Assessment Activity Report Due April 20, 2018 to the Office of Academic Planning

Assessment of Program Learning Goal(s): Findings template Please see resources about closing the loop and assessing program learning outcomes at the Academic Planning website [http://air.sfsu.edu/assessment/resources](http://air.sfsu.edu/assessment/resources)

Assessment Findings and Analysis Rubric – developed and used by the University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee (UAAAC) to provide feedback to programs about their assessment findings.

Reports should analyze and summarize the results of the assessment: how well did students meet the program’s learning objective(s)? How well did assessment capture that learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPED</th>
<th>DEVELOPING</th>
<th>NEEDS DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings offer evidence that goals were met, partly met, or not met</td>
<td>Findings are mostly aligned with assessment goals and results</td>
<td>Findings unrelated to assessment results</td>
<td>No findings are given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings used to improve student learning and program quality</td>
<td>Findings directed at improving student learning and program outcomes</td>
<td>Findings do not indicate ongoing engagement with student learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The assessment of program learning goals should be on a rotation, so that only one or two are evaluated in any given year, but all would be evaluated on approximately a five year cycle.

Department __Computer Science_________ College ______COSE_________________________

Degree Program_____BS in Computer Science______________

1. Please list your program learning goals.

PLO 1: Students will be able to design, develop, document, and test software using current techniques.
PLO 2: Students will understand the fundamentals of computer architecture and computing theory.
PLO 3: Students will be able to solve problems working in group settings. This translates to the following outcomes.
PLO 4: Students will demonstrate the ability to give presentations and write technical reports.
PLO 5: Students will demonstrate understanding of the importance of social and ethical issues related to the profession.

2. Which program learning goal did you choose to assess this semester?

PLO 1: Students will be able to design, develop, document, and test software using current techniques.

3. How was the assessment completed? What evidence did the faculty consider (e.g. written papers, presentations, portfolios)? How were faculty involved in the process of assessment?

We focused on the entry-level course to our core programming sequence: CSC 210 Introduction to Programming. Currently, we offer a supporting lab CSC 211, but 211 is only optional; very few 210 students take the 211 lab. Our overall impression: many find 210 a challenging course. Our concern is it may not be a good entry-level experience into our program.

We overviewed:
DFW rates Fall 2015 to Spring 2017
SETE scores Fall 2015 to Spring 2017
grades of students completing 210, with and without 211
practices in Introduction to Programming courses at San Jose State and CSU LA

4. What did you find? Is the program learning goal being met?

- DFW rates for CSC 210 are higher than we would like (avg. 34%), and varies significantly across sections/instructors
- SETE scores are also highly variable across sections/instructors
- Students who take 210 with 211 have significantly better grades than students who take 210 without 211

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GPA for 210 w. 211 (CR)</th>
<th>GPA for 211 w/o 211 (or NC in 211)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F15</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F16</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Both San Jose State and CSU LA require a lab component with their Introduction to Programming courses

5. What assessment activities do you plan to undertake next academic year?

- Will you “close the loop” for this finding and work on steps to improve the student learning outcomes based on these findings (e.g. create signature assignments, change the required courses)?
  
  We plan to propose the CSC 211 lab as a requirement for CSC majors. We will reallocate units for other courses; this should not require adding units to the major.

- Are there other assessment findings from the assessment of this program learn goal that you will report through another assessment findings report?

  We also studied student success in several other courses in the core programming track. The findings will be shared at a later date.

- In light of your assessment work, changes in the field, or other influences, do you want to take the opportunity to revise the program learning goals next year (program learning goal report)?

  We will probably continue working on PLO #1, for other courses related to it.

- Will you move on to assess a different program learning goal (assessment findings report)?

  No.