Institutional Effectiveness Report
2020-2021

Program: Computer Science MS

College and Department: College of Engineering – Computer Science

Contact: Jerry Gannod

Mission: "Our mission is to be widely recognized for enabling students to have global impact through innovative and quality programs, through research that emphasizes collaborative partnerships, and by enabling the success of a diverse student, faculty, and alumni community."

This mission is consistent with the University's mission to "provide lea

about how and when students are exposed to research opportunities. For the evaluation of PG 2 and SLO 1.

3. Time to degree completion – Timely graduation is important for students and for the responsible use of department resources. Students going beyond 2.5 years for their M.S. should be an exception. Note that we use the 2.5-year measure due to the fact that many graduate students defend late in their intended semester of graduation and will miss the defense deadline for graduation. As such, while a student successfully defends their thesis or project in one semester, they are listed as a graduate of the following semester. Our desired level of attainment is 80% graduating within 2.5 years. We are not including direct admit PhD students who are also pursuing their M.S. degree because their timeline can be very different. We will use this metric to determine the process for matriculating students through the program, including the clarification of key milestones and periodic demonstrations of progress. For the evaluation of SLO 2

Results:

PG 1: The student should achieve at least a 3.5 GPA in breadth of knowledge in the discipline and depth in the specific area of his/her specialization.

2016-17	2017-18	2018-19

SLO 1: The student should demonstrate knowledge of the techniques, methods, and disciplines of computer science research through research presentations and publications.

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Number of graduates	6	7			

Revised Course Offerings (PG 1, SLO 2)

Given the increased number of students in our program, in the summer of 2021 we revisited the 3-year graduate course offering schedule so that ou

Appendices

1. Curriculum Map
2. Oral Defense and Thesis/Project Assessment Form

Appendix 1: Curriculum Map

Computer Science – Master's Program

Course	Title	Student Outcomes	
		SLO1	SLO2
CSC 5100	Operating Systems	X	X
CSC 5200	Computer Networks	X	X
CSC 5220	Data Mining/Machine Learning	X	X
CSC 5240	Artificial Intelligence	X	X
CSC 5320	Computer Architecture	X	X
CSC 5400	Analysis of Algorithms	X	X
CSC 5570	IT Security	X	X
CSC 5575	Info Assurance & Cryptography	X	X
CSC 5580	Software Reverse Engineering	X	X
CSC 5585	Software and Systems Security	X	X
CSC 5710	Dsgn/Dev – Human/Web Interface	X	X
CSC 5750	Computer Graphics	X	X
CSC 5760	Parallel Programming	X	X
CSC 5770	Distributed & Cloud Computing	X	X
CSC 6220	Data Mining	X	X
CSC 6230	Machine Learning	X	X
CSC 6240	Math/Theory - Machine Lrning	X	X
CSC 6260	Advanced Topics in A.I.	X	X
CSC 6300	Web-Based Database Systems	X	X
CSC 6320	Adv Computer Architecture	X	X
CSC 6400	Internet Algorithms	X	X

CSC 6450	Adv Theory of Computation	X	X
CSC 6575	Internet Security	X	X
CSC 6580	Advanced Reverse Engineering	X	X
CSC 6585	Secure Software Development	X	X
CSC 6730	Advanced Networking	X	X
CSC 6740	Parallel/Distributed Algorithm	X	X
CSC 6760	Grid Computing	X	X
CSC 6770	Service Oriented Computing	X	X
CSC 6780	Distributed Computing	X	X
CSC 6910	Computer Science Seminar	X	X
CSC 6980	Masters Project	X	X
CSC 6990	Research & Thesis	X	X

5. Graduates of the M.S. program in Computer Science will display technical quality in their writing. Please assess this candidate's technical writing content using the following scale:

1 – weak, consisting of the following: poor organization; unclear problem statement/technical approach; issues with figures/tables; missing relevant references.

2 – needs some work, including some of the following: unclear organization; problem statement/technical approach need some work; some issues with figures/tables; missing some relevant references.

3 – good, consists of the following: appropriate organization; clear problem statement and technical approach; no issues with figures/tables; solid list of references.

4 – excellent,