



**Department/Unit Assessment Report for AY 2018 - 2019**

**Due: May 24, 2019**

**Completed by:** S. Aun Hassan

**Other assessment contributors:** Brad Gilbreath, Laee Choi, He-Boong Kwon

**Department/Unit:** HSB/Undergraduate (BSBA)

**Date report completed:** May 15, 2019

Please describe the previous year’s assessment activities and follow-up for your program/unit below. Please complete this form for each separate department/unit if you supervise more than one. Submission instructions: Complete this form and attach any appropriate documentation. Have appropriate supervisor review and approve the report. Submit PDF report to provostoffice@csupueblo.

Thank you.

**Briefly describe the main mission/goal of your unit:**

The mission of the Hasan School of Business at Colorado State University – Pueblo is “We transform students, innovate in teaching, conduct ourselves with professionalism, and engage with and positively impact our stakeholders.”

**I. Assessment of Outcomes in this cycle.** Including key performance indicators, processes, results, and recommendations for continuous improvement. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for the next year based on the assessment process.

A. Which of the department/unit outcomes were assessed during this cycle? <b>Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the unit’s strategic and/or management plan or goals.</b>	B. When was this outcome <u>last</u> assessed (year) and what is the frequency of assessment?	C. What method was used for assessment of this outcome? <b>Please include a copy of instruments and/or rubrics used in the assessment process.</b>	D. Who/what was assessed? Please describe the data collected and/or evaluation artifacts involved.	E. What is the expected achievement level (benchmark or goal) for this outcome?	F. What were the results of the assessment? Include the proportion of results meeting expectation.	G. What were the department/unit conclusions about the assessment results? Have you met or exceeded your goals?	H. What changes/improvements are planned based on this assessment?
Problem Solving – Qualitative: Appropriately use methods to solve problems	Spring 2019	There were two faculty members from within the discipline that assessed the artifacts	There were ten – 2-page case analyses collected from MGMT 475 that were	We expect that at least 70 percent of our students will meet or exceed our expectations. For <i>exceeds</i> ,	The assessors were unable to assess this SLO due to the nature of the artifact collected	The artifact did not allow assessors to assess this sub-goal. The earlier round of assessments were just below target. We have	The rubric for this SLO, qualitative problem solving, should be reviewed for possible improvement or adaptation for assessing this type of problem solving. Specifically, SLO

			assessed	appropriately uses methods. For <i>meets</i> , often appropriately uses methods.		had challenges assessing this specific sub-goal as the 'methods' used to solve qualitative problems do not seem as apparent for assessment. Will continue to assess and will monitor results and intervene or delete this sub-goal if still doesn't seem viable to assess methods.	<i>appropriately use methods to solve problems</i> , may not be the best sub-goal or sub-goal wording for this learning outcome. Alternatively, faculty could arrive at a problem-solving method for qualitative problems to teach undergraduates, whereby the current sub-goal is still appropriate. Next assessment is scheduled for Spring 2022.
Problem Solving – Qualitative: Evaluate business situations	Spring 2019	There were two faculty members from within the discipline that assessed the artifacts	There were ten – 2-page case analyses collected from MGMT 475 that were assessed	We expect that at least 70 percent of our students will meet or exceed our expectations. For <i>exceeds</i> , appropriately uses methods. For <i>meets</i> , often appropriately uses methods.	Seventy percent of students met or exceeded expectations given in our rubrics.	70% of the students met or exceeded expectations which was better than the previous assessment however, the overall impression of student performance was not impressive, just adequate.	The rubric for this SLO, qualitative problem solving, needs to be reviewed for possible improvement or adaptation for assessing this type of problem solving. Next assessment is scheduled for Spring 2022.
Problem Solving – Qualitative: Develop viable recommendations	Spring 2019	There were two faculty members from within the discipline that assessed the artifacts	There were ten – 2-page case analyses collected from MGMT 475 that were assessed	We expect that at least 70 percent of our students will meet or exceed our expectations. For <i>exceeds</i> , appropriately uses methods. For <i>meets</i> , often appropriately uses methods.	Seventy percent of students met or exceeded expectations given in our rubrics.	70% of the students met or exceeded expectations which was significantly lower than the previous assessment. We need to observe this sub-goal carefully at the next scheduled assessment.	The rubric for this SLO, qualitative problem solving, needs to be reviewed for possible improvement or adaptation for assessing this type of problem solving. Next assessment is scheduled for Spring 2022.

Comments on part I:

**II. Closing the Loop. Describe the data-informed changes made in your department/unit during the AY 2018 - 2019 cycle.** These are those that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles. **Provide a timeline for addressing other needed changes.**

A. What outcome(s) did you address? <b>Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the unit's unit's strategic and/or management plan or goals.</b>	B. When was this outcome assessed to generate the data which informed the change? (year)	C. What were the recommendations for improvement from the previous assessment?	D. How were the recommendations for change acted upon?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
Demonstrate the effective use of team tools	Summer 2018	The AoL team notified faculty about the student-learning shortcoming and asked them to think about what they could do to address it in their courses. The team also asked the instructor using teamwork in his course, to help address the learning shortcoming. The HSB faculty were acquainted with "Creating Team Norms" from AgileConnection so they can utilize it in courses as appropriate.	The faculty member using teamwork in his course agreed to implement changes in his course. Another instructor is creating a learning module introducing students to what norms are, why they're helpful to shape early on in a team's existence, and having students identify preferred norms for student groups they will work in during their coursework. One other faculty member indicated he would give a lecture on being a good team member to prepare his students for the work they do in groups.	We plan to assess this SLO again in fall 2019 after these close-the-loop can be expected to have had a measurable effect on student capabilities.
Demonstrate effective behavior in teams	Summer 2018	- Same as above	- Same as above	- Same as above

Comments on part II:

## UNDERGRADUATE LEARNING GOALS REVIEWER FORM

**ARTIFACT#:** \_\_\_\_\_

**REVIEWER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**To the reviewer:**

Exceeds expectations = 2; Meets expectations = 1; Does not meet expectations = 0

Please use ‘**Comment**’ section to provide qualitative observation for each sub-goal. Capturing your observations of student performance there will help you write your overall report of student performance and your ideas for how to improve student performance.

**LEARNING GOAL TWO: PROBLEM SOLVING - QUALITATIVE**

Our students will be able to analyze problems and develop solutions.

**MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES**

Students will:

- 2.1 appropriately use methods to solve problems.
- 2.2 evaluate business situations.
- 2.3 develop viable recommendations.

<b>PROBLEM SOLVING - QUALITATIVE RUBRIC</b>				
<b>EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>	<b>Exceeds expectations (=2)</b>	<b>Meets expectations (=1)</b>	<b>Does not meet expectations (=0)</b>	<b>REVIEWER SCORE</b>
2.1 Appropriately use methods to solve problems.	Appropriately uses methods.	Often appropriately uses methods.	Fails to appropriately use methods.	
<b>Comment:</b>				
2.2 Evaluate business situations.	Situations are evaluated correctly.	Situations are usually evaluated correctly.	Situations are not correctly evaluated.	

<b>Comment:</b>				
2.3 Develop viable recommendations.	Makes viable recommendations supported by appropriate analyses.	Makes recommendations with some support.	Makes recommendations that are poorly supported and/or non-viable.	
<b>Comment:</b>				

**Approved by** (Name of Supervisor): \_\_\_\_\_ reviewed and approved assessment report:

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_