SACS Comprehensive Standard 3.3 Institutional Effectiveness

1.   The _____BBA MANAGEMENT___ program identifies expected outcomes and assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcome:

The faculty members of the ___BBA MANAGEMENT__ program have drafted an assessment plan than includes student learning outcomes aligned with the appropriate level university learning goals. The learning goals for the __BBA MANAGEMENT___ program are listed below.

Expected Outcome: MGTLG1 Demonstrate proficiency in analytical thinking, critical analysis, creativity and/or problem-solving as applied to a management problem, case study, or other applied problem.
Assessment Results: Spring 2013, Spring 2013, and Spring 2014.
Mean embedded assessment score using 1 (low) to 4 (high) scale.

Critical Thinking Project Presentation	3.65	3.53	3.37
Bottleneck Presentation Evaluation	3.62	3.35	3.62

Expected Outcomes: MGTLG2 Demonstrate competency in interpersonal, oral, and written communications in a management context or an applied problem.
Assessment Results: Spring 2011, Fall 2012 and Spring 2014
Mean embedded assessment score using 1 (low) to 4 (high) scale.

Oral Presentation	3.39	3.0	3.49
Written Communication	3.15	2.87	3.72

Expected Outcomes: MGTLG3 Contemporary management theory and practice in the context of organizational behavior.
Assessment Results: Spring 12, Spring 2013, Fall 2013, and Spring 2014
Mean embedded assessment score using 1 (low) to 4 (high) scale.

Post Test Score	3.22	3.31	2.93	2.84

Expected Outcomes: MGTLG3 Demonstrate knowledge of contemporary theory and practice in management (MFT Score).
Assessment Results: Spring 2013, Fall 2013, and Spring 2014
Mean embedded assessment score using 1 (low) to 4 (high) scale.

MFT	2.07	2.33	1.88

Expected Outcomes: MGTLG4 Demonstrate ethical decision making in an organizational situation.
Assessment Results: Fall 2012, Fall 2013, and Spring 2014
Mean embedded assessment score using 1 (low) to 4 (high) scale.

Identification	2.69	2.44	3.00
Description	2.26	2.06	1.90
Decision-making	2.47	1.72	2.06
Causes	2.34	1.97	1.96

Expected Outcome: Demonstrate knowledge of contemporary theory and practice in management.
Assessment Results:
Mean Overall MFT results for Management majors:
2013-2014 = 26th percentile as compared to goal of 50th percentile.
2012-2013 = 34th percentile as compared to goal of 50th percentile.
2011-2012 = 40th percentile as compared to goal of 50th percentile.
2010-2011 = 25th percentile as compared to goal of 50th percentile.
2009-2010 = 50th percentile as compared to goal of 50th percentile.
2008-2009 = 45th percentile as compared to goal of 50th percentile.

Mean Management Assessment Indicator for Management majors:
2013-2014 = 34th percentile as compared to goal of 75th percentile.
2012-2013 = 33rd percentile as compared to goal of 75th percentile.
2011-2012 = 25th percentile as compared to goal of 75th percentile
2010-2011 = 25th percentile as compared to goal of 75th percentile.
2009-2010 = 60th percentile as compared to goal of 75th percentile.
2008-2009 = 30th percentile as compared to goal of 75th percentile.

2.   The _____BBA MANAGEMENT_____ program provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results:

MGT LG1: Demonstrate proficiency in analytical thinking, critical analysis, creativity and/or problem-solving as applied to a management problem, case study, or other applied problem.

The results have stayed consistent for bottleneck presentations evaluations. Last year the mean was 3.62 and this year was 3.35 and 3.62. The critical thinking project, using a course-embedded assessment, was 3.65 last year and was slightly lower this year with means of 3.53 and 3.37. The rubric used had a goal of 4.0. In the 2012 Spring Semester, management students were given a handout early in the semester with examples of selected skill sets applied to managerial problems with explanations on what to expect with regard to analytical thinking, critical analysis and problem solving. In addition, feedback was provided on all written case reports regarding how well each student and/or group demonstrated proficiency in these areas. Handouts utilized at the Harvard Business School for case analysis and recommendations for managerial action were modified for the assignment sets utilized at ASU. These efforts to clarify expectations and provide concrete examples still seems to have merit. As time passes, this initiatives will be fine-tuned in an effort to continually improve each year. Since a perfect score of 4.0 is almost impossible, these scores are really good.

MGTLG2: Demonstrate competency in interpersonal, oral, and written communications in a management context or an applied management problem.

In Spring 2011, the rubric for assessing the learning goal was applied resulting in a mean score of 3.39 on the presentation and 3.15 for audience connection. The stated goal was mistakenly stated as a mean of 4.0 or above on both criteria, however, the correct goal should have been 4.0 on a point-scale.

In order to achieve better results in the Fall 2012 semester, students were required to do two presentations on an applied problem involving a systems environment instead of only one presentation. Feedback provided during the first iteration of the assignment helped performance on the second application, which was the assessment activity for this learning goal in the spring. As a result, the 2012 student mean scores improved to 2.87 for presentation quality and 3.0 for audience engagement. Spring 2013 scores were unavailable due to problems with data input and the assignment of this course to a new instructor in Fall 2013. Therefore, the most recent data is the Spring 2014 with 3.72 for presentation quality and 3.49 for audience engagement. These results show significant progress, which suggests that the improvement made last year should be continued. Considering the rubric goal was 4.0, these results are excellent.

MGT LG3: Contemporary management theory and practice in the context of organizational behavior.

Using a goal of 4.0, early assessment results showed an slight improvement from 3.22 (Spring 2012) to 3.31 (Spring 2013). The most resent assessments were lower with 2.93 (Fall 2013) and 2.84 (Spring 2014). This decrease seems to be a reflection of using as new textbook and increasing the size of this class. Therefore, the PowerPoints, provided to students, have been updated according to material in the new textbook and each chapter lecture addresses key points. The expectation is the PowerPoints will be used to take notes during the lecture. Since both written and oral reinforcement of the key ideas is one way to enhance learning; group participation on chapter quizzes, assessment exercises, and YouTube videos are used to show the applied side of organizational theory and its relevance to effective management strategies in various types of organizations. As class materials are updated and adjusted to meet student learning needs, the expectation is that this score will improve. Obviously there is always room for improvement as reaching the stated goal of 4.0 is ideal even if a perfection is never reached.

MGT LG3: Demonstrate knowledge of contemporary theory and practice in management.

In 2012 there was great concern regarding the 25th percentile mean score on the MFT management assessment indicator since the percentile mean only a few years ago was in the 60th percentile. However, last year improved with the mean moving up to the 33rd percentile and the 2014 mean has improved a little to the 34th percentile, which is closer to the stated goal of being at or above the 75th percentile. The inconsistency shown over the last five years is difficult to understand. Therefore, questions have been raised about the reliability of the MFT. The department has proposed switching from the MFT in business to alternative Peregrine. The department is planning to invite a Peregrine representative in the Fall of 2014 to discuss how this assessment tool might provide better feedback on courses learning objectives, key topics covered, or other misalignment with assessment criteria.

The assumption that MFT assessment would become more fine-tuned as feedback was analyzed and more clearly understood has not occurred. Therefore, it seems like an ideal time to re-evaluate our assessment options and consider Peregrine as a tool to better align our classroom objectives with learning outcomes that will lead to reaching our continuous improvement goals. Our expectations are that over time, the data analysis and what it means will become clearer, thereby leading to the development of more effective action steps. As with any assessment process, the learning curve can be time consuming but will hopefully lead to new and better ways of assessing where we are on our path to goal achievement and how to get there more quickly.

MGT LG4: Demonstrate ethical decision making in an organizational setting.

This is the first iteration in which this Learning Goal had three data points on which to base recommendations for improvement. Overall, the data shows that students are not able to effectively identify and describe an ethical issue in an organizational setting, as well as recognize managerial causes for and appropriate decisions in response to those ethical dilemmas. Overall mean score for the academic year on this assessment item was 2.14 on a scale of 1-4. Two improvements will be made in this area. First, the grading rubric for the assessment will be rewritten with greater precision and specificity in order to facilitate cross-instructor accuracy/reliability. Second, ethical implications will be embedded into other assignments and topics (e.g. homework, quizzes and selection and recruiting), increasing student exposure to the ethical dilemmas encountered by practicing managers. These changes will be implemented in spring 2015.

MGTLG5: Demonstrate knowledge of basic international business and globalization concepts associated with the practice of management in an applied problem or case study.
Assessment: No data available.

Data for LG5 was not collected, in part due to the decision to eliminate the International major. Data for LG5 will be collected in the future as soon as the schedule for International classes are determined and a data collection strategy is developed.