

## ASSURANCE OF LEARNING COMMITTEE REPORT 2008-2009

### ASSESSMENT PROCESS

The COB accomplished several major goals in the assessment process in 2008-2009:

- (1) Following the College-wide faculty vote in May 2008, as of August 2008 the Assessment Committee was staffed with five elected members with the responsibility to serve as experts on assessment and to provide guidance, help and feedback to the curriculum committees. All five members have attended AACSB assessment training. The committee was renamed “Assurance of Learning Committee” to reflect its broadened scope of activity.
- (2) In order to achieve closer integration between the activity of the Assurance of Learning Committee and the Undergraduate and Graduate curriculum committees, as suggested by the Steering committee in Spring 2008, the Assurance of Learning Committee worked closely with the Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum Committees to specify the learning objectives for each learning goal, to develop assessment rubrics, and to ensure implementation of the assessment schedule. Assurance of Learning Committee members attended all meetings of the Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum Committees as ex officio members to provide ready input on any assessment questions.
- (3) The Assurance of Learning Committee developed assessment rubrics for each learning goal and objective and trained faculty in using them. All assessment rubrics and spreadsheets to be filled out by faculty are accessible on the COB web-site at <http://cob.sfsu.edu/cob/aacsb/assessment/index.cfm>
- (4) After years of experimenting with rubrics and methods of teamwork assessment, major progress was made by adopting CATME, an online teamwork assessment system developed by an NSF-sponsored research team. Implementing CATME not only improved faculty ability to assess students’ contributions to team projects, but also increased students’ motivation and commitment to their teams. After receiving positive feedback from both faculty and students, the Assurance of Learning Committee approved the system for ongoing implementation in the COB.
- (5) The Assurance of Learning Committee developed a detailed assessment schedule to ensure the assessment of each learning objective in at least two semesters, as per the latest AACSB requirements (see Appendix A). The Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 assessment schedules were circulated at the beginning of each semester, which ensured large-scale faculty involvement by more than 50 faculty. As a result, more than 3500 undergraduate and 700 graduate students were assessed per semester, assuring that nearly every COB student has been assessed on one or more learning objectives.
- (6) Finally, based on the assessment data collected during the past five years, the Assurance of Learning committee met with the Undergraduate and Graduate curriculum committees, as well as with faculty in charge of specific courses, to provide feedback and suggestions for improvement in particular classes and the entire undergraduate and graduate curricula. These meetings closed the loop for developing and implementing the COB assessment program. Details on the feedback provided by the Assurance of Learning committee and examples of specific curriculum improvements are discussed in the *Assessment Improvements* section of this report.

The Assurance of Learning Committee assisted the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee in developing the learning goals and objectives for the BSBA program and aligning them with the core classes included in the undergraduate curriculum. The BSBA learning goals and objectives are available on the COB web-site at <http://cob.sfsu.edu/cob/aacsb/assessment/index.cfm>. The same web-page also provides access to the alignment matrices for the undergraduate core classes, as well as each department's concentrations, with the undergraduate learning goals and objectives.

The Assurance of Learning Committee assisted the Graduate Curriculum Committee and the EMBA program Director in specifying the learning objectives for the MBA and EMBA programs and aligning them with the core classes included in the graduate curriculum. The MBA and EMBA learning goals and objectives and the rubrics for measuring learning outcomes are available on the COB web-site at <http://cob.sfsu.edu/cob/aacsb/assessment/index.cfm>. The same web-page also provides access to the alignment matrices for the graduate core classes with the learning goals and objectives.

In addition to direct measurement of student performance on the learning goals and objectives, the COB has been conducting periodically indirect assessments of the undergraduate and graduate programs by collecting feedback from five stakeholder groups: undergraduate students, undergraduate alumni, MBA students, MBA alumni, and faculty. The feedback survey was designed by the Educational Benchmarking Inc., a private educational measurement firm that does similar surveys for colleges all over the United States. Information about the EBI survey is accessible online at <http://online.sfsu.edu/~pertula/assessment/>.

## ASSESSMENT RESULTS

**BS in Business Administration.** The results of the direct assessment of the BSBA learning objectives using assessment rubrics for course-embedded analysis are shown in Table 1. The table shows the aggregate percentage of students scoring "acceptable" or higher on each learning objective, the number of students assessed is in brackets. Detailed information on each learning objective assessed in Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 is provided in Appendix B.

The Assurance of Learning Committee recommended and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee approved in Fall 2008 a target of 85% acceptable or better performance on each learning objective measured by an assessment rubric. This ambitious target reflects the shared goal of the COB faculty to improve the quality of the BSBA program. The results show that student performance on functional knowledge, oral communications and teamwork consistently meets target. Performance on ethical, social and global awareness appears to be inconsistent and needs improvement. There is also a need for improvement in students' analytical skills – both quantitative and qualitative. A more detailed analysis of the student performance on analysis of business problems showed that most students perform unacceptably due to failure to connect theory or methods learned in class to practical problems. The worst performance appears to be on written communications. These poor results are due primarily to grammar, style and language issues (see details by trait in Appendix B).

**Table 1 – BS in Business Administration Learning Objectives**

Learning objectives	Spring 2004	Spring 2005	Spring 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Summer 2008	Fall 08	Spring 2009
Functional knowledge	BAT 45% (110)	BAT 49% (153)	BAT 46% (123)		BAT 50% (174)		BAT 51% (100)		BAT 58% (223) 92% (1148)	88% (1937)
Written communication							74% (108)	73% (108)	83% (27)	78% (88)
Oral communication							92% (72)		88% (363)	91% (285)
Qualitative analysis									82% (208)	70% (282)
Quantitative analysis							83% (321)*	80% (673)*	84% (830)	81% (970)
Teamwork skills				91% (80)*	94% (71)*	89% (149)*	95% (147)*		97% (492)	85% (397)
Ethical & social awareness									87% (103)	75% (145)
Global awareness									89% (119)	82% (111)

\* Note: Prior to Fall 2008, different rubrics were used for assessing quantitative analysis and teamwork skills.

In addition to assessment rubrics, the COB also administers the Cal State standardized learning assessment test (BAT) once a year, starting in Spring 2004. The BAT tests retention of knowledge acquired during the entire course of undergraduate studies. It was given to a sample of graduating seniors enrolled in BUS690 and BUS682. The target performance for the BAT test set by the Assurance of Learning Committee and approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is 50% correct answers. The average student performance on the BAT test (including subjects not covered in the COB) is reported in Table 1 under “functional knowledge”. Overall, student performance has improved over the past five years. A breakdown of student performance by subject area (for the areas covered in the COB) is shown in Table 2.

As Table 2 shows, in most subject areas students met the 50% target. The strongest performance has been in Information systems, Marketing, Management and Accounting. The subject areas with weak performance have been Finance and Statistics. Since the BAT test does not include International Business as a subject area, starting in Spring 2009 the International Business department initiated systematic assessment of student knowledge on the most important areas of international business in the core undergraduate class IBUS 330 (International Business and Multicultural Relations). Similar supplemental assessment of content knowledge has been performed in MKTG 431 in Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 and will continue in other core classes. The results from Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 assessment of functional knowledge in IBUS 330 and MKTG 431 are reported in Table 1 and detailed data by class are provided in Appendix B.

**Table 2 – BAT Test Results by Subject Area**

Year	Sample size	Accounting	Management	Finance	Marketing	Information systems	Statistics
Spring 2004	n=110	50%	44%	43%	49%	59%	34%
Spring 2005	n=153	50%	51%	37%	55%	65%	37%
Spring 2006	n=123	51%	47%	35%	52%	61%	30%
Spring 2007	n=174	51%	54%	39%	57%	68%	33%
Spring 2008	n=100	51%	53%	38%	57%	68%	28%
		53%*	65%*	41%*	71%*	66%*	34%*
Fall 2008	n=223	49%	53%	39%	55%	64%	29%
		53%*	64%*	43%*	68%*	62%*	35%*

\* Adjusted scores based only on the items that testing has shown to be reliable.

**Master of Business Administration.** The results of the direct assessment of the MBA learning objectives using assessment rubrics for course-embedded analysis are shown in Table 3. The table shows the aggregate percentage of students scoring “acceptable” or higher on each learning objective, the number of students assessed is in brackets.

**Table 3 – Master of Business Administration Learning Objectives**

Learning objectives	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009
Content knowledge				94% (33)	94% (33)
Global awareness				86% (33)	73% (32)
Ethical awareness					98% (53)
Quantitative analysis		84% (28)*	90% (61)*	86% (121)	81% (81)
Qualitative analysis				85% (77)	88% (190)
Teamwork skills				97% (77)	95% (34)
Written communication				89% (94)	87% (186)
Oral communication	80% (73)	74% (38)	93% (43)	93% (114)	95% (98)

\* Note: Prior to Fall 2008, different rubrics were used for assessing quantitative analysis.

As Table 3 shows, all learning goals meet the 85% acceptable or higher performance cut-off, except for global awareness and quantitative analysis in Spring 2009. The significant improvement in oral communication performance can be attributed both to the higher admission standards for incoming MBA students since Fall 2007 and the stronger emphasis on business communication skills on part of the BUS890 instructors.

Consistent with the efforts to improve the quality of the MBA program, in May 2009 the Assurance of Learning Committee recommended and the Graduate Curriculum Committee

approved a new target of 90% acceptable or better performance on each learning objective. In order for this new target to be achieved, curriculum improvements have to focus on refining students' analytical skills (both quantitative and qualitative), as well as ethical, social and global awareness. A more detailed analysis of the student performance on analysis of business problems showed that students struggle to connect theory to practice by either identifying the appropriate framework that applies to a practical problem or interpreting the meaning of a quantitative result for practice. Student performance on analyzing ethical, social and global problems similarly needs improvement in student ability to identify an appropriate framework that applies to a particular practical problem.

**Executive MBA.** The EMBA program was assessed for the first time during the 2008-2009 academic year. Given the small size of the program (about 70 students) and the rotating schedule of class offerings, the Assurance of Learning Committee recommended that faculty who teach in the EMBA program volunteer to assess one or more of the EMBA learning objectives in their classes. The results of the direct assessment of the EMBA learning objectives using assessment rubrics for course-embedded analysis are shown in Table 4. The table shows the aggregate percentage of students scoring “acceptable” or higher on each learning objective, the number of students assessed is in brackets. It should be noted that the each class in the EMBA program represents an entire cohort, so the reported assessment results cover all students enrolled in the EMBA program during 2008-2009.

As the Table 4 shows, all learning goals meet the 85% acceptable or higher performance cut-off. Similarly to the MBA program, in May 2009 the Assurance of Learning Committee recommended and the Graduate Curriculum Committee approved a new target of 95% acceptable or better performance on each learning objective for the EMBA learning objectives. Student performance on teamwork and global awareness already meets this new target. However, analytical skills need further improvement in order to reach the 95% target.

**Table 4 – EMBA Learning Objectives**

Learning objectives	Fall 2008	Spring 2009
Content knowledge		
Global awareness	100% (17)	
Ethical awareness		
Quantitative analysis		85% (31)
Qualitative analysis		
Teamwork skills	99% (22)	
Written communication		
Oral communication		

**Indirect assessment: E.B.I. Survey.** In the Spring of 2002, 2003, 2004, 2006 and 2008 a survey of seniors and graduate students was conducted. Sample sizes have been about 200 undergraduate and 75 graduate students. The survey questions focused on satisfaction levels with various aspects of the program including advising and perceived value of the educational experience. The results of the E.B.I. survey have been presented for discussion with the Dean and the faculty members each September. The information about the strongest and weakest areas in the COB curriculum and program administration obtained through the E.B.I. survey has been used for initiating significant changes in the management of the undergraduate and graduate programs, as well as for revising the learning goals and objectives for each program to ensure that students are indeed learning the skills they will need after graduation.

The average undergraduate student satisfaction for Spring 2008 was 4.85 on a 7-point scale with 7 being the maximum possible score. The items on which students rated the COB highest and lowest in Spring 2008, compared to previous years, are listed in Appendix C. Undergraduate students report highest satisfaction with the quality of instruction and coverage of topic in strategy, business ethics, social responsibility and globalization – areas of strong priority according to the COB strategic mission. Students also report that they have improved most their analytical and problem solving skills, which is one of the major goals of the BSBA program. The biggest sources of dissatisfaction appear to be the COB career services and administrative support – a problem that has been addressed substantively in 2008-2009 despite the resource constraints faced by the COB. Another problem that still needs to be addressed is student satisfaction with the extra feedback provided by instructors in addition to grades – student satisfaction on the feedback-related questions has shown slight increase over time but there is still room for improvement.

### ASSESSMENT IMPROVEMENTS

Based on the assessment results, various changes occurred at the level of individual instructors, courses, and the overall undergraduate and graduate curricula. Further improvements have been discussed during the feedback meetings between the Assurance of Learning committee and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, the Graduate Curriculum Committee, course-coordinators and instructors.

**Improvements in Individual Level Instruction and Pedagogy.** One of the major benefits of involving a large number of faculty members in assessment activities in 2008-2009 was that, by doing assessment, multiple faculty identified misalignment between some course learning objectives and their teaching methods. For example, several faculty members noticed that they expect students to implement skills that have not been introduced, reinforced, and mastered before, which led to multiple students performing unacceptably. Such observations led faculty members to revise the sequence of delivery of course materials, or to supplement course materials with new ways to enhance students' skills, which in turn resulted in improved student performance on the same skills. For example, as a part of a two-semester writing assessment in BUS784, one faculty used a professional consultant to provide feedback on students' written assignments, which led to significant improvements in the students writing skills. Overall, by actively performing assessment, many faculty members identified specific reasons for poor student performance on a given learning objective and devised new instruction methods and

course content to ensure that students actually master the intended skills. Changes in teaching methods were reported by instructors of BUS682, BUS690, DS412, IBUS690, MGMT650, and MGMT605 in the BSBA program, by instructors of DS856, BUS784 and BUS890 in the MBA program, and by the instructor of BUS886 in the EMBA program.

**Feedback and Improvements in Course Curricula.** In an effort to provide feedback and suggestions for improvement, the Assurance of Learning committee initiated a series of feedback meetings with course coordinators and faculty teaching core courses for which multiple semesters of assessment data were collected. In particular, meetings with the course coordinators and the faculty teaching BUS890, DS412 and DS 411 took place in Fall 2008, meetings with the course coordinators and the faculty teaching BUS690 and DS412 took place in Spring 2009. In addition, in February 2009 the Assurance of Learning committee solicited feedback from all faculty members who implemented the online system for teamwork assessment CATME. Based on this feedback, the Assurance of Learning committee decided to keep implementing the system college-wise and to recommend CATME to the entire University for consideration.

In addition to the meetings initiated by the Assurance of Learning committee, several departments, including Management, Decision Science, and International Business, conducted series of meetings to discuss in further detail the assessment results in their classes and to revise particular courses. These meetings led to the revision of the course curricula of BUS690, BUS890, DS412, DS411, DS856, IBUS330, IBUS590, and IBUS690. For example, starting in Fall 2008, all BUS690 instructors implemented a uniform course curriculum that ensures mastering analysis of business problems through multiple case analyses and incorporates several assignments reinforcing student oral communications, analytical thinking, and teamwork skills and allowing for direct assessment of the level of mastery these skills.

The DS department introduced a course-wide flow chart to help DS412 students identify the type of quality control chart required for a given problem. This streamlining appears to have had a positive effect on the number of students scoring acceptable or higher on problem identification in quality management. In addition, the department reviewed the course content for DS 412, along with industry developments and courses from similar programs. One of the main required topics from DS412 was shifted to DS411, where the department felt it was more appropriate. Another required topic was eliminated, and the remaining content was restructured to update the course, and to provide instructors more flexibility to incorporate topics they felt were relevant and develop a cohesive course.

The International Business department also revised the core online IBUS 330 course to incorporate a series of critical thinking questions in the weekly quizzes and exams. New written assignments were introduced to improve students' written communication skills. In the capstone course Global Strategy (IBUS 690), instructors increased the portion of individual case assignments, so that each student has the opportunity to practice their analytical skills, critical thinking skills and written communication skills. In addition, the instructors used the assessment feedback from Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 to reinforce the weak areas that students need to improve, such as grammar in written communications, eye contact in oral communications, and applying the theory to the real world business problems.

**BS of Business Administration Program Improvements.** In addition to the ongoing review and evaluation of the core undergraduate courses, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee invited the Assurance of Learning committee for a joint meeting in May 2009. During this meeting, the members of the two committees discussed the assessment results in the BSBA program and identified some flaws in the undergraduate curriculum that impede students' progress on the undergraduate learning objectives. The two committees identified as a reason for poor performance on written and oral communications and ethics-social awareness the fact that students are introduced to these critical skills in their last semester although they are expected to apply the skills in multiple classes before that. In particular, students are introduced to the basic concepts and frameworks of ethics and social responsibility in BUS682 – one of the last classes they take before graduation. Yet, they are expected to apply these concepts in multiple classes before that time. Similarly, most students take their Business communications class (BUS360) in their last year instead of at the beginning of their business studies, causing poor performance. As a result, many students never master these skills. Both committees agreed that during the forthcoming undergraduate curriculum revision, measures should be taken to ensure that students are introduced to the basics of business communication and business ethics before enrolling in upper level business classes.

The two committees also agreed that core classes alone cannot ensure that students get introduced to, apply, and master each of the learning objectives of the BSBA program. Therefore, a major emphasis should be given to the concentration classes, which have already been designed to reinforce particular learning objectives. The Assurance of Learning committee recommended that during the ongoing reviews of the concentration courses, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee should request course coordinators to provide an assessment plan that ensures assessment of concentration classes on a rotation basis.

**Master of Business Administration Program Improvements.** In April 2009, the Assurance of Learning committee met with the Graduate Curriculum Committee to discuss assessment results and to recommend improvements in the MBA curriculum. The Assurance of Learning committee pointed to the fact that many students fail to connect theory and practice as a common problem across multiple learning objectives. The two committees agreed to raise this issue during the all-faculty kick-off meeting in Fall 2009, and to solicit creative suggestions from faculty how to address the problem throughout the curriculum.

## Appendix A

## Assessment Schedule for the B.S. of Business Administration Program

Learning goal	Spring 2004	Spring 2005	Spring 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Summer 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	Summer 2009
<b>Goal 1</b>										
Functional knowledge	BUS690 (BAT)	BUS690 (BAT)	BUS690 (BAT)	BUS690 (BAT)		BUS690 (BAT)		BUS690 (BAT) MKTG431	IBUS330 MKTG431	
<b>Goal 2</b>										
Oral communication							BUS360	BUS690 MNGT648 MNGT650 MKTG433	BUS690 BUS360 MGNT650	BUS360
Written communication							BUS360	BUS360	MGNT650 BUS360	BUS360
<b>Goal 3</b>										
Quantitative analysis					DS411 DS412	DS212 DS411 DS412		DS212 DS411 DS412 MNGT407 FIN350 FIN536	ACCT307 DS411 DS412 FIN350 ISYS363	
Qualitative analysis								BUS690 MNGT650	BUS690 MNGT650	
<b>Goal 4</b>										
Teamwork skills								BUS690 MNGT605 MNGT650 MNGT535 DS412 DS601	BUS690 IBUS690 DS412 MGNT605 MGNT650	
<b>Goal 5</b>										
Ethical & social awareness								BUS682	BUS682	
Global awareness								IBUS690 IBUS590	IBUS690 IBUS590	

### Assessment Schedule for the Master of Business Administration Program

<b>Learning objectives</b>	<b>Spring 2007</b>	<b>Fall 2007</b>	<b>Spring 2008</b>	<b>Fall 2008</b>	<b>Spring 2009</b>
<b>Goal 1</b>					
Content knowledge				IBUS815	IBUS815
<b>Goal 2</b>					
Ethical social awareness					BUS784
Global awareness				IBUS815	IBUS815
<b>Goal 3</b>					
Quantitative analysis		DS856	DS856	ACCT831 DS856	FIN819 ISYS814
Qualitative analysis				BUS890 ACCT831	BUS890 DS856 MGNT842
<b>Goal 4</b>					
Teamwork skills				BUS890 ACCT831	BUS890
<b>Goal 5</b>					
Oral communication	BUS 890	BUS 890	BUS 890	MKTG860 BUS890 BUS788	MKTG860 BUS890
Written communication				MKTG860 DS856	DS856 FIN819 ISYS814 MKTG860

## Appendix B

## Method of Assessing Learning Goals for Undergraduate Program in Fall 2008

Learning Goals	Course Assessed	Sampling	Methodology	% acceptable or excellent	Response/Action Items
1. Discipline Knowledge	MKTG 431 MKTG 434	N=1148	Multiple-choice test	92%	Performance meets target.
2a. Written Communication Skills	BUS 360	N = 27	Written assignment	Traits: Purpose: 77% Audience: 96% Organization: 81% Support: 90% Citation: 81% Understanding: 100% Conclusion: 89% Grammar: 42% Idioms: 92% <b>Average: 83%</b>	Students need to improve their grammar, organization and citations.
2b: Oral Communication Skills	BUS 690 MGMT 650 MKTG 433 MGMT 648	N = 363	Project Presentations	Traits: Introduction: 87% Assumptions: 95% Methodology: 92% Solution: 86% Conclusion: 90% Voice: 88% Enunciation: 88% Eye Contact: 83% Body Language: 90% Response to Questions: 83% PowerPoint: 89% <b>Average: 88%</b>	Students need to work on eye contact and response to questions.
3a: Qualitative Analysis	BUS 690 MGMT 650	N = 208	Case analysis	Traits: Identification: 90% Data: 93% Analysis: 83% Integration: 63% Alternatives: 85% Recommendations: 88% <b>Average: 82%</b>	Need to work on integration
3b: Quantitative Analysis	MGMT 407 DS 212 DS 412 FIN 350 FIN 536	N = 830	Quantitative assignment	Traits: Identification : 88% Execution : 85% Conclusion : 72% <b>Average: 84%</b>	Students need to work on drawing conclusions based on the analysis
4. Team Skills	BUS 690 IBUS 690 DS 412 DS 601 MGMT 605 MGMT 650 MGMT 535	N = 492	www.catme.org online team peer evaluation questionnaire	Traits: Contributing: 97% Interacting: 97% Keeping on Track: 97% Quality: 97% Knowledge: 98% <b>Average: 97%</b>	Performance meets target.

5a. Ethical Awareness	BUS 682	N = 103	Written assignment	<u>Traits:</u> Dilemma: 91% Stakeholders: 93% Alternatives: 88% Frameworks: 74% Action: 87% <b>Average: 87%</b>	Students need to work on using the appropriate theoretical frameworks to analyze ethical problems.
5b. Global Awareness	IBUS 590 IBUS 690	N = 119	Projects and Short Case Analysis	<u>Traits:</u> Identification: 98% Analysis: 82% Application: 87% <b>Average: 89%</b>	Students need to work on analyzing the impact of global factors in certain business situations

Note: For all goals the target is at least 85% of the students to perform acceptable and above on each trait.

#### Method of Assessing Learning Goals for MBA Program in Fall 2008

Learning Goals	Course(s) Assessed	Sampling	Methodology	% acceptable or excellent	Response/Action Items
1. Content Knowledge	IBUS 815	N=33	Written assignment	94%	Performance meets target.
2. Global Awareness	IBUS815	N=33	Written assignment	<u>Traits:</u> Identification: 88% Analysis: 85% Application: 85% <b>Average: 86%</b>	Students need to improve on problem identification, analysis and application.
3a. Quantitative Skills	ACCT 831 DS 856	N=121	Quantitative task	<u>Traits:</u> Identification: 92% Execution: 80% Conclusions: 86% <b>Average: 86%</b>	Need to work on execution and conclusions.
3b. Qualitative Analysis	ACCT 831 BUS 890	N = 77	Case analysis	<u>Traits:</u> Problem: 88% Facts&Data: 82% Analysis: 77% Integration: 77% Alternatives: 100% Recommendations: 84% <b>Average: 85%</b>	Need to work on problem identification, use of facts and data, analysis and integration.
4. Teamwork Skills	ACCT 831 BUS 890	N = 77	Team project	<u>Traits:</u> Contributing: 96% Interacting: 96% Keeping on Track: 97% Quality: 97% Knowledge: 97% <b>Average: 97%</b>	Performance meets target.
5a: Written Communications	MKTG 860 DS 856	N = 94	Written assignment	<u>Traits:</u> Purpose: 90% Audience: 96% Organization: 90% Support: 81% Understanding: 96% Conclusion: 82% Grammar: 86% Idioms: 94%	Need to work on support and conclusions

				<b>Average: 89%</b>	
5b. Oral Communications	MKTG 860 BUS 890 MGMT 788	N=114	Oral Presentation	<u>Traits:</u> Introduction: 93% Assumptions: 100% Methodology: 92% Solution: 100% Conclusion: 91% Voice: 91% Enunciation: 90% Eye Contact: 86% Body Language: 87% Response to Questions: 94% PowerPoint: 99% <b>Average: 93%</b>	Work on eye contact and body language.

Note: For all goals, target level is 90% or higher acceptable performance on each trait.

#### Method of Assessing Learning Goals for EMBA Program in Fall 2008

Learning Goals	Course(s) Assessed	Sampling	Methodology	% acceptable or excellent	Response/Action Items
4. Teamwork Skills	Cohort 14	N=22	Team project	<u>Traits:</u> Contributing: 95% Interacting: 100% Keeping on Tract: 100% Quality: 100% Knowledge: 100% <b>Average: 99%</b>	Performance meets target.
5b: Global Awareness	IBUS 815	N = 17	Written assignment	<u>Traits:</u> Identification: 100% Analysis: 100% Application: 100% <b>Average: 100%</b>	Performance meets target.

Note: Target level of performance is 95% or higher on all traits.

#### Method of Assessing Learning Goals for Undergraduate Program in Spring 2009

Learning Goals	Course(s) Assessed	Sampling	Methodology	% acceptable or excellent	Response/Action Items
1. Discipline Knowledge	MKTG431; MKTG432; MKTG434; IBUS330	N=1937	Multiple choice test	Marketing Kn: 92% International business knowledge: 82% <b>Average: 88%</b>	Goals are being met at an acceptable level. We will continue monitoring to ensure the program is on target

2a. Written Communication Skills	BUS 360; MGNT 650	N = 88	Written assignment	<u>Traits:</u> Purpose: 73% Audience: 89% Organization: 82% Support: 72% Citation: Understanding: 83% Conclusion: 56% Grammar: 72% Idioms: 98% <b>Average: 78%</b>	Students need to improve drawing valid conclusion, as well as grammar, and support, to a less extent.
2b: Oral Communication Skills	BUS 690 MGNT 650 BUS 690	N = 285	Project Presentations	<u>Traits:</u> Introduction: 95% Assumptions: 95% Methodology: 93% Solution: 91% Conclusion: 90% Voice: 91% Enunciation: 89% Eye Contact: 80% Body Language: 90% Response to Questions: 87% PowerPoint: 96% <b>Average: 91%</b>	Goals are being met at an acceptable level. We will continue monitoring to ensure the program is on target.
3a: Qualitative Analysis	BUS 690 MGNT 650	N = 282	Case analysis	<u>Traits:</u> Identification: 66% Data: 89% Analysis: 57% Integration: 51% Alternatives: 80% Recommendations: 77% <b>Average: 70%</b>	Need to work on identification, analysis and integration.
3b: Quantitative Analysis	ACCT 307 DS 411 DS 412 FIN 350 ISYS 363	N = 970	Quantitative assignment	<u>Traits:</u> Identification : 88% Execution : 83% Conclusion : 71% <b>Average: 81%</b>	Students need to work on drawing conclusions based on the analysis
4. Team Skills	BUS 690 IBUS 690 DS 412 MGNT 605	N = 397	www.catme.org online team peer evaluation questionnaire	<u>Traits:</u> Contributing: 85% Interacting: 89% Keeping on Track: 80% Quality: 86% Knowledge: 85% <b>Average: 85%</b>	Goals are being met at an acceptable level. We will continue monitoring to ensure the program is on target
5a. Ethical Awareness	BUS 682	N = 145	Written assignment	<u>Traits:</u> Dilemma: 74% Stakeholders: 74% Alternatives: 79% Frameworks: 64% Action: 83% <b>Average: 75%</b>	Students need to work on using the appropriate theoretical frameworks to analyze ethical problems.

5b. Global Awareness	IBUS 590 IBUS 690	N = 111	Projects and Short Case Analysis	<u>Traits:</u> Identification: 88% Analysis: 80% Application: 76% <b>Average: 82%</b>	Students need to work on analyzing the impact of global factors in certain business situations and application of theories to practice.
----------------------	----------------------	---------	----------------------------------	---	---

Note: For all goals the target is at least 85% of the students to perform acceptable and above on each trait.

#### Method of Assessing Learning Goals for MBA Program in Spring 2009

Learning Goals	Course(s) Assessed	Sampling	Methodology	% acceptable or excellent	Response/Action Items
1. Content Knowledge	IBUS 815	N=33	Written assignment	94%	Goals are being met at an acceptable level. We will continue monitoring to ensure the program is on target.
2a. Global Awareness	IBUS 815	N=32	Written assignment	<u>Traits:</u> Identification: 72% Analysis: 72% Application: 75% <b>Average: 73%</b>	Students need to improve on problem identification, analysis and application.
2b. Ethics Awareness	BUS 784	N=53	Written assignment	<u>Traits:</u> Dilemma: 100% Stakeholders: 100% Alternatives: 98% Frameworks: 92% Action: 98% <b>Average: 98%</b>	Goals are being met at an acceptable level. We will continue monitoring to ensure the program is on target.
3a. Quantitative Skills	FIN 819 ISYS 814	N=81	Quantitative task	<u>Traits:</u> Identification: 79% Execution: 80% Conclusions: 85% <b>Average: 81%</b>	Need to work on identification.
3b. Qualitative Analysis	BUS 890 DS 856 MGNT 842	N = 190	Case analysis	<u>Traits:</u> Problem: 94% Facts&Data: 89% Analysis: 83% Integration: 80% Alternatives: 96% Recommendations: 86% <b>Average: 88%</b>	Need to work on analysis and integration.
4. Teamwork Skills	BUS 890	N = 34	Team project	<u>Traits:</u> Contributing: 85% Interacting: 97% Keeping on Track: 97% Quality: 97% Knowledge: 100% <b>Average: 95%</b>	No Goals are being met at an acceptable level. We will continue monitoring to ensure the program is on target.
5a: Written Communications	DS 856 FIN 819 ISYS 814	N = 91	Written assignment	<u>Traits:</u> Purpose: 78% Audience: 85% Organization: 88% Support: 90%	Need to work on purpose, citation and conclusions.

				Citation: 59% Understanding: 89% Conclusion: 83% Grammar: 88% Idioms: 98% <b>Average: 87%</b>	
5b. Oral Communications	BUS 890	N=69	Oral Presentation	<u>Traits:</u> Introduction: 100% Assumptions: 97% Methodology: 97% Solution: 99% Conclusion: 99% Voice: 88% Enunciation: 99% Eye Contact: 83% Body Language: 90% Response to Qs: 78% PowerPoint: 99% <b>Average: 95%</b>	Work on eye contact, voice and response to questions.

Note: For all goals target level is 90% or higher acceptable performance on each trait.

#### Method of Assessing Learning Goals for EMBA Program in Spring 09

Learning Goals	Course(s) Assessed	Sampling	Methodology	% acceptable or excellent	Response/Action Items
2a: Quantitative Skills	DS 886	N = 62		Traits: Identification: 94% Execution: 79% Conclusions: 81% <b>Average: 85%</b>	Students need to work on execution and conclusion.

Note: Target level of performance is 95% or higher on all traits.

## Appendix C

**The Highest and Lowest Satisfaction Items in the Undergraduate student Sample in Spring 2008**  
(Based on Educational Benchmarking, Inc. Survey Results – Spring 2003-2008)

	Spring 2008	Spring 2006	Spring 2004	Spring 2003
	n=147	n=135	n=205	n=173
<b>Highest-satisfaction items:</b>				
Satisfaction with: Quality of teaching in required subject matter: Business Policy / Strategy	5.64	5.22	5.36	5.85
Learning outcomes: To what extent did the Business program enhance your: Presentation skills	5.56	5.50	5.56	4.36
Satisfaction with: Accessibility of major course instructors outside of class	5.49	4.91	5.44	5.11
Satisfaction with: Business curriculum instructors presenting social responsibility issues	5.47	5.13	5.53	5.20
Satisfaction with: Business curriculum instructors presenting ethical issues	5.47	5.23	5.59	5.21
Satisfaction with: Quality of teaching in required subject matter: Business Law / Legal Environment	5.45	4.45	5.40	5.11
Learning outcomes: To what extent did the Business program enhance your: Ability to solve problems	5.41	5.25	5.45	5.31
Learning outcomes: To what extent did the Business program enhance your: Ability to analyze and interpret data	5.41	5.21	5.46	5.25
Satisfaction with: Business curriculum instructors presenting a global perspective	5.39	5.19	5.44	5.23
Learning outcomes: To what extent did the Business program enhance your: Ability to define problems	5.36	5.31	5.44	5.47
<b>Lowest-satisfaction items:</b>				
Career services: Satisfaction with access to school's alumni to cultivate career opportunities	3.70	3.67	3.68	3.46
Admin and Support Services: Satisfaction with availability of courses in students' major	3.93	3.41	4.21	3.73
Career services: Satisfaction with quality of companies recruiting on campus	4.03	4.04	3.84	3.54
Satisfaction with: Opportunities for interaction with practitioners	4.04	3.92	4.31	3.91
Career services: Satisfaction with assistance in preparation for permanent job search	4.05	3.83	3.78	3.39
Quality of instruction and faculty: Teaching in your required courses	4.16	3.96	4.48	4.14
Quality of instruct/faculty: Feedback on assignments (other than grades) received from instructors in required courses	4.21	4.02	4.28	3.96
Career services: Satisfaction with number of companies recruiting on campus	4.25	4.20	3.81	3.39
Satisfaction with: Leadership opportunities in Business program's extracurricular activities	4.35	4.13	4.34	4.04
Quality of instruct/faculty: Feedback on assignments (other than grades) received from instructors in major courses	4.40	4.24	4.55	4.23