

Academic Program Assessment Plan

Graduate Programs

Hasan School of Business

CSU-Pueblo

Identification

This is the assessment plan for graduate programs at the Hasan School of Business (HSB) at Colorado State University – Pueblo (CSU-Pueblo). The plan was developed in 2010 by Brad Gilbreath, updated by him in 2018, updated again in 2019 by Brad and Aun Hassan, and recently updated by Laee Choi, He-Boong Kwon, and Carl Wright. The contact entity for this plan is the HSB's Assurance of Learning (AoL) Committee. The HSB's graduate programs comprise a Master's of Business Administration (MBA) offered in Pueblo as well as an online program.

Mission, Goals and Student Learning Outcomes

What is the mission of the department and how does it relate to the school's mission?

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. The intellectual pursuits of our faculty focus primarily on applied scholarship and instructional development. Our outreach activities - developed in partnership with the community - serve to enhance the quality of life and economic well-being in southeastern Colorado.”

A key part of the HSB's mission is to have positive transformational effects on students. The HSB and CSU-Pueblo serve students from a broad spectrum, including many from lower socio-economic strata, under-represented populations, and first generation students. Our most important task at the HSB is effecting positive change in our students so that they are prepared as business professionals. We build student skills through active learning, experiential education, and collaborations with businesses and community members. HSB graduates are a critical component of Pueblo's economic infrastructure, while many make contributions in other cities, states, and countries.

What are the student learning outcomes and how do they relate to the program's mission?

The HSB currently has four learning outcomes for its graduate students. Specifically, these are that they will be able to

- achieve organizational goals;
- manage organizational change;
- be socially responsible; and
- formulate strategic decision.

Although we will continue to monitor whether our learning outcomes are what is needed to achieve our mission, our current thinking is that the outcomes support what we are trying to achieve in terms of developing students' skills for success in the workplace.

Are learning outcomes written as observable skills and abilities?

All of the HSB's graduate learning outcomes are observable.

Are the outcomes discrete and non-overlapping?

The graduate learning outcomes are sufficiently orthogonal. The learning outcomes also are sufficiently discrete because they do not encompass lists of multiple or disparate skills and knowledge, and also differentiate the learning outcomes as contrasted to undergraduate outcomes.

Are the outcomes limited in number to five or six but not more than eight?

The HSB currently has four graduate learning outcomes. We have considered adding other outcomes at various times, but our current thinking is that our four outcomes are sufficient.

What are the performance criteria?

When assessing student performance on a particular learning outcome, we rate whether the student—on the artifact we are evaluating—exceeded, met, or did not meet the learning objectives being assessed with that artifact. The actual criteria for evaluating the level of performance (e.g., *exceeds*, *meets*, *does not meet* expectations) are specified in a rubric. For example, for the MBA SLO, Being Socially Responsible, we have one measurable objective: "*Graduates will make strategic decisions applying business knowledge and analytic skills*". To evaluate this objective, we will have more specific criteria in a rubric. The AoL team is now developing the evaluation rubric.

What level of performance is expected of students for each criterion?

For each criterion, we expect that at least 80 percent of our graduate students will meet or exceed expectations.

How are the learning outcomes communicated to department faculty and students, and to the community?

A primary way of communicating our learning outcomes is on the HSB website. Once at our website, the learning outcomes are easily accessible by clicking on "About Us" and then on "Assurance of Learning." The HSB's learning outcomes assessment is described in the CSU-Pueblo Catalog. In addition, our learning outcomes are discussed with and approved by the HSB Board of Advisors.

Curriculum

Do the courses and their objectives, in aggregate, meet the outcomes for the program?

We answer this question by reviewing our curriculum map using a two-step process. First, we look for gaps in the map (i.e., outcomes that are not addressed in at least one course). Second, we examine the levels at which each outcome is addressed (i.e., "introduced," "developing," and

“mastery”) to determine if there are sufficient opportunities through which students can build related skills.

During 2010 the HSB conducted a thorough curriculum-mapping process and review of the resulting map. At the graduate level, there are no gaps. In other words, all ‘core’ MBA courses are represented as potential artifact-gathering sources. We determined that there are at least several courses in the curriculum where the outcomes are addressed at either the “developing” or “mastery” level. We conducted a review of the curriculum map during 2018, and the next review of the curriculum-mapping will be conducted in AY 2020-2021.

Does the curriculum provide opportunities for students to demonstrate they have learned the program outcomes?

The HSB’s graduate curriculum map indicates that faculty require students to demonstrate each of the learning outcomes and sub-goals in our core courses. Artifacts of student learning include exams, papers, presentations, and case studies. These artifacts give students opportunities to continue to build and demonstrate skills throughout the curriculum.

Assessment Methods

What assessment methods will be used to measure each of the learning outcomes?

The HSB primarily uses an embedded assessment approach. Artifacts of student work pertinent to a particular learning outcome are collected, and these artifacts are evaluated by faculty external to the course in which the artifact was collected to determine students’ level of mastery. Whenever possible we assess individual student’s work rather than group projects. Each SLO has “measurable objective(s),” that are components of the overall learning goals. Students’ level of mastery is assessed using rubrics developed for this purpose. To ensure inter-rater reliability, we have implemented processes whereby raters meet before and after artifacts are assessed. In addition, for follow-up (loop-closing) activities on subsequent artifact evaluation, the same raters will be utilized, when possible, for consistency and reliability.

Are descriptions of the assessment processes clear and detailed?

Before 2009, creating clarity for the overall assessment process and where the HSB stands on each learning outcome was a challenge. Since then we have developed a variety of documents that make the process much clearer. For example, for each learning outcome, we now have a summary document (i.e., dashboard) encapsulating what we have learned about student performance, actions taken to address shortcomings, results of those interventions, and the next planned assessment. We have created a curriculum map that clearly communicates the level of exposure students receive relative to each learning outcome in our core courses. And we have an artifact review procedure that specifies what both the AoL Committee and artifact assessors should do before, during, and after assessments. During AY 2020-2021, the descriptions of the assessment processes will be modified based on the newly-developed SLOs.

Are the assessment processes explicitly linked to the student learning outcomes?

All of the HSB's assessment processes are explicitly linked to the student learning outcomes, with the exception of the Educational Testing Service Major Field Test (MFT). The MFT provides insight into our students' knowledge of nine core business subjects. The results can be compared to external benchmarks (scores from other business schools). Anytime our students score substantially lower than the national average on a subject, we brainstorm how to improve. For example, one action we have taken was creating sample questions in each subject (based on past tests) so that students could be better prepared in subjects that they had taken years ago.

There are challenges associated with using the MFT. It is difficult to get students to take it seriously as they know it is not linked to grades or to graduation.

Are the means of assessment commensurate with the available resources?

Keeping assessment to a maintainable level of effort while achieving clear insight into what our students are learning (and not learning) is our goal. Assessment work does, at times, contribute to role conflict and role overload for faculty members because time spent on assessment detracts from that available for other important demands (e.g., research). We continue to work to develop ways to streamline our assessment processes, making them more efficient, and also to spread assessment work more evenly rather than engaging in spurts of activity prior to accreditation visits.

What timetable will be implemented for each method, who is involved, and who is responsible for them?

We have developed a timetable to assess each of our SLOs twice in every five years. Learning outcomes for which student performance was deficient may be assessed in a year-and-a-half to two years, while outcomes for which student performance has met expectations for the last several assessments may be scheduled for assessment in three years. All faculty are involved in assessing student performance, drafting action plans and implementing the action plans. The assessment process is coordinated by the AoL Committee, which is composed of HSB faculty. Overall responsibility for assessment rests with the Dean.

Are multiple methods employed?

The HSB uses multiple methods to assess student learning. Foremost, direct measurement is utilized whereby individual artifacts are gathered in various courses and then evaluated by faculty members. Actions are then designed in response to results and patterns. The MFT is also used as a measure of student learning, and it gives us benchmark data we can use to compare ourselves to other business schools. We are considering how to effectively make use of indirect assessment to complement what we learn from our other methods.

Are sufficient direct measures of student learning utilized?

The HSB utilizes direct-assessment methods as a primary source of evaluation. Our judgments about whether students are meeting our learning objectives are based exclusively on faculty evaluations of artifacts of student work from our courses.

What is the policy regarding assessing team projects versus students' individual work?

We can gain a better understanding of student performance by assessing artifacts of individual students' work rather than team-produced work. It is our policy to assess individual work as recommended by AACSB. In the rare instances where we assess team-produced work, there will be a good reason for doing so.

Can these methods also be used for accreditation purposes?

Because our accrediting agency, The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), requires rigorous assessment of student learning, the processes described in this Assessment Plan are helpful in maintaining the HSB's accreditation with the AACSB.

How are students involved in the assessment process?

Currently, student involvement in assessment processes is minimal, though we plan to implement activities aimed at increasing student awareness. Some of the HSB's faculty are discussing AACSB and assessment in respective courses to increase student awareness. Additionally, the HSB's learning objectives are reviewed by the Dean's Advisory Council (a group of our students).

Assessment Results

How are assessment results evaluated?

After assessing artifacts of student work using rubrics of the learning outcomes, the percentages of students exceeding, meeting, and not meeting each sub-goal of each learning objective are calculated. These results are then shared with faculty in meetings to discuss the results. Action plans to address any deficiencies are then discussed and, if appropriate, implemented.

How are faculty and students involved in interpreting and evaluating results, and developing strategies to improve the curriculum?

Once faculty have seen the overall results of the assessment process and the percentage of students meeting each sub-goal, a "sensemaking" process begins. Faculty discuss the results and provide examples that relate to what the overall numbers indicate. Once faculty have considered and discussed the assessment results, meetings are held to talk about root causes of sub-par performance on any outcomes and possible actions to address the shortcomings. We plan to involve students to help us interpret results and develop strategies to improve the curriculum.

Are the results used to help the department achieve its program outcomes?

We know that assessment results are more or less useless unless something is done with them. We ask faculty to use the results to help address shortcomings in student performance regarding learning outcomes. We also develop group-level close-the-loop interventions that all faculty are asked to implement. The degree to which we use results in a conscientious manner is independently evaluated by our accrediting agency, the AACSB.

How are assessment results used to improve the curriculum and program?

Assessment is an established activity in the HSB. The results of our assessment activities are discussed and used to guide our efforts to improve our admissions processes, our teaching, and our curriculum. For example, we determined that too many of our MBA students were not writing as

well as we desired. This has led us to begin using the Graduate Management Admission Test's *Analytical Writing Assessment* (AWA) to assess incoming students' skills. Those who score below a certain level on the AWA are required to take an English course suitable for addressing their writing deficiencies.

Are the results being used for budgeting and strategic planning?

No. So far none of our assessment results have been significant enough to require shifts in our budgeting or changes to our strategic plan.

How are results disseminated to faculty, students, advisory boards, and administrators?

As discussed earlier, faculty learn of assessment results in faculty meetings as well as through other means (e-mail, memos, etc.). We can improve the degree to which we provide feedback on assessment results to our boards and to our students. The university also can improve, which is why the following strategy (i.e., 1.3.6.B) is in the 2015–2020 strategic plan: Investigate additional ways to measure, document, and publicize the University's effectiveness in preparing students for academic and professional success.

Are students informed about their progress toward the learning outcomes?

Students are not informed about their progress toward learning outcomes. We see this as a positive transition we can make within the HSB. Currently, students think about their degree attainment from a "check off the boxes" mentality, meaning they concentrate on completing courses required in the curriculum of their particular degrees. What we aspire to achieve is for students to have two goals: (a) to complete the courses required for the degree they are seeking, and (b) to master the learning outcomes that must be achieved to graduate with a degree from the HSB. In other words, we want students to be at least as concerned with mastering important skills as they are about completing course work and attaining a certain GPA. We are aware that a few universities (e.g., Alverno College) have shifted to this approach, and we believe we can benefit from their "lessons learned."

Continuous Processes

What processes are in place to ensure that the academic program assessment plan is periodically reviewed, evaluated, and updated when appropriate?

We have developed a comprehensive set of planning and tracking documents which describe when we will assess each of our learning outcomes, who will be involved, and what artifacts will be used (i.e., curriculum map and engagement map). The yearly assessment plan summary prepared for the Provost's Office serves as a reminder to systematically and critically review our assessment processes.

Who is responsible for initiating and supporting the on-going process of program improvement?

The HSB Dean is the cognizant manager of the HSB's process of program improvement and is ultimately responsible. Because the HSB faculty and staff are involved in and are primary implementers of improvement actions, the HSB assessment process is collaborative.

Who is responsible for ensuring that results from each year are the basis for action plans for the following year?

The HSB's AoL Committee is responsible for overseeing that assessment results are followed up with appropriate actions. In terms of implementing the actions (i.e., closing the loop), the HSB's Curriculum Committee is responsible for helping direct any curriculum changes with appropriate faculty.

How is equivalency in learning assured in the online program versus the traditional program?

We will alternate where we assess our learning outcomes. For example, if we assessed writing skills in a traditional face-to-face course last assessment, we will schedule our next assessment of that learning outcome in an online course. We will monitor for differences in learning between the face-to-face and online programs.

What steps are taken to assure that artifact reviews are conducted in a rigorous and efficient manner?

The artifact review procedure mentioned earlier was created to help with that. It specifies activities to do before an artifact review (e.g., meet with the instructor to ensure understanding of the artifacts), during the review (e.g., makes notes about observations of student performance), and after (e.g., reach consensus among reviewers about the most accurate score for each artifact).

What steps are taken to prevent faculty "churn" (turnover) and burnout among those leading assessment efforts?

This is a major issue for the HSB. Many faculty avoid serving on the AoL Committee because of the heavy workload. Scheduling and managing assessments, requesting assistance from faculty, ensuring that reviewers perform their tasks correctly, reminding faculty to finish tasks and do them as specified, documenting results, preparing reports, and following up on numerous programmatic and close-the-loop issues is immensely time-consuming if performed at a high level. The AoL Committee, therefore, requires participants who actively engage in the committee's task in a conscientious manner; passive faculty who "sit" on the committee but do little work are of no use and hamper assessment efforts, so we try to keep these people off the committee. That, however, in combination with what was noted earlier about faculty's reluctance to serve on the committee, severely limits the pool of suitable committee members. In addition, we expect that SLOs that have been simplified would help to reduce the workload of the AoL committee.

How are individual close-the-loop efforts by individual faculty encouraged and documented?

When an unsatisfactory level of performance on a learning outcome is identified, faculty are informed and asked what they can do to address that deficiency. Their planned actions are requested in writing, and, recently, faculty have been asked to describe their close-the-loop actions via an online questionnaire.

What methods are used to ensure that "lessons learned" are captured? What resources can new AoL Committee members use to get "up to speed"?

Successes and mistakes in assessment activities are evaluated and useful tips for the future are included in this assessment plan and in the artifact review procedure. New AoL Committee members can ramp up their knowledge by reading this assessment plan, reviewing AoL documents on the HSB I-drive, reading the artifact review procedure, reading the most-recent assessment summary, asking for tips from former AoL Committee members, attending an AACSB assurance of learning workshop, and reading this article: Gilbreath, B., Norman, S., Frew, E., Fowler, K., & Billington, P. (2016). Helpful tools for managing the assurance of learning process. *Business Education Innovation Journal*, 8(1), 111–122.

Do you approach assessment from a mastery or improvement standpoint?

The HSB assesses students' knowledge and skills related to our learning outcomes at "exit," or near graduation whenever possible. While some programs try to track improvement in students' skills, for example, between their sophomore and senior years, we do not follow that approach. Our assessment efforts are involved and intensive, and we believe that trying to measure students' improvement rather than their mastery, near graduation, would siphon off limited time and resources that are needed for close-the-loop activities.

What are some of the HSB's goals for the next few years regarding assessment, student learning, and process improvement?

The HSB's AoL Committee believes that the following goals are worth pursuing:

- formally incorporating assurance of learning contributions as an expected job duty that is specifically addressed as part of the annual performance review (APR) within the category *service*;
- refining our rubrics to do a better job of capturing the essential and most meaningful differences between students who exceed, meet, and do not meet expectations on SLOs that have been newly developed;
- improving some of our learning outcomes to reflect the skills our graduate need most to ensure if the new SLOs are appropriate to follow the guideline of AACSB;
- improving the degree to which we provide feedback on assessment results to our boards and to our students; and
- involving students in analyzing and addressing learning deficiencies and determining possible solutions.

How frequently are all SLOs assessed?

The HSB's AoL committee attempts to assess every SLO on regular basis with them being twice in every five years. If however there are issues or concerns with a specific SLO then we try to assess it more frequently. We plan in advance as to which SLOs will be assessed in the next academic year and contact the faculty offering the courses covering these SLOs for artifact collection and assessment. Here are the SLOs that we will be assessing during AY 2020–2021:

Graduate SLOs (developed in AY 2019-2020)	Planned Semester of Assessment
<p>Goal 1: Achieving organizational goals Objective: 1.1. Graduate will implement or manage team dynamics in the achievement of organizational goals.</p>	Spring 2021
<p>Goal 2: Managing organizational change Objective: 2.1. Graduate will implement change management techniques in addressing organizational responses to change—global and/or innovative technology</p>	Spring 2022
<p>Goal 3: Being socially responsible Objective: 3.1. Graduates will be ethically and socially responsible in decision making.</p>	Fall 2021
<p>Goal 4: Formulating strategic decision Objective: 4.1. Graduates will make strategic decisions applying business knowledge and analytic skills.</p>	Fall 2020