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OUTCOME #1: Information system development skills
When confronted with a business problem, student teams will be able to demonstrate the ability to analyze the facts, obtain user requirements, design a system meeting these requirements, develop a working prototype of the system using appropriate technology, and document the project thoroughly.

Assessment Method 1: Analysis and design skill assessment
Assessment Method Description
When confronted with a business problem, student teams will be able to demonstrate the ability to analyze the problem and design an appropriate system to solve the associated business problems within the context of the project. The resulting projects, generated in ISMN 4090, will be evaluated by an ISMN undergraduate faculty committee. Specifically, the assessment focuses on (1) appropriate use of methodology, (2) meeting user requirements, (3) quality of the system design, (4) quality of the user interface, (5) working functionality of prototype, and (6) quality of the user manual, and (7) quality of overall system development documentation. The goal for this assessment is that at least 75% of the ISMN BSBA students will achieve an average rating of 4.0 or higher on a 5-point scale measuring each of these seven analysis and design related skills, where 5 is superior and 1 is unacceptable.

The Assessment Rubric is in Appendix A.

Findings
These findings are based on the performance of 30 students during fall semester, 2012. 83.3% of the ISMN BSBA students achieved a score of 4.0 or better on all seven analysis and design related skills. Averages were, respectively, 4.67, 4.00, 4.08, 4.17, 4.33, 4.08, and 4.08. The results this year were down somewhat from the previous year. This is likely due to the three very exceptional projects that were a part of last year’s evaluation.
How did you use findings for improvement?
The results will be used to target areas where increased emphasis will be put in order to improve student skills in the areas where student performance was down. Specifically, an evaluation will to done to determine how learning related to these criteria might be improved: (2) meeting user requirements, (3) quality of the system design, (6) quality of the user manual, and (7) quality of overall system development documentation.

Additional Comments
The evaluation this year was based on six projects. Of the six, two were very good and the remainder were comparatively ordinary. None were exceptional, as was the case the previous year.

Assessment Method 2: Database skills
Assessment Method Description
When confronted with a business problem, student teams will be able to demonstrate the ability to develop appropriate databases and systems to solve business problems within the context of the system development process. The database component of projects, developed in ISMN 4090, will be evaluated by the ISMN undergraduate committee. Specifically, the assessment focuses on (1) quality of the database design, (2) quality of implementation/working functionality of the database, and (3) quality of database documentation. The goal for this assessment is that at least 75% of the ISMN BSBA students will achieve an average rating of 4.0 or higher on a 5-point scale measuring each of these three database related skills, where 5 is superior and 1 is unacceptable.

The Assessment Rubric is in Appendix A.

Findings
These findings are based on the performance of 30 students during fall semester, 2012. 83.3% of the ISMN BSBA students achieved a score of 4.0 or better on all three database related skills. Averages were, respectively, 4.50, 4.71, and 4.64.

How did you use findings for improvement?
The results will be used to target areas where increased emphasis will be put in order to improve student skills in the areas where students underperformed.

Additional Comments
See the sections “How did you use findings for improvements” and “additional comments” associated with the first assessment method above.
Assessment Method 3: Telecommunication skills

Assessment Method Description
When confronted with a business problem, student teams will be able to demonstrate the ability to develop appropriate telecommunications capabilities to support information systems developed in the context of the systems development process. The telecommunications component of projects, developed in ISMN 4090, will be evaluated by the ISMN undergraduate committee. Specifically, the assessment focuses on (1) quality of the telecommunications design, (2) quality of telecommunications implementation/working functionality, and (3) quality of telecommunications documentation. The goal for this assessment is that at least 75% of the ISMN BSBA students will achieve an average rating of 4.0 or higher on a 5-point scale measuring each of these three telecommunications related skills, where 5 is superior and 1 is unacceptable.

The Assessment Rubric is in Appendix A.

Findings
These findings are based on the performance of 30 students during fall semester, 2012. 83.3% of the ISMN BSBA students achieved a score of 4.0 or better on all three telecommunications related skills. Averages were, respectively, 4.86, 4.86, and 4.71.

How did you use the findings for improvement?
The results will be used to target areas where increased emphasis will be put in order to improve student skills in the areas where students underperformed.

Additional Comments
See the sections “How did you use findings for improvements” and “additional comments” associated with the first assessment method above.

NOTE: The ISMN BSBA curriculum has recently been updated and there are now no required telecommunications courses; they are now all electives. Therefore, this third assessment method, "Telecommunications Skills," will be dropped for the assessment going forward.

OUTCOME #2: COB and ISMN Learning Objectives
When confronted with 17 critical learning objectives related to performance in business and within the ISMN field, seniors would report a high level of agreement that their educational program
prepared them well in these 17 outcome areas.

**Assessment Method**
Indirect Method for Assessing Learning

**Assessment Method(s) Description**
The Senior Survey is administered annually to College of Business (COB) students. The major component of the Senior Survey is students’ assessment, using a five-point scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree), of the extent to which a degree program effectively prepared students for each of 17 learning outcomes. Examples of learning outcomes are “to demonstrate interpersonal skills necessary for my field of study,” “to utilize creativity,” and “to process information and make effective decisions.” The goal for this assessment is that at least 75% of the ISMN BSBA students will achieve an average rating of 4.0 or higher on this 5-point scale.

The Assessment Rubric is in Appendix A.

**Findings**
The survey was sent to the 757 Harbert College of Business students who graduated during the Fall, 2012, through Summer, 2013, semesters. Of the 31 ISMN students who were sent the survey, 25.8%, or eight students, responded. ISMN students’ average ratings were 4.0 or above on 13 (76%) of the 17 learning outcomes (down from 17 of 17 last year). Therefore, ISMN students met the learning goal (75% or above) for the 17 learning outcome assessed by the Senior Survey. The means (based on seven responses for each objective) by learning objective were: “My Harbert College of Business degree program prepared me” (1) for effective performance in my chosen career field – 3.7; (2) to understand theories or subject matter in my field of study – 3.9; (3) to effectively demonstrate spreadsheet analysis skills related to my field of study – 3.7; (4) to effectively demonstrate interpersonal skills necessary for my field of study – 3.9; (5) to effectively communicate information and ideas orally – 4.1; (6) to effectively communicate information and ideas in writing – 4.3; (7) to understand ethical issues in business – 4.0; (8) to understand the influence of political and social issues on business decisions – 4.1; (9) to understand the influence of law and administrative regulations on business decisions – 4.1; (10) to work effectively on my own (independently) – 4.0; (11) to work effectively as a member of a team – 4.1; (12) to utilize creativity – 4.0; (13) to interact effectively with individuals from different cultures or backgrounds from my own – 4.1; (14) to take initiative (i.e., demonstrate leadership) – 4.3; (15) to adapt to change and be flexible – 4.1; (16) to process information and
make effective decisions – 4.0; and (17) to use quantitative analysis for decision-making – 4.0.

**How did you use findings for improvement?**

Though the goal was met, the poorer performance relative to the previous year will be investigated to determine what changes in the curriculum, and in specific courses, might be appropriate. Specifically, these four areas will be closely evaluated: (1) "for effective performance in my chosen field" (mean= 3.7); (2) "to understand theories or subject matter in my field of study" (mean= 3.9); (3) "to effectively demonstrate spreadsheet analysis skills related to my field of study" (mean=3.7); and (4) "to effectively demonstrate interpersonal skills necessary for my field of study" (mean= 3.9). For example, for (1) above, we may discuss with our industry advisory board where increased emphasis should be placed in order to better prepare the graduates to "hit the ground running" in their new positions. We might also personally contact graduates to discuss what they needed to make them better prepared to perform effectively. For (2) above, we might need to emphasize the connection between the theories and subject matter and the application of that knowledge through the use of additional illustrations, cases, and/or real-world projects. For (3) above, we might need to investigate how that material is being presented in the Computer Science course where it is taught and make suggestions that would make the outcomes more relevant for business applications. Or, we might simply include, in appropriate courses, additional applications and/or problems that require the use of spreadsheets in their solution. For (4) above, the increased use of real-world projects, which require greater interaction with teammates and with users in the business community, could positively impact this outcome.

In addition, the new curriculum that is currently in the implementation stage was designed to positively impact these learning outcomes. Obviously, however, only time, and this process, will tell on this point. We will continue to monitor the impact of the new curriculum.

**Additional Comments**
### BS in ISMN Assessment Rubric

#### Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Not acceptable 0 – 1</th>
<th>Acceptable 2 – 3</th>
<th>Superior 4 - 5</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;D: Appropriate use of analysis and design methodology</td>
<td>Inappropriate or poor choice and/or use of methodology</td>
<td>Most elements of methodology chosen and used appropriately</td>
<td>Excellent choice and use of methodological elements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;D: Degree to which user requirements were met</td>
<td>Few user requirements met or met accurately</td>
<td>Most user requirements met accurately</td>
<td>User requirements met very accurately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;D: Quality of system design</td>
<td>System design was poor or largely inappropriate</td>
<td>System design was good and substantially appropriate</td>
<td>System design was excellent and appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;D: Quality of user interface</td>
<td>The user interface was poor and/or inappropriate</td>
<td>The user interface was good and substantially appropriate</td>
<td>The user interface was excellent and appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working functionality of prototype</td>
<td>The prototype did not demonstrate appropriate functionality and/or performed poorly</td>
<td>The prototype demonstrated substantially appropriate functionality and/or performed reasonably well</td>
<td>The prototype demonstrated appropriate functionality and performed very well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of user manual</td>
<td>The user manual was not helpful and/or difficult to understand</td>
<td>The user manual was reasonably helpful and understandable</td>
<td>The user manual was very helpful and easy to understand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of overall system development documentation</td>
<td>The documentation was incomplete and/or inappropriate</td>
<td>The documentation was reasonably complete and appropriate</td>
<td>The documentation was thorough, appropriate, done well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of database design</td>
<td>The database design was poor and/or inappropriate</td>
<td>The database design was reasonably accurate and appropriate</td>
<td>The database design was accurate and appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of implementation/ functionality of the database</td>
<td>The implementation and/or functionality of the database had serious flaws</td>
<td>The implementation and/or functionality of the database were substantially accurate</td>
<td>The implementation and/or functionality of the database were complete and accurate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of database documentation</td>
<td>The documentation was incomplete and/or inappropriate</td>
<td>The documentation was reasonably complete and appropriate</td>
<td>The documentation was thorough, appropriate, done well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of telecommunications design</td>
<td>The telecommunications design was poor and/or inappropriate</td>
<td>The telecommunications design was reasonably accurate and appropriate</td>
<td>The telecommunications design was accurate and appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of telecommunications implementation/ working functionality</td>
<td>The implementation and/or functionality of telecommunications elements had serious flaws</td>
<td>The implementation and/or functionality of the telecommunications elements were substantially accurate</td>
<td>The implementation and/or functionality of the telecommunications elements were complete and accurate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of telecommunications documentation</td>
<td>The documentation was incomplete and/or inappropriate</td>
<td>The documentation was reasonably complete and appropriate</td>
<td>The documentation was thorough, appropriate, done well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

---

*Note: The points column is not filled in as it may vary depending on the specific criteria assessment.*