Missing Elements of Computer Science Curricula 2013

Dr. Muhammad Anwar-ur-Rehman Pasha[1] and Shaheen Pasha[2]

[1] Imperial College of Business Studies, Lahore, Pakistan.

Received: 9 April 2012 Accepted: 30 April 2012 Published: 15 May 2012

Abstract

Rapidly expanding computing domain has forced educational institutions to up-grade existing curricula of computing degree programs. Recently, a joint task force of Association for Computing Machinery and IEEE-Computer Society has published the Strawman Draft of Computer Science Curricula 2013. The Draft has introduced some new ideas to keep computing curricula modern and relevant. The recommended curricula have designed in the light of 6

Index terms— Computing Curriculum, Computer Science Curricula 2013, Computing Model Curriculum, Dispositions in Computing, Hidden Curriculum in Computing, Global E

1 Introduction

raditionally, computing is used as an umbrella term to represent the following five disciplines:

1. Computer Engineering (CE) focuses on computing hardware and associated computing aspects.

2. Computer Science (CS) focuses on computing theory, methodology, innovation, development (programming) of technologies and applications, and applying computing to new disciplines.

2 Information Systems (IS) focuses on applying

computing in organizations and organizational information management. 4. Information Technology (IT) focuses on solving organizational computing challenges by integrating technologies into solutions and deploying and maintaining the solutions. 5. Software Engineering (SE) focuses on developing large complex software systems.

Computing is a rapidly progressing domain. In recent years many significant developments have been made and many new concepts have been introduced. For example, "Computational Lens" (Karp, 2011) which articulates a new relationship between computer science and other sciences, "Ternary Computing" dealing with computing for the masses ??Li, 2010), "e-Science" managing massive experimental data and collaborating via the Net, "Computational Thinking" (Wing, 2006;, Cloud Computing (Li & Zhang, 2009), Biological Computing (Garfinkel, 2000), etc. In parallel, the integration of computing in other disciplines introduces new disciplines such as "Computational-x" (e.g., computational mathematics, computational physics, computational finance, etc.) and "x-Informatics" (e.g., bio-informatics, dental-informatics, clinical-informatics, etc.) (ACM & IEEE-CS, 2012). Many such developments compel the international community to update the curricula of computing degree programs to meet the needs of the time.

The practice of developing a model curriculum in the computing domain started in 1965 when the Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) for Computer Science curriculum published their recommendations ??ACM, 1965). Since then the international community has developed many model curricula to keep computing discipline up-to-date. Recently, the Joint Task Force on Computing Curricula Association for Computing Machinery and IEEE-Computer Society has published the Strawman Draft of Computer Science Curricula 2013 (ACM & IEEE-CS, 2012). The recommendations made in this Draft have introduced some new ideas to keep computing curricula modern and relevant. The Draft has invited suggestions & recommendations from the international community to be included in the Ironman report going to be released in 2013. In this paper we have pointed out some short comings of the recommended curricula and made recommendations to make it more robust and effective.

We believe the recommendations made in this paper may generate some thought provoking ideas for developing model curriculum for computing degree programs.

The organization of this paper is as follow. A review of the computing model curriculum development efforts is presented in the next section. Some important aspects of the Strawman Draft are outlined in the next section. Section 4 has identified some shortcomings of the curriculum recommended in the Draft. Concluding discussion and recommendations are presented in the last section.

3 II.

4 Computing model curriculum development

In computing domain, the history of model curriculum development started with the publication of the recommendations of the ACM for Computer Science curriculum ??ACM, 1965). Since then many efforts have been made to keep the computing curriculum up-todate. These efforts include, for example, Curriculum 68 ??ACM, 1969)

5 CS curricula 2013: the strawman draft

The Draft has provided a comprehensive revision of the existing curricula. It is prepared in the light of following guidelines, as reported in (ACM/IEEE-CS, 2012): ? The "Big Tent" view of CS to accommodate the challenges of emerging disciplines include more cross-disciplinary work new programs of the form "Computational Biology," "Computational Engineering," and "Computational X". The Draft has introduced three levels of knowledge description: Tier-1 Core, Tier-2 Core, and(D D D D) B 2012 Year

Elective. Topics have been identified as either "core" or "elective". The draft suggests that a curriculum should include all topics in the tier-1 core and ensure that all students cover this material. Also, all or almost all topics in the tier-2 core should be taught to all students. It has also been suggested that the curriculum should include significant elective material as covering only the "core" topics is insufficient for a complete curriculum (ACM/IEEE-CS, 2008).

IV.

6 Shortcomings of the cs curriculum 2013

The Draft is prepared to keep the computing curricula up-to-date and relevant but the following aspects may raise questions about its effectiveness.

7 a) Low response rate

The Draft reports that "the survey was sent to approximately 1500 Computer Science (and related discipline) Department Chairs and Directors of Undergraduate Studies in the United States and an additional 2000 Department Chairs internationally. We received 201 responses, representing a wide range of institutions". In this case the response rate is just 6% which raises the question of reliability, validity and acceptability of its recommendations. Studies suggest that an achievable and acceptable rate is 75% for interviews and 65% for self-completion postal questionnaires (Arber, 2001; ??itzia & Wood,1998). Similarly, Mundy (2002) comments that "There's no magic figure on response rates. Higher is better: 60% would be marginal, 70% is reasonable, 80% would be good, 90% would be excellent" (p. 25). The recommendations made in the light of 6% response rate can only represent the point of view of a specific community. It cannot be generalized. b) An Ad-hoc approach towards the core body of knowledge

The Draft has added two new knowledge areas in the core body of knowledge: "Information Assurance and Security" and "Parallel and Distributed Computing" as the survey respondents indicated a strong need of these topics. There is no doubt the identified areas are important but the concept of computing is evolving and expanding with an unprecedented pace. The approach of adding new concepts as they emerge will make the computing core over-crowded and unmanageable.

8 c) Incomplete curriculum guidelines

The Draft includes guidelines regarding knowledge areas, curricula and course exemplars, institutional challenges, key principles & professional practice, and characteristics of graduates. As a normal practice, an effective curriculum provides guidelines for students' learning, contents for learning, sequence of courses of study, instructional methods and activities, instructional resources, educational settings, evaluation methods for assessing student learning, accountability measures for teaching-learning processes, etc. (Talbot, 2004; HEC, 2012; UNESCO, 2012). Whereas, the recommendations of the Draft covers only few of these aspects.

9 d) Inconsistency in the use of terms 'Computing' and 'Computer Science'

A substantial amount of research efforts have been carried out to define the distinctive features and characteristics of five key disciplines of computing. In the Draft, the term "computing" and "computer science" are used interchangeably that make it unclear that the proposed recommendations are for 'Computer Science" degree program or for the whole spectrum of computing related degree programs. This aspect is making its scope ambiguous. e) Over-ambitious contents and learning outcomes Topics included in the defined knowledge areas can be considered over-ambitious and seems difficult to cover within the proposed time span.

10 f) Dispositions: an ignored aspect

The concept of dispositions has become an important element of an effective curriculum. It can be thought of as habits of mind or tendencies to respond to certain situations in certain ways. For example, curiosity, friendliness, bossiness, meanness, and creativity are dispositions, rather than of skills or items of knowledge (Katz, 1995). Preparing students for having the disposition to be a programmer is more important than having programming skills. This important aspect is missing from the proposed curriculum.

11 g) Other missing aspects

Global education, 21 st century skills, inclusive education, and hidden curriculum are among the important aspects of 21 st century education. These aspects have not been addressed in the Draft.

V.

12 Discussion & recommendations

Computing is a rapidly changing domain and will continue to change for the foreseeable future. Both institutions and faculty are striving to address how to meet the needs of the students studying in computing and other newly emerging disciplines as they are being considered responsible of producing well-rounded computing graduates equipped with professional competencies ready to work in a more holistic way than simply demonstrating technical skills. For this purpose they need a flexible curriculum model that would take a broader view of the field and provides guidelines to meet the challenges of 21 st As discussed earlier, the Draft has increased the size of the core body of knowledge by adding new knowledge areas. In recent years many new concepts have been introduced and will continue in the foreseeable future. The approach of adding new knowledge areas in the computing core will make it unmanageable if new knowledge areas continue to emerge. The wisdom suggests that in place of increasing the size of the core, a more appropriate approach has to be adopted for accommodating new ways of thinking, application and evolution of computing. We believe, in place of increasing the size of the computing core, some common knowledge areas should be identified which could strengthen students' conceptual understanding required to study higher level computing concepts. These common knowledge areas should be equally important for both the students of core computing disciplines and the students studying in newly emerged fields. In this regard we recommend that the computing core should be based on following knowledge areas which are essential for a whole range of computing degree programs including "computational-x" and "x-informatics". These knowledge areas are: Keeping a small core will allow institutions to include newly emerging areas like quantum computing, bilogical, cloud computing, etc. It will also allow them to produce their own brands through offering special topics or training. Branding in higher education is a topic of great interest among the higher education community (Brunzel, 2007;Lockwood & Hadd, 2007); Temple, 2006).

We also propose the following curriculum structure for computing degree programs: For the selection of course contents "Selective Abandonment" strategy (Lovely & Smith, 2004) is strongly recommended as it allows teachers to prioritize the content of instructional material into three categories: essential material must be covered and have top priority, supportive may be dealt with in conjunction with other material or as a cooperative or independent learning experience, and extraneous material can be included as time allows.

It could be argued that we have eliminated the traditional core areas like computer programming, data structure and algorithms, data-communication, digital logic design and computer organization, etc. We believe these subjects have different standpoints in different domains. For example, low level computer programing is more useful for computer engineering students as compared to the students of information systems. Time has come to realize that to develop an appropriate mindset the students need to study material related to that particular domain . Such topics could be covered under the category of 'Domain Specific Elective Courses'. This way institutions can offer different contents to the students of different degree programs. Similarly, courses like discreet structures, data-communication, digital logic design and computer organization could be offered under 'Computing Supporting Elective Courses'. Science, Mathematics, etc. could be covered under 'Interdisciplinary supporting Elective Course'. Course like Philosophy, Psychology, Sociology, Comparative Study of Religions, etc. could be taught under 'General Education Electives'. The Capstone project will allow students to demonstrate the knowledge and skills they have learnt during the course of their study. Jackson (2008) argues that higher education has a responsibility to help students to develop and promote their understanding and awareness of their own creativities, identity and lifelong learning experiences. He further comments "Preparing students for a lifetime of working, learning and living in uncertain and unpredictable worlds that have yet to revealed is perhaps one of the greatest responsibilities and challenges confronting universities all over the world." Katz (1993) argues that "One of the major questions to be addressed when developing a curriculum is, What should be learned?" One way to answer this question, as (Katz, 1991) explains, "is to adopt at least four types of learning goals, those related to knowledge, skills, dispositions, and feelings. The acquisition of both knowledge and skills is taken for granted as an educational goal, and most educators would also readily agree that many feelings (e.g., self-esteem) are also influenced by school experiences and are thus worthy of inclusion among learning goals. However, dispositions are seldom included, although they are often implied by the inclusion of attitudes (e.g., attitudes toward learning) as goals" (Katz, 1993).

The role of dispositions in computing education is very important. For example, having the disposition to be a programmer is much better that just having programming skills. Similarly, and, having the disposition to be a software engineer is much batter than just having software engineering skills. Katz (1995) (D D D D) B 2012

Year pointed out that "Dispositions are not learned through formal instruction or exhortation. Many important dispositions are in-born in all children like the dispositions to learn and to make sense of experience." Many dispositions that most adults want children to acquire or to strengthen -for example, curiosity, creativity, cooperation, openness, friendliness-are learned primarily from being around people who exhibit them; they are strengthened by being used effectively and by being appreciated rather than rewarded (Kohn, 1993).

To strengthen the dispositions computing students should have, they must be provided with the opportunity to express the dispositions in their behavior. When manifestations of the dispositions occur, they can be strengthened as the students observe their effectiveness and the responses to them and experiences satisfaction from them. Dweck (1991) argue that an effective curriculum can strengthen certain dispositions by setting learning goals rather than asking teachers to set some performance goals. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that the forthcoming Iransman Draft must identify those dispositions which are essential for computing students and make part of the curriculum.

Hidden Curriculum is an important component of any educational program (Jackson, 1968). Hidden curriculum deals with the elements of socialization embedded in the curriculum and are imparted to students through daily routines, curricular content, and social relationships, yet are not part of the formal curricular content. Emile Durkheim views educational systems reflect underlying changes in society because the systems are a construct built by society, which naturally seeks to reproduce its collectively held values, beliefs, norms, and conditions through its institutions (Giddens, 1972). He further comments, "Society can survive only if there exists among its members a significant degree of homogeneity; education perpetuates and reinforces this homogeneity by fixing in the child, from the beginning, the essential similarities collective life demands". He also comments that socializing children to hold particular values such as those of "achievement" and "equality of opportunity" is necessary to this consensus and is the primary function of education (Giddens, 1972).

The Draft has addressed the issue of professional practices and considers it as a discrete area which has to be treated explicitly. We believe topics like professional ethics, soft skills, public speaking, critical thinking & reasoning, modern literacies, interpersonal attributes, entrepreneurship, attitude towards lifelong learning, other life & social skills should not be considered discrete items and to be taught independently. Such concepts should be threaded into the entire fabric of the curriculum and taught as a hidden curriculum. This approach will, on the one hand, make room for other valuable concepts. On the other hand, it will make students responsible citizen, ethically sound professionals, and sociable members of the society.

The biggest pitfall in selecting the contents and learning outcomes for any learning activity is to be overambitious for the time allocated. The over-ambitious contents and learning outcomes is another aspect of the Draft which must be addressed. Let's take the example of "Algorithms and Complexity (AL)" knowledge area. The Draft has proposed the following contents, learning outcomes and number of hours. Explain what is meant by "best", "average", and "worst" case behavior of an algorithm. [Knowledge] 2. In the context of specific algorithms, identify the characteristics of data and/or other conditions or assumptions that lead to different behaviors.

[Evaluation] 3. Determine informally the time and space complexity of simple algorithms.

[Application] 4. Understand the formal definition of big O.

[Knowledge] 5. List and contrast standard complexity classes.

[Knowledge] 6. Perform empirical studies to validate hypotheses about runtime stemming from mathematical analysis. Run algorithms on input of various sizes and compare performance. [Application] 10. Explain the use of big omega, big theta, and little o notation to describe the amount of work done by an algorithm.

[Knowledge] 11. Use recurrence relations to determine the time complexity of recursively defined algorithms.

[Application] 12. Solve elementary recurrence relations, e.g., using some forms of a Master Theorem.

[Application]

Teaching of the above mentioned course contents and expecting the mentioned learning outcomes from students in just 4 hours seem unrealistic. We believe the proposed learning outcomes require more time on the part of both teachers and students for their completion than is mentioned. Knight (2002) argues that in the higher education contents should be offered in order to maximize the chance that learners will experience coherence, progression and deep learning. If the contents and outcomes are over-ambitious compare to the time available, these cannot go without compromising the essential characteristics of the learning experience (Barnett, et al., 2001;Pasha & Pasha, 2012a). Di Carlo (2009) argues that attempting just to cover the overcrowded course contents limit students to simply learning facts without developing the ability to apply their knowledge to solve novel problems. It puts an extra cognitive load on students (Chandler & Sweller, 1991). and makes both faculty and students overburdened (Gibbs, 1981;Ironside, 2004). As a result, the students' academic achievements get effected (Apple, 2001;Jones, 2008). For an effective learning students need to be engaged in higher order cognitive activities which are related to the upper half of Bloom's taxonomy (Bloom & David, 1959;Pasha & Pasha, 2012a).

The high pace of knowledge exploration, inventions of new technologies, and the convergence of computing and other disciplines, the emergence of new domains & disciplines have introduced new challenges to curriculum development for degree programs. These trends demand a flexible approach for curriculum development which not only meets the existing challenges but also have the potential to accommodate the future needs as well (Pasha & Pasha, 2012a).

We need to realize that the 21 st century has been labeled as an era of knowledge economies which have manifested itself in many different ways like science and technology bonding has become stronger than ever before, innovation has become more important for economic growth and competitiveness, continuing education and lifelong learning have got unprecedented importance in organizational practices, investment in intangible assets has become more valuable than investments in fixed capital (Pasha & Pasha, 2012b). These trends have led to an increased competition in the business world (Utz, 2006). Also the relationship between knowledge and technology has become more evident. Although, the economic activities all over the world are increasingly becoming knowledge oriented but the degree of knowledge and technology integration into economic activity is now so great that knowledge & technology have been recognized as the drivers of productivity and economic growth (Kogut & Zander, 1992;Nonaka, & Takeuchi, 2002;Choo, 2002;Zítek & Klímová, 2011). In today's world, the basic economic resource -the means of production -is no longer capital, nor natural resources, nor labor. It is and will be the knowledge workers who possess high levels of education and/or expertise in a particular area, and who use their cognitive skills to engage in complex problem solving. Such knowledge workers will be the assets of the organization (Drucker, 2006). In this sense transforming computing students into valuable knowledge workers should be one of the key purposes of a curriculum (Pasha & Pasha, 2012c).

Time has come to realize the changing patterns of 21 st century universities education which have removed the identity of place, the identity of time, the identity of the scholarly community, and the identity of the student community. For accommodating these changes, we need to understand the five contemporary competing epistemological pressures on the higher education curriculum. **??**rigges (2000) suggests that the future of the higher education curriculum will hang significantly on the way in which this competition is resolved: 1. The deconstruction of the subject, as reflected in, for example, the modularization of the curriculum; 2. The cross-curricular 'key' skills movement; 3. The learning through experience movement and the shift of the seat of learning outside the academy; 4. The anarchic potential of web-based learning; and 5. The reaffirmation of the subject as the academic and organizational identity.

We believed, similar to other disciplines, people from computing domain must appreciate these challenging aspects and find practical ways to resolve these conflicts. We also believe giving considerations to the following aspects would make computing curricula more agile, responsive and accommodating: The ? Allow institutions to integrate the concept of branding within their degree programs.

We believe that the recommendations made in this paper may provide some useful ideas to be included in the Ironman Draft which is going to be released in 2013 [6].

Figure 1:

.1 Acknowledgment

We express our sincere and deep gratitude to our colleagues and professionals from teaching and software Industry who made it possible to streamline our thoughts for this research. We also pay our thanks to our institutions for providing the opportunity to conduct this research.

[Cambridge Journal of Education] , *Cambridge Journal of Education* 30 (1) p. .

[Published Studies'. International Journal for Quality in Health Care] , *Published Studies'. International Journal for Quality in Health Care* 10 p. .

[Garfinkel (2000)] , S L Garfinkel . *Technology Review* 2000. May/June, 71-77.

[Ieee-Cs ()] *A Curriculum in Computer Science and Engineering. IEEE Computer Society Education Committee/Model Curriculum Subcommittee Report*, Ieee-Cs . 1976. IEEE Computer Society.

[Pasha and Pasha (2012)] 'A Pragmatic Approach for Implementing Knowledge Management in Pakistani Organizations Using Open Source Technologies'. M A Pasha , S Pasha . *International Journal of Computer Application* 2012c. May 2012. (Submitted for publication)

[Mundy ()] 'A Question of Response Rate'. D Mundy . *Science Editor* 2002. 25 (1) p. 25.

[An Undergraduate Program in Computer Science-Preliminary Recommendations Communications of the ACM ()] 'An Undergraduate Program in Computer Science-Preliminary Recommendations'. *Communications of the ACM* 1965. ACM. 8 (9) p. .

[Bridges ()] *Back to the Future: the higher education curriculum in the 21st century*, D Bridges . 2000.

[Knight ()] *Being a Teacher in Higher Education*, P T Knight . 2002. Buckingham: SRHE/OU Press.

[Temple ()] *Branding higher education: illusion or reality?'. Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, P Temple . 2006. 10 p. .

[Lockwood and Hadd ()] 'Building a Brand in Higher Education: Why Business Practice-Particularly Brand Strategies -are Becoming Essential in Today's Universities''. R C Lockwood , J Hadd . *Gallup Management Journal Online* 2007. 12 p. .

[Drucker ()] *Classic Drucker*, P F Drucker . 2006. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation.

[Li and Zhang ()] *Cloud Computing Beyond Turing Machine'. Communications of the China Computer Federation*, D Li , H Zhang . 2009. 5 p. .

[Chandler and Sweller ()] 'Cognitive Load Theory and the Format of Instruction'. P Chandler , J Sweller . *Cognition and Instruction* 1991. 8 p. .

[Wing ()] *Computational Thinking and Thinking about Computing'. Philosophical Transactions of the*, J Wing . 2008. 1881. Royal Society. 366 p. .

[Wing ()] 'Computational Thinking''. J Wing . *Communications of the ACM* 2006. 49 (3) p. .

[Acm/Ieee-Cs ()] *Computer Science Curriculum 2008: An Interim Revision of CS*, Acm/Ieee-Cs . 2008. 2001. ACM Press. (ACM/IEEE-CS Joint Interim Review Task Force Report)

[Acm/Ieee-Cs ()] 'Computing Curricula'. Acm/Ieee-Cs . *Recommendations of ACM & IEEE-CS Joint Curriculum Task Force*, (Baltimore, MD) 1991. 1991. ACM Press.

[Acm/Ieee-Cs ()] 'Computing Curricula'. Acm/Ieee-Cs . *Recommendations of ACM & IEEE Curriculum Task Force on Computer Science* 2001. 2001. IEEE Computer Society Press and ACM Press.

[Acm/Ieee-Cs ()] *Computing Curricula 2005: The Overview Report*, Acm/Ieee-Cs . 2005. IEEE and ACM Press.

[Barnett et al. ()] *Conceptualising Curriculum Change', Teaching in Higher Education*, R Barnett , G Parry , K Coate . 2001. 6 p. .

[Ironside ()] 'Covering Content" and Teaching Thinking: Deconstructing the Additive Curriculum'. P M Ironside . *Journal of Nursing Education* 2004. 43 (1) p. .

[Curriculum 68: Curriculum Committee on CS Recommendations for Academic Programs in Computer Science Communications 'Curriculum 68: Curriculum Committee on CS Recommendations for Academic Programs in Computer Science'. *Communications of the ACM* 1969. ACM. 11 (3) p. .

[Curriculum 78: Recommendations for the Undergraduate Program in CS Communications of the ACM ()] 'Curriculum 78: Recommendations for the Undergraduate Program in CS'. *Communications of the ACM* 1979. 22 (3) p. .

[Curriculum recommendations for the Undergraduate Program in Computer Science SIGCSE Bulletin ()] 'Curriculum recommendations for the Undergraduate Program in Computer Science'. *SIGCSE Bulletin*, 1977. 2 p. .

[Arber (ed.) ()] *Designing Samples*, S Arber . N. Gilbert (ed.) 2001. London: SAGE Publications.

[Katz ()] *Dispositions as Educational Goals*, L G Katz . 1993. (ERIC Digest)

[Katz ()] 'Dispositions in early childhood education'. L G Katz . *Talks with teachers of young children. Norwood, N: Ablex*, L G Katz (ed.) 1995. p. .

[Apple ()] *Educating the "Right" Way: Markets, Standards, God, and Inequality*, M W Apple . 2001. New York. (Rout ledge Falmer)

[Giddens ()] *Emile Durkheim Selected Writings*, A Giddens . 1972. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

[Pasha and Pasha (2012)] 'Essentials of Knowledge Management: Concepts, Theories and Practices'. M A Pasha , S Pasha . `http://www.innovators.edu.pk/?q=node/139>` *Innovators Knowledge Services* 2012b. June 2012.

[Utz ()] *Fostering Innovation, Productivity, and Technological Change: Tanzania in the Knowledge Economy*, A Utz . 2006. (World Bank Institute, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/the World Bank)

[Graduate Employability in Asia, Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education UNESCO ()] 'Graduate Employability in Asia, Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education'. *UNESCO* 2012.

[Zítek and Klímová ()] 'Knowledge Economy and Knowledge Infrastructure'. V Zítek , V Klímová . *Proceedings of International Conference on Applied Economics*, (International Conference on Applied Economics) 2011. p. .

[Kogut and Zander ()] 'Knowledge of the firm, combinative capabilities, and the replication of technology'. B Kogut , U Zander . *Organization Science* 1992. 3 p. .

[Li] G Li . *2010. Information Science and Technology in China: A Roadmap to 2050*, (Berlin) Science Press Beijing and Springer-Verlag.

[Jackson ()] *Life in Classrooms*, P Jackson . 1968. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

[Ieee-Cs ()] 'Model Program in Computer Science and Engineering'. Ieee-Cs . *IEEE Computer Society Educational Activities Board/Model Program Committee Report* 1983. IEEE Computer Society.

[Talbot ()] 'Monkey See, Monkey Do: A Critique of the Competency Model in Graduate Medical Education'. M Talbot . *Medical Education* 2004. 38 p. .

[National Reports on the Undergraduate Curriculum, Traditional and Contemporary Perspectives -Innovations in the Undergradu *National Reports on the Undergraduate Curriculum, Traditional and Contemporary Perspectives -Innovations in the Undergraduate Curriculum, Higher Education Curriculum, Available at: <http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/ 1896/Curriculum-Higher-Education*, 2012. June 2012. p. 28.

[Kohn ()] *Punished by rewards: The trouble with gold stars, incentive plans, A's, praise, and other bribes*, A Kohn . 1993. Boston, MA; Houghton Mifflin.

[Denning ()] *Report on the ACM Task Force on the Core of Computer Science*, P J Denning . 1988. New York: ACM Press.

[Sitzia and Wood ()] *Response Rate in Patient Satisfaction Research: An Analysis of 210*, J Sitzia , N Wood . 1998.

[Pasha and Pasha ()] 'Rethinking of Computing Curricula in Higher Education in Pakistan''. M A Pasha , S Pasha . *International Journal of Advanced Research in Computer Science* 2012a. 3 (3) p. .

[Lovely and Smith ()] 'Selective abandonment: How and when to say no''. S Lovely , S Smith . *Principal Leadership* 2004. 5 (3) p. .

[Dweck ()] 'Self-theories and goals: Their role in motivation, personality, and development'. C S Dweck . *Nebraska symposium on motivation*, Richard A Dienstbier (ed.) (Lincoln) 1991. University of Nebraska Press. 38 p. .

[Acm/Ieee-Cs ()] 'Strawman Draft: Computer Science Curricula'. Acm/Ieee-Cs . *The Joint Task Force on Computing Curricula Association for Computing Machinery and IEEE-Computer Society*, 2012. 2013.

[Jones ()] *Student Engagement -Creating a Culture of Academic Achievement*, R D Jones . 2008. (International Center for Leadership in Education)

[Jackson ()] 'Tackling the Wicked Problem of Creativity in Higher Education'. N Jackson . *International Conference Brisbane at the ARC Centre for the Creative Industries and Innovation*, 2008.

[Bloom and David ()] 'Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals, by a committee of college and university examiners'. B S Bloom , R K David . *Handbook I: Cognitive Domain*, (New York, Longmans) 1959. 1959.

[Katz (ed.) ()] *The Care and Education of America's Young Children: Obstacles and Opportunities. Ninetieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part I*, L G Katz . S. L. Kagan, (ed.) 1991. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. p. . (Pedagogical Issues in Early Childhood Education)

[Margolis ()] *The Hidden Curriculum in Higher Education*, E Margolis . 2001. Routledge.

[Nonaka and Takeuchi ()] *The Knowledge-Creating Company*, I Nonaka , H Takeuchi . 2002. New York: Oxford University Press.

[Choo ()] *The Strategic Management of Intellectual Capital and Organizational Knowledge*, C W Choo . 2002. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

[Dicarlo ()] 'Too much content, not enough thinking, and too little FUN!''. S E Dicarlo . *Advances in Physiology Education* 2009. 33 (4) p. .

[Gibbs ()] 'Twenty terrible reasons for lecturing'. G Gibbs . *SCED Occasional Paper* 1981. (8) .

[Karp ()] 'Understanding Science through the Computational Lens''. R Karp . *Journal of Computer Science and Technology* 2011. 26 (4) p. .

[Brunzel ()] 'Universities Sell Their Brands''. D L Brunzel . *Journal of Product & Brand Management* 2007. 16 (2) p. .