



Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2019-2020

Program: HBS/Undergraduate (BSBA)

(Due: June 1, 2020)

Date report completed: _May 30, 2020_

Completed by: Laee Choi

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved): He-Boong Kwon, Carl Wright

Brief statement of Program mission and goals:

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.”

I. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in this cycle. Including processes, results, and recommendations for improved student learning. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2019-2020 based on the assessment process.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO <u>last</u> reported on prior to this cycle? (semester and year)	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved (N).	E. What is the expected proficiency level and how many or what proportion of students should be at that level?	F. What were the results of the assessment? (Include the proportion of students meeting proficiency.)	G. What were the department’s conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment?
<u>Global Awareness:</u> Demonstrate understanding of global issues and perspectives that may impact	Fall 2017	There were two HSB faculty members who assessed the artifacts. They worked in a scoring process for the artifacts independently,	Three team-case analyses collected from MKTG 475 (International Marketing) were used. Individual work from 16	We expect that at least 70 percent of our students will meet or exceed our expectations.	There were two evaluation criteria: 1) understanding global issues and perspectives and 2) having ability to link the issues and perspective to business solutions.	Students drew their conclusions and suggestions based upon their understanding on the global issues and perspectives, therefore overall assessment	The rubric for this SLO will be reviewed for possible improvement and student performance will be monitored continuously. The faculty will discuss the way to

business solutions.		and then discussed the appropriate score for each artifact to finalize the assessment.	students were identified and assessed.		For 1 st criterion, 100% of students met (37.5%) or exceeded (62.5%) expectations. For 2 nd criterion, 100% of students met (50%) or exceeded (50%) expectations.	outcome is somewhat similar to the result from evaluation criteria 1 but with slightly less details in connecting their understanding to the proposed solutions and conclusions. All students demonstrated 'Meets expectations' and 'Exceeds expectations', however, more emphasis on the analysis and the interlinking skills might be a potential area for further improvement.	improve students' skills to interlink their understanding of global issues to business solutions.
---------------------	--	--	--	--	---	---	---

Comments on part I: In February 2019, HSB had the AACSB visit. The visit team suggested two important changes in SLOs: 1) simplifying the measurements and processes of SLOs and 2) differentiating SLOs of undergraduate from those of MBA. The new goals/objectives and the new reviewer form are shown in Appendix A and B, respectively. Especially, Appendix A shows newly revised and simplified undergraduate SLOs.

AoL committee (Lae Choi, He-Boong Kwon, Carl Wright) attended AACSB Assurance of Learning (AoL) Seminar that took place in Tampa, FL in November 4-5, 2019, and learned how to design the measurement and process of SLOs in the business school. Appendix C summarizes AACSB AoL Seminar report.

In accordance to the suggestion of the AACSB team and the AoL training, during AY 2019 – 2020, we have focused on creating created new goals and objectives for undergraduate. Global Awareness is the first newly-developed and assessed SLO following the revision of SLOs in fall 2019..

II. Closing the Loop. Describe at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during the 2019-2020 cycle. These are those that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) or other issues did you address in this cycle? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed to generate the data which informed the change? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment column H and/or feedback?	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?
<p><u>Goal 2.2. Problem Solving Qualitative:</u> 2.2.1. Appropriately use methods to solve problems. 2.2.2: Evaluate business situations. 2.2.3: Develop viable recommendations.</p>	<p>Spring 2019</p>	<p>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 2.2.1. <i>'appropriately use methods to solve problems'</i>, may not be the best sub-goal or sub-goal wording for this learning outcome as the 'methods' used to solve qualitative problems do not seem as apparent for assessment.</p> <p>For SLO 2.2.2 and 2.2.3. in the previous one, even though we met expectations during that assessment, we will continue to monitor and continue to look for more ways to improve in this area.</p>	<p>In accordance with advice from AACSB visit (Feb., 2019) and the training from AACSB AoL Seminar (Nov. 2019), the AoL team modified the SLO regarding Problem Solving (both quantitative and qualitative) and HSB faculty approved the change. The new SLO is the following:</p> <p><u>Goal 2. Problem Solving:</u> 2.1. Identify problem(s) in unstructured settings and apply appropriate quantitative techniques to solve the problem(s). 2.2. Identify problem(s) in unstructured settings and analyze appropriate information to develop viable recommendations.</p>	<p>We plan to assess this SLO again in Spring 2022 by using the new SLO. Particularly, the Qualitative Problem Solving will be assessed by Objective 2.2. We expect that the new SLO would produce a measurable effect on student capabilities.</p>

Comments on part II:

Appendix A. UNDERGRADUATE LEARNING GOALS & OBJECTIVES

OLD

1. Communication

- 1.1: Demonstrate proper mechanics in written formats.
- 1.2: Use vocabulary appropriate for target audience.
- 1.3: Be effective in oral communication and presentations.

2.1 Problem Solving – Quantitative

- 2.1.1: Appropriately define problem(s).
- 2.1.2: Identify known and unknown information.
- 2.1.3: Translate problem into mathematical language.
- 2.1.4: Solve the problem.
- 2.1.5: Check your answer.

2.2 Problem Solving – Qualitative

- 2.2.1: Appropriately use methods to solve problems.
- 2.2.2: Evaluate business situations.
- 2.2.3: Develop viable recommendations

3. Global Awareness

- 3.1: Demonstrate appropriate terminology associated with the global business environment
- 3.2: Effectively evaluate situations associated with global organizations.

4. Ethical Awareness

- 4.1: Identify relevant facts.
- 4.2: Identify ethical issues.
- 4.3: Identify ethical alternatives
- 4.4: Recommend appropriate actions.

5. Team Skills

- 5.1: Describe the role of teams in organizations
- 5.2: Demonstrate the effective use of team tools
- 5.3: Demonstrate effective behavior in teams

NEW

Goal 1. Communication

Objective:

- 1.1. Prepare a written document and/or oral presentation that are focused, well-organized, as well as mechanically and professionally sound.

Goal 2. Problem Solving

Objective:

- 2.1. Identify problem(s) in unstructured settings and apply appropriate quantitative techniques to solve the problem(s).
- 2.2. Identify problem(s) in unstructured settings and analyze appropriate information to develop viable recommendations.

Goal 3. Global Awareness

Objective:

- 3.1. Demonstrate understanding of global issues and perspectives that may impact business solutions.

Goal 4. Ethical Awareness

Objective:

- 4.1. Demonstrate awareness of ethical issues and possible impacts on business decision making

Appendix B. UNDERGRADUATE LEARNING GOALS REVIEWER FORM

REVIEWER: _____

LEARNING GOAL: GLOBAL AWARENESS

MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES

Students will: *Demonstrate understanding of global issues and perspectives that may impact business solutions.*

- Artifact: Three case analyses (written format) from MKTG 475
- A total number of students: 16
 - Artifact number: **U_GA01** = 5 students (student #1 to #5)
 - Artifact number: **U_GA02** = 6 students (student #6 to #11)
 - Artifact number: **U_GA03** = 5 students (student #12 to #16)
- Reviewer score: average score of 16 students
- Review Procedure
 - Use a separate rubric rating sheet for each artifact or student (see next page).
 - In the sheet, check score of each artifact or student
 - After evaluating all artifact, put a total number of students for each score and the average score into Evaluation Result (below).
 - If you encounter difficulty during the assessment, contact the members of the AoL Committee for guidance.

To the reviewer:

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

Please use ‘**Comment**’ section to provide qualitative observation for each criteria. 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.

EVALUATION RESULT

Evaluation Criteria 1: Students understand global issues and perspectives

Exceeds expectations (=2)	Meets expectations (=1)	Does not meet expectations (=0)	AVERAGE SCORE
Comment:			

Evaluation Criteria 2: Students have ability to link the issues and perspective to business solutions

Exceeds expectations (=2)	Meets expectations (=1)	Does not meet expectations (=0)	AVERAGE SCORE
Comment:			

RUBRIC RATING SHEET

Evaluation Criteria 1: Students understand global issues and perspectives

Artifact No.	Student	Exceeds expectations (=2)	Meets expectations (=1)	Does not meet expectations (=0)
U_GA01	#1			
	#2			
	#3			
	#4			
	#5			
U_GA02	#6			
	#7			
	#8			
	#9			
	#10			
	#11			
U_GA03	#12			
	#13			
	#14			
	#15			
	#16			
Comment:				

Evaluation Criteria 2: Students have an ability to link the issues and perspective to business solutions

Artifact No.	Student	Exceeds expectations (=2)	Meets expectations (=1)	Does not meet expectations (=0)
U_GA01	#1			
	#2			
	#3			
	#4			
	#5			
U_GA02	#6			
	#7			
	#8			
	#9			
	#10			
	#11			
U_GA03	#12			
	#13			
	#14			
	#15			
	#16			
Comment:				

Appendix C. AACSB Assurance of Learning Seminar I Report

November 4-5, 2019 in Tampa, Florida, USA

Facilitator: Karen Ann Tarnoff, Ph.D.

Associate Dean for Assessment and International Programs

Associate Professor of Management

College of Business and Technology

East Tennessee State University

Phone: 423-439-5299 | Email: tarnoffk@etsu.edu

About our facilitator—

Dr. Karen Tarnoff is an excellent facilitator—well informed, high energy, confident, and personal. SACS, AACSB, ABET, CADE are the accrediting bodies for which she is responsible to coordinate for six diverse departments (i.e., Accountancy; Economic and Finance; Management and Marketing; Computer and Information Sciences; Military Science and Technology, Survey, and Digital Media). Her degrees were granted by VA Tech—BS in Psychology and Sociology to Ph.D. in Human Resource Management in 1999.

Take-Away Items—

- Less is More in AOL Assessment
- AOL is Data Driven Student Learning Assessment System and Not Data Collection Exercises
- ETS Testing for Learning Goals—Not so useful today
- Data Reliability is not necessary an indication of Data Validity
- Simply Economic Data Collection Instrument
- The shift is to An Internal Driven Focus from External AACSB Focus
- One Clear Direct Measurement for each objective –Six Rubrics one Test
- Every Measurement System has faults—Just Fix Them and Move On—System Improvement
- AOL is Not Value Added—No Need for Pre-test and Post-test—Demonstrate that Students meet our objectives—Do not have to demonstrate value added—Demonstrate Only Quality Student-Output
- Not Every Objective Per Semester Needs to be Assessed
- No More than eight (8) Learning Goals—Average four (4) Goals Per program
- Assess 20% to 25% or Less of Student Enrolled in Program Is a Good Sample—You will have explained logic to team members—Small Programs 100% Sample
- Visiting Team Members Desires to See Data of Student Improvement
- New Programs Must Improve Student learning—if not why the new program?
- Movement to Positive is not a compliance requirement
- Report Results by Programs
- Develop or Adopt Measurement Instruments

- Learning objectives can be created based on three dimensions of Bloom’s Taxonomy—Cognitive, Affective, and Psychomotor.
- Learning objectives should be measureable with specific rubrics.
- Individual students should be evaluated—not recommend group assignments.
- Each learning goal will be measured twice in 5 years, with curriculum improvements in between the two measurements—‘Close the loop’
- It is more efficient to have one assessment that assess multiple objectives.
- AACSB’s focus is on “program” assessment, not “course” assessment.
- AOL process should be Simple-Easy-Efficient