88; n = 8.  **Spring 2016 Senior Seminar Speaking Results**  2/2 = 100.0% scored at 3 or above.  Average Rating = 4.00; n = 2.  **Summer 2016 Senior Seminar Speaking Results**  3/3 = 100.0% scored at 3 or above.  Average Rating = 3.67; n = 3.  **Fall 2016 Senior Seminar Speaking Results**  8/9 = 88.9% scored at 3 or above.  Average Rating = 3.44; n = 9.  **Spring 2017 Senior Seminar Speaking Results**  6/7 = 85.7% scored at 3 or above.  Average Rating = 3.57; n = 7. | Assessed by the Senior Seminar instructor and reported by CASL. |
|  | **Senior Survey Questions 1.1 and 1.3.**  Fall 2015.  Student satisfaction with oral communication skills as measured by Senior Survey question 1.1 (I can make effective business presentations.) and question 1.3 (I can communicate effectively orally about business matters.) | Students will average at least 6 out of 7 on both of these questions. | **Fall 2015 Senior Survey Results for Question 1.1**  Average = 6.50, Std Dev. = 0.53, n = 8  **Fall 2015 Senior Survey Results for Question 1.3**  Average = 6.25, Std Dev. = 1.16, n = 8 | Data collected by School of Business Senior Survey. |
| 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. |  | **AY 2015 Results:**  MIS Students: Average =27.14; n = 21  All EIU Seniors: Average = 24.68; n = 1478 |  |

(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 was implemented in 2016-17. No data for Learning Objectives 4 and 5 was collected during 2015-16 as a transition year.

The MIS Assessment Plan called for the new Learning Objective 4 to be assessed in MIS 3530 Business Web Site Design. However, due to a sabbatical leave by the faculty member who regularly teaches this course, and the lack of an established rubric for this new learning objective, no data for this learning objective was collected during 2016-17.

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 software and the envisioned computer exercises were not conducted. 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.

With the transition in MIS curricula and MIS Learning Objectives, we have not formally expanded our coverage of the EIU undergraduate learning goals as suggested by the Director of CASA in response to our most recent report.

Due to budgetary constraints during this three-year assessment period, Senior Surveys were administered only one semester (Fall 2015) in the School of Business. Therefore, indirect assessment of Learning Objectives 1, 3, 6.1, and 6.2 via that instrument is very limited in this report.

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.

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 2014-17.**

Assessment Rubric for MIS 3200 Lab Projects – Fall 2014 (Illia)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. | Demonstrates basic skills for installing and configuring a NOS.  **1** | Demonstrates good skills for installing and configuring a NOS.  **3** | Demonstrates extensive skills for installing and configuring a NOS.  **14** |
| **Disk management including partitioning, de-fragmenting, quotas.** | Demonstrates no or little skills for managing disks. | Demonstrates limited skills for managing disks. | Demonstrates basic skills for managing disks.  **2** | Demonstrates good skills for managing disks.  **1** | Demonstrates extensive skills for managing disks.  **15** |
| **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. | 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.  **16** |
| **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. | Demonstrates good skills for implementing directory services and managing domain users.  **3** | Demonstrates extensive skills for implementing directory services and managing domain users.  **15** |
| **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.  **1** | Demonstrates extensive skills for implementing group policies.  **16** |
| **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.  **1** | Demonstrates extensive skills for configuring Web services.  **16** |

Assessment Rubric for MIS 3200 Lab Projects – Spring 2015 (Illia)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. | Demonstrates basic skills for installing and configuring a NOS.  **1** | Demonstrates good skills for installing and configuring a NOS.  **1** | Demonstrates extensive skills for installing and configuring a NOS.  **13** |
| **Disk management including partitioning, de-fragmenting, quotas.** | Demonstrates no or little skills for managing disks. | Demonstrates limited skills for managing disks. | Demonstrates basic skills for managing disks. | Demonstrates good skills for managing disks.  **1** | Demonstrates extensive skills for managing disks.  **14** |
| **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. | 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.  **2** | Demonstrates extensive skills for managing user and group accounts, and assigning rights.  **12** |
| **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.  **1** | Demonstrates good skills for implementing directory services and managing domain users.  **1** | Demonstrates extensive skills for implementing directory services and managing domain users.  **13** |
| **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.  **1** | Demonstrates extensive skills for implementing group policies.  **13** |
| **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. | Demonstrates good skills for configuring Web services.  **2** | Demonstrates extensive skills for configuring Web services.  **13** |

Assessment Rubric for MIS 3200 Lab Projects – Fall 2015 (Illia)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Level of Comprehensiveness | | | | |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| **Installing and configuring a network operating system.** | Demonstrates no or little skills for installing and configuring a NOS. | Demonstrates limited skills for installing and configuring a NOS. | 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.  **10** |
| **Disk management including partitioning, de-fragmenting, quotas.** | Demonstrates no or little skills for managing disks. | Demonstrates limited skills for managing disks. | Demonstrates basic skills for managing disks.  **1** | Demonstrates good skills for managing disks.  **3** | Demonstrates extensive skills for managing disks.  **10** |
| **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. | Demonstrates basic skills for managing user and group accounts, and assigning rights.  **2** | Demonstrates good skills for managing user and group accounts, and assigning rights.  **3** | Demonstrates extensive skills for managing user and group accounts, and assigning rights.  **9** |
| **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.  **4** | Demonstrates extensive skills for implementing directory services and managing users.  **8** |
| **Implementing group policies.** | Demonstrates no or little skills for implementing policies. | Demonstrates limited skills for implementing policies. | Demonstrates basic skills for implementing group policies.  **3** | Demonstrates good skills for implementing group policies.  **3** | Demonstrates extensive skills for implement. policies.  **8** |
| **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.  **5** | Demonstrates extensive skills for configuring Web services.  **8** |

Assessment Rubric for MIS 3200 Lab Projects – Spring 2016 (Illia)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Level of Comprehensiveness | | | | |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| **Installing and configuring a network operating system.** | Demonstrates no or little skills for installing and configuring a NOS. | Demonstrates limited skills for installing and configuring a NOS. | Demonstrates basic skills for installing and configuring a NOS.  **3** | Demonstrates good skills for installing and configuring a NOS.  **2** | Demonstrates extensive skills for installing and configuring a NOS.  **11** |
| **Disk management including partitioning, de-fragmenting, quotas.** | Demonstrates no or little skills for managing disks. | Demonstrates limited skills for managing disks. | Demonstrates basic skills for managing disks.  **2** | Demonstrates good skills for managing disks.  **3** | Demonstrates extensive skills for managing disks.  **11** |
| **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. | Demonstrates basic skills for managing user and group accounts, and assigning rights.  **2** | Demonstrates good skills for managing user and group accounts, and assigning rights.  **4** | Demonstrates extensive skills for managing user and group accounts, and assigning rights.  **10** |
| **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.  **4** | Demonstrates extensive skills for implementing directory services and managing users.  **10** |
| **Implementing group policies.** | Demonstrates no or little skills for implementing policies. | Demonstrates limited skills for implementing policies. | Demonstrates basic skills for implementing group policies.  **3** | Demonstrates good skills for implementing group policies.  **3** | Demonstrates extensive skills for implement. policies.  **10** |
| **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.  **5** | Demonstrates extensive skills for configuring Web services. **10** |

Assessment Rubric for MIS 3200 Lab Projects – Fall 2016 (Illia)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Level of Comprehensiveness | | | | |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| **Installing and configuring a network operating system.** | Demonstrates no or little skills for installing and configuring a NOS. | Demonstrates limited skills for installing and configuring a NOS. | Demonstrates basic skills for installing and configuring a NOS.  **2** | Demonstrates good skills for installing and configuring a NOS.  **9** | Demonstrates extensive skills for installing and configuring a NOS.  **12** |
| **Disk management including partitioning, de-fragmenting, quotas.** | Demonstrates no or little skills for managing disks. | Demonstrates limited skills for managing disks. | Demonstrates basic skills for managing disks.  **1** | Demonstrates good skills for managing disks.  **8** | Demonstrates extensive skills for managing disks.  **14** |
| **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. | Demonstrates basic skills for managing user and group accounts, and assigning rights.  **3** | Demonstrates good skills for managing user and group accounts, and assigning rights.  **7** | Demonstrates extensive skills for managing user and group accounts, and assigning rights.  **13** |
| **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.  **8** | Demonstrates extensive skills for implementing directory services and managing users.  **13** |
| **Implementing group policies.** | Demonstrates no or little skills for implementing policies. | Demonstrates limited skills for implementing policies. | Demonstrates basic skills for implementing group policies.  **3** | Demonstrates good skills for implementing group policies.  **7** | Demonstrates extensive skills for implement. policies.  **13** |
| **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.  **9** | Demonstrates extensive skills for configuring Web services. **13** |

Assessment Rubric for MIS 3200 Lab Projects – Spring 2017 (Illia)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Level of Comprehensiveness | | | | |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| **Installing and configuring a network operating system.** | Demonstrates no or little skills for installing and configuring a NOS. | Demonstrates limited skills for installing and configuring a NOS. | Demonstrates basic skills for installing and configuring a NOS.  **2** | Demonstrates good skills for installing and configuring a NOS.  **8** | Demonstrates extensive skills for installing and configuring a NOS.  **11** |
| **Disk management including partitioning, de-fragmenting, quotas.** | Demonstrates no or little skills for managing disks. | Demonstrates limited skills for managing disks. | Demonstrates basic skills for managing disks.  **1** | Demonstrates good skills for managing disks.  **8** | Demonstrates extensive skills for managing disks.  **12** |
| **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. | Demonstrates basic skills for managing user and group accounts, and assigning rights.  **3** | Demonstrates good skills for managing user and group accounts, and assigning rights.  **7** | Demonstrates extensive skills for managing user and group accounts, and assigning rights.  **11** |
| **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.  **7** | Demonstrates extensive skills for implementing directory services and managing users.  **12** |
| **Implementing group policies.** | Demonstrates no or little skills for implementing policies. | Demonstrates limited skills for implementing policies. | Demonstrates basic skills for implementing group policies.  **3** | Demonstrates good skills for implementing group policies.  **7** | Demonstrates extensive skills for implement. policies.  **11** |
| **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.  **9** | Demonstrates extensive skills for configuring Web services. **11** |

Assessment Rubric for MIS 3200 Final Exam – Fall 2014 (Illia)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. | Basic understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models.  **1** | Good understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models.  **3** | 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. | Basic knowledge of internetworking devices. | Good knowledge of internetworking devices.  **4** | 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.  **1** | Good understanding of data and signal transmission.  **1** | 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.  **1** | Good knowledge of physical and wireless media.  **2** | 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.  **1** | Good understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing.  **2** | Complete understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing.  **15** |

Assessment Rubric for MIS 3200 Final Exam – Spring 2015 (Illia)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. | Basic understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models.  **1** | Good understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models.  **1** | Complete understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models.  **13** |
| **Knowledge of internetworking devices (switch, bridge, routers)** | No knowledge of internetworking device. | Limited knowledge of internetworking devices. | Basic knowledge of internetworking devices. | Good knowledge of internetworking devices.  **2** | Complete knowledge of internetworking devices.  **13** |
| **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.  **1** | Good understanding of data and signal transmission.  **1** | Complete understanding of data and signal transmission.  **13** |
| **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.  **1** | Good knowledge of physical and wireless media.  **2** | Complete knowledge of physical and wireless media.  **12** |
| **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.  **1** | Good understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing.  **1** | Complete understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing.  **13** |

Assessment Rubric for MIS 3200 Final Exam – Fall 2015 (Illia)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. | 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.  **10** |
| **Knowledge of internetworking devices (switch, bridge, routers)** | No knowledge of internetworking device. | Limited knowledge of internetworking devices. | Basic knowledge of internetworking devices.  **2** | Good knowledge of internetworking devices.  **1** | Complete knowledge of internetworking devices.  **11** |
| **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.  **1** | Good understanding of data and signal transmission.  **2** | Complete understanding of data and signal transmission.  **11** |
| **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.  **1** | Good knowledge of physical and wireless media.  **2** | Complete knowledge of physical and wireless media.  **11** |
| **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.  **1** | Good understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing.  **2** | Complete understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing.  **11** |

Assessment Rubric for MIS 3200 Final Exam – Spring 2016 (Illia)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. | Basic understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models.  **2** | Good understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models.  **3** | Complete understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models.  **11** |
| **Knowledge of internetworking devices (switch, bridge, routers)** | No knowledge of internetworking device. | Limited knowledge of internetworking devices. | Basic knowledge of internetworking devices.  **2** | Good knowledge of internetworking devices.  **4** | Complete knowledge of internetworking devices.  **10** |
| **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.  **3** | Complete understanding of data and signal transmission.  **11** |
| **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.  **11** |
| **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.  **11** |

Assessment Rubric for MIS 3200 Final Exam – Fall 2016 (Illia)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. | Basic understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models.  **3** | Good understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models.  **8** | Complete understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models.  **12** |
| **Knowledge of internetworking devices (switch, bridge, routers)** | No knowledge of internetworking device. | Limited knowledge of internetworking devices. | Basic knowledge of internetworking devices.  **2** | Good knowledge of internetworking devices.  **9** | Complete knowledge of internetworking devices.  **12** |
| **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.  **3** | Good understanding of data and signal transmission.  **9** | Complete understanding of data and signal transmission.  **11** |
| **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.  **1** | Good knowledge of physical and wireless media.  **7** | 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.  **1** | Good understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing.  **8** | Complete understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing.  **14** |

Assessment Rubric for MIS 3200 Final Exam – Spring 2017 (Illia)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. | Basic understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models.  **2** | Good understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models.  **8** | Complete understanding of the OSI and the TCP/IP models.  **11** |
| **Knowledge of internetworking devices (switch, bridge, routers)** | No knowledge of internetworking device. | Limited knowledge of internetworking devices. | Basic knowledge of internetworking devices.  **2** | Good knowledge of internetworking devices.  **7** | Complete knowledge of internetworking devices.  **12** |
| **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.  **3** | Good understanding of data and signal transmission.  **7** | Complete understanding of data and signal transmission.  **11** |
| **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.  **1** | Good knowledge of physical and wireless media.  **7** | Complete knowledge of physical and wireless media.  **13** |
| **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.  **1** | Good understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing.  **8** | Complete understanding of the Internet operation and IP addressing.  **12** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SCHOOL OF BUSINESS** | | **Fall 2015** | |  | |
| **SENIOR SURVEYS RESULTS** | | **n=8** | | **n=** | |
| **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.** | **6.50** | **0.53** |  |  |
| **1.2** | **I can communicate effectively in writing about business matters.** | **6.37** | **0.92** |  |  |
| **1.3** | **I can communicate effectively orally about business matters.** | **6.25** | **1.16** |  |  |
| **1.4** | **I understand the interactions between the global environment and individual businesses.** | **6.12** | **0.64** |  |  |
| 1.5 | I understand the processes for developing organizational policies, strategies, and objectives. | 6.00 | 0.76 |  |  |
| **1.6** | **I understand the effects of laws and regulations on business decision-making.** | **5.75** | **1.04** |  |  |
| **1.7** | **I can recognize and analyze ethical issues as part of business decision-making.** | **6.25** | **0.71** |  |  |
| **1.8** | **I understand the implications of diversity in the business environment.** | **6.25** | **1.04** |  |  |
| 1.9 | I can analyze financial statements of business organizations. | 6.37 | 0.52 |  |  |
| 1.10 | I understand the finance functions within business organizations. | 6.00 | 1.07 |  |  |
| 1.11 | I understand the role of the customer in meeting organizational objectives. | 6.62 | 0.74 |  |  |
| 1.12 | I understand pricing, distribution, and promotion of goods and services. | 6.25 | 0.46 |  |  |
| 1.13 | I understand the functions of managers in planning, organizing, leading, and controlling organizations. | 6.62 | 0.52 |  |  |
| 1.14 | I understand the role of human interactions in successful organizations. | 6.62 | 0.52 |  |  |
| 1.15 | I understand how operations, finance, and marketing function together to achieve organizational objectives. | 6.25 | 0.71 |  |  |
| 1.16 | I understand the uses of information systems in business decision-making. | 6.87 | 0.35 |  |  |
| 1.17 | I understand the role of technology in organizations. | 6.87 | 0.35 |  |  |
| 1.18 | I am able to work effectively as a member of a team. | 6.62 | 0.52 |  |  |
| **1.19** | **I can analyze and solve business problems.** | **6.62** | **0.52** |  |  |
| 1.20 | I can use the computer effectively for business applications. | 6.87 | 0.35 |  |  |
| **1.21** | **I am prepared to interpret statistical data for use in business decision-making.** | **6.12** | **1.13** |  |  |
| **1.22** | **I am prepared to interpret financial data for use in business decision-making.** | **6.00** | **0.93** |  |  |
| **1.23** | **I can effectively research businesses issues.** | **6.12** | **0.64** |  |  |

(continued on next page)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SCHOOL OF BUSINESS** | | **Fall 2015** | |  | |
| **SENIOR SURVEYS RESULTS (continued)** | | **n=8** | | **n=** | |
| **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.** | **6.25** | **0.71** |  |  |
| **2.2** | **I am prepared to use appropriate hardware and software as productivity tools for gathering, processing, storing, and retrieving information.** | **6.87** | **0.35** |  |  |
| **2.3** | **I am prepared to design, model and develop data base applications using appropriate program logic and constructs.** | **6.50** | **1.07** |  |  |
| **2.4** | **I am able to logically develop a solution to a business problem.** | **6.62** | **0.52** |  |  |
| **2.5** | **I am able to apply networking principles, and design and manage a computer network for a small business.** | **6.37** | **0.74** |  |  |
|  | 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. | 6.50 | 0.74 |  |  |
| 3.2 | Attitude of faculty toward students. | 6.14 | 1.21 |  |  |
| 3.3 | Class size in your major courses. | 6.75 | 0.46 |  |  |
| 3.4 | Concern shown to you as an individual. | 5.87 | 0.99 |  |  |
| 3.5 | Technology to support your class work. | 6.00 | 1.07 |  |  |
| 3.6 | Preparation to meet your professional goals. | 6.00 | 1.07 |  |  |
| 3.7 | Preparation to compete in job market. | 5.50 | 1.31 |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Information Systems Careers and Logic Skills MIS2000 - Homework assignment 1-4** | | | | **Fall 2014 (Hampton)** |  |
|  | Level of Comprehensiveness | | | | |
| CRITERIA | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Logical Reasoning and Concepts (HW4) | 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.  **1** | 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. **16** |
| Problem-Solving Strategies/ Procedures (HW4) | 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.  **1** | Typically, uses an effective strategy to solve the problem(s).  **4** | Typically, uses an efficient and effective strategy to solve the problem(s).  **16** |
| Algorithm & Logic Development (HW4) | 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. | 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. | 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.  **2** | 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. **19** |

(continued on next page)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Information Systems Careers and Logic Skills MIS2000 - Homework assignment 1-4** | | | | **Fall 2014 (Hampton)** | (continued) |
|  | Level of Comprehensiveness | | | | |
| CRITERIA | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Program Documentation: Program Purpose, Explanations, Clarity of Coding, and Annotation (HW4) | 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. | 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. | 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.  **10** | 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.  **10** |
| Program Requirements and Specifications: Identifies important details and information (HW4) | 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. **2** | 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. | Student identifies most main requirements of the problem accurately, but may have some inaccuracies. One requirement for the program was not met.  **2** | Student identifies all main requirements of the problem accurately. All requirements for the program are met.  **17** |
| Identify user decisions; determine implications on logic; use design techniques to implement user decisions (HW4) | 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. **2** | 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.  **2** | 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.  **17** |

(continued on next page)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Information Systems Careers and Logic Skills MIS2000 - Homework assignment 1-4** | | | | **Fall 2014 (Hampton)** | (continued) |
|  | Level of Comprehensiveness | | | | |
| CRITERIA | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Record at a time processing (HW1) | 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.  **4** | Student can design and code some instructions accurately but may have some inaccuracies. Two requirements for the program were not met. **1** | Student can design and code most instructions accurately but may have some inaccuracies. One requirement for the program was not met.  **5** | Student can design and code for single record or input from the screen. All requirements for the program are met.  **13** |
| Looping constructs (HW2) | Student cannot design and code any loop constructs. No requirements for the program were met.  **1** | Student cannot design and code some loop constructs accurately; many inaccuracies. More than two requirements for the program were not met.  **4** | Student can design and code some loop constructs accurately but may have some inaccuracies. Two requirements for the program were not met.  **4** | Student can design and code most loop constructs accurately but may have some inaccuracies. One requirement for the program was not met.  **8** | Student can design and code loop constructs accurately. All requirements for the program are met.  **5** |
| Modularization techniques (HW3) | Student cannot design or perform modularization techniques. None meet requirements.  **1** | Student can design and perform modularization techniques accurately, but has many to all that don't meet requirement.  **1** | Student can design and perform modularization techniques accurately, but may have several that don't meet requirement. **3** | Student can design and perform modularization techniques accurately, but may have one that doesn't meet requirement. **6** | Student can design and perform modularization techniques accurately. All requirements for the program are met.  **12** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Information Systems Careers and Logic Skills MIS2000 - Homework assignment 1-4** | | | | **Spring 2015 (Hampton)** |  |
|  | Level of Comprehensiveness | | | | |
| CRITERIA | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Logical Reasoning and Concepts (HW4) | 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.  **1** | Explanation of problem shows substantial understanding of the logical concepts used to solve the problem(s). Uses effective logic reasoning.  **1** | Explanation of problem shows complete understanding of the logical concepts used to solve the problem(s). Uses complex and refined logical reasoning.  **8** |
| Problem-Solving Strategies/ Procedures (HW4) | 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.  **1** | Typically, uses an effective strategy to solve the problem(s).  **1** | Typically, uses an efficient and effective strategy to solve the problem(s).  **8** |
| Algorithm & Logic Development (HW4) | 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. | 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. | 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. | 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.  **8** |

(continued on next page)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Information Systems Careers and Logic Skills MIS2000 - Homework assignment 1-4** | | | | **Spring 2015 (Hampton)** | (continued) |
|  | Level of Comprehensiveness | | | | |
| CRITERIA | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Program Documentation: Program Purpose, Explanations, Clarity of Coding, and Annotation (HW4) | No documentation.  **2** | 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. | 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. **1** | 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.  **1** | 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.  **5** |
| Program Requirements and Specifications: Identifies important details and information (HW4) | 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. **1** | Student identifies most main requirements of the problem accurately, but may have some inaccuracies. One requirement for the program was not met.  **1** | Student identifies all main requirements of the problem accurately. All requirements for the program are met.  **8** |
| Identify user decisions; determine implications on logic; use design techniques to implement user decisions (HW4) | 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. | 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.  **1** | 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. |

(continued on next page)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Information Systems Careers and Logic Skills MIS2000 - Homework assignment 1-4** | | | | **Spring 2015 (Hampton)** | (continued) |
|  | Level of Comprehensiveness | | | | |
| CRITERIA | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Record at a time processing (HW1) | 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.  **1** | Student can design and code some instructions accurately but may have some inaccuracies. Two requirements for the program were not met. **3** | Student can design and code most instructions accurately but may have some inaccuracies. One requirement for the program was not met.  **3** | Student can design and code for single record or input from the screen. All requirements for the program are met.  **3** |
| Looping constructs (HW2) | 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.  **2** | Student can design and code some loop constructs accurately but may have some inaccuracies. Two requirements for the program were not met.  **4** | Student can design and code most loop constructs accurately but may have some inaccuracies. One requirement for the program was not met.  **2** | Student can design and code loop constructs accurately. All requirements for the program are met.  **1** |
| Modularization techniques (HW3) | 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.  **2** | Student can design and perform modularization techniques accurately, but may have several that don't meet requirement. | Student can design and perform modularization techniques accurately, but may have one that doesn't meet requirement. **2** | Student can design and perform modularization techniques accurately. All requirements for the program are met.  **6** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Introduction to Business Logic and Programming Skills MIS2000 - Homework Assignments** | | | | **Fall 2015 (Lee)** |  |
|  | 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. | Explanation of problem shows substantial understanding of the logical concepts used to solve the problem(s). Uses effective logic reasoning.  **1** | Explanation of problem shows complete understanding of the logical concepts used to solve the problem(s). Uses complex and refined logical reasoning. **17** |
| 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. | Typically, uses an effective strategy to solve the problem(s).  **2** | Typically, uses an efficient and effective strategy to solve the problem(s).  **16** |
| 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. | 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.  **1** | 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.  **2** | 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** |

(continued on next page)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Introduction to Business Logic and Programming Skills MIS2000 - Homework Assignments** | | | | **Fall 2015 (Lee)** | (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. **2** | 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.  **2** | 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.  **13** |
| 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. | Student identifies most main requirements of the problem accurately, but may have some inaccuracies. One requirement for the program was not met.  **1** | Student identifies all main requirements of the problem accurately. All requirements for the program are met.  **17** |
| 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. | 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.  **2** | 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.  **16** |

(continued on next page)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Introduction to Business Logic and Programming Skills MIS2000 - Homework Assignments** | | | | **Fall 2015 (Lee)** | (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. **2** | Student can design and code most instructions accurately but may have some inaccuracies. One requirement for the program was not met.  **11** | Student can design and code for single record or input from the screen. All requirements for the program are met.  **5** |
| 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.  **1** | Student can design and code some loop constructs accurately but may have some inaccuracies. Two requirements for the program were not met.  **1** | Student can design and code most loop constructs accurately but may have some inaccuracies. One requirement for the program was not met.  **13** | Student can design and code loop constructs accurately. All requirements for the program are met.  **3** |
| 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.  **2** | Student can design and perform modularization techniques accurately, but may have several that don't meet requirement. **2** | Student can design and perform modularization techniques accurately, but may have one that doesn't meet requirement. **7** | Student can design and perform modularization techniques accurately. All requirements for the program are met.  **7** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Introduction to Business Logic and Programming Skills MIS2000 - Homework Assignments** | | | | **Spring 2016 (Lee)** |  |
|  | 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. | Explanation of problem shows substantial understanding of the logical concepts used to solve the problem(s). Uses effective logic reasoning.  **2** | 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.  **1** | Typically, uses an effective strategy to solve the problem(s).  **2** | 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. | 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.  **1** | 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.  **1** | 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. **18** |

(continued on next page)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Introduction to Business Logic and Programming Skills MIS2000 - Homework Assignments** | | | | **Spring 2016 (Lee)** | (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. **2** | 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. **1** | 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.  **4** | 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.  **13** |
| 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. | Student identifies most main requirements of the problem accurately, but may have some inaccuracies. One requirement for the program was not met.  **1** | Student identifies all main requirements of the problem accurately. All requirements for the program are met.  **19** |
| 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. **1** | 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.  **4** | 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.  **15** |

(continued on next page)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Introduction to Business Logic and Programming Skills MIS2000 - Homework Assignments** | | | | **Spring 2016 (Lee)** | (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. **3** | Student can design and code most instructions accurately but may have some inaccuracies. One requirement for the program was not met.  **14** | Student can design and code for single record or input from the screen. All requirements for the program are met.  **3** |
| 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.  **2** | Student can design and code some loop constructs accurately but may have some inaccuracies. Two requirements for the program were not met.  **1** | Student can design and code most loop constructs accurately but may have some inaccuracies. One requirement for the program was not met.  **7** | 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.  **2** | Student can design and perform modularization techniques accurately, but may have several that don't meet requirement. **5** | Student can design and perform modularization techniques accurately, but may have one that doesn't meet requirement. **8** | Student can design and perform modularization techniques accurately. All requirements for the program are met.  **5** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Introduction to Business Logic and Programming Skills MIS2000 - Homework Assignments** | | | | **Fall 2016 (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.  **2** | Explanation of problem shows substantial understanding of the logical concepts used to solve the problem(s). Uses effective logic reasoning.  **10** | Explanation of problem shows complete understanding of the logical concepts used to solve the problem(s). Uses complex and refined logical reasoning. **3** |
| 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.  **1** | Typically, uses an effective strategy to solve the problem(s).  **2** | Typically, uses an efficient and effective strategy to solve the problem(s).  **12** |
| 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.  **4** |

(continued on next page)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Introduction to Business Logic and Programming Skills MIS2000 - Homework Assignments** | | | | **Fall 2016 (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. **2** | 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.  **2** | 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.  **10** |
| 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. **1** | Student identifies most main requirements of the problem accurately, but may have some inaccuracies. One requirement for the program was not met.  **8** | Student identifies all main requirements of the problem accurately. All requirements for the program are met.  **6** |
| 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. **3** | 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.  **8** | 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.  **4** |

(continued on next page)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Introduction to Business Logic and Programming Skills MIS2000 - Homework Assignments** | | | | **Fall 2016 (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. **3** | Student can design and code most instructions accurately but may have some inaccuracies. One requirement for the program was not met.  **2** | Student can design and code for single record or input from the screen. All requirements for the program are met.  **10** |
| 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.  **2** | Student can design and code most loop constructs accurately but may have some inaccuracies. One requirement for the program was not met.  **7** | Student can design and code loop constructs accurately. All requirements for the program are met.  **6** |
| 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. **6** | Student can design and perform modularization techniques accurately. All requirements for the program are met.  **5** |

Management Information Systems Assessment Plan

Assessment Rubric for MIS 4200 Database Project—Fall 2014 (Illia)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Level of Comprehensiveness | | | | |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Understand and apply activities in the systems development life cycle to produce appropriate deliverables | Little or no application of SDLC phases. No Baseline Project plan; no feasibility assessment; no project scope statement; no project management techniques; little or no documentation of SDLC. | At least two phases of SDLC complete. Minimal Baseline Project plan, feasibility addressed but not complete; limited scope statement; limited project management techniques; limited documentation of SDLC. 1 | At least 3 phases of SDLC complete; Baseline Project plan sections present but lacking in depth; feasibility complete but lacking depth; project management techniques present including Gantt charts; documentation present but lacking depth. 1 | At least 4 phases of SDLC complete; all sections of Baseline Project plan complete with appropriate supporting detail and feasibility. Project management techniques present including Gantt charts and management analysis; documentation complete. 2 | All 5 phases of SDLC complete; all sections of Baseline Project plan complete with full support-ing documentation. Project management techniques present including Gantt charts, management analysis, and full feasibility with sufficient economic analysis. Manage-ment issues fully analyzed and documented. Complete doc-umentation fully organized. 16 |
| Creates appropriate systems process diagrams and documentation to support systems design and development | Little or no under-standing of process modeling. Context DFD incomplete and does not represent business reality. Diagram 0 and subsequent Level diagrams missing. Structured English logic missing. | Minimal understanding of process modeling. Context DFD complete; incomplete Diagram 0 and subsequent Level diagrams missing. Structured English logic missing and/or incomplete. | Context Diagram and Level 0 diagrams complete but subsequent Level diagrams missing and/or incomplete. Diagrams not balanced. Structured English logic incomplete and does not reflect Level diagrams. Little or no documentation.  1 | Context Diagram and Level 0 diagrams complete and balanced. Subsequent Level diagrams mostly complete and balanced. Structured English logic mostly complete and reflects Level diagrams. Some documentation. 2 | All DFD diagrams complete and balanced. Structured English logic complete and reflects Level diagrams. Full documentation of diagrams.  17 |
| Creates complete logical data models and documentation to support systems design and development | Incorrect Entity Relationship Diagram; no application of normalization principles. | Minimal Entity Relationship Diagram with incorrect resolution of many-to-many relationships; minimal cardinality and connectivity principles applied; normalized to at least First Normal Form. 1 | Entity Relationship Diagram with resolution of many-to-many relationships; some cardinality and connect-ivity principles applied; some errors in normal-ization but understanding of normalization demonstrated. 1 | Entity Relationship Diagram with correct cardinality and connectivity applied. Third Normal Form principles applied.  1 | Demonstrates full understanding of Entity Relationship Diagram, including unary and recursive relationships. Demonstrates full understanding of normalization principles.    17 |
| Application of Relational Principles and Structured Query Language | Violates principles of relational design; inability to write simple SQL DDL and DML statements. | Shows minimal understanding of relational principles; can write simple SQL DDL and DML statements using single table structures.  1 | Shows understanding of relational principles and can apply the principles to table design; can write SQL DDL and DML statements involving more than one table.  1 | Shows understanding of relational principles and can apply the principles to table and view design. Can write complex SQL DDL and DML statements involving multiple tables, including joins, unions, and intersections. 1 | Shows full understanding of relational principles and can apply the principles to table, view, and index design. Can write complex SQL DDL and DML statements, including all types of joins, unions, intersections, and complex subqueries. 17 |

(continued on next page)

Management Information Systems Assessment Plan

Assessment Rubric for MIS 4200 Database Project—Fall 2014 (Illia) – (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Application of Principles of Human Interface Design | Demonstrates little or no understanding of interface design principles in forms, reports and graphics; does not apply template design to the project. | Demonstrates minimal understanding of interface design principles in forms, reports, and graphics; templates not consistently applied. Minimal GUIs and menus with nonworking items. Graphics inconsistently used.  1 | Demonstrates understanding of interface design principles with minimal template application. Forms, reports, and graphics work consistently with database. Working GUIs and menus. Graphics applied.  1 | Demonstrates understanding of interface design principles with complete template application in forms, reports, and graphics. Working GUIs and menus with graphics form integrated project. Demonstrates understanding of multiple breaks and groupings in reports. 3 | Demonstrates full understanding of interface design principles with sophisticated templates. A range of GUIs used with full drop-down menus. Various graphic formats applied. Full range of forms and reports models applied.  15 |
| Use of Programming Logic Constructs | Demonstrates little or no understanding of programming constructs and Oracle PL/SQL. | Demonstrates minimal understanding of programming constructs and Oracle PL/SQL; modules do not perform consistently; GUI triggers not correctly configured; little or no error trapping.  1 | Demonstrates understanding of programming constructs and Oracle PL/SQL; modules perform consistently; GUI triggers configured correctly; minimal error trapping.  1 | Demonstrates understanding of programming constructs and Oracle PL/SQL; demonstrates ability to create program blocks and GUI triggers with use wide range of Oracle functions and procedures; error trapping consistent with module development. 1 | Demonstrates full understanding of programming constructs and Oracle PL/SQL; demonstrates ability to create sophisticated program blocks with integrated SQL code. Triggers show full knowledge of Oracle functions and procedures. Full error trapping.  17 |
| Integration of Multiple Programs from within main application; use of global program registries | Demonstrates little or no understanding of program integration; inability to create working project | Demonstrates minimal understanding of program integration; global registry not set correctly; project connections not set correctly; one or more of compiled modules fails. | Demonstrates understanding of program integration with global and user registries configured correctly. Project components compile correctly. Demonstrates use of multiple form application with global project paths.  1 | Demonstrates development of integrated database application with splash screen and timer, module navigation through multiple forms. Modules call programs from within programs using both data and control blocks.  3 | Demonstrates full understanding of integrated application with custom interfaces, sophisticated navigation tools, alerts and messages, and the use of data and control blocks from within modules.  16 |
| Creates complete systems and user documentation | Little or no system or user documentation. | Some system documentation but not complete or accurate. Little user documentation. | System documentation mostly complete but may not reflect current version of software. User documentation lacks appropriate logic and detail.  2 | System documentation complete and organized and reflects current version of software. User documentation is complete but lacks appropriate graphical detail. 2 | Full system and user documentation. Documentation is carefully organized and reflects current version of software. Graphical detail enhances documentation.  16 |

Management Information Systems Assessment Plan

Assessment Rubric for MIS 4200 Database Project—Spring 2015 (Illia)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Level of Comprehensiveness | | | | |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Understand and apply activities in the systems development life cycle to produce appropriate deliverables | Little or no application of SDLC phases. No Baseline Project plan; no feasibility assessment; no project scope statement; no project management techniques; little or no documentation of SDLC. | At least two phases of SDLC complete. Minimal Baseline Project plan, feasibility addressed but not complete; limited scope statement; limited project management techniques; limited documentation of SDLC. | At least 3 phases of SDLC complete; Baseline Project plan sections present but lacking in depth; feasibility complete but lacking depth; project management techniques present including Gantt charts; documentation present but lacking depth. 1 | At least 4 phases of SDLC complete; all sections of Baseline Project plan complete with appropriate supporting detail and feasibility. Project management techniques present including Gantt charts and management analysis; documentation complete. 1 | All 5 phases of SDLC complete; all sections of Baseline Project plan complete with full support-ing documentation. Project management techniques present including Gantt charts, management analysis, and full feasibility with sufficient economic analysis. Manage-ment issues fully analyzed and documented. Complete doc-umentation fully organized. 11 |
| Creates appropriate systems process diagrams and documentation to support systems design and development | Little or no under-standing of process modeling. Context DFD incomplete and does not represent business reality. Diagram 0 and subsequent Level diagrams missing. Structured English logic missing. | Minimal understanding of process modeling. Context DFD complete; incomplete Diagram 0 and subsequent Level diagrams missing. Structured English logic missing and/or incomplete. | Context Diagram and Level 0 diagrams complete but subsequent Level diagrams missing and/or incomplete. Diagrams not balanced. Structured English logic incomplete and does not reflect Level diagrams. Little or no documentation. | Context Diagram and Level 0 diagrams complete and balanced. Subsequent Level diagrams mostly complete and balanced. Structured English logic mostly complete and reflects Level diagrams. Some documentation. 2 | All DFD diagrams complete and balanced. Structured English logic complete and reflects Level diagrams. Full documentation of diagrams.  11 |
| Creates complete logical data models and documentation to support systems design and development | Incorrect Entity Relationship Diagram; no application of normalization principles. | Minimal Entity Relationship Diagram with incorrect resolution of many-to-many relationships; minimal cardinality and connectivity principles applied; normalized to at least First Normal Form. | Entity Relationship Diagram with resolution of many-to-many relationships; some cardinality and connect-ivity principles applied; some errors in normal-ization but understanding of normalization demonstrated. 1 | Entity Relationship Diagram with correct cardinality and connectivity applied. Third Normal Form principles applied.  2 | Demonstrates full understanding of Entity Relationship Diagram, including unary and recursive relationships. Demonstrates full understanding of normalization principles.    10 |
| Application of Relational Principles and Structured Query Language | Violates principles of relational design; inability to write simple SQL DDL and DML statements. | Shows minimal understanding of relational principles; can write simple SQL DDL and DML statements using single table structures. | Shows understanding of relational principles and can apply the principles to table design; can write SQL DDL and DML statements involving more than one table.  1 | Shows understanding of relational principles and can apply the principles to table and view design. Can write complex SQL DDL and DML statements involving multiple tables, including joins, unions, and intersections. 1 | Shows full understanding of relational principles and can apply the principles to table, view, and index design. Can write complex SQL DDL and DML statements, including all types of joins, unions, intersections, and complex subqueries. 11 |

(continued on next page)

Management Information Systems Assessment Plan

Assessment Rubric for MIS 4200 Database Project—Spring 2015 (Illia) – (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Application of Principles of Human Interface Design | Demonstrates little or no understanding of interface design principles in forms, reports and graphics; does not apply template design to the project. | Demonstrates minimal understanding of interface design principles in forms, reports, and graphics; templates not consistently applied. Minimal GUIs and menus with nonworking items. Graphics inconsistently used. | Demonstrates understanding of interface design principles with minimal template application. Forms, reports, and graphics work consistently with database. Working GUIs and menus. Graphics applied.  1 | Demonstrates understanding of interface design principles with complete template application in forms, reports, and graphics. Working GUIs and menus with graphics form integrated project. Demonstrates understanding of multiple breaks and groupings in reports. 1 | Demonstrates full understanding of interface design principles with sophisticated templates. A range of GUIs used with full drop-down menus. Various graphic formats applied. Full range of forms and reports models applied.  11 |
| Use of Programming Logic Constructs | Demonstrates little or no understanding of programming constructs and Oracle PL/SQL. | Demonstrates minimal understanding of programming constructs and Oracle PL/SQL; modules do not perform consistently; GUI triggers not correctly configured; little or no error trapping.  1 | Demonstrates understanding of programming constructs and Oracle PL/SQL; modules perform consistently; GUI triggers configured correctly; minimal error trapping.  1 | Demonstrates understanding of programming constructs and Oracle PL/SQL; demonstrates ability to create program blocks and GUI triggers with use wide range of Oracle functions and procedures; error trapping consistent with module development. 1 | Demonstrates full understanding of programming constructs and Oracle PL/SQL; demonstrates ability to create sophisticated program blocks with integrated SQL code. Triggers show full knowledge of Oracle functions and procedures. Full error trapping.  10 |
| Integration of Multiple Programs from within main application; use of global program registries | Demonstrates little or no understanding of program integration; inability to create working project | Demonstrates minimal understanding of program integration; global registry not set correctly; project connections not set correctly; one or more of compiled modules fails. | Demonstrates understanding of program integration with global and user registries configured correctly. Project components compile correctly. Demonstrates use of multiple form application with global project paths.  1 | Demonstrates development of integrated database application with splash screen and timer, module navigation through multiple forms. Modules call programs from within programs using both data and control blocks.  2 | Demonstrates full understanding of integrated application with custom interfaces, sophisticated navigation tools, alerts and messages, and the use of data and control blocks from within modules.  10 |
| Creates complete systems and user documentation | Little or no system or user documentation. | Some system documentation but not complete or accurate. Little user documentation. | System documentation mostly complete but may not reflect current version of software. User documentation lacks appropriate logic and detail. | System documentation complete and organized and reflects current version of software. User documentation is complete but lacks appropriate graphical detail. 2 | Full system and user documentation. Documentation is carefully organized and reflects current version of software. Graphical detail enhances documentation.  11 |

Management Information Systems Assessment Plan

**Assessment Rubric for MIS 4200 Database Project—Fall 2015 - Spring 2017 (Wang)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Items** | **Comments** | **Possible Points** | **Deducted Points** |  | **MIS 4200, Fall 2015-Spring 2017**  **Database Projects** | |
| Professionally prepared report |  | (3) |  |  | **Semester**  Average | **Results** |
| A summary of any interview questions asked, answers obtained and assumptions made. |  | (3) |  |  | **Fall 2015**  Av = 88.2 | 8/8 (100%) scored 80 or above;  3/8 (37.5%) scored 90 or above |
| ERD for your database, and any discussion needed. |  | (10) |  |  | **Spring 2016**  Av = 88.6 | 15/15 (100%) scored 70 or above;  14/15 (93.3%) scored 80 or above;  4/15 (26.7%) scored 90 or above |
| DFD for your database, and any discussion needed. |  | (10) |  |  | **Fall 2016**  Av = 86.1 | 15/15 (100%) scored 70 or above;  11/15 (73.3%) scored 80 or above;  3/15 (20.0%) scored 90 or above |
| The set of normalized relations for your database (including primary and foreign keys) and any discussion needed. |  | (5) |  |  | **Spring 2017**  Av = 80.4 | 13/15 (86.7%) scored 70 or above;  13/15 (86.7%) scored 80 or above;  6/15 (40.0%) scored 90 or above |
| A discussion of any referential integrity constraints needed to guarantee the integrity of your database. |  | (4) |  |  |  |  |
| The user documentation for your database. This is the user manual. Should be detailed so that the user knows how to properly enter data and get the reports needed. |  | (10) |  |  |  |  |
| Implementation issues and suggestions for addressing them. |  | (3) |  |  |  |  |
| ***Technology issues (strengths and limitations) that you discovered during the project.*** |  | (3) |  |  |  |  |
| ***Lessons learned (this is really important!!).*** |  | (4) |  |  |  |  |
| Database  * Database should work * Implementation of relationships is done to match the ERD and Normalized Relations * Queries are running * Requested forms are working * Other documentation (e.g., initial works) |  | (45) |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | (100) |  |  |  |  |
| Final Team Grade (Note: your individual grade may (or may not) differ from the team grade depending on the peer evaluation results) |  |  | |  |  |  |

Management Information Systems Assessment Plan

Assessment Rubric for MIS 4330 (Advanced Java Programming) – Spring 2015 (Lee)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Level of Comprehensiveness** | | | | |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| **Java Syntax** | Student is unable to write basic source code in Java | Student is unable to compile and run programs successfully | Student demonstrates knowledge of language syntax by compiling and running programs with significant assistance from others | Student demonstrates knowledge of language syntax by compiling and running programs with errors, but needs assistance to troubleshoot some of the errors  **8** | Student demonstrates knowledge of language syntax by compiling and running programs without errors  **2** |
| **Object-oriented Concepts** | Student demonstrates knowledge of object-oriented concepts by achieving levels of less than 60% on course examinations | Student demonstrates knowledge of object-oriented concepts by achieving levels of 60% or greater on course examinations | Student demonstrates knowledge of object-oriented concepts by achieving levels of 70% or greater on course examinations | Student demonstrates knowledge of object-oriented concepts by achieving levels of 80% or greater on course examinations  **3** | Student demonstrates knowledge of object-oriented concepts by achieving levels of 90% or greater on course examinations  **7** |
| **User Interfaces** | Student is unable to develop basic user interfaces | Student-written user interfaces have bugs, will not run, or possess basic design flaws | Student demonstrates knowledge of the concept of user interfaces by modifying a pre-existing user interface | Student demonstrates knowledge of the concept of user interfaces by designing and implementing user interfaces on at least one originally written program **1** | Student demonstrates knowledge of the concept of user interfaces by designing and implementing user interfaces on multiple originally written programs **9** |
| **File I/O and Serialization** | Student is unable to perform file I/O in a program | Student shows some success in file I/O but the code does not work correctly | Student can modify file I/O code in an existing program  **1** | Student can design and code file I/O from scratch  **7** | Student can design and code file I/O from scratch and can perform serialization **2** |
| **Multithreading** | Student is unable to use multithreading in a program | Student can modify existing multithreading code with assistance | Student can modify existing multithreaded code without assistance  **3** | Student can design original multithreaded code with assistance  **4** | Student can design original multithreaded code without assistance  **3** |
| **Swing Components** | Student is unable to use Swing components | Student can use the Swing library in existing code with assistance | Student can modify existing code using Swing components without assistance | Student can write original code using Swing components with assistance **2** | Student can write original code using Swing components without assistance **8** |
| **Database** | Student is unable to access database data using Java | Student can access database data in existing code with assistance | Student can access and manipulate database data in existing code without assistance | Student can write original code that accesses and modifies data from a database with assistance **1** | Student can write original code that accesses and modifies data from a database without assistance **9** |
| **Web Programming** | Student is unable to write or modify Java web applications | Student can modify existing code for Java web applications with assistance | Student can modify existing code for Java web applications without assistance | Student can write original code for Java web applications with assistance **7** | Student can design and write original Java web applications without assistance. **3** |

Assessment Rubric for MIS 4850 Final Exam – Spring 2015 (Illia)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Level of Comprehensiveness | | | | |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| **Understanding of various types of systems attacks.** | No understanding of the various types of systems attacks. | Limited understanding of the various types of systems attacks. | Basic understanding of the various types of systems attacks.  **1** | Good understanding of the various types of systems attacks.  **2** | Complete understanding of the various types of systems attacks.  **17** |
| **Knowledge of defense systems including firewalls, IDS, IPS…** | No knowledge of defense systems. | Limited knowledge of defense systems. | Basic knowledge of defense systems.  **1** | Good knowledge of defense systems.  **1** | Complete knowledge of defense systems.  **18** |
| **Understanding of cryptographic systems.** | No understanding of cryptographic systems. | Limited understanding of cryptographic systems. | Basic understanding of cryptographic systems.  **1** | Good understanding of cryptographic systems.  **2** | Complete understanding of cryptographic systems.  **17** |
| **Understanding of applications’ security.** | No understanding of applications security. | Limited understanding of applications security.  **1** | Basic understanding of applications security.  **1** | Good understanding of applications security.  **1** | Complete understanding of applications security.  **17** |
| **Configuring defense tools to secure network resources.** | No knowledge of defense systems’ configuration. | Limited knowledge of defense systems’ configuration. | Basic knowledge of defense systems’ configuration.  **1** | Good knowledge of defense systems’ configuration.  **1** | Complete knowledge of defense systems’ configuration.  **18** |

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% |

**School of Business Writing Rubric (approved by School of Business Curriculum Committee, May, 2008)**

**Course: MIS 3530 – Fall 2014 (Lee) – Assessed by Group Project Reports – Total # of Groups: 9**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Marginal** | **Unacceptable** |
| **Development and Purpose** |  Clearly communicates purpose   Clearly identifies and fully develops all ideas/themes   Establishes and maintains clear focus  **5** |  Mostly communicates purpose   Identifies and develops main ideas/themes, but may lack clarity or depth   Establishes focus but not fully maintained **3** |  Vaguely communicates purpose   Does not identify or develop some main ideas/themes   Focus is vague and not fully maintained  **1** |  Mostly fails to communicate purpose   Does not identify or develop most ideas/themes   Mostly fails to establish and maintain focus |
| **Organization** |  Clearly and consistently organizes ideas   Effectively structures and orders paragraphs   Links ideas with smooth and effective transitions  **4** |  Consistently organizes ideas, but structure may be formulaic or unsophisticated   For the most part effectively structures and orders paragraphs   For the most part, effectively links ideas but transitions may be unclear or ineffective **3** |  Frequently does not organize ideas; structure is formulaic or unsophisticated   Often does not structure or order paragraphs   Links some ideas, but transitions are missing or unclear  **2** |  Does not organize ideas   For the most part, does not structure or order paragraphs   Does not link ideas |
| **Style** |  Uses sophisticated and varied sentence structure   Uses vocabulary and style that appropriate to the audience  **6** |  Uses effective and varied sentence structure   Uses vocabulary and style that are mostly appropriate to the audience; some words may be used incorrectly  **3** |  Uses little variety in sentence structure; some syntax errors may be present   Uses vocabulary or style that are frequently inappropriate to the audience; words are often used incorrectly |  Uses no variety in sentence structure; syntax errors frequently present   Uses vocabulary or style that are inappropriate to the audience; words are consistently used incorrectly |
| **Research/data information and**  **integration** |  Uses credible sources   Integrates source material and data seamlessly into body of text   Incorporates sophisticated visual aids that enhance understanding   Appropriately cites and documents references and sources **3** |  Mostly uses credible sources   Integrates most source material and data into body of text   Effectively incorporates appropriate visual aids   Mostly cites and documents references and sources  **4** |  Uses some credible sources   Includes but does not integrate source material and data into body of text   Incorporates some appropriate visual aids   Occasionally cites and documents references and sources **2** |  Does not use credible sources   Does not use source material or data   Fails to incorporate appropriate visual aids   Fails to cite and document references and sources |
| **Managerial Response** |  Identifies and describes appropriate business concepts   Demonstrates creative and innovative thought   Uses appropriate balance of outside sources and independent thought   Reaches clear conclusions supported with sound reasoning  **4** |  Identifies and describes some appropriate business concepts   Provides some creative or innovative thought   Achieves general balance of outside sources and independent thought   Reaches and supports conclusions but some detail and/or reasoning not clear  **3** |  Identifies or describes some appropriate business concepts   Mainly lacks creative or innovative thought   Either outside sources or independent thought clearly outweighs the other   Reaches some vague conclusions that are not clearly supported **2** |  Fails to identify or describe appropriate business concepts   Fails to demonstrate creative and innovative thought   Relies exclusively on either outside sources or independent thought   Fails to reach or support conclusions |
| **Mechanics** |  Makes virtually no grammar, punctuation, or spelling errors  **8** |  Makes few grammar, punctuation, or spelling errors; these are not distracting to the reader  **1** |  Makes occasional grammar, punctuation, or spelling errors; these may be distracting to the reader |  Makes frequent grammar, punctuation, or spelling errors; these are distracting to the reader |

**School of Business Writing Rubric (approved by School of Business Curriculum Committee, May, 2008)**

**Course: MIS 3530 – Fall 2016 (Brown) – Assessed by Individual Presentations – Total # of Students: 29**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Marginal** | **Unacceptable** |
| **Development and Purpose** |  Clearly communicates purpose   Clearly identifies and fully develops all ideas/themes   Establishes and maintains clear focus  **16** |  Mostly communicates purpose   Identifies and develops main ideas/themes, but may lack clarity or depth   Establishes focus but not fully maintained **7** |  Vaguely communicates purpose   Does not identify or develop some main ideas/themes   Focus is vague and not fully maintained  **6** |  Mostly fails to communicate purpose   Does not identify or develop most ideas/themes   Mostly fails to establish and maintain focus |
| **Organization** |  Clearly and consistently organizes ideas   Effectively structures and orders paragraphs   Links ideas with smooth and effective transitions  **20** |  Consistently organizes ideas, but structure may be formulaic or unsophisticated   For the most part effectively structures and orders paragraphs   For the most part, effectively links ideas but transitions may be unclear or ineffective **5** |  Frequently does not organize ideas; structure is formulaic or unsophisticated   Often does not structure or order paragraphs   Links some ideas, but transitions are missing or unclear  **4** |  Does not organize ideas   For the most part, does not structure or order paragraphs   Does not link ideas |
| **Style** |  Uses sophisticated and varied sentence structure   Uses vocabulary and style that appropriate to the audience  **22** |  Uses effective and varied sentence structure   Uses vocabulary and style that are mostly appropriate to the audience; some words may be used incorrectly  **7** |  Uses little variety in sentence structure; some syntax errors may be present   Uses vocabulary or style that are frequently inappropriate to the audience; words are often used incorrectly |  Uses no variety in sentence structure; syntax errors frequently present   Uses vocabulary or style that are inappropriate to the audience; words are consistently used incorrectly |
| **Research/data information and**  **integration** |  Uses credible sources   Integrates source material and data seamlessly into body of text   Incorporates sophisticated visual aids that enhance understanding   Appropriately cites and documents references and sources **24** |  Mostly uses credible sources   Integrates most source material and data into body of text   Effectively incorporates appropriate visual aids   Mostly cites and documents references and sources  **4** |  Uses some credible sources   Includes but does not integrate source material and data into body of text   Incorporates some appropriate visual aids   Occasionally cites and documents references and sources **1** |  Does not use credible sources   Does not use source material or data   Fails to incorporate appropriate visual aids   Fails to cite and document references and sources |
| **Managerial Response** |  Identifies and describes appropriate business concepts   Demonstrates creative and innovative thought   Uses appropriate balance of outside sources and independent thought   Reaches clear conclusions supported with sound reasoning  **20** |  Identifies and describes some appropriate business concepts   Provides some creative or innovative thought   Achieves general balance of outside sources and independent thought   Reaches and supports conclusions but some detail and/or reasoning not clear  **5** |  Identifies or describes some appropriate business concepts   Mainly lacks creative or innovative thought   Either outside sources or independent thought clearly outweighs the other   Reaches some vague conclusions that are not clearly supported **4** |  Fails to identify or describe appropriate business concepts   Fails to demonstrate creative and innovative thought   Relies exclusively on either outside sources or independent thought   Fails to reach or support conclusions |
| **Mechanics** |  Makes virtually no grammar, punctuation, or spelling errors  **25** |  Makes few grammar, punctuation, or spelling errors; these are not distracting to the reader  **2** |  Makes occasional grammar, punctuation, or spelling errors; these may be distracting to the reader **2** |  Makes frequent grammar, punctuation, or spelling errors; these are distracting to the reader |

Management Information Systems Assessment Plan

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

Spring 2016, Fall 2016, and Spring 2017 (Wang)

Groups of 3-4 students complete a semester-long database project resulting in a working prototype. Each group gives two presentations during the semester corresponding the conclusion of Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the project. 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.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Semester/Phase** | **Measure** | **Number of Presentations, n =** | **Visuals** | **Content** | **Style** | **Q&A** | **Overall** |
| **Spring 2016/Phase 1** | **Average** | **4** | **8.1** | **8.6** | **8.3** | **8.3** | **8.5** |
|  | Number (percentage) at or above 9 |  | 1 (25%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
|  | Number (percentage) at or above 8 |  | 2 (50%) | 4 (100%) | 3 (75%) | 3 (75%) | 3 (75%) |
|  | Number (percentage) at or above 7 |  | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) |
| **Spring 2016/Phase 2** | **Average** | **4** | **8.8** | **8.8** | **9.1** | **8.9** | **8.9** |
|  | Number (percentage) at or above 9 |  | 2 (50%) | 2 (50%) | 3 (75%) | 1 (25%) | 2 (50%) |
|  | Number (percentage) at or above 8 |  | 3 (75%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) |
|  | Number (percentage) at or above 7 |  | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) |
| **Fall 2016/Phase 1** | **Average** | **4** | **8.2** | **8.8** | **8.9** | **9.0** | **9.1** |
|  | Number (percentage) at or above 9 |  | 1 (25%) | 2 (50%) | 2 (50%) | 2 (50%) | 2 (50%) |
|  | Number (percentage) at or above 8 |  | 3 (75%) | 3 (75%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) |
|  | Number (percentage) at or above 7 |  | 3 (75%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) |
| **Fall 2016/Phase 2** | **Average** | **4** | **9.2** | **9.2** | **8.9** | **9.1** | **9.3** |
|  | Number (percentage) at or above 9 |  | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 1 (25%) | 2 (50%) | 4 (100%) |
|  | Number (percentage) at or above 8 |  | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) |
|  | Number (percentage) at or above 7 |  | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) |
| **Spring 2017/Phase 1** | **Average** | **4** | **9.1** | **9.0** | **9.3** | **9.2** | **9.0** |
|  | Number (percentage) at or above 9 |  | 2 (50%) | 2 (50%) | 4 (100%) | 3 (75%) | 3 (75%) |
|  | Number (percentage) at or above 8 |  | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) |
|  | Number (percentage) at or above 7 |  | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) |
| **Spring 2017/Phase 2** | **Average** | **4** | **9.6** | **9.2** | **9.4** | **9.6** | **9.4** |
|  | Number (percentage) at or above 9 |  | 4 (100%) | 2 (50%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) |
|  | Number (percentage) at or above 8 |  | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) |
|  | Number (percentage) at or above 7 |  | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) |
| **All** | **Average** | **24** | **8.8** | **8.9** | **9.0** | **9.0** | **9.0** |
|  | Number (percentage) at or above 9 |  | 14 (58.3%) | 13 (54.2%) | 14 (58.3%) | 12 (50%) | 15 (62.5%) |
|  | Number (percentage) at or above 8 |  | 20 83.3%) | 23 (95.8%) | 23 (95.8%) | 23 (95.8%) | 23 (95.8%) |
|  | Number (percentage) at or above 7 |  | 23 (95.8%) | 24 (100%) | 24 (100%) | 24 (100%) | 24 (100%) |