

Colorado State University – Pueblo Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2013–2014

Due: June 2, 2014

Program: Bachelor of Science – Business Administration

Date: June 1, 2014

Completed by: Steve Norman and Brad Gilbreath

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's assessment): Hailu Regassa, Peter Billington, Seong-Jong Joo, He-Boong Kwon, Lia Sissom, Geri Wink, and Beth Vega

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 submit it to the dean of your college/school as per the deadline established. The dean will forward it to me as an email attachment before June 2, 2014. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at <http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/Assessment/ResultsAndReports/Pages/default.aspx>.

Please describe the 2013-2014 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2014-2015 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2013-2014 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2012-2013. 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? Please indicate the 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.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many or what proportion of 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?
1.1: Demonstrate proper mechanics in written formats.	Fall 2010*	Written assignments from students were assessed by 2 faculty members.	We assessed all 9 students from BUSAD 493 – Senior Seminar.	We expect that at least 70% of our students meet or exceed expectations based on the attached rubrics.	Only 56% of students met or exceeded expectations, which is below our goal of 70%.	Students did not meet expectations; therefore, we need an intervention aimed at this sub-goal.	We will discuss as a faculty during our fall 2014 convocation to identify appropriate intervention(s) to remedy this deficiency. We also will seek student input into contributing causes of this skill deficiency and potential remedies.

1.2: Use vocabulary appropriate for target audience.	Fall 2010 ¹	Written assignments from students were assessed by 2 faculty members.	All 9 students from BUSAD 493 – Senior Seminar.	We expect that at least 70% of our students meet or exceed expectations based on the attached rubrics.	Seventy-eight (78) percent of students met or exceeded expectations, which is above our goal of 70%.	Students met expectations, but there is always room for improvement.	We will discuss as a faculty and see if there is a way to leverage actions for improvement noted above. The input we will seek from students may also provide us with ideas.
2.1.1: Appropriately define problem(s).	This is a new sub- goal for problem solving as discussed below in Section II.	Exam questions were assessed by 2 faculty members.	Twelve (12) of 39 artifacts collected were reviewed from students in MGMT 311 – Operations and Quality Management.	We expect that at least 70% of our students meet or exceed expectations based on the attached rubrics.	Twelve (12) of 12 students (100%) met or exceeded expectations.	On our initial assessment of this sub-goal, it appears that students performed adequately on this sub-goal.	We will continue to assess and monitor future results.

¹We are listing the last assessment before the current one that is reported on here.

2.1.2: Identify known and unknown information.	This is a new sub-goal for problem solving as discussed below in Section II.	Exam questions were assessed by 2 faculty members.	Twelve (12) of 39 artifacts were reviewed from students in MGMT 311 – Operations and Quality Management.	We expect that at least 70% of our students meet or exceed expectations based on the attached rubrics.	Eleven (11) of 12 students (92%) met or exceeded expectations.	On our initial assessment of this sub-goal, it appears that students performed adequately on this sub-goal.	We will continue to assess and monitor future results.
2.1.3: Translate problem into mathematical language.	This is a new sub-goal for problem solving as discussed below in Section II.	Exam questions were assessed by 2 faculty members.	Twelve (12) of 39 artifacts were reviewed from students in MGMT 311 – Operations and Quality Management.	We expect that at least 70% of our students meet or exceed expectations based on the attached rubrics.	Twelve (12) of 12 students (100%) met or exceeded expectations.	On our initial assessment of this sub-goal, it appears that students performed adequately on this sub-goal.	We will continue to assess and monitor future results.

2.1.4: Solve the problem.	This is a new sub-goal for problem solving as discussed below in Section II.	Exam questions were assessed by 2 faculty members.	Twelve (12) of 39 artifacts were reviewed from students in MGMT 311 – Operations and Quality Management.	We expect that at least 70% of our students meet or exceed expectations based on the attached rubrics.	Four (4) of 12 students (33%) met or exceeded expectations.	On our initial assessment of this sub-goal, it appears that students need improvement with this sub-goal.	We will discuss these results during fall 2014 convocation and will implement a performance improvement plan for this sub-goal.
2.1.5: Check your answer.	This is a new sub-goal for problem solving as discussed below in Section II.	Exam questions were assessed by 2 faculty members.	Twelve (12) of 39 artifacts were reviewed from students in MGMT 311 – Operations and Quality Management.	We expect that at least 70% of our students meet or exceed expectations based on the attached rubrics.	Ten (10) of 12 students (83%) met or exceeded expectations.	On our initial assessment of this sub-goal, it appears that students performed adequately on this sub-goal.	We will continue to assess and monitor future results.

Comments: * = Collected artifacts spring 2013 in BUSAD 101, *Business Careers and Opportunities*. However, after further consideration, the artifacts were deemed inappropriate due to the nature of the assignment as compared to our rubrics. We are focusing on examining our students' "exit skills" in relation to our learning outcomes. We, therefore, decided that assessing student mastery in a freshman-level course would provide limited benefit. Therefore, we collected artifacts in fall 2013 from BUSAD 493 *Senior Seminar*.

II. 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? Please indicate the semester and year.	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?
2.1.1: Appropriately define problem(s).	Fall 2011 for overall problem solving (See section C).	After much discussion and research, part of our intervention for addressing challenges from prior problem-solving assessments was implementing a new problem-solving process for quantitatively-oriented problems. (We kept the prior problem-solving rubrics for qualitatively-based problems). The process we are referring to is a pedagogical approach for teaching problem solving by having students adopt a five-step problem-solving process. Faculty introduced this in 100- and 200-level courses and sought to develop students' abilities in higher-level quantitatively-oriented	Yes, the recommendations from our faculty discussions and research were acted upon. As discussed previously, we completely changed our approach to problem solving and distinguished between quantitatively-oriented problems and qualitatively-oriented problems. In other words, we tailored our pedagogical approaches to the sub-type of problem-solving skills we are attempting to help students master. We implemented this tailored approach throughout the program, mainly by a faculty-led intervention to	After implementing our new pedagogical approach at multiple levels in the curriculum, which is ongoing, we need to allow some time for the approach to "bear fruit." In other words, we built time for <i>introducing</i> , <i>developing</i> , and <i>mastering</i> the problem-solving approach into our assessment schedule. We believe the earliest we can robustly assess the results of our close-the-loop intervention will be spring 2015.

		courses (operations management, accounting, statistics, finance, etc.). This is the first full assessment of this new process.	utilize the five-step problem-solving process in their courses.	
2.1.2: Identify known and unknown information.	Fall 2011 for overall problem solving (See section C).	Please see above. Clarification: The sub-goals listed in the far-left column are the steps in the five-step process we have been referring to. So the recommendations for change that we implemented included all of these sub-goals (i.e., 2.1.1–2.1.5)	Please see above.	
2.1.3: Translate problem into mathematical language.	Fall 2011 for overall problem solving (See section C).	Please see above.	Please see above.	
2.1.4: Solve the problem.	Fall 2011 for overall problem solving (See section C).	Please see above.	Please see above.	
2.1.5: Check your answer.	Fall 2011 for overall problem solving. (See section C).	Please see above.	Please see above.	

Comments:

UNDERGRADUATE LEARNING GOALS REVIEWER FORM

ARTIFACT #: _____

REVIEWER: _____

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

LEARNING GOAL ONE: COMMUNICATION

Our students will be able to communicate effectively.

MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES

Students will:

- 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.

COMMUNICATION RUBRIC				REVIEWER SCORE
EVALUATION CRITERIA	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectations	
1.1 Demonstrate proper mechanics in written formats.	Documents have proper grammar and punctuation.	Documents have a few minor grammar and punctuation errors.	Documents demonstrate limited understanding of proper grammar and punctuation.	

1.2 Use vocabulary appropriate for target audience.	Correctly uses vocabulary.	Generally uses vocabulary correctly.	Often uses vocabulary incorrectly.	
--	----------------------------------	--	--	--

UNDERGRADUATE LEARNING GOALS REVIEWER FORM

ARTIFACT #: _____

REVIEWER: _____

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

LEARNING GOAL TWO: PROBLEM SOLVING - QUANTITATIVE

Our students will be able to analyze problems and develop solutions.

MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES

Students will:

- 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.

PROBLEM SOLVING RUBRIC				
EVALUATION CRITERIA	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Does not meet expectations	REVIEWER SCORE
2.1 Appropriately define problem(s).	Appropriately defines problem(s).	Defines problem 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 into mathematical language.	Properly translates most of the problem into mathematical language.	Does not properly translate problem into mathematical language.	
2.4 Solve the problem.	Properly solves the problem.	Properly solves most of the problem.	Does not properly solve the problem.	
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 check answer(s) for reasonableness and magnitude.	