Colorado State University – Pueblo Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2014-2015   Due: June 1, 2015

Program: Bachelor of Science – Business Administration   **Date:** May 21, 2015

Completed by: Steve Norman and Brad Gilbreath

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's assessment): Kristyn White-Davis, Geri Wink, and Ian Brennan**.**

Please complete this form for underground, 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 2014-2015 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2015-2016 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2014-2015 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2013-2014. 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 program are planned based on this assessment?
Undergraduate learning goal 1.1 (Demonstrate	Fall, 2013 (both sub-goals)	Written assignment	We evaluated 6 artifacts out of the 12	We expect that at least 70% of undergradua	For sub-goal 1.1, only 50% of students	The results from this assessment, specific to sub-goal 1.1, are a bit	The challenge remains with defining, measuring, and assessing what 'format' means. Despite

competency in written communication - Format) and 1.2 (Demonstrate competency in written communication – Vocabulary)			received, based on random assignment. Students were from our business introductory course, MGMT 101, so most were freshmen.	te students will meet or exceed expectations based on the attached rubrics.	met or exceeded expectations. For sub-goal 1.2, 100% of students met or exceeded expectations.	perplexing. We generally focus on our students' "exit skills," or the extent to which, by the time they leave our program, they can do we what we say they should be able to do (in terms of learning outcomes). In this case we deviated from our typical approach and assessed skills at the 100-level rather than at the 400-level. Though these students were freshman, the results cannot be ignored and actions must be implemented to improve results.	our ongoing efforts to better standardize this area, some assessors focus more on punctuation and grammar, while others view it as more of a citation formatting issue. We will get more time during the fall convocation meeting to discuss this in detail as a faculty and continue to target ways to better define and then improve in this area.
Undergraduate learning goal 4 – Ethical Awareness and its 4 sub-goals (4.1 - identify relevant ethical facts; 4.2 –	Fall, 2012 (all sub-goals)	Written assignment	We evaluated 10 artifacts out of the 22 received based on random assignment.	We expect that at least 70% of undergraduate students will meet or exceed expectations	For sub-goal 4.1, 70% of students met or exceeded expectations; for sub-goal 4.2, 100% of	Though all students met or exceeded expectations for all sub-goals, we must continue to look for ways to continuously enhance student	Though we met expectations during this assessment, we will continue to monitor and continue to look for more ways to improve in this area. More specifically, we can investigate

identify ethical issues; 4.3 – identify ethical alternatives; 4.4 – recommend appropriate actions)			Students were from our business ethics class, so most were juniors or seniors.	based on the attached rubrics.	students met or exceeded expectations; for sub-goal 4.3, 90% of students met or exceeded expectations; and for sub-goal 4.4, 100% of students met or exceeded expectations.	learning and we will do so. Specifically, results for sub-goal 4.1 barely met expectations. Thus, we will look at improving students' ability to be able to identify relevant ethical facts.	pedagogical best practices for teaching students to identify relevant ethical facts and find places in our curriculum to introduce, develop, and achieve mastery.

Comments:

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?

Last year, we also assessed undergraduate written skills (Demonstrate competency in written communication - Format) and 1.2 (Demonstrate competency in written communication – Vocabulary).	Fall 2013	We decided to focus more on written communication in our courses. Specifically, we agreed that professors and instructors would discuss and evaluate our students' ability to apply proper formatting and vocabulary to written communication.	Partially. It appears that our actions specific to vocabulary might be helping, specifically at the entry level (recall that the artifacts mentioned in Section I were collected from an entry-level class, BUSAD 101, so results need to be replicated in higher-level courses). Additionally, we need to better capture what each professor or instructor is doing in this area, and then communicate these practices to all faculty and instructors in order to make them more common. However, specific to sub-goal 1.1 (format), we need to follow up and create specific actions that will help in the area of formatting specifically. It will also help if we, as a faculty, discuss and define what 'format' means, and then be sure that we are evaluating those factors consistently. The assurance of learning	Since the current sample was perhaps significantly different from the last sample (100-level students this time vs 400-level students last time), it is difficult to determine whether our actions were effective. Given this, we devote time during our fall convocation meeting and will do an activity to help improve the area of formatting while also discussing vocabulary. In other words, we will discuss the observations of student performance among the faculty, gain clarity on which aspects of student performance still need improvement (e.g., following format), and generate ideas about how to address the shortcomings and improve student performance.

			committee could have been more active in this area during the past year and we will be sure to follow up accordingly next year.	
We also continue to work on our learning goal of problem solving (2.1.1 – appropriately define the problem; 2.1.2 - Identify known and unknown information; 2.1.3 – translate problem into mathematical language; 2.1.4 – solve the problem; and 2.1.5 – check your answer.	Fall, 2013	Since we recently adopted a new process for teaching problem solving, we decided to stay the course and get more students through the new process in various courses and then assess. Overall, our students had succeeded in all sub-goals except for 2.1.4 (33% success rate), so we have discussed as a faculty to focus more attention on that step of the process (please note that the steps and process that we agreed on parallel the wording of the related sub-goals).	Yes, the recommended actions were acted upon and continue to be so.	As mentioned, the initial results collected last year seemed promising, but we will continue to implement agreed upon actions and will assess in the near future.

Comments: