

The Journal of
Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology

Volume 18, 2021

Table of Contents

Virtual Instruction Support for Faculty Laura McLaughlin, Joanne Ricevuto	1-30
Technologies for Teaching in an Online Environment Christina Ellis, Mae Lane, Tori Hollas, Jaime Coyne	31-39
An Empirical Examination of the Effects of CTO Leadership on the Alignment of the Governance of Big Data and Information Security Risk Management Effectiveness Shannon Block, Steven H. Munkeby, Samuel Sambasivam	41-61
Machine Learning-based Flu Forecasting Study Using the Official Data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Twitter Data Ali Wahid, Steven H. Munkeby, Samuel Sambasivam	63-81
Framing the Innovation Mindset Laura McLaughlin, James McLaughlin	83-102
The Role of Service-Learning in Information Systems Education Tana Feyt, Gwamaka Mwalemba	103-119
Zooming?! - Higher Education Faculty Perspectives Moshe Leiba, Ruti Gafni	121-140
Distance Learning During the COVID-19 Crisis as Perceived by Preservice Teachers Gila Cohen Zilka	141-159
Findings From an Examination of a Class Purposed to Teach the Scientific Method Applied to the Business Discipline Nicole Buzzetto-Hollywood	161-172
Online Teaching With M-Learning Tools in the Midst of Covid-19: A Reflection Through Action Research Minh Huynh, Eraj Khatiwada	173-193

Review Process

Except where otherwise noted, all papers were reviewed using a process commonly known as double-blind (that is, with author and affiliation information) by between 6 and 10 external reviewers. The reviewers did not know the identity of the authors nor the authors of the reviewers. Reviewers were matched to papers using a formula to minimize the psychological distance between reviewers' stated expertise and interest and the topics covered in the paper. In cases where this formula did not provide at least 6 reviewers,

reviewers were randomly assigned to papers. No reviewer was required to review more than 3 papers.

Reviewers were instructed to mentor the submission's authors by providing feedback on how to improve the submission. They were further required to recommend whether or not the paper should be accepted using a six-point scale (from "reject" to "must accept").

The authors of all papers, whether accepted or not, were provided with the reviewers' feedback as part of our process of mentoring authors. Authors of accepted papers were required to revise their submissions in light of the issues raised in the reviews.

We believe that the papers in this journal represent a great contribution to science.