

Colorado State University – Pueblo Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2012-2013**Due: June 1, 201****Program:** Bachelor of Science – Business Administration**Date:** May 29, 2013**Completed by:** Steve Norman and Brad Gilbreath**Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's assessment):** Peter Billington, Hailu Regassa, and Kevin Duncan

Please complete this form for each undergraduate, minor, certificate, and graduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S., M.S.) in your department. Please copy any addenda (e.g., rubrics) and paste them in this document, and return it to Erin Frew, erin.frew@colostate-pueblo.edu as an email attachment before June 1, 2013. 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? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed?	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.	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 to the <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment?
SLO 4 – Ethical Awareness (sub-goals 4.1-4.4): 4.1 – Identify Relevant Facts	Fall 2010	A rubric (attached) was utilized to assess performance. The artifact used was exam questions pertinent to	Artifacts were gathered from all students (mostly juniors and seniors) in FIN 330.	We expect at least 70% of students to meet or exceed expectations (in this case, answer at least 70% of	100% of students answered at least 70% of the questions correctly.	Students seem to be adequately grasping ethical issues related to financial aspects of organizations.	This latest assessment was a follow-up assessment (loop closing) to a prior effort to increase focus on ethical issues related to financial aspects within an organization. Since student performance

		this learning goal.		the multiple-choice or T/F questions correctly – <i>meets expectations</i>).			seemed to increase in this course, we will continue to emphasize related ethical issues in FIN 330 (and other courses).
4.2 – Identify Ethical Issues	Fall 2010	A rubric (attached) was utilized to assess performance. The artifact used was exam questions pertinent to this learning goal.	Artifacts were gathered from all students (mostly juniors and seniors) in FIN 330.	We expect at least 70% of students to meet or exceed expectations (in this case, answer at least 70% of the multiple-choice or T/F questions correctly – <i>meets expectations</i>).	100% of students answered at least 70% of the questions correctly.	Students seem to be adequately grasping ethical issues related to financial aspects of organizations.	This was a follow-up assessment (loop closing) to an earlier effort to increase focus on ethical issues related to financial aspects within an organization. Since student performance seemed to increase in this course, we will continue to emphasize related ethical issues in FIN 330 (and other courses).
4.3 - Identify Ethical Alternatives	Fall 2010	A rubric (attached) was utilized to assess performance. The artifact used was exam questions pertinent to this learning goal.	Artifacts were gathered from all students (mostly juniors and seniors) in FIN 330.	We expect at least 70% of students to meet or exceed expectations (in this case, answer at least 70% of the MC or T/F questions correctly – meet	100% of students answered at least 70% of the questions correctly.	Students seem to be adequately grasping ethical issues related to financial aspects of organizations.	This latest assessment was a follow-up assessment (loop closing) for a prior effort to increase focus on ethical issues related to financial aspects within organizations. Because student performance seemed to increase in this course, we will continue to emphasize related ethical issues in

				expectations).			FIN 330 (and other courses).
4.4 - Recommend Appropriate Actions	Fall 2010	Rubrics (attached) were utilized to assess performance and applied to specific exam questions.	Artifacts were gathered from all students (mostly juniors and seniors) in FIN 330.	We expect at least 70% of students to meet or exceed expectations (in this case, answer at least 70% of the MC or T/F questions correctly – meet expectations).	100% of students answered at least 70% of the questions correctly.	Students are grasping ethical issues related to financial aspects of organizations to an adequate degree.	As described earlier, this year's effort was an investigation of an intervention to increase focus on ethical issues related to financial decisions in organizations. Since student performance improved in this course, we will continue what we are doing.
SLO 5 (sub-goals 5.2 and 5.3 *please note sub-goal 5.1 was not assessed this time given the nature of the artifact): 5.2 – Demonstrate the effective use of team tools.	This is a new sub-goal for our UG program, so this is the first assessment conducted for this learning goal.	Rubrics were developed (attached) to assess whether students are utilizing effective team tools (attending meetings, fulfilling team roles, following up on action items, contributing to team goals, etc.). These rubrics were	Artifacts were gathered from all students and teams in MGMT 485 (capstone course with mostly seniors).	We expect at least 70% of students to meet or exceed expectations in the related sub-goals.	100% of students met or exceeded expectations.	Though this is the first assessment for this new goal and sub-goal, it seems that, overall, students are performing well in terms of using helpful team tools.	Assessing student mastery of learning goals is a process, so we will continue to learn from our assessments both procedurally and pedagogically. We have noted minor adjustments that should be made to better assess these team-related sub-goals. For instance, we were unable to assess sub-goal 5.1 (Describe the role of teams in organizations) so we will determine some way for

		then applied to student evaluations of other team members stemming from a semester-long team project.					students to demonstrate this knowledge in the future.
5.3 – Demonstrate effective behavior in teams.	As with sub-goal 5.2, this is a new sub-goal, so this was the first assessment.	Rubrics were developed (attached) to assess whether students are demonstrating effective behavior in teams. These rubrics were then applied to student write-ups of other team members (i.e., the peer evaluations mentioned in sub-goal 5.2) based on observations in a semester-long team project.	Students in MGMT 485 (capstone course composed of mostly seniors).	We expect at least 70% of students to meet or exceed expectations in the related sub-goals.	100% of students met or exceeded expectations.	Though this is the first assessment of this new goal and sub-goal area, it seems that, overall, students are teaming well. As could be expected, there were a few students who didn't contribute a fair share to their group's task; but, in general, most students were able to find a niche and perform as a contributing member of their team. So one of our conclusions is that the students—as perceived by their	As noted earlier, we will continue to evaluate this new sub-goal and find ways to better assess student learning and to improve pedagogical methods. We will also continue to include team activities in various courses to reinforce team concepts and performance. We will review our curriculum to ensure that we are adequately introducing and developing the desired team behaviors before we expect students to exhibit mastery of them. We will consider whether we can teach our students more about how to influence peer behavior,

						<p>peers—were more effective at exhibiting desired behaviors than we would have predicted.</p>	<p>particularly that of “slackers” (i.e., social loafers). What techniques can our students use to effect behavior change in their peers? Slackers are notoriously difficult to influence, but there may be techniques or behavioral consequences our students can learn that will enhance their chance of having a positive effect on poor contributors’ behavior. Assessment-wise, it could be helpful for us to have a more systematic way of assessing exactly what team behaviors our students are performing well, and the behaviors at which they are not as effective. For this assessment we used a qualitative assessment of team behaviors from students’ peers. Perhaps that could be complemented with some structured,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							quantitative scale measuring students' adeptness at key team behaviors.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

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? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	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?
Sub-goal 4.1 – Identify Relevant Facts	Fall 2010	From the previous assessment, we discussed the issue with finance faculty and decided to create more focused discussions of identifying ethical issues in FIN 330. Prior to this time, there was only sporadic discussion of ethical issues and students did not consistently identify relevant facts. By focusing on these issues more closely, students can solidify this knowledge	Yes, recommendations identified in the past were acted upon, even when adjunct professors were utilized as was the case during the fall of 2012 when Professor Regassa was on sabbatical.	Overall, though minor adjustments will continue to be made, as is the case with all assessment activity, the results (i.e., student learning) seemed to be enhanced for this goal and sub-goals.

		through discussion and repetition, and perform better at identifying ethical information.		
4.2 – Identify Ethical Issues	Fall 2010	Related to above, by focusing class discussions on possible ethical issues, students were able to better identify ethical issues that could cause concern.	Yes, recommendations identified in the past were acted upon, even when adjunct professors were utilized as was the case during the fall of 2012 when Professor Regassa was on sabbatical.	Although we will continue to make minor adjustments to our related pedagogy and assessment methods, the results seemed to be enhanced with this goal and sub-goals. We will continue to monitor our students' ability to identify ethical issues.
4.3 – Identify Ethical Alternatives	Fall 2010	By discussing ethical issues in class and brainstorming possible alternatives, students seemed to be better at identifying ethical alternatives. Though the exam questions were somewhat limited at assessing students' abilities to identify alternatives, the students did seem to be more open to alternatives.	Yes, recommendations identified in the past were acted upon. All finance professors now address this learning content in their courses.	As students performed well on this sub-goal, we will focus attention on other student learning areas and pedagogy issues that need attention. However, we will reassess our students' performance on this sub-goal in two years or less.
4.4 – Recommend Appropriate Actions	Fall 2010	Related to 4.3 above, once students are able to better identify broader alternatives, this increases students' ability to then recommend appropriate actions based on alternatives identified in 4.3.	Yes, recommendations identified in the past were acted upon, even when adjunct professors were utilized as was the case during the fall of 2012 when Professor Regassa was on sabbatical.	We plan to continue looking for pedagogical improvements and improved ways to measure this sub-goal. Overall, though, our assessment results indicate that this learning goal is not, at present, a problem area. Our current plans call for assessing students' ethical decision making skills in a different course next time so we can gain a richer understanding of their

				abilities.
Please note that SLO 5.2 and 5.3, discussed above, are new SLO's. Therefore, there is no loop-closing at this time.				

Comments:

1. Can the reviewers of these plans identify some “best practices” that could be singled out for sharing with other departments (because they might be useful in other programs)?
2. Can programs or departments that seem to be doing particularly well on assessment, as indicated in these reports and by the Assistant Provost’s direct observations of their assessment practices, receive some accolade and reinforcement from the President? Accolade would be nice, but a “spot bonus” to exemplary departments’ budgets would *really* get some attention (and encourage more attention to assessment). As a well-respected organizational behavior scholar noted, “behavior is a function of its consequences.” Unfortunately some Deans do not seem to be willing to “step up” and enforce consequences that will change unacceptable behavior (e.g., refusal to conduct meaningful assessment). There should be some meaningful consequences for programs or departments doing an abysmal job on assessment. Could someone with “coercive power” (the Provost) or “position power” (e.g., the President) get involved in fostering some behavior change? Our shared interests depend on the University’s reputation, which depends on accreditation, which, in turn, depends on documenting student learning and taking appropriate actions to improve. Programs that neglect assessment put us all at risk.

UNDERGRADUATE LEARNING GOALS REVIEWER FORM**ARTIFACT#:** _____**REVIEWER:** _____

To the reviewer: Exceeds expectations = 2; Meets expectations = 1; Does not meet expectations = 0

LEARNING GOAL FOUR: ETHICAL AWARENESS

Our students will understand concepts related to ethics.

MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES

Students will:

- 4.1 identify relevant facts.
- 4.2 identify ethical issues.
- 4.3 identify ethical alternatives.
- 4.4 recommend appropriate actions.

ETHICAL AWARENESS RUBRIC				REVIEWER SCORE
EVALUATION CRITERIA	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectations	
4.1 Identify relevant facts.	Shows strong ability to identify relevant facts.	Identifies most relevant facts.	Often fails to identify relevant facts.	
4.2 Identify ethical issues.	Shows strong ability to identify ethical issues.	Identifies most ethical issues.	Often fails to identify ethical issues.	
4.3 Identify ethical alternatives.	Clearly identifies ethical alternatives.	Identifies some ethical alternatives.	Fails to identify ethical alternatives.	
4.4 Recommend appropriate actions.	Recommends appropriate actions	Recommends some appropriate actions.	Fails to recommend appropriate actions.	

UNDERGRADUATE LEARNING GOALS REVIEWER FORM

ARTIFACT#: _____

REVIEWER: _____

To the reviewer: Exceeds expectations = 2; Meets expectations = 1; Does not meet expectations = 0

LEARNING GOAL FIVE: Team skills

Our students will be able to effectively work in a team.

MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES

Students will:

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

TEAM SKILL RUBRIC				REVIEWER SCORE
EVALUATION CRITERIA	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectations	
5.1: Describe the role of teams in organizations	Comprehensively describes the roles of teams in organizations (e.g., strong description; provides examples that support description)	Accurately describes the role of teams in organizations	Does not describe the role of teams in organizations	
5.2: Demonstrate the effective use of team tools	Demonstrates skilled use of tools that contribute to team effectiveness (e.g., sets appropriate goals, creates effective plan for managing conflict, defines roles clearly, creates effective system for scheduling and updating progress, etc.)	Uses tools that contribute to team effectiveness (agendas, minutes, schedules, records of delegated tasks, etc.)	Unable to correctly use team tools or fails to make use of most of the applicable tools	
5.3: Demonstrate effective behavior in teams	Demonstrates skill in working as a team (e.g., works effectively to achieve the team's objectives, constructively addresses social loafing, conflict is not excessive and is constructively resolved, behaviors build cohesion and positive team climate, etc.).	Works collaboratively to achieve the team's objectives.	(a) No successful outcome or (b) some success but with clearly dysfunctional team behavior.	