1. What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?

We assessed the following two outcomes, both tied to University Outcome 1.1.1 Students will achieve programmatic learning outcomes.

Outcome 1: Basic knowledge: Graduates will demonstrate an understanding of each of the subject areas that define the discipline as well as the interrelationships that exist among them.

Outcome 4: Applied Design Skills: Graduates will have the ability to apply appropriate design constructs: requirements analysis and specification, design, implementation, and testing.

2. How were the student learning outcomes assessed?

A) What methods were used?

For Outcome 1:
> 50th percentile overall and in content areas of the MFT
All graduates have a GPA of better than 2.5 in core courses.

For Outcome 4:
>75% of project groups produce successful projects.
All teams produce minimally successfully documents as measured by the content rubrics.

B) Who was assessed?

For Outcome 1: Senior CS majors (n = 35)
For Outcome 4: Graduating CS major (n = 28)

C) When was it assessed?

For Outcome 1: Winter Term 2015 and Spring Term 2015
For Outcome 4: Winter Term 2015
3. What was learned?

- Only 34% of the graduating seniors received a 50th percentile on the MFT. Based on survey data, the MFT data was determined to be poor because there was no incentive for students to apply themselves to the test and many students were upset at having to pay a fee in order to take the test. This appears to have been a problem in the past as well as it is mentioned on the previous report.
- The overall GPA of all but two students met the 2.5 minimum requirement.
- All graduating seniors produced successful projects.
- All teams produced documents deemed successful based on the content rubrics.

4. What will the department or program do as a result of that information?

- Starting in 2015–2016, the MFT will be tied to student grades in order to provide an incentive for students to apply themselves on the test.

5. What did the department or program do in response to previous years’ assessment results, and what was the effect of those changes?

- Unfortunately, everyone involved with the 2013–2014 assessment has left the university and it is unclear what, if any, changes were made based on that report. However, looking at the action items, it appears that many of the identified issues were a result of enrollment pressure. The CS department has been able to increase the total number of Tenure Track lines and is currently working to fill these positions.

6. Questions or suggestions? Contact Tom Henderson (henderst@cwu.edu) or Bret Smith (bpsmith@cwu.edu)