

Program: Master's of 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 #2, Decision-making and problem solving. Specifically, we evaluated 5 of	Though we have had an SLO pertaining to problem solving, which was	A quiz was utilized to assess these sub-goals. (Rubrics attached).	Students from ACCTG 510 were assessed during the spring of 2013.	For our MBA program, we expect 80% of students to meet or exceed expectations.	100% of students evaluated met or exceeded expectations.	This is an initial evaluation of our new sub-goals for problem solving; overall, students did well on this assessment.	Since this is an initial evaluation of our new sub-goals, we will need to continue to modify our rubrics and processes to be sure we are accurately assessing as intended.

our sub-goals related to this major learning goal: 2.1 – Appropriately define problem(s) Note: Each of the sub-goals— 2.1 through 2.5—is a step in the problem-solving process that we adopted as “the HSB problem-solving process.” This process was adopted because, at the undergraduate level, students were having great difficulty in solving quantitative problems.	last assessed Fall 2009, we created a new process during the fall of 2012 to be implemented spring of 2013. Therefore, this is the initial assessment of the new sub-goals as broken down (i.e., incorporating steps helpful in problem solving).						This assessment utilized a quiz, which was suitable for our initial assessment. We will look for a more rigorous artifact exercise in the future to provide a more robust evaluation of students’ ability to appropriately define problems.
2.2 – Identify known and unknown information	Please see above. Additional background:	Please see above – quiz	Students from ACCTG 510 were assessed	For our MBA program, we expect 80% of students	90% of students evaluated met or	Please see above. Additional background: We are in the early	Please see above. In addition: We will discuss among faculty “lessons learned” from

	We had conducted an extensive review of the pedagogical literature on problem solving and identified a helpful process for problem solving. After extensive discussion among the faculty, we adopted this problem solving model and based our pedagogy on it beginning in Spring 2013.		during the spring of 2013.	to meet or exceed expectations.	exceeded expectations.	stage of implementing our new sub-goals and supporting pedagogical approach, but indications thus far are positive.	implementing the problem-solving pedagogy. We also will verify and document who is utilizing the new pedagogy so we ensure that we give students enough exposure to <i>develop</i> the skills we are seeking to help them with their problem solving routine.
2.3 – Translate problem into mathematical language	Please see above.	Please see above – quiz	Students from ACCTG 510 were assessed during the spring of 2013.	For our MBA program, we expect 80% of students to meet or exceed expectations.	90% of students evaluated met or exceeded expectations.	Please see above.	Please see above.

2.4 – Solve the problem	Please see above.	Please see above – quiz	Students from ACCTG 510 were assessed during the spring of 2013.	For our MBA program, we expect 80% of students to meet or exceed expectations.	90% of students evaluated met or exceeded expectations.	Please see above.	Please see above.
2.5 – Check your answer	Please see above.	Please see above – quiz	Students from ACCTG 510 were assessed during the spring of 2013.	For our MBA program, we expect 80% of students to meet or exceed expectations.	90% of students evaluated met or exceeded expectations.	Please see above.	Please see above.

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?
MBA decision-making and problem solving (quantitative	Though the sub-goals of decision-making and problem solving	As mentioned, we modified the process and evaluation rubrics for assessing problem solving at both the graduate	Yes, we implemented a new process for teaching and then evaluating problem solving.	Initial results support our changes. Students in ACCTG 510 did well overall as a result. Professor Eriksen posted the process on his syllabus and altered

problems). Specifically, 5 sub-goals were assessed: 2.1 Appropriately define the problem. 2.2 Identify known and unknown variables. 2.3 Translate problem(s) to mathematical language. 2.4 Solve the problem. 2.5 Check the answer.	were assessed in the fall of 2009, the sub-goals recently changed. Therefore, these specific sub-goals were assessed for the first time during this cycle.	and undergraduate levels. Given mixed results in this area in the past, we did some research on alternative ways to teach problem solving. Our research found a more methodical way of teaching and evaluating problem solving and we changed our process based on this research.		his teaching to support and reinforce this new process. Moreover, the faculty as whole agreed to begin teaching the new problem-solving method. Next steps involve finding a more rigorous exercise to collect as an artifact to better test the process and students' use of the process.

Comments: This report causes us to reflect on our assessment activities and reminds us of assessment-related actions we need to follow-up on. We appreciate the efforts of the Assistant Provost and contributing faculty to ensure that student learning is systematically assessed. While assessment requires some effort, we have seen the payoffs in terms of knowing what “exit skills” our students are accruing and identifying where we may have not been reaching expectations in terms of student learning. We have learned things that intuition (i.e., professors’ informal observations of student work) and course grades cannot tell us.

This process and the template seem clear and well designed, but would it be possible to make the intent of Part B clearer? The instructions there seem fairly clear, but maybe another sentence or two like this could help: “Part B of the report, the lower half, is where programs document close-the-loop activities. In other words, the top half of the report pertains to what you assessed during this most recent academic year,

whereas the lower half describes what you did during the most recent academic year to remedy or improve things you noticed during the prior academic year's assessments.

GRADUATE LEARNING GOALS REVIEWER FORM

ARTIFACT #: _____

REVIEWER: _____

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

LEARNING GOAL TWO: DECISION MAKING AND PROBLEM SOLVING -

Quantitative

Our graduate students will be able to analyze problems, identify relevant issues, and craft workable solutions.

MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES

Students will be able to:

2.6 Appropriately define the problem.

2.7 Identify known and unknown variables.

2.8 Translate problem(s) to mathematical language.

2.9 Solve the problem.

2.10 Check the answer.

2.6 Critically analyze and question knowledge claims in the specialized discipline.

DECISION MAKING AND PROBLEM SOLVING RUBRIC				REVIEWERS SCORE
COMPETENCY	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does not meet Expectations	
2.1 Appropriately define problem(s).	Appropriately defines problem(s).	Defines problem(s) with some minor challenges.	Fails to appropriately define problem(s).	
2.2 Identify known and unknown information.	Identifies known and unknown information appropriately.	Identifies most, but not all, known and unknown information.	Fails to identify known and unknown information.	
2.3 Translate problem into mathematical language.	Properly translates problem(s) into mathematical language.	Properly translates most of the problem(s) into mathematical language.	Does not properly translate problem(s) into mathematical language.	
2.4 Solve the problem.	Properly solves the problem(s).	Properly solves most of the problem(s).	Does not properly solve the problem(s).	
2.5 Check your answer.	Properly checks answer(s) for reasonableness and magnitude.	Properly checks most answer(s) for reasonableness and magnitude.	Does not properly checks answer(s) for reasonableness and magnitude.	
2.6 Critically analyze and question knowledge claims in the specialized discipline.	Properly analyzes and questions knowledge claims within the specialized discipline.	Properly analyzes and questions most knowledge claims within the specialized discipline.	Does not properly analyze and question knowledge claims within the specialized discipline.	