Colorado State University – Pueblo   Undergraduate Program Assessment Report for AY 2011-2012   Due: June 1, 2012

Program: Hasan School of Business – Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA)   **Date:** May 29, 2012

Completed by: Steve Norman and Brad Gilbreath

Please complete this form for each undergraduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S.) in your department and return it to Erin Frew, erin.frew@colostate-pueblo.edu as an email attachment before June 1, 2011. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/Assessment/Resources/Pages/default.aspx. Thank you.

I. Program student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessed in this cycle, processes, results, and recommendations.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle?	B. When was this SLO last assessed?	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO?	D. Who was assessed?	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many students should be at it?	F. What were the results of the assessment?	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements are planned based on this assessment?
Problem Solving	Fall 2010	Exam questions	Students enrolled in BUSAD 360	Our expected achievement level is that at least 70% of undergraduate students are at either the "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" levels.	Overall, students did not meet expectations for this SLO. In terms of Subgoal 2.2, *evaluate business situations*, 40% of students exceeded expectations, 27% met expectations, and 33% did not meet expectations (so, 67% met or exceeded which	There has been a positive trending in this area that is encouraging. However, given past results that showed some challenges in this area, we will continue to monitor results in both qualitative and quantitative courses. This is an area—particularly	We continue to face challenges in the problem solving area, especially in more quantitative courses. During our Fall 2012 convocation we plan on dedicating time to discuss deficiencies in this area and will put an action plan in place through our curriculum. Though it is difficult to standardize across all subject areas, perhaps

| | | | | | is below our target of 70%).

As for Subgoal 2.3, *develop viable recommendations*, the artifact we used did not lend itself to assessing "exceeds expectations"; it was more of a *meets*, *does not meet* judgment because students made a simple recommendation which was either correct or incorrect. For this subgoal, 60% of the students met expectations and 40% did not. | in solving quantitative problems—that we need to devote focused effort to and engage more faculty in closing the loop by implementing interventions to help students improve their quantitative problem-solving skills. | there is a common process that we can reinforce throughout our curriculum in order to give students a common foundation for approaching problem solving. We also will be seeking our incoming Dean's advice about how to produce more action from individual faculty in addressing the shortcomings in this learning goal. A greater number of interventions to improve students' problem-solving skills by individual faculty are needed. So far, faculty engagement in addressing this learning goal deficiency has been relatively weak, with few faculty taking action. This is something we will address during the AYR 2012-2013 to foster more faculty engagement. |
| Team skills | The team skills SLO is a new addition | Team-based projects | Students enrolled in MGMT 485 | Our expected achievement level is that at least 70% of | We have yet to evaluate the team skills results (artifacts collected | To be determined. | To be determined. |

			undergraduate students are at either the "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" levels.	but not yet reviewed). We have developed rubrics and evaluation criteria and we will test this process with the artifacts gathered this spring (2012). Once we go through this process, we will likely have some good feedback to implement as we move forward with this new SLO.		
(i.e., a newly added learning outcome).						

Comments:

B. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this cycle that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) did you address?	B. When was this SLO last assessed?	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	D. Were the recommendations for change acted upon? If not, why?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
Problem Solving	Fall 2010	We had implemented process improvement ideas in some courses relative to problem solving processes and we had	There were some changes implemented in operations management and accounting courses. For	Presently we do not have sufficient data to assess the impact of the changes that have been implemented in the operations management and

| | | planned on revising and monitoring these results. We also planned to have follow-up conversations to identify "lessons learned" from the instructors who tried the new teaching techniques. | example, we had searched the literature for pedagogical techniques that help students increase their problem-solving skills, and several instructors tested the techniques in their courses during Spring 2011. We held a lesson-learned discussion, but were dismayed to find that one of the instructors experimenting with the new methods had jettisoned the approaches we had discussed.

There were some additional interventions to improve students' problem solving by individual instructors. For example, an instructor introduced new learning exercises in Econ 202. The first Econ 202 exercise requires students to derive the price elasticity for a good based on their demand curve. The second exercise provides re-enforcement of cost concepts so they are better equipped to evaluate and recommend. | accounting courses. These changes are in a "pilot" stage with continuous refinement planned in future courses. However, discussions will be held soon (Fall 2012 convocation meeting) to identify what worked regarding the changes, and what didn't work so well during the pilot stage with the goal of coming up with a standardized process that students can utilize with any problem solving activity.

In the economics course, students demonstrated an improved understanding of using the appropriate method, evaluating the business situation and developing viable recommendations.

For the business statistics course, we presume the instructor's close-the-loop interventions were helpful. It can be difficult to definitively assess results of interventions without pre-and-post designs. Even then, variations in individual course sections (i.e., student differences) make determining effects difficult. Overall, despite this instructor's interventions, students' problem-solving performance was below expectations. It is clear that a more aggressive and widespread action plan (across the curriculum) to improve student performance is needed. |

			An instructor who teaches business statistics adopted a case-based textbook, which he believed would have a positive effect on students' attitudes toward the relevance of the course material (hence impacting their motivation to learn). The instructor had found that approximately 15–20 percent students were typically missing in most classes, so he included attendance points (10%), quizzes (10%), homework (10%), and case presentations (10%) to have positive effects on student learning. In addition, the instructor had his graduate assistant sit in on classes and serve as a tutor.	

Comments: