

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT
East Central University

Program Name: Computer Science

College/School Name: College of Health and Science

Academic Year Assessed: 2020-2021

Assessment Report Requirements:

1. **Program Goals, Student Learning Outcomes (SLO), and Criteria:** At *minimum*, your Program Assessment Plan should have 2 overarching goals and 3 major outcomes derived from the goals that assess the core of your program. Each SLO must have at least 2 criteria and each criterion must have at least one instrument.
2. **Assessment Across Program:** Your SLOs and criteria must assess a majority of your students each year and assess from early in the program to the end.
 - Assessing through the program gives you the ability to identify weak points for improvement.
3. **Instruments:** Attach ALL Instruments listed in your assessment plan in the APPENDIX at the end of the Plan/Report.
4. **Instruments Using Direct/Indirect Measures:** Your Program Assessment Plan should include both direct and indirect measures of learning, with direct measures in the majority.
5. **Validation through External Instruments:** *If possible*, use an external instrument as a direct measure (e.g., ETS/MFT, ACAT, NCLEX, OSAT) to validate your local direct measures.
 - *The Office of Institutional Effectiveness pays for external testing.*
6. **Analysis of Data by Faculty:** All faculty integral to the Program will meet to discuss and analyze the data at the end of the academic year to determine what the collected data says about the program's performance during the current year and how that new knowledge will translate into proposed actions/changes in the coming year(s).
7. **Completion of Template:** *You are required to complete all sections of this report template.* Follow the directions as written. Contact the Assessment Coordinator before modifying the template to match the specific elements of your program assessment plan.
8. **File Name:** Use the following format to name this file before uploading:
 - Program Name Degree Level Asmt Report AY XXXX-XX
 - e.g., Art BFA Asmt Report AY 2020-21
 - e.g., Ed Leadership MEd Asmt Report AY 2020-2021
9. **Upload to Teams:** Complete your plan/report using the template and upload it to your Team channel. Email your Vice President and the Assessment Coordinator to let them know you have finished. *IF you make further changes to your report in Teams, notify your Vice President and the Assessment Coordinator via email.*

See Glossary of Terms for further explanation:

UGRP_ECU Unit Assessment Team >> General channel >> Files.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT
East Central University

Assessment Plan, Data, and Analysis

Mission Statements & Goals

EAST CENTRAL UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT:

We educate and empower students to understand and transform our world.

PROGRAM GOAL(S):

The primary goal of the Computer Science Program is to prepare graduates to enter professional fields or graduate schools requiring an undergraduate education in computer science.

ASSESSMENT ACROSS THE PROGRAM STATEMENT:

Each year, the computer science program assesses student learning from the beginning to the end of the program. The early part of the program is assessed via criterion 2.1, the middle of the program is assessed via criterion 2.2, while the end of the program is assessed via criteria 1.1, 1.2, 3.1 and 3.2.

EXTERNAL INSTRUMENT AVAILABILITY FOR PROGRAM:

Major Field Test in Computer Science is used for assessment.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME 1:

Student will acquire content knowledge in computer science.

Criterion 1.1: Overall student performance on Educational Testing Service (ETS) Major Field Test (MFT) in Computer Science.

Population/Course: All computer science majors enrolled in CMPSC 4473 Theory of Programming Languages.

Instrument/Measurement (copy/paste instrument in Appendix): ETS administered Major Field Test (MFT) in Computer Science.

Standard: The departmental mean score should be greater than or equal to one standard deviation below the national mean score.

Data Table 1.1:

Academic Year	Number of Students	ECU Range of Scores	ECU CS Program Mean	National Institutional Mean	National Institutional Standard Deviation
2020-2021	20	120-167	128	145.1	9.2
2019-2020	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
2018-2019	31	120-151	128	145.4	9.2

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT
East Central University

2017-2018	30	120-165	134	145.8	9.5
2016-2017	30	120-168	132	147.4	9.7

NOTE: For 2019-2020, no data due to covid19 (students did not meet in person, hence no exam administered).

Analysis Table 1.1:

Analysis Question	Analysis Response
1. Was your standard met or not met for the year?	The standard was not met for the year.
2. Whether met or not met, explain how your unit performed in relation to the standard (relate the data in the table to the standard).	Of the 20 students from ECU, 2 scored above the national average. The highest ECU score was 167 which is comparable to previous years. The standard deviation for ECU was 12.
3. Discuss possible reasons why the unit performed as it did this year.	The below average performance of ECU computer science majors on the MFT can be attributed to the following: a. Insufficient exposure of majors to computer science content. This restricts the development of the logical thinking process which is heavily required for a career in software engineering. b. All classes during the previous academic were taught in the online/blended format. Class attendance and interaction was minimal.
4. Look at the 5-year data trends and discuss those. Note if data seem to be increasing/decreasing with time and if so, reasons why.	The results are consistent with previous years.
5. Using your analysis responses, make specific data-driven decisions about your unit. If no actions or changes are needed, state that. Copy/paste the #5 response to Current Actions and/or Changes (end of template)	Hire more computer science PhD professors to enrich the program and strengthen students. The program is lacking in longevity of professors. This weakens any program.

Criterion 1.2: Student performance on individual Assessment Indicators (sub-disciplines) within the MFT. These are: Programming and Software Engineering; Discrete Structures and Algorithms; and Systems-Architecture/Operating Systems/Networking/Database.

Population/Course: All computer science majors enrolled in CMPSC 4473 Theory of Programming Languages.

Instrument/Measurement (copy/paste instrument in Appendix): ETS administered Major Field Test (MFT) in Computer Science.

Standard: The departmental mean score should be greater than or equal to one standard deviation below the national mean score for at least two of the three Assessment Indicators.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT
East Central University

Data Table 1.2:

Academic Year	Assessment Indicator	National Institutional Mean	National Institutional Standard Deviation	ECU Math Program Mean
2020-2021	Programming	49.4	11.0	26
	Discrete	40.2	10.2	21
	Systems	40.3	8.0	29
2019-2020	Programming	ND	ND	ND
	Discrete	ND	ND	ND
	Systems	ND	ND	ND
2018-2019	Programming	49.9	11.0	29
	Discrete	40.4	10.2	23
	Systems	40.7	8.1	24
2017-2018	Programming	51.4	11.1	36
	Discrete	41.2	10.4	29
	Systems	41.4	8.4	31
2016-2017	Programming	52.4	11.4	33
	Discrete	42.6	11.1	25
	Systems	42.5	9.1	33

NOTE: For 2019-2020, no data due to covid19 (students did not meet in person, hence no exam administered).

Analysis Table 1.2:

Analysis Question	Analysis Response
1. Was your standard met or not met for the year?	The standard was not met for the year.
2. Whether met or not met, explain how your unit performed in relation to the standard (relate the data in the table to the standard).	Among the 20 students tested, all except 2 of the majors performed well below the national averages for each of the three assessment indicators.
3. Discuss possible reasons why the unit performed as it did this year.	The below average performance of ECU computer science majors on the MFT can be attributed to the following: a. Insufficient exposure of majors to computer science content. This restricts the development of the logical thinking process which is heavily required for a career in software engineering. b. All classes during the previous academic were taught in the online/blended format. Class attendance and interaction was minimal.
4. Look at the 5-year data trends and discuss those. Note if data seem to be increasing/decreasing with time and if so, reasons why.	The results are consistent with previous years, perhaps following a downward trend in the "programming" category.
5. Using your analysis responses, make specific data-driven decisions about your unit. If no actions or changes are needed, state that. Copy/paste the #5 response to Current Actions and/or Changes (end of template)	Hire more computer science PhD professors to enrich the program and strengthen students. The program is lacking in longevity of professors. This weakens any program.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT

East Central University

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME 2: Student will acquire oral and written communication skills appropriate to computer science majors.

Criterion 2.1: Satisfactory written skills developed by program majors.

Population/Course: All computer science majors enrolled in CPSMA 2923 Data Structures and Algorithm Analysis.

Instrument/Measurement (copy/paste instrument in Appendix): Oral student presentations in CPSMA 2923 Data Structures and Algorithm Analysis.

Standard: At least 80% of the program majors should score at least three out of five on these presentations per the scoring rubric developed.

Data Table 2.1:

Academic Year	Number of Students	Range of Scores	Mean of Scores	Percent Pass Rate
2020-2021	63	0-5	3.45 *4.83 (see note below)	71.4 *100 (see note below)
Academic Year	Number of Students	Range of Scores	Total students scoring 3/5 or above	Percent Pass Rate
2019-2020	21	ND	19	90
2018-2019	20	ND	19	95
2017-2018	11	ND	9	82
2016-2017	24	ND	22	95

NOTES:

- Out of the 63 students assessed for 2020-2021, there were 18 who **did not complete the assignment and received 0**. If those scores are disregarded, the mean becomes **4.83** and the pass rate becomes **100%**.
- For 2019-2020, no data due to covid19 (students did not meet in person, hence no exam administered).
- Range and Mean of Scores were not reported prior to 2020-2021.

Analysis Table 2.1:

Analysis Question	Analysis Response
1. Was your standard met or not met for the year?	If the students who did not complete the assignment are included then the standard was not met. If we only consider the students who attempted the assignment, then the standard was certainly met since 100% of those that submitted the assignment scored 3 or above.
2. Whether met or not met, explain how your unit performed in relation to the standard (relate the data in the table to the standard).	The students who completed the assignment all performed at a satisfactory level (scored 3 or above). These were the same students who actively participated in the course either by attending in

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT
East Central University

	person on their assigned days or participating in the live zoom call for each lecture.
3. Discuss possible reasons why the unit performed as it did this year.	Almost all of the students did their presentations remotely or submitted a recording. Perhaps not being physically present in front of the class and professor allowed them to be more relaxed which in turn led to a better presentation.
4. Look at the 5-year data trends and discuss those. Note if data seem to be increasing/decreasing with time and if so, reasons why.	If considering only the students that attempted the assignment, it is evident that there is significant improvement in the pass rate.
5. Using your analysis responses, make specific data-driven decisions about your unit. If no actions or changes are needed, state that. Copy/paste the #5 response to Current Actions and/or Changes (end of template)	Develop uniform rubric for this instrument.

Criterion 2.2: Satisfactory written skills developed by program majors.

Population/Course: All computer science majors enrolled in CMPSC 3943 Software Design and Development.

Instrument/Measurement (copy/paste instrument in Appendix): Written student material submitted in CMPSC 3943 Software Design and Development.

Standard: At least 80% of the program majors should score at least three out of five in each category of the scoring rubric developed. Categories in the rubric include: Written English; Organization; and Content of Material.

Data Table 2.2:

Academic Year	Number of Students	Category	Total students scoring 3 or above	ECU Range of Scores	Mean of Scores	Percent Pass Rate
2020-2021	49	Written	47	0 - 4.75	3.82	95
		Organization	47	0 - 4.60	3.84	96
		Content	47	0 - 4.67	3.82	95
2019-2020	38	Written	33	ND	ND	87
		Organization	34	ND	ND	89
		Content	36	ND	ND	95
2018-2019	28	Written	23	ND	ND	82
		Organization	25	ND	ND	89
		Content	26	ND	ND	93

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT
East Central University

2017-2018	38	Written	30	ND	ND	80
		Organization	32	ND	ND	85
		Content	32	ND	ND	85
2016-2017	33	Written	28	ND	ND	85
		Organization	26	ND	ND	80
		Content	30	ND	ND	90

NOTE: Range and Mean of Scores were not reported prior to 2020-2021.

Analysis Table 2.2:

Analysis Question	Analysis Response
1. Was your standard met or not met for the year?	This standard was met for this academic year.
2. Whether met or not met, explain how your unit performed in relation to the standard (relate the data in the table to the standard).	Most of students were able to submit the project report according to the expectations given to them in the project description. This standard for at least 80% of students scoring a 3 or more out of 5 total points was met in each of the three categories since 95% and 96% of students scored three or higher on the written assignment. Note that several students did not submit the assignment at all. If these students were not considered in the analysis, this percentage would be much closer to 100%.
3. Discuss possible reasons why the unit performed as it did this year.	The students had to submit several phases of this report during the semester, those phases were graded with some feedback on their writing phase by phase. Hence, their final reports were overall up to the expectation.
4. Look at the 5-year data trends and discuss those. Note if data seem to be increasing/decreasing with time and if so, reasons why.	The data from this assessment has an increasing trend over the last two academic years.
5. Using your analysis responses, make specific data-driven decisions about your unit. If no actions or changes are needed, state that. Copy/paste the #5 response to Current Actions and/or Changes (end of template)	Develop uniform rubric for this instrument.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT
East Central University

Criterion 2.3: Satisfactory oral skills developed by program majors.

Population/Course: All computer science majors enrolled in CMPSC 3943 Software Design and Development.

Instrument/Measurement (copy/paste instrument in Appendix): Oral student presentations in CMPSC 3943 Software Design and Development.

Standard: At least 80% of the program majors should score at least three out of five on these presentations per the scoring rubric developed.

Data Table 2.3:

Academic Year	Number of Students	ECU Range of Scores	Total students scoring 3 or above	Mean of Scores	Percent Pass Rate
2020-2021	49	0 - 4.6	46	3.65	93.8
2019-2020	38	ND	33	ND	87

NOTES: Range and Mean of Scores were not reported prior to 2020-2021. This assessment measure was first implemented in AY 19-20 so there is not yet 5 years of data to report.

Analysis Table 2.3:

Analysis Question	Analysis Response
1. Was your standard met or not met for the year?	This standard was met for this academic year.
2. Whether met or not met, explain how your unit performed in relation to the standard (relate the data in the table to the standard).	This standard for at least 80% of students scoring a 3 or more out of 5 total points was met since approximately 94% of students scored three or higher on oral presentation. Note that several students did not submit the assignment at all. If these students were not considered in the analysis, this percentage would be higher.
3. Discuss possible reasons why the unit performed as it did this year.	Since, the oral presentations were done in groups, where each group member has his/her own turn, they were doing several practices among themselves before the actual presentations, and some were showing me their presentation ahead of the actual presentation to get some feedback from me. Hence, due to the extra practice, their oral presentations satisfied expectations overall.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT
East Central University

4. Look at the 5-year data trends and discuss those. Note if data seem to be increasing/decreasing with time and if so, reasons why.	The data from this assessment has an increasing trend over the last two academic years.
5. Using your analysis responses, make specific data-driven decisions about your unit. If no actions or changes are needed, state that. Copy/paste the #5 response to Current Actions and/or Changes (end of template)	Develop uniform rubric for this instrument.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME 3: Student will acquire a high-quality education in computer science and the ability to apply the content knowledge and communication skills acquired to secure fulfilling careers in computer science.

Criterion 3.1:

Population/Course: All computer science program majors (freshmen-senior).

Instrument/Measurement (copy/paste instrument in Appendix): ECU student opinion surveys completed by computer science program majors (freshman-senior).

Standard: A minimum of 75% satisfaction should be achieved in each category of the survey.

Data Table 3.1:

Academic Year	Category	Number of Students	Student Number Indicating Satisfaction	Percentage
2020-2021	Advising (Q5.6)	25	18	72
	Instruction (Q5.8)	25	14	56
	Classroom (Q5.14)	26	19	73
	Technology (Q5.14)	26	20	76
2019-2020	Skills (Q5.24)	37	26	70
	Knowledge (Q5.26)	35	28	80
	Critical Thinking (Q5.28)	34	29	85
	Problem Solving (Q5.30)	35	29	83
2018-2019		25	21	84
2017-2018		21	18	85
2016-2017		19	19	100

NOTE: For AY before 2019-2020, we are not sure of the category/questions used from the student survey.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT
East Central University

Analysis Table 3.1: A response is required for each question in the table.

Analysis Question	Analysis Response
1. Was your standard met or not met for the year?	The standard was met in one of the four categories.
2. Whether met or not met, explain how your unit performed in relation to the standard (relate the data in the table to the standard).	Three of the four questions fell below the 75% satisfaction (a 4 or 5 as a response). But of those three, two were just below the marker.
3. Discuss possible reasons why the unit performed as it did this year.	This is a small sample in comparison with the number of majors overall. This portion filling out the survey is only about 12% of the major. One possibility for this small sample is that the disgruntled students are the ones that largely completed the survey. Other reasons point to the high turnover rate in the department, which usually correlates to lack of satisfaction for students. High turnover invariable causes harm to students and a program.
4. Look at the 5-year data trends and discuss those. Note if data seem to be increasing/decreasing with time and if so, reasons why.	This is the first year we have had data on the current survey and the results are quite different from prior years.
5. Using your analysis responses, make specific data-driven decisions about your unit. If no actions or changes are needed, state that. Copy/paste the #5 response to Current Actions and/or Changes (end of template)	We need to reword the standard to make clear exactly what questions we intend to look at for this standard.

Criterion 3.2: TBD

Population/Course:

Instrument/Measurement (copy/paste instrument in Appendix):

Standard:

Data Table: [For instructions see *Glossary of Terms Pgm Asmt* in Teams.]

Academic Year	Range of Scores	Mean of Scores	Percent Pass Rate	n
2020-2021				
2019-2020				
2018-2019				

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT
East Central University

2017-2018				
2016-2017				

NOTE: [Add explanation for missing data (ND) in the table]

Analysis Table: A response is required for each question in the table.

Analysis Question	Analysis Response
1. Was your standard met or not met for the year?	
2. Whether met or not met, explain how your unit performed in relation to the standard (relate the data in the table to the standard).	
3. Discuss possible reasons why the unit performed as it did this year.	
4. Look at the 5-year data trends and discuss those. Note if data seem to be increasing/decreasing with time and if so, reasons why.	
5. Using your analysis responses, make specific data-driven decisions about your unit. If no actions or changes are needed, state that. Copy/paste the #5 response to Current Actions and/or Changes (end of template)	

Summary Table of Student Learning Outcomes/Criteria/Instruments				
Student Learning Outcomes	Criteria/Instrument (modify table to fit your plan)	Direct/ Indirect Measure	Met	Not Met
SLO1: Student will acquire content knowledge in computer science.	1.1: Overall student performance on ETS administered MFT in Computer Science	Direct		X
	1.2: Student performance on individual Assessment Indicators (sub-disciplines) within the MFT	Direct		X
SLO2: Student will acquire oral and written communication skills appropriate to computer science majors.	2.1: Satisfactory oral skills developed by program majors (CPSMA 2923 Data Structures and Algorithms)	Direct	X	X
	2.2: Satisfactory written skills developed by program majors (CMPSC 3943 Software Design and Development)	Direct	X	
	2.3 Satisfactory oral skills developed by program majors (CPSMA 3943 Software Design and Development)	Direct	X	
SLO3: Student will acquire ability to apply content knowledge and communication skills from Student Learning Outcomes 1 and 2, respectively. These	3.1: Quality of education provided by the computer science program as reported by first-year program graduates and all computer science majors (freshman-senior).	Indirect	X	X
	3.2: TBD			

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT
East Central University

application skills will prepare them for careers in industry.				
---	--	--	--	--

Student Information for this Academic Year: 2020-2021	
Total, <i>unduplicated</i> number of students assessed this academic year	142
Program census for Fall	204
Program census for Spring	197
Total number of Fall Program graduates	24
Total number of Spring/Summer graduates	30
Mean major GPA of Fall graduates	3.17
Mean major GPA of Spring/Summer graduates	3.31

NOTE: With the exception of the unduplicated number assessed (yellow), student information is provided by Office of Institutional Effectiveness and is made available in your Teams folder. For help with determining unduplicated number, contact the Assessment Coordinator.

Faculty Meeting: List meeting date(s) and a roster of those in attendance.

Item	Dates	Attendees
End-of-Month Meeting (Dept. of Math and CS)	August 2020, September 2020 October 2020 January (14 & 29) 2021 March 2021 May 2021	Mary Harper; Andrew Wells; Nancy McClain; Nicholas Jacob; Michelle Lastrina; Matthew Lynam; Mary Kay Tarver; Vladimir Ufimtsev; Waynette Nell; Jalal Omer; Khem Poudel; Sometimes Dr. Hobbs (adjunct)
Dept. Assessment Committee	January (25 & 28) 2021 February (2, 5, 23, 25) 2021 March (4, 9, 11) 2021 April (29) 2021 May (3) 2021	Mary Harper; Michelle Lastrina *One meeting about corequisite data had the following in attendance: Matthew Lynam; Nancy McClain; Andrew Wells;

Sharing with Stakeholders:

1. Stakeholders for this Program include: [**list** all within and without the ECU community]
2. Current program assessment reports are available on the website of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness:
https://myecu.ecok.edu/ICS/Institutional_Reporting/Assessment_Reporting_and_Outcomes.inz
This link will change Fall 21 since MyECU is being phased out – I will let you know what to change it to.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT
East Central University

SUMMARY OF LAST 5 YEARS' ACTIONS/CHANGES/REVIEWS & UPDATES

For instructions see *Glossary of Terms Pgm Asmt* in Teams.

Academic Year	Summary of Actions/Changes from Report
2020-2021	<p>Criterion 1.1 and 1.2: Hire more computer science PhD professors to enrich the program and strengthen students. The program is lacking in longevity of professors. This weakens any program.</p> <p>Criterion 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3: Develop uniform rubric for this instrument.</p> <p>Criterion 3.1: We need to reword the standard to make clear exactly what questions we intend to look at for this standard.</p> <p>Action: Work to develop Criterion 3.2</p>
2019-2020	Change: Deleted Criterion 3.2 since no longer gather this data.
2018-2019	Change: Criterion 2.3 modified. Evaluation of Criterion 2.3 will begin in AY 2019-2020.
2017-2018	No changes or actions.
2016-2017	Change: ECU student opinion survey will also be used for Criterion 3.1 starting AY 2017-2018.

Academic Year	Summary of Annual Reviews of Dean and/or UAC (Reviews found in Teams folder; UAC <i>does not</i> review annually)	Updates in Response to Reviews
2019-2020		
2018-2019		
2017-2018		
2016-2017		
2015-2016		

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT
East Central University

APPENDIX

Copy/paste screenshots or narrative of blank instruments (rubrics, surveys, data report requests, prepared spread sheets, etc) here.

CRITERION 2.1

Name of person completing attached evaluation form: _____

Presentation:

1. Presenter understood how the algorithm worked
2. Presenter clearly demonstrated how the sorting algorithm works
3. Presenter successfully used an example to demonstrate the algorithm
4. Presenter spoke loud and clear throughout the presentation and was able to communicate effectively
5. Presenter clearly demonstrated whether or not the sorting algorithm is stable (as implemented) and provided examples to support that claim
6. Presenter clearly explained the complexity of the algorithm and its performance in best, worst, and average cases.

Code

1. Presenter provided code by specified deadline to allow sufficient time for classmates to review and test thoroughly.
2. Code provided uses good programming style with proper indentation for optimal readability
3. Code contains well-written and properly placed comments throughout to clearly explain code
4. Code successfully implements the algorithm as presented in class and is easy to see correlation between presentation and program.

Documentation

1. Presenter provided all required documentation for assigned sorter
2. Documentation was well-written with good grammar, spelling, etc.
3. Documentation was formatted properly for inclusion in complete product.
4. Presenter was able to clearly explain if clarification needed for final document.

Overall

1. Overall Evaluation of the package deal (presentation, explanation, examples, code, comments, etc).
A+ - Outstanding A – Very Good B – Above Average C – Average/Acceptable D – Below Average F – Unacceptable/Incomplete
2. Overall rank among peers. Order all students 1-15 with 1 being the person who contributed most and 15 being the person who contributed least.

Data Structures and Algorithm Analysis
Presentation Assignment (10 points total)
Due Date: **Wednesday, May 5th, 11:59pm**

1. Create a PowerPoint/Prezi (whichever presentation software you want) presentation on any topic related to Data Structures and Algorithm Analysis. You can use a topic covered in class (and expand it), or any other related topic. A great source of possible topics is the highly recommended textbook *"Introduction to Algorithms"* given in the syllabus. Your presentation should be **at least 4 minutes long (but not much more than that)**. Your objective is to present something interesting, something you have learned about your chosen topic that you think is worth sharing, and do so in an effective manner. **For full points you have to include material that was not presented in class.** You may work in groups of at most 3. **Submit your slides by Wednesday, 05/05, 11:59pm.**
2. Record a presentation of your slideshow using the screen share feature in zoom. Your presentation should be **at least 4 minutes** in length, so be careful with the amount of slides you include, and **each person in your group must present some portion of the overall presentation.** **Submit the link to your recording by Wednesday, 05/05, 11:59pm.**

Submit your Powerpoint/Prezi presentation and a link to your recording via Blackboard (each person in a group should submit a copy).