

POAR Rubric (2021-22)

Program name **COMPUTER INFORMATION SYSTEMS**

Notes: The reconciled score of each criterion is listed at the end of the rubric along with the comments offered by the reviewers

1. The program's mission statement is clearly aligned with the overall mission of the institution.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

2. The program has developed a sufficient number of goals (objectives) that clearly address the breadth of the program requirements and expectations.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

3. The program has developed a sufficient number of clear and measurable learning outcomes for each goal (objective).

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

4. The program has developed multiple measures of assessment for each learning outcome; measures may be direct/indirect and/or qualitative/quantitative.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

5. The program has developed benchmarks for each assessment technique that are both reasonable and challenging.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

6. The program has collected meaningful data directly related to each learning outcome.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

7. Assessment data have been explicitly used to identify challenges and/or successes resulting in program modifications or "staying the course", respectively.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

8. The assessment process covers the breadth of the student experience and clearly demonstrates the depth of understanding needed to successfully complete the program.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

9. The program's commitment to continuous improvement is clearly demonstrated by the information contained in the assessment plan, findings, and executive summary.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

10. The assessment process used by the program is feasible and does not overload or overburden faculty either collectively or individually.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

CRITERION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	TOTAL
SCORE	5	3	3	4	3	3	4	5	3	3	36

Summary Comments

Most of the measures listed in the executive summary are actually goals or expected outcomes. The actual measures used appear to be course requirements. For example, one outcome measure is listed as “weekly assignments, discussion boards, cases, two exams, a final exam, and a semester project in CIS 4413.” This should not be the case as this type of measurement provides little more insight than course averages and retention rates. Specific questions or exams should be identified to measure individual outcomes. You have only provided Assurance of Passing, not Assurance of Learning.

All of the measures used are internal course requirements. Most are broad generalizations. There should be plenty of external objective measures such as scores on software or program

certifications or percentage of students certified in certain programming languages. There is zero excuse for not having external measures of outcomes given the subject matter. There are no less than 10 LinkedIn Learning certifications for every subject taught in this program that can be easily added as course requirements directly through Blackboard and/or Canvas at no cost to the students. Other software companies allow different types of certifications, also. Start by making each certification or badge worth 10 or 15% of the course grade and set a goal for at least 70% success rate. Then, adjust your goals and course instruction as necessary over time.

At least two of the learning outcomes were deemed immeasurable because they were taught in other programs. This should definitely not be the case. If those skills are necessary outcomes for the students, then they should be assessed within an applied setting in an upper-level or capstone-level course. For instance, since junior level writing skills are listed as necessary, a written paper or project should be assessed in one or more 4000-level courses to ensure that the skills necessary for CIS are being provided in ENG-3903. If not, then the CIS should design a course to ensure the gap is being filled. The same applies with skills from the business courses. Most of those can be tested with questions on the exit exam. Capturing scores on each of those particular questions provides a reasonable assessment of student capabilities upon graduation.

The exit exam is an outstanding assessment of student learning. However, it is the only true assessment, and it is not aligned with any given program outcome. Rather than just reporting the general grade average on that, create a general program goal that your students can use concepts collectively to compete in practice. Then, set a target percentage to pass and report that. Without adding any extra work, you've created a measurable

outcome with a target objective that can be used to assess a relative program goal. Same with other requirements - Since most of your measurements include final exams, use that instead of class GPA. Set a goal that 80% will score 75% or better on the comprehensive final exam with no more than 10% D,F, or Withdrawals for the intro, and the required courses for the major. The term projects are fantastic internal assessments and can be used to assess multiple goals (i.e., a simple relational database project can be used to assess advanced Office skills with Access, business environment, problem solving with cardinality, and programming skills in SQL or No-SQL). The easiest way to validate the learning is by adding professional badges and/or certification requirements. Make them pass/fail and set an objective for how many will obtain the certifications. They require no extra work on the faculty and you only have to report the results.

The faculty and department appear to be doing everything well. They are simply doing a poor job of providing evidence of it. Creating simple measures out of the work that you are already doing will make it much easier to assess the quality of instruction and learning. It will also reduce faculty workload, especially relative to course design and accreditation reporting.

There is very clear evidence that this program is using assessment data to drive decision making. Additionally the mission of this program stands in direct alignment with the University's focus on understanding the "needs of local, regional, and national employers and delivering graduates that can adequately fill current IT positions."