

Continuous Improvement Input (From the minutes of the 2/14/17 meeting):

MS in Computer Science: MS has been re-worked over the last 2 years and has focused on student scholarships. Committee agrees with need for faculty to continue to consider distinguishing outcomes between degrees to ensure that outcome levels appropriate for graduate degree. Need to include a clear assessment plan in the MOU/Action plan. Committee encourage program to put plans to establish an advisory board and strengthening internship opportunities into their MOU/Action Plan Internships for students.

Dean Review Input:

The MS CompSci program has struggled in past years with low enrollment. However, in the past year or two great strides have been made raising the visibility of the program, and in increasingly degree program applications. This a direct result of the increase in the number of faculty, and subsequent attention to the MS CompSci program. Additionally, EU has put increased effort into recruiting international students for the program. This is beginning to pay off, especially in receiving students from India. Directions for the future focus on adding more tenure track and lecturer faculty. The program has had a challenge in scheduling enough courses per semester to keep students on track for their degrees. Additionally, international students need at least 9 units per semester in order to stay in compliance with Homeland Security requirements. The projection financially for the program going forward is positive. EU is committed to fully supporting the program as enrollment grows.

Provost Input:

The program review highlights the fact that Computer Science is a vibrant and growing program that adds much to the campus. The faculty bring many opportunities to their students through their teaching and research activities. These add to the overall campus community. The review also provides a valuable opportunity to identify areas where the program can focus attention and make significant improvements that will be important for the future of the program.

Scores of “1” from external reviewers in the categories of Course and Program Learning Outcomes; Learning Outcome Data and Analysis; and Program Planning are of particular concern. The program review document does not provide substantial useful information to inform the review in these categories. As the external reviewers note *“There are currently no well-defined learning outcomes. Additionally, there is no consistently implemented assessment process in place (even for course outcomes).”* The program must take immediate steps to resolve this issue and should not plan to actively pursue ABET accreditation until such time as it has implemented a meaningful assessment program that meets both campus expectations and ABET standards.

While the self-study provides some useful information about the program and its direction, in general it lacked much of the information and analysis that is typically expected in a program review at CI. Program reviews provide an opportunity for programs to examine and reflect on issues such as curriculum, student learning, learning outcomes and student success. While the self-study and report by external reviewers note specific needs for resources, it is difficult to determine how to weigh those needs in the absence of meaningful data about basic program outcomes. In order to better understand the successes (and needs) of the program, Computer Science should align its program review cycle by completing a full self-study at the same time that the self-study for the Information Technology program is prepared. This will allow the added benefit of providing the program the opportunity to determine how these different degree programs work with each other.

It should be noted that, in response to the report of the external review team, the program is already taking steps to establish an external advisory board. This will assist the program in its efforts to refine its focus, develop external sources of support and plan for the future.