Meta-assessment Analysis Report for the College of Business Administration

Submitted to the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment

February 18, 2015

Section 1: Description of Meta-assessment Methodology Employed by the College

The College of Business Administration conducted its meta-assessment by asking two faculty members in each of the four departments (Accounting, General Business, Economics and International Business, Management and Marketing) to evaluate six unit-level OATdb entries for 2013-2014.

Thus, two faculty evaluators assessed each unit's OATdb entries using the following directions:

Review each individual assessment as though you were grading a student paper.
1. Do you understand what is being assessed, why it is being assessed, and how it is being assessed?
2. Do the findings, actions, and plan for continuous improvement make sense?
3. Is the assessment written such that it is understandable and looks professional?
4. If an outside reviewer (SACS, AACSB, etc.) saw this assessment report, would it be something COBA is proud of showing?

In addition to the two faculty evaluators, one associate dean also assessed each unit's OATdb entries using the rubric provided by the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment. Evaluators were given the information on December 8 and completed their evaluations by January 23.

Section 2: Plan for Distributing Completed Rubrics to Units

Completed rubrics will be distributed to each unit by March 27. The units will discuss the feedback from the meta-assessment and make plans to implement improvements in the process. In addition to each unit receiving their own feedback, all units within the College of Business Administration will be given access to the entire college's meta-assessment to see how their evaluations compared to others.

Department meetings (Accounting, Economics, General Business, and Management/Marketing) are scheduled to discuss assessment of academic majors and the business foundation within each department. These meetings will serve to inform all faculty within each department of the modifications that need to be made moving forward.

Section 3: Observed Strengths within College Assessment Plans

- Each unit has identified key elements of student learning or unit goals that are universally accepted as appropriate.
- Faculty have met to discuss ways to improve student learning, and some units have implemented plans for continuous improvement that have resulted in greater student learning.
- Based on the university rubric that rewards quantity of documents uploaded into OATdb, some units scored in the exemplary range.

Section 4: Observed Weaknesses within College Assessment Plans

Primary weakness:
> Inconsistency of reporting between units makes it difficult to compare progress from one unit to another. For example, the method of assessment is inconsistent across the college, with inconsistency in the assessment tools (quiz, exam, project, case), the number of courses used, the number of questions used, and the number of students used.

Other weaknesses:
- Goals, objectives, indicators, criterion, and findings are poorly defined or worded in some units.
- Stated goals and corresponding objectives are not aligned in some cases.
- Some units appear to copy and paste information from one year to the next without proper revision.
- Some units do not truly assess what is purportedly being assessed (e.g., using one course to assess an entire major, but including non-majors along with majors in the assessment).

Section 5: Strategies Needed to Address Identified Weaknesses

Each unit will receive feedback from the meta-assessment and will address any identified weaknesses. In 2013, the College of Business Administration initiated an Assessment Retreat to communicate information about assessment and to share best practices. In 2014, the Assessment Retreat was adapted to a Learning Retreat format in which assessment information was incorporated into a session along with teaching strategies and best practices.

Section 6: Training/Resources Needed to Implement the College's Improvement Strategy

The Learning Retreat, which is expected to become an annual fall event, will serve as a means of weaving teaching, learning, and assessment together. In addition, the College of Business Administration has decided on a basic reporting structure for assessment that is consistent across majors or units. Each major or unit should determine what, where, and how to assess stated goals, but the reporting structure will allow an outside reviewer to move from one assessment to the next without requiring a complete reframing of the assessment process.

A framework for consistency moving forward includes the following requirements for assessing the majors.
- If pre-tests and post-tests are used:
    a. evaluate/interpret pre-test results
    b. evaluate/interpret change
    c. evaluate/interpret post-test results (independent of pre-test)
- Assess majors only for major specific knowledge; do not include non-majors.
- If not an undue burden, each required course in the major (including those from other departments) should be assessed at least once a year.
- Avoid the use of IDEA scores in "major" assessment. Can use IDEA scores for all COBA, if desired, but not for individual majors.
- If evaluating communication or critical thinking within the major, it must go beyond the communication or critical thinking assessment occurring at the business foundation level.

Appendix A – Competed Rubrics

College of Business Administration

There are five goals for COBA. Goal 1, promote quality academic programs, has appropriate objectives.

Goal 2, support the recruitment and retention of a productive, high-quality faculty, is good, but there is nothing about recruitment in the objectives, and retention is assumed to be related only to faculty development. Objective 1, funding for faculty development, appears to be tied entirely to the departmental travel budgets. Objective 3, providing funding for research databases, also seems tied more closely to development than to recruitment and retention. Should development be stated in goal 2? Concerning recruitment and retention, should there be objectives for successful faculty searches, number of tenured faculty, years of tenure, or marketing of COBA to potential candidates?

Goal 3, provide environment supporting student professional and academic success, is well-stated. However, the only two objectives for this goal are expanding online course offerings and developing academic support material. Should there be objectives to support student organizations or encourage ACE courses? What about objectives for student professional development or academic student competitions?

Goal 4, developing relationships with non-student stakeholders, is good. Should the career fair be added as an objective?

Goal 5, external recognition of quality, only lists one objective – to increase involvement with AACSB and only involves the dean. Should objectives be added to involve faculty as a means of increasing external recognition of quality? Would faculty research enhance recognition?

Goal 6, effective administration, is OK.

The Plan for Continuous Improvement is OK.

Some typos throughout should be fixed. No KPIs in some sections – only actions. Lots of attachments.

Using the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment rubric, COBA assessment is acceptable overall. There are an adequate number of goals, objectives, KPIs, and actions that are appropriate for the program. All sections of the Plan for Continuous Improvement have been completed, and there are several attachments to support the assessment.

Department of Accounting

Goals – *Needs improvement. Goal needs revision. Should outline the mission of department (at several places mission statement has been referred to but has never been stated what exactly is the mission statement of the department). For example, the goal could be to be the regional leader in providing high-quality education in accounting and train students to have a successful career in accounting field.*

Objectives – *Acceptable.*

KPIs – *Acceptable.*

Criterion – *Acceptable.*

Findings – *Acceptable.*

Action – *Acceptable.*

This department has one goal and two objectives along with several performance indicators.

1) Do you understand what is being assessed, why it is being assessed and how it is being assessed?

Yes, these three aspects are clear for the most part. My only suggestion refers to the use of FES to assess research and service effectiveness. The document refers to minimum scores in FES forms 3 and 4 but the objective metrics to get these FES scores are not mentioned.

2) Do the findings, actions, and plans for continuous improvement make sense?

It is difficult to assess this because it is not mentioned the specific ways that: i) faculty with good research performance will be encouraged to continue publishing; and ii) the department would work with faculty that are not meeting research expectations.

3) Is the assessment written such that it is understandable and looks professional?

Yes.

4) If an outside reviewer (SACS, AACSB, etc) saw this assessment report, would it be something COBA is proud of showing?

Yes.

<u>General Comments</u>

The teaching, research, and service performance of faculty are being assessed by using FES scores, which is good. The department has taken action to maintain the faculty composition in terms of SA, PA, and SP consistent with AACSB standard which again is good.

Department of Economics and International Business

<u>Goal 1 – Promote the development and maintenance of quality academic programs</u>

Objective 1 - *No specific comments for this objective.*

Objective 2
Result: *Suggest using "developed" instead of "worked on putting together"*
Action: *Misspelled "offering"*

<u>Goal 2 – Support the recruitment and retention of a productive, high quality faculty</u>

Objective 1: *Should change wording to meet 2013 AACSB standard 15*
KPI: *Should change wording to meet 2013 AACSB standard 15*
Result: *No results listed*
Action: *No actions listed*

Objective 2 – *No specific comments for this objective.*

<u>Goal 3 – Provide an environment supporting students' professional academic success</u>

Objective 1
Result: *Misspelled "offered"*

Objective 2: *Change "TUC" to "TWC"*
Result: *No results listed*
Action: *No actions listed*

<u>Goal 4 – Enhance external recognition of quality</u>

Objective 1: *Perhaps add "to external constituents" to make consistent with goal*
Result: *Since the objective was not to earn grants and achieve accomplishments, but rather to identify and "externally" promote those earned/achieved: How was Dr. Quast's accomplishment identified and promoted outside of this document?*
Action: *Perhaps indicate how the department will "continue to promote…"*

<u>Plan for Continuous Improvement</u>

Remove "ttment" from document
Update language for 2013 AACSB standards definitions of faculty categories

<u>General Comments</u>

The assessment is understandable and hopefully will reflect positively on the COBA. There are a reasonable number of goals and objectives entered which appear to be appropriate for the department. Most KPI's are aligned with the objectives, but some results and actions are not entered.

Department of General Business and Finance

Goal – *Average. The goal is very generic.*

Objective – *Mostly average. With the objective written in terms of online education, it sounds like face to face is irrelevant.*

KPIs – *Average.*

Criterion – *Poor for most. Using AACSB guidelines is good, however. How does one measure assurance of learning? just saying "support" and "improve" is not clear.*

Findings – *Mostly poor. The results are not measureable. They are stated in non-quantitative terms.*

Action – *Mostly average.*

<u>General Comments</u>

Review of programs! How does the department plan on doing that? Develop online support material – the devil is in the details. How much in advance will the department develop and publish its schedule?

Department of Management and Marketing

Goal 1 – Promote efficient and effective administration within the department

The goal statement is nondescript and only advocates promoting effective administration within the department though the allocation of resources. The statement is so broad that it has no real meaning.

Objective 1: *The goal here seems to be simply having the necessary staff to teach all of the classes required. This does connect to the goal, but seems a somewhat obvious need for any department and not specific to Management and Marketing. While this can be measured, I question the value of this for an accrediting body*

KPI: *Again the statement is self-evident and not specific to Management and Marketing at all. No instruments for measurement are specified.*

Result: *All results are non-specific to Management and Marketing and might be associated with any department or program. There is simply no point in including items like: attempting to keep tenure/tenure track faculty at a 3-3 load or attempting to keep new course preparations low for faculty. While AACSB, and other accrediting agencies do care about course load, this is something that should be specified at the college level rather than the departmental level.*

Action: *Here they bring up the issue of online courses (this is the first mention of the subject in this section) and indicate that efforts will be made to provide additional online course offerings. This, it would seem, contradicts earlier statements in results concerning reducing course preparations, which online course development would require. It should be noted that the authors specify that new positions have been requested and that their search for adjuncts continues at this time. Again, I am not sure that this is something that needs to be specified to an accrediting body. No future plans were outlined. Nothing specific provided here.*

Goal 2 – Promote the development and maintenance of quality academic programs

Again the goal statement here is nondescript advocating for the "goal of providing quality academic programs to our students." This is in no way exclusive to the Management and Marketing Department and might be applied anywhere.

Objective 1: *No objective is stated. Rather, the authors simply indicate, "Programs in the department are reviewed on a regular basis." This statement has no real meaning. What is the "objective" here? The only thing that they are telling us is what they are doing...not what their objective is for doing it. Nothing stated here can be measured and no measurement is specified.*

KPI: *This section notes that departments met to review programs. No instruments or indicators are described.*

Result: *Again, the statement provided is nondescript and somewhat meaningless. They simply state that, "Recommendations resulted from the meetings." This does not tell an accrediting body anything useful.*

Action: *Here the authors specify that changes were made to programs based on the recommendations provided...but they do not specify what those changes were. This gives the accrediting body nothing to review. No future plans are outlined.*

7

NOTE: Rather than specify a new section, the authors simply lay out a new objective here. One would assume that this new objective and all subject matter relating to it also relates back to one of the "goals" listed previously. However, it is confusing which goal might apply.

Objective 2: *No real objective statement made. Rather the authors simply note that funds will be used in a manner consistent with maintaining AQ and PQ faculty. I would also note here that AACSB is no longer making use of this terminology. Nothing stated here can be measured and no measurement is specified.*

KPI: *This statement simply indicates that the department will spend an unspecified amount on the faculty for 2013-2014. This is nondescript and also dated.*

Result: *The only statement made here is that the money allocated will be spent. Also note that the verb tense for the statement is wrong.*

Action: *This statement is the most descriptive offered and notes where monies were spent, for what, and where documentation can be found. This statement is good. No future plans are outlined.*

Objective 3*: This is a restatement of the exact statements made for the Human Resource Deployment section applicable to Management and Marketing previously described in this document. As the sections are virtually identical, statements made in the previous section also apply here.*

<u>Goal 3 – Recruit and retain a high-quality faculty</u>

Objective 1: *Basically a restatement of the "goal" noted above. Nothing of value specified here. Nothing stated here can be measured and no measurement is specified.*

Result: *"Three new faculty were hired". Using the authors' own criteria for selecting candidates, this statement gives no indication of the quality of the candidates selected or even their educational background*

Action: *No action step is noted in this section.*

Objective 2: *This is a restatement of the exact statements made for the Human Resource Deployment section applicable to Management and Marketing previously described in this document. As the sections are virtually identical, statements made in the previous section also apply here.*

Objective 3: *This is a restatement of the exact statements made for the Faculty Development section applicable to Management and Marketing previously described in this document. As the sections are virtually identical, statements made in the previous section also apply here.*

<u>Goal 4 – Student professional and academic success</u>

Objective 1: *"Provide financial support for student organizations and projects within the department". (Note that nothing here appears measurable. How would this be quantified?)*

 KPI: *The authors simply note here that they will provide support for students through faculty sponsorship. No indications of instruments for measurement are noted, and no process is outlined. No detail provided*

Result: *Here the authors simply note that money was spent on students in competitions off campus. Again, no details are provided and no data presented. It appears that no real measurement took place.*

Action: *This is a restatement of the "Results" section with slightly more detail in that the cities students visited are specified. No next steps are outlined*

Objective 2: *This is a restatement of the exact statements made for the Human Resource Deployment section applicable to Management and Marketing previously described in this document. As the sections are virtually identical, statements made in the previous section also apply here.*

Objective 3: *This is a restatement of the exact statements made in the earlier Program Review sections previously described in this document. As the sections are virtually identical, statements made in the previous section also apply here.*

<div align="center">Plan for Continuous Improvement</div>

Plans outlined for expansion of APICS and encouraging students to engage in COBA activities and programs. Overall, this is an effective statement but no PLAN is outlined at all for how this will be achieved. Further, as the document makes several reference to the 2013-2014 academic year, this information is dated and no data for the achievement of this plan is provided.

<div align="center">General Comments</div>

The deployment of human resources, program review, faculty development, and support for student organization objectives are succinctly written and backed by relevant measures taken within the department.

The report references a local APICS chapter, and the department's goal to increase participation in it, but provides no information about the organization itself. I'm of the belief that the report should be a bit more "stand-alone" in this regard.

On more than one instance, the same performance indicator, result, and action appears under numerous goals, which creates the appearance of redundancy within the report. Much of the information underneath one goal was simply copied & pasted to other goals.

The report itself is eight pages long, but there is only about three pages of unique information within it. Based on this, I do not feel that this report should be given to an outside reviewer as an example of model work.

The number of goals and objectives are reasonable, but there is some confusion in how some things could be measured. Program review objective and KPI associated with it are both vague. No update for continuous improvement.

<div align="center">**Professional Golf Management (PGM) Program**</div>

Goal – *Excellent. 1st sentence in goal – should it read "…20 PGA Golf Management programs" rather than "…20 PGA Golf Management universities"?*

Objective – *Excellent. Should the first objective read "…PGA golf management professionals" rather than "…PGA members"? Major issue: Objective has NO indicator and associated criterion for performance in the academic program, unless that is embedded somewhere in the level 1, 2, & 3 criterion. If it is, then it needs to be clearly labelled and described using academic metrics – credit hours, GPA, etc.*

Indicator – *Excellent.*

Criterion – *Excellent for playing ability test and internship. Unacceptable for PGA educational program.*

Findings – *Excellent for playing ability test and internship. Unacceptable for PGA educational program. On the finding for the PAT pass rates – do we know the specific ranking as opposed to saying "ranks highly amongst other PGA…"?*

Action – *Excellent for playing ability test and internship. Unacceptable for PGA educational program.*

Plan for Continuous Improvement

Not clear what the following sentence means, "The program will also continue to find ways to enhance the classroom experience for our students when conveying the learning outcomes of the PGA's educational curriculum."

Instructions for PCI asks us to detail the elements of previous PCI that were implemented, and if not implemented why? However, this was not done. Need to outline the program.

Instructions for PCI also ask to detail plan moving forward in the last section. Perhaps use wording such as, "In 2014-1015, the successful initiative we now have in place will be supplemented with the following enhancements and new actions. Then number the actions.

General Comments

PCI is basically the same from one period to the next. The PCI program needs additional work.

On the internship experience criterion, it talks about a detailed evaluation. Is this evaluation scored in any way? What must be achieved for the student to "succeed?" In the finding section on internship evaluation, it says student evaluations and host evaluations "will be compared…" Since this is a finding, should it read the evaluations "have been compared…" Or is this process not in place yet? If it is not, how else has "success" been measured or documented?

On the retention result, there needs to be a major discussion of the 36% two-year retention rates. Why are we losing so many? Is this common in PGA programs? In the PCI section, this should be addressed.

Gibson D. Lewis Center for Business Research and Economic Development

Goal 1 – Support COBA faculty

Objective 1: *This part is unclear: "…engage in research activities to(?) external and internal constituencies." Should it be "for external and internal constituencies?"*

KPI: *Research forums: notes that feedback is provided by those in attendance at forums. Will they be questioned about the nature of the feedback? Not in results.*

Goal 2 – Promote faculty expertise

"To provide the means for COBA faculty to share its expertise." Share expertise with who? Everyone? Colleagues in COBA?

Objective 1 – *No specific comments for this objective.*

<div align="center">Goal 3 – Build COBA image</div>

Objective 1: *Since the journal is being listed under this goal (build COBA image) which relates to external constituents, perhaps add the journal to Goal 2 indicators?*

Objective 2 – *No specific comments for this objective.*

<div align="center">Plan for Continuous Improvement</div>

Simply continuing to publish the journal twice a year: How is this an improvement? Perhaps improve by increasing readership or number of submissions?

<div align="center">General Comments</div>

This assessment was understandable, sensible, professional, and hopefully will reflect positively on the college.

KPI results – skilled personnel to perform economic impact studies relates to KPI indicator, but not as well to objective of publishing economic impact studies.

No specific details on the implementation of actions including items such as dates, resources needed, and individuals responsible.

<div align="center">**Small Business Development Center**</div>

Goals – *Acceptable. Only one goal. Goals and objectives may be confused – some objectives may be better goals.*

Objectives – *Acceptable. Objective 6 (impact clients) needs improvement.*

KPIs – *Acceptable. Objective 5 (total clients) – indicator is 158, but the results achieved are 434. The difference between numbers in indicator and results need explanation.*

Findings – *Acceptable.*

Action – *Acceptable. Not required on objective 1 as the objective was met.*

This program has one goal and six objectives.

1) Do you understand what is being assessed, why it is being assessed and how it is being assessed?

Yes, these three aspects are clear for the most part. I think the role of the consultants should be explained a little better in the performance indicator of the first and fifth objective.

2) Do the findings, actions, and plans for continuous improvement make sense?

Yes.

3) Is the assessment written such that it is understandable and looks professional?

Yes. My only minor suggestion is mentioned in the first point above.

4) If an outside reviewer (SACS, AACSB, etc) saw this assessment report, would it be something COBA is proud of showing?

Yes.

<div align="center">General Comments</div>

There is an overlap between objective 5 (total clients) and 6 (impact clients) – the difference between the two is unclear. Objective 5 – total clients – is a little unclear. Is this the total identified? the total contacted? the total enrolled? the total served? Objective 6 – impact clients – is a little unclear. Does impact refer to client success? to clients being educated? to contact hours with clients? The KPI seems to indicate impact is contact hours, but is this truly impact?

<div align="center">**Business Foundation**</div>

One goal (Basic knowledge and competency in subject areas essential to all business professionals) and three objectives (Core areas of business knowledge, effective oral and written communication, essential critical thinking and problem solving skills) are included.

Basic Knowledge and Competency in Subject Areas Essential To All Business Professionals:

Goal: Excellent goal statement outlining why the curriculum exists: So that business students have fundamental knowledge of multiple business disciplines-not just the one in which they specialize.

Objective: Students must demonstrate competency in: accounting, business statistics, business law, economics, marketing and management information systems. This statement is very specific outlining each area of importance to be measured. This relates effectively to the goal statement and is effective. This connects very well to the indicator described below which provides for measurement of the concepts.

NOTE: Based on the Goal and Objective outlined above, the authors then present each area of importance in the following order: Accounting, Finance, Marketing, Business Law, Management Information Systems, Management, Business Statistics, Economics. After this some additional elements are included such as: Operations Management Business Knowledge, Business Communication, and Critical Thinking and Problem Solving (Note that these areas were not specified in the "Objective" and they will need to be if they are to be included here).

It should also be noted that each area should be presented in the order that is specified in the "Objective", as this will add clarity for the reader.

Indicator: Common questions in final exams across all sections are embedded in the final exams of the courses listed (exceptions to this include: Business Communication and Business Statistics which will be discussed below.) These questions provide the data needed for measurement and assessment. Note that the language used here is very effective and easily understood.

Criterion: Criteria are specified in that the number of correct responses to the common questions used for each objective is then divided by the number of attempts. A score is then specified as necessary for objective attainment (Note that this score changes between areas, but it is always specified and easy for the reader to locate).

Findings: Data for each area is then specified in detail with actual calculations and scores reported. This is very effective and easy to follow for the reader giving the accrediting body the exact information needed. The only issue is that the data included is from 2013 and needs to be updated as soon as possible.

NOTE: The authors chose to present each area in the manner described here. Each was equally effective and used the procedure specified above. It should be noted that "Actions" for each area were not presented until the end of the report.

Actions: For each area the findings are summarized including the percentage of students attaining the minimum standard for each criteria. Additionally, the percentage for the previous year is presented giving the reader some indication longitudinal analysis. It should also be noted that a plan for improving scores is consistently presented focused on improving scores of any students who do not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable knowledge. I would note here that these sections are excellent and easy to follow and understand.

EXCEPTION AREAS:

There were three areas that did not follow the standardized reporting used for Business Foundation: Business Communication, and Business Statistics.   For these areas no "Findings" are included. This should be included in future reporting.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

A detailed plan for continuous improvement is presented including the following elements: Increased data collection from a greater number of courses, and alteration to existing business communication courses in order to improves student abilities in grammar/mechanics and continent/organization.

The information included here is also a bit dated, but it is very detailed outlining the exact approach that is to be taken in order to solve existing problems and how assessment will take place in the future.

NOTE: Overall this is an excellent example of what this type of assessment should look like.

1.   *Do you understand what is being assessed, why it is being assessed, and how it is being assessed?*

       It is clear that the goal of the business foundation is that graduating students have a fundamental knowledge of multiple business disciplines, not just their selected major. The business foundation disciplines include accounting, business statistics, business law, economics, finance, management, marketing and management information systems.

       Common questions are embedded in the final exams of multiple sections of ACCT 2301, ACCT 2302, FINC 3320, MKTG 3310, BUAD 2301, BUAD 3335, MGIS 3310, MGMT 4370, BANA 2372, BANA 3363, ECON 2301, ECON 2302

       The what, why and how are all fairly clear across all disciplines.

2.   *Do the findings, actions, and plan for continuous improvement make sense?*

There are no published findings for FINC 3320. However, I personally wrote two reports over the past two years that summarized the findings for FINC 3320, so I am a bit confused as to why they do not show up here. If it was my job to upload the results to the database, I was unaware.

There are no published findings for BUAD 2301.

There are no published findings for MGIS 3310.

3.   *Is the assessment written in such that it is understandable and looks professional?*

On the whole, the best written piece belongs to ACCT, however, the best "findings" section belongs to BANA and ECON. All others are quite ordinary. Below is a table indicating the disciplines that satisfied/did not satisfy all assessment requirements.

1 = satisfied
0 = not satisfied

	ACCT	FINC	MKTG	BUAD	MGIS	MGMT	BANA	ECON
Goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Objective	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Indicator	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Criterion	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Findings	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1
Actions	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
Improvement	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0

4.   *If an outside reviewer (SACS, AACSB, etc.) saw this assessment report, would it be something COBA is proud of showing?*

Of my four reviews, I assign a # 3 ranking to Business Foundation.

<u>General comments</u>

Why are there different percentages throughout the criteria (60%, 70%, 75%)? Is there some reason for the different levels of comprehension in each area? In some places it is hard to follow the line of reasoning from the objective to the finding because the indicator/criterion is confusing. It's not clear if some criterion were met because several findings are not entered. Lots of action items missing. The plan for continuous improvement is weak.

Bachelor of Business Administration in Accounting

<u>Goal 1 – Functional competencies for entry into the accounting profession</u>
Only one goal. Should there be five? Should the examples be the objectives?

Objective 1 Decision-making competency:

Goal Statement: Strong. Broad enough to cover the entire degree yet with enough specifics to set up the objectives.

Objectives: Again these are strong. They are well connected to the goal statement and provide a context for measurement.

Indicator (Decision Making): This is appropriate in that it gives some measure of flexibility for the instructor in determining what measures are appropriate for the course. Also I like that results are then tabulated by the Assessment Committee.

Criterion (Decision Making): The problem with this section is that it falls to the individual instructor to "determine a minimal acceptable score for each indicator". The argument made for this in this section indicates that it is necessary due to the different kinds of indicators that the instructor might choose. I don't see the connection here. It should not matter what indicator is chosen by the instructor, the score necessary to show competence needs to be standardized for that particular indicator. Failing to do so equates to findings that are not generalizable, and that produces findings for the department that are somewhat meaningless.

It should be noted that there is also a lack of specificity in this section concerning the level of expected attainment for objective achievement. In other words, how would we KNOW that objectives have been met?

Additionally, there is no information provided in this section concerning how the criterion was established.

The "finding" that was added which details how the percentages are calculated for the eventual finding is fine and would be appropriate if the criterion section is fixed.

Finding (Decision Making): This would be fine if the above criterion section is fixed. It is clear and well presented.

Action (Decision Making): This section seems to simply accept the status quo. It indicates that the findings meet the minimum standard and were the same as last year, so no changes are suggested. However, this still leaves 22% of students who are not meeting the necessary competency levels. If I were looking at this blindly, I would immediately wonder why no effort is being made to improve the competency rate. In other words, how are we going to reach the 22% we missed when we do this next time?

Objective 2 Risk analysis competency:

Objective: Second comma in first parenthetical statement is not necessary. In final sentence, "professional's" needs an apostrophe.

Overall section is effective. I like the inclusion of the specific measurable examples here, as I think it makes the section come alive.

Question: In the first example given, is it necessary to specify that fraud is included? This seemed automatic to me, particularly in light of the previous section when it is mentioned.

NOTE: All remaining sections are essentially identical to those presented in the other competency sections. Thus, my comments are also identical and applicable to each section.

Indicator: This is appropriate in that it gives some measure of flexibility for the instructor in determining what measures are appropriate for the course. Also I like that results are then tabulated by the Assessment Committee.

Criterion: The problem with this section is that it falls to the individual instructor to "determine a minimal acceptable score for each indicator". The argument made for this in this section indicates that it is necessary due to the different kinds of indicators that the instructor might choose. I don't see the connection here. It should not matter what indicator is chosen by the instructor, the score necessary to show competence needs to be standardized for that particular indicator. Failing to do so equates to findings that are not generalizable, and that produces findings for the department that are somewhat meaningless.

It should be noted that there is also a lack of specificity in this section concerning the level of expected attainment for objective achievement. In other words, how would we KNOW that objectives have been met?

Additionally, there is no information provided in this section concerning how the criterion was established.

The "finding" that was added which details how the percentages are calculated for the eventual finding is fine and would be appropriate if the criterion section is fixed.

Finding: This would be fine if the above criterion section is fixed. It is clear and well presented.

Action: This section seems to simply accept the status quo. If I were looking at this blindly, I would immediately wonder why no effort is being made to improve the competency rate. In other words, how are we going to reach the students we missed when we do this next time?

Objective 3 Leveraging technology to develop and enhance functional competencies:

Question: In the initial goal statement, this criterion is presented last in the list. Yet, here it is third in the list. Is there a reason for this? Regardless, either the order should be changed in the goal statement or this section should be moved to the end.

Objective: This is solid. I like the emphasis on technology here, and I think a solid argument for its importance is made.

The only issue I have is with the second example given: *Assess the risk of technology and automated business processes.* I honestly do not know what that means. I think this one needs some level of clarification for the reader.

NOTE: All remaining sections are essentially identical to those presented in the other competency sections. Thus, my comments are also identical and applicable to each section.

Indicator: This is appropriate in that it gives some measure of flexibility for the instructor in determining what measures are appropriate for the course. Also I like that results are then tabulated by the Assessment Committee.

Criterion: The problem with this section is that it falls to the individual instructor to "determine a minimal acceptable score for each indicator". The argument made for this in this section indicates that it is necessary due to the different kinds of indicators that the instructor might choose. I don't see the connection here. It should not matter what indicator is chosen by the instructor, the score necessary to show competence needs to be standardized for that particular indicator. Failing to do so equates to findings that are not generalizable, and that produces findings for the department that are somewhat meaningless.

It should be noted that there is also a lack of specificity in this section concerning the level of expected attainment for objective achievement. In other words, how would we KNOW that objectives have been met?

Additionally, there is no information provided in this section concerning how the criterion was established.

The "finding" that was added which details how the percentages are calculated for the eventual finding is fine and would be appropriate if the criterion section is fixed.

Finding: This would be fine if the above criterion section is fixed. It is clear and well presented.

Action: This section seems to simply accept the status quo. If I were looking at this blindly, I would immediately wonder why no effort is being made to improve the competency rate. In other words, how are we going to reach the students we missed when we do this next time?

Objective 4 Measurement competency:

Objective: This is solid. No changes needed.

NOTE: All remaining sections are essentially identical to those presented in the other competency sections. Thus, my comments are also identical and applicable to each section.

Indicator: This is appropriate in that it gives some measure of flexibility for the instructor in determining what measures are appropriate for the course. Also I like that results are then tabulated by the Assessment Committee.

Criterion: The problem with this section is that it falls to the individual instructor to "determine a minimal acceptable score for each indicator". The argument made for this in this section indicates that it is necessary due to the different kinds of indicators that the instructor might choose. I don't see the connection here. It should not matter what indicator is chosen by the instructor, the score necessary to show competence needs to be standardized for that particular indicator. Failing to do so equates to findings that are not generalizable, and that produces findings for the department that are somewhat meaningless.

It should be noted that there is also a lack of specificity in this section concerning the level of expected attainment for objective achievement. In other words, how would we KNOW that objectives have been met?

Additionally, there is no information provided in this section concerning how the criterion was established.

The "finding" that was added which details how the percentages are calculated for the eventual finding is fine and would be appropriate if the criterion section is fixed.

Finding: This would be fine if the above criterion section is fixed. It is clear and well presented.

Action: This section seems to simply accept the status quo. If I were looking at this blindly, I would immediately wonder why no effort is being made to improve the competency rate. In other words, how are we going to reach the students we missed when we do this next time?

<center>Objective 5 Reporting competency:</center>

Objective: This looks fine. I particularly appreciate the detail provided by the examples you include of potential communication episodes and their relevance.

NOTE: All remaining sections are essentially identical to those presented in the other competency sections. Thus, my comments are also identical and applicable to each section.

Indicator: This is appropriate in that it gives some measure of flexibility for the instructor in determining what measures are appropriate for the course. Also I like that results are then tabulated by the Assessment Committee.

Criterion: The problem with this section is that it falls to the individual instructor to "determine a minimal acceptable score for each indicator". The argument made for this in this section indicates that it is necessary due to the different kinds of indicators that the instructor might choose. I don't see the connection here. It should not matter what indicator is chosen by the instructor, the score necessary to show competence needs to be standardized for that particular indicator. Failing to do so equates to findings that are not generalizable, and that produces findings for the department that are somewhat meaningless.

It should be noted that there is also a lack of specificity in this section concerning the level of expected attainment for objective achievement. In other words, how would we KNOW that objectives have been met?

Additionally, there is no information provided in this section concerning how the criterion was established.

The "finding" that was added which details how the percentages are calculated for the eventual finding is fine and would be appropriate if the criterion section is fixed.

Finding: This would be fine if the above criterion section is fixed. It is clear and well presented.

Action: This section seems to simply accept the status quo. If I were looking at this blindly, I would immediately wonder why no effort is being made to improve the competency rate. In other words, how are we going to reach the students we missed when we do this next time?

NOTE: While I appreciate the efforts of standardization, I would note that the language used in many of the sections is identical across the various competencies. While this makes it easy to follow, I wonder if we are risking being a bit too "cookie cutter" here. In other words, does it look like we are just simply doing the same thing over and over to simply complete the assessment without giving any real thought to it? How will this appear to an outside party?

<u>Plan for continuous improvement</u>

This section essentially says very little. The only real statements made indicate that there is a plan for continued assessment and that some changes (not detailed) **could** be implemented to increase this emphasis. No data is provided to show improvement from one year to the next (save under "Decision Making" in which it is stated that no changes were noted). This section does little to indicate how improvement will be achieved or even if one could expect that it might be attempted.

Appendices:

The meeting minutes included were interesting and seem to address my central complaint as outlined in the sections above: that each instructor has too much control on determining minimum acceptable scores and determining their own assessment practices. It is noted that there are efforts to **try** to fix this by fall of 2014, but no real plan is specified. This leads the reader to wonder if such a plan exists and how it would work in light of the current assessment practices as outlined in the previous sections. If a plan is in place, it needs to be detailed here AND the previous sections should reflect that changes are in the works.

The additional appendices indicating what sections assess each particular competency are interesting and informative. They should be retained.

1.   *Do you understand what is being assessed, why it is being assessed, and how it is being assessed?*

   It is made clear that that proficiency in decision modeling, risk analysis, measurement, reporting, and leveraging technology are the most important goals for graduating students with a BBA in Accounting. Examples of each type of goal are provided along with how the department plans on assessing performance.

2.   *Do the findings, actions, and plan for continuous improvement make sense?*

   There appears to be too much autonomy awarded to the faculty member in the assessment process. On the surface, there is little uniformity across professors/sections to make any real sense of the output data. For instance, the assessment process reads "In each course, the instructor will determine a minimal acceptable score for each indicator used for assessment in that class. This minimal acceptable score may very both across classes as well as inside a particular class. This variability is necessary due to the different type of indicators (exam questions, projects, cases, and/or problem assignments) used to assess students' achievement". If the objective to use the data to help make decisions, the data needs to have more structure.

   Stated differently, the findings are simple "success ratios", which are calculated as the percentage of successful student attempts. However, a successful attempt in one section may not constitute a successful attempt in another.

3.   *Is the assessment written in such that it is understandable and looks professional?*

The assessment report itself is nicely written and professional.

4.   *If an outside reviewer (SACS, AACSB, etc.) saw this assessment report, would it be something COBA is proud of showing?*

Of my four reviews, I assign a # 1 ranking to Accounting.

<u>General comments</u>

Indicators are not clear in terms of what measures what. Criterion percentages are OK. The statement, "Each instructor will determine acceptable score" is vague. Is it consistent across instructors? On findings, is decision-modeling only at the junior level? Why are findings combined in some cases and not in others? Do the findings only include accounting majors or everyone in the class?

There doesn't seem to be a clear tie between the objective, indicator, criterion and finding. Plan for continuous improvement is very basic.

Bachelor of Business Administration in Banking and Financial Institutions

Goals - *Acceptable*

Objectives - *Acceptable*

Indicator - *Acceptable*

Criterion - *Acceptable*

Findings - *Acceptable*

Action - *Acceptable*

This program has five goals and three objectives.

1) Do you understand what is being assessed, why it is being assessed and how it is being assessed? Yes, these three aspects are clear.

2) Do the findings, actions, and plans for continuous improvement make sense?

Yes, it is clear that a writing component is the next step in the assessment. It is my guess that this would be an evaluation of the first objective but it would be ideal to make this clear in the report.

3) Is the assessment written such that it is understandable and looks professional?

Yes. My only minor suggestion is to include a sample case study since two out of the three objectives are evaluated with case studies.

4) If an outside reviewer (SACS, AACSB, etc) saw this assessment report, would it be something COBA is proud of showing?

Yes.

This assessment is well-written.

Bachelor of Business Administration in Economics

Goal – *Poor. Goal was "generic" and not stated "broadly." that is, stating that a BBA in Economics must know economics is obvious.*

Objective – *Above average. Objectives should be reworded – instead of saying "students should…" say "students will…" On the finding for objective (students should be able to analyze data), there is no conclusion from the results of students not internalizing the lessons taught in BANA 2372.*

Indicators – *Above average for most. Indicator used in ECON 2302 was above average. The indicator for the data analysis assessment is not clear. Are the results from ECON 3357 and ECON 4357 just economics majors or all students in the classes? There were 38 students in ECON 3357 and 75 students in ECON 4357.*

Criterion – *Poor for ECON 3373 and ECON 4340; Above average for ECON 3357 and ECON 4357; Excellent for ECON 2302.*

Findings – *Poor for ECON 3373 and ECON 4340; Above average for ECON 3357 and ECON 4357; Excellent for ECON 2302. Finding for objective (students should be familiar with macroeconomic concepts) only uses 3 questions. This seems insufficient to assess this body of knowledge.*

Action – *Above average for most. Indicator used in ECON 2302 was above average. On the action item for objective (students should be able to analyze data), how will adding more data analysis courses increase proficiency when they aren't getting it now? Enhance current course instruction/support.*

Plan for Continuous Improvement

There is a suggestion to include a more traditional econometrics course into the curriculum. Why do we believe students will demonstrate greater success on econometrics which requires even more higher-order quantitative skills?

General Comments

Good structure. Well-ordered and easy to follow. Slight inconsistencies that are easily addressed. Only real issue is the exhibits. Each should be clearly numbered and labelled with a very brief explanation of what it is. In the document, reference which exhibit contains the evidence supporting the analysis and finding. Use the write up of the Fall 2013 Micro Principles assessment as a template for the others. Well done. The others, less so.

ECON 3357 should have been used for assessing Microeconomics concepts. ECON 2302 includes all majors. Assessing the previous course students took is not appropriate to assess what the current course is teaching. No need to assess Data Analysis in two different courses.

Recommendation: State goals so they can be operationalized (e.g., students should understand macroeconomic concepts, microeconomic concepts, data analysis, and international economics).

On the findings for macroeconomics objective, three questions were used. Are they essay questions or multiple choice questions? Only 18 students took the exam – are these all economics majors? On the findings for microeconomics objective, assessed all students and not just the economics majors. Why would the results be considered representative of just the economics students?

Bachelor of Business Administration in Entrepreneurship

Goals – *Acceptable. Goal 1, objective 1 (self-evaluation) – N is missing and number of imbedded questions is also missing. Objective 6 (cost control) – unmet expectations. How will "increased instruction" be operationalized? Goal 2 (critical thinking) was achieved through "group projects." Why not assess this through individual projects in order to avoid free riding? Satisfaction goal, measured by IDEA score, seems odd. IDEA scores don't necessarily indicate satisfaction, but rather than students' perception of the teacher, course, and progress on IDEA goals – which may be very different from the assessment goals.*

Objectives – *Acceptable. Lots of objectives for goal 1 (10 total). Are this many objectives necessary? They seem like very good objectives, but there are a lot.*

Indicators – *Acceptable. Embedded questions are OK, but there is no information on how many questions or how many students. On group projects and teams, how do you separate the individual student's work from that of the group?*

Criterion – *Acceptable.*
Findings – *Acceptable.*
Action – *Acceptable.*

This program has five goals and 18 objectives.

1) Do you understand what is being assessed, why it is being assessed and how it is being assessed?

Yes, these three aspects are clear for the most part. I think the type of embedded questions used should be explained a little further in each objective. Are they multiple choice, essay type, problems, etc.? Are professor using the same rubric for essays? I have a similar concern for the indicators where students are required to complete cases or problem to solve.

2) Do the findings, actions, and plans for continuous improvement make sense?

Yes.

3) Is the assessment written such that it is understandable and looks professional?

Yes.

4) If an outside reviewer (SACS, AACSB, etc) saw this assessment report, would it be something COBA is proud of showing?

Yes.

There is no information about the number of students assessed. I understand projects requiring computer competency were used to assess computer competency, but if computer skills are not taught in entrepreneurship courses, shouldn't the assessments occur in MGIS courses? or the courses that teach the specific Microsoft skills used in entrepreneurship classes? For example, if students don't already know computer skills, having a demonstration of computer competency (action item for capable communicator goal) doesn't seem sufficient. Extracurricular activity goal was unmet – 30% success rate.

Bachelor of Business Administration in Finance

Goal – *Poor. Goal is not well defined. It sounds like BBA's in finance need to only know how to use formulas.*

Objective – *Average.*
Indicator – *Average.*

Criterion – *Average.*

Findings – *FINC 4345 Average. FINC 4390 Poor.*

Action – *FINC 4345 Average. FINC 4390 Poor.*

General Comments

A second goal was stated for the BBA; not sure if it is "decision making" or "finance". Not sure why information from the IDEA form is included in the assessment of BBA in Finance. The attachment was good and had a lot of detail. This assessment was not very good. The assessment standards are very low, and the method used to asses was not very good.

The assessment does not tell the number of students who were assessed. More information should be included in the objective on core qualitative concepts and principles. The criterion for this objective is confusing and needs more information. IDEA should not be part of the major assessment. Need to separate finance majors from other students.

Assessment results are not really used to plan for continuous improvement.

Bachelor of Business Administration in General Business

Goal 1 – Capable communicators and decision makers

Objective 1 – writing competency
In finding, be consistent in spelling out or writing number and percent (forty-five percent vs. 50%).

Objective 2 – speaking competency
Note if there are no findings because this has not been implemented yet. Note this will be implemented in a future semester, if applicable.

Objective 3 – learning objectives
Poorly worded sentence stressing the need for effective communication. Are these bulleted points the KPI or part of the objective? Need to add indicator, finding/result, and action.

Goal 2 – capable business decision makers
Course references at end of sentence is confusing (if you don't know that they are course reference numbers – and I didn't until I read the rest of this section). Goal doesn't match bold goal title. Perhaps reword "The goal of the General Business program is to develop capable business decision makers by providing students with a broad base of knowledge in business." Since all three objectives under this goal relate to Business law courses or concepts, perhaps complete sentence to indicate providing students with a broad base of knowledge in "business legal concepts?"

Objective 1 – general business core concepts and principles
Indicator a – Remove BUAD 3355 at end, but include both course references in paragraph along with title of course. Remove course reference at end of paragraph. Move first paragraph to indicator section or delete. Move last sentence to Action. No actions noted. Move action from bottom of p. 6 to top of p. 7. Indicator b – add course title. Repetitive information in criterion from indicator at top of p. 6 – suggest deleting. First paragraph repetitive – suggest deleting. A lot of data provided, making it difficult to pull out relevant information.

Goal 3 – General business student satisfaction

Objective 1 – General business effective instruction
On indicator, does this refer to each GBA faculty member or just one course for all faculty? On finding, move first paragraph to Criterion. Add s to "course" in second paragraph.

Plan for Continuous Improvement

Plan for continuous improvement (2013-2014) is identical to "previous cycle."

General Comments

If I were to rank these assessments, General Business Administration would come in second to the others I evaluated.
The third objective under the capable communicator goal is by itself with no indicator, criterion, finding or action. The findings are a little confusing. There are no findings on oral communication; there are typos throughout the OATdb entries (interesting given the goals of effective written communication); and it looks like GBA and non-GBA majors are all included together.
The Previous cycle of plan for continuous improvement looks like it was copied from one year to the next with very little change. It looks like no real thought was put into the PCI section.

Bachelor of Business Administration in Human Resource Management

Goal Statement: *This is broad to the point of ineffective. All that it states is that the subject is necessary. There is no real way to connect anything to this statement. What are the guiding principles here? It also fails to mention any of the objectives (compensation, benefits, training, staffing, and employee development), which will be assessed.*

Compensation:

Objective: *The objectives are VERY specific and easy to understand. Each is measurable and concrete. The four items listed can easily be measured and this sets up the Indictor section well.*

Indicators: *Easy to understand and simple. The idea is that questions embedded on examination will be the only method of assessment. These, presumably, will be simple to find in the event that they are reviewed. Good work.*

Criterion*: Easy to relate to the indicators and simple to understand and assess. If 70% of the embedded questions are answered correctly, the student makes the cut. Simple to work with and assess.*

Finding: *Question groups are clearly discussed and related to the four objectives. Again, easy to follow and understand.*

Action: *I would like a bit more here. A little more on what instructors are actually going to DO in order to improve student comprehension. Also, I would like some goal setting for performance in future years.*

Benefits:

Objective: *This stands in stark contrast to the way that Compensation was handled. I think that it would be better do list the items as they did in Compensation. This is a bit unclear.*

Criterion: *This is good. Easy to follow and simple. If the embedded questions are answered correctly, the student makes the cut.*

Findings: *No assessment was completed at this time. Assessment to take place in 2014-2015.*

Action: *It states that faculty met to discuss ways to improve student comprehension of material, but if no assessment was done how did they have that discussion in any meaningful way. Again I would like to see some goals for performance set and an outline of metrics for achievement of those goals.*

NOTE: *This section needs significant work. It does not currently say much about what is being assessed or why. It needs to be more specific overall.*

Training:

Objective: *This stands in stark contrast to the way that Compensation was handled. I think that it would be better do list the items as they did in Compensation. This is a bit unclear.*

Criterion: *This is good. Easy to follow and simple. If the embedded questions are answered correctly, the student makes the cut.*

Findings: *No assessment was completed at this time. Assessment to take place in 2014-2015.*

Action: *It states that faculty met to discuss ways to improve student comprehension of material, but if no assessment was done how did they have that discussion in any meaningful way. Again I would like to see some goals for performance set and an outline of metrics for achievement of those goals.*

NOTE: *This section needs significant work. It does not currently say much about what is being assessed or why. It needs to be more specific overall.*

Staffing:

Objective: *This stands in stark contrast to the way that Compensation was handled. I think that it would be better do list the items as they did in Compensation. This is a bit unclear.*

Criterion: *This is good. Easy to follow and simple. If the embedded questions are answered correctly, the student makes the cut.*

Findings: *No assessment was completed at this time. Assessment to take place in 2014-2015.*

Action: *It states that faculty met to discuss ways to improve student comprehension of material, but if no assessment was done how did they have that discussion in any meaningful way. Again I would like to see some goals for performance set and an outline of metrics for achievement of those goals.*

NOTE: *This section needs significant work. It does not currently say much about what is being assessed or why. It needs to be more specific overall.*

Employee Development:

Objective: *This stands in stark contrast to the way that Compensation was handled. I think that it would be better do list the items as they did in Compensation. This is a bit unclear.*

Criterion: *This is good. Easy to follow and simple. If the embedded questions are answered correctly, the student makes the cut.*

Findings: *No assessment was completed at this time. Assessment to take place in 2014-2015.*

Action*: It states that faculty met to discuss ways to improve student comprehension of material, but if no assessment was done how did they have that discussion in any meaningful way. Again I would like to see some goals for performance set and an outline of metrics for achievement of those goals.*

NOTE: *This section needs significant work. It does not currently say much about what is being assessed or why. It needs to be more specific overall.*

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

I like the outline of what is going to be done in the next year.

In the section in which the respondents are asked elements of the previous PFCI that were implemented, the respondents response is too simplistic and does not outline what measures were used and how effective they were. This is the heart of the question. The bottom line is that Compensation was assessed and the details need to be provided.

 Details for the PFCI for 2014-2015 are not provided. These should be presented in detail.

1.	*Do you understand what is being assessed, why it is being assessed, and how it is being assessed?*

	The Human Resource Management department writes about assessing 1) Compensation 2) Benefits 3) Staffing and 4) Employee Development.

2.	*Do the findings, actions, and plan for continuous improvement make sense?*

	The only topic that has thus far been assessed and has any findings is Compensation. All the other topics indicate that assessment will occur in the next academic year (2014-2015).

	In each of the four areas that are to be assessed, the criterion reads…

"70% of students in Principles of Management will answer 70% of embedded questions from a common question set correctly"

Are only 70% of the common questions being used? Does the faculty member have the autonomy to choose which 70%? If so, this creates subsequent problems associated with using the data to make decisions.

3. *Is the assessment written in such that it is understandable and looks professional?*

   The assessment report is written fairly well, however, there is not much substance considering only one of four topics has any findings to evaluate.

4. *If an outside reviewer (SACS, AACSB, etc.) saw this assessment report, would it be something COBA is proud of showing?*

   Of my four reviews, I assign a # 4 ranking to Human Resource Management.

<u>General Comments</u>

Only one course is used under compensation objective (compensation course – no number), but it says embedded questions in multiple courses will be used. Compensation action says HR faculty met to discuss ways to improve student comprehension of the material, but what are the ways? They're not listed in the document. On benefits, it looks like a principles of management course was used to assess this objective. Why wasn't an HR course used? Also, even though benefits was not assessed, will HR majors be separated from all other majors in the principles of management course? The action item for benefits says HR faculty met to discuss ways to improve student comprehension of the material, but the objective was not assessed. These same concerns are repeated in the objectives on staffing and development. The plan for continuous improvement sections don't match between what was hoped to accomplish, what happened, and what will be done in the future.

Bachelor of Business Administration in International Business

Goal – Outstanding program in international business

Objective 1 – Students should understand the impact of the increasing integration of *(misspelled)* the global economy
Finding for objective 1: information about 80%, while good to have, doesn't relate directly to the criterion of at least 70& of students responding correctly to the embedded questions. Action: possibly include the 80% note in the action section and how the remaining 20% that have failed to meet the minimum will be addressed, if at all. The finding doesn't list the number of students or the number of questions.

Objective 2 – Students should understand the financial and economic aspects of conducting business internationally
Criterion 2: economic impact typo. On finding, information about 68%, while good to have, doesn't relate directly to the criterion of 70% of students responding correctly to the embedded questions. Possibly include the 68% note in the Action section and how the remaining 32% that have failed to meet the minimum will be addressed, if at all. Unclear wording about what "increase the time allotment"

means – assume it means class time on teaching the topic. Also typo "MAT will encourage instructors will increase the time allotment." The criterion and finding don't match – the criterion lists four courses that will be used for assessment, but the finding says the questions only came from one course (FINC 4340).

Objective 3 – Students should understand the management and marketing challenges of international business
Inconsistent presentation of MGMT, MKTG 4340 and MGMT/MKTG 432- and class number different. On finding, inconsistent presentation of Objective 3 and Objective three. Why would you consider an objective for an irregularly offered course? Also, wording of "which addressed the objective" seems a bit redundant.

<u>Plan for Continuous Improvement</u>

"The MAT will meet early..." second sentence in first paragraph is unclear.

<u>General Comments</u>

Entire assessment seems like unit went through the motions; each indicator/criterion is essentially the same. The writing style needs some work. It is understandable as it is, but I think it could be written better. There was one term that I would like to see spelled out on the first occurrence (MAT). The findings are somewhat vague.

Bachelor of Business Administration in Management

Goal – Students will obtain a broad base of knowledge of management principles

Objective – Students will understand principles and concepts relating to the planning function of management
The indicator says multiple courses will be used to evaluate student understanding, but the criterion lists only one course – Principles of Management. Should the indicator say multiple courses or multiple sections of one course? The finding seems a little unusual – 75 students in one section of MGMT 3310 answered 41.83% of 8 questions correctly – that's a very low success rate – 3.5 questions out of 8. The action for planning should address the finding, not tell the assessment process.
Finding is not in % form. Unclear if 75 students = 70% of students in principles of management. Also, should clearly state that the learning objective was not met.

Objective – Students will understand principles and concepts relating to the leading function of management

The indicator says multiple courses will be used to evaluate student understanding, but the criterion lists only one course – Principles of Management. Should the indicator say multiple courses or multiple sections of one course? The action for planning should address the finding, not tell the assessment process.

Finding is not in % form. Unclear if 75 students = 70% of students in principles of management. Also, should clearly state that the learning objective was met.

Objective – Students will understand principles and concepts relating to the controlling function of management

The indicator says multiple courses will be used to evaluate student understanding, but the criterion lists only one course – Principles of Management. Should the indicator say multiple courses or multiple sections of one course? There is an action listed, but no data in the finding because no data was collected for this objective.

Objective – Students will understand principles and concepts relating to the organizing function of management
The indicator says multiple courses will be used to evaluate student understanding, but the criterion lists only one course – Principles of Management. Should the indicator say multiple courses or multiple sections of one course? Low success rate – 53.47% (5.3 out of 10 questions). The action for planning should address the finding, not tell the assessment process.

Finding is not in % form. Unclear if 75 students = 70% of students in principles of management. Also, should clearly state that the learning objective was not met.

Plan for Continuous Improvement

Previous cycle plan for continuous improvement says "A multi-year multi-course multi-instructor data collection plan has been developed and will be used to schedule the collection of assessment data across all course in the management major." If this is the case, why is only one course being assessed this year? Also, don't all business majors take Principles of Management? Are you including non-management majors with management majors? Typos in this part of the document. "We will load our long range plan for improvement sometime during AY 2014-2015." Where is it?

General Comments

All objectives read, "Student will understand…" Should objectives use terms such as demonstrate or analyze? As written, it seems unclear how the objectives could be measured.
Actual findings reported are OK, but lack of info for criterion and indicator make it hard to follow from beginning to end. Action needs to address findings. It looks like large chunks of text were copied and pasted throughout.

Bachelor of Business Administration in Management Information Systems

Goal – Management Information Systems – A broad base of knowledge

Objective – Networking

While I understand that this entire paragraph relates to networking, this seems like two objectives (1. understand telecommunications services and networking technologies; 2. installing and managing networks). On the indicator and criterion, again it seems that there should be two separate indicators and two separate criteria for two seeming separate objectives. On criterion, "the class average" refers to which class? the class in parentheses in the indicator? On action section, it is unclear what is meant by the reference to Fall 2017. Does this mean you're not planning to address test question performance until Fall 2017? Finding missing.
Networking objective is confusing. Information systems action, systems analysis and design action is missing.

Objective – Information systems

On criterion, no assessment of change between pre- and post-test? Inconsistent assessment given indicator includes pre-test performance. Who is the target class? the class in parentheses? Doesn't this class (MGIS 3310) include all BBA majors?

Objective – Programming

This seems like two objectives, and the first (analyze and define business problems from a programming perspective) seems like it could not be accomplished until the second (understand basic concepts of programming…) has been. It seems that there should be to separate indicators for two seeming separate objectives. Looks like you need multiple indicators for multiple objectives. Consider moving last sentence in criterion section to Action section. In the criteria, noted, in the first sentence, that the average exam score should be 75%. There are no findings related to this criterion. Again, multiple findings for multiple objectives. Where are the actions "subsequently" described? I'm not sure if that references the next paragraph (which is a nice action plan!) or somewhere later in the document. Finding and action missing. Pretest/posttest is confusing – no discussion of it in criterion or finding, but it's in the heading of the indicator that pre-test and post-test will be used.

Objective – Systems analysis and design

Two objectives, two indicators, two criteria. Finding and action missing

Objective – Database

Wording issue in last sentence of indicator "…reflect performance on two <u>specific</u> learning objectives, <u>specifically</u>…" Last two sentences of criterion should be in Action section. Indicator says pretest and posttest will be used, but criterion says "Students are assumed to have no previous knowledge of database design and…are not given a pretest." Why mention a pretest if one is not given?

<u>Plan for Continuous Improvement</u>

The PCI seems to be well-written.

<u>General Comments</u>

If I were to rank the assessments I evaluated, MIS would be the best. You may want to consider using the MIS assessment as an example for other departments.
Findings were entered for two objectives out of six. Networking not assessed until Fall 2017? There is some confusion over pre-test and post-test reports. Electronic commerce does not have a finding.

Bachelor of Business Administration in Marketing

Goals – *Acceptable. Criterion on objective 1 – average performance on embedded exam questions should be more than 75%.*

Objectives – *Acceptable for objective 1, needs improvement for objective 2. The class average on embedded questions should be 75% consistent with elsewhere. Currently it is 70%. Objective 2 (Students will demonstrate ability to collect and interpret market research data) doesn't match the indicator (Assessment of the understanding of facts – Bloom's taxonomy level 2 – and being able to apply this knowledge to a new situation – Bloom's taxonomy level 3 – will be determined in two ways." How is collecting and interpreting data the same as understanding facts and applying to a new situation?*

Indicators – *Acceptable.*

Criterion – *Acceptable to needs improvement. Nothing about number of students.*

Findings – *Unacceptable. No findings on several objectives. Marketing majors were included with all students in MKTG 3310, so how do you know marketing majors learned what they were supposed to learn? No summary of data in the OATdb file – all data was in the attachments, but it was 15 different things. Kind of hard to follow. All supporting documents were for one objective only.*

Action – *Acceptable. On objective 2, threshold score of 50% while criterion is based on a threshold score of 70%/75%. Action should be consistent with criterion. It's unclear if students are exposed to data analysis since the objective emphasizes on "collect and interpret" market research data.*

This program has one goal and five objectives.

1) Do you understand what is being assessed, why it is being assessed and how it is being assessed?

Yes, these three aspects are clear for the most part. In the second and fourth objectives it would be desirable to show the rubrics used to evaluate the written assignments.

2) Do the findings, actions, and plans for continuous improvement make sense?

Yes, it is clear that a more targeted evaluation of concepts included in MKTG3310 is the next step. The last sentence in the continuous improvement section may be deleted since it refers to the schedule that includes past semesters where assessment did not take place.

3) Is the assessment written such that it is understandable and looks professional?

Yes. My only minor suggestion is mentioned above.

4) If an outside reviewer (SACS, AACSB, etc) saw this assessment report, would it be something COBA is proud of showing?

Overall looks good, it seems that there has been some delays in implementing the assessment that should be explained in the text.

General Comments

Attachment AA doesn't match the description in the narrative. There's a lot of fluff in the attachments about Bloom's taxonomy, quiz, and an entire case study. Overall, the plan for continuous improvement is very basic – probably because only one learning objective is assessed.

Master of Business Administration

Goal – *Acceptable. Only one goal entered.*

Objective – *Acceptable. On objective 1 – is the writing assignment a group project?*

Indicator – *Needs improvement. Objective and indicator are identically worded.*

Criterion – *Acceptable.*

Finding – *Acceptable. Number of students is too low on strategic decision-making objective.*

Action – *needs improvement. Suggest concrete steps to improve students' progress. The action section is weak.*

This program has one goal and three objectives.

1) Do you understand what is being assessed, why it is being assessed and how it is being assessed?

Yes, it is clear. Very minor suggestion: an example of the rubrics used in one assignment may help the reader better understand what and how is being addressed.

2) Do the findings, actions, and plans for continuous improvement make sense?

It is not possible to answer this question at the time because the results from the Graduate Advisory Committee meeting of the Fall 14 were not included in the package.

3) Is the assessment written such that it is understandable and looks professional?

Yes.

4) If an outside reviewer (SACS, AACSB, etc) saw this assessment report, would it be something COBA is proud of showing?

The plan for continuous improvement from the Graduate Advisory Committee should be included in the document to answer this point.

<u>General Comments</u>

Online student performance is better than face to face on the communication objective? Does this objective only include written communication proficiency and not "oral" and "computer skills?" See the communication goal of BBA-entrepreneurship. Plan for continuous improvement is weak.

Master of Science in Accounting

Goal – *Excellent. Only one very broad goal.*

Objective – *Above Average. Five entered. Lots of detail listed in objective, but it's not carried throughout the findings.*

Indicator – *Above average*

Criterion – *Above Average. A little vague considering the detail in the objectives. Why is there information about junior and senior level in the criterion for a master level program?*

Findings – *Above Average*

Action – *Above Average*

<p align="center">General Comments</p>

The objectives met the goals. It's not clear if "measurement" was assessed in any course (ACCT 5311). It is difficult to determine the exact method used to assess the objectives (pretest-posttest, posttest only). Could not determine which courses were used to assess decision modeling, leveraging technology. Used multiple pedagogy (exams, projects, cases, assignments, etc.) for assessment. Recommend making a grid to make sure all the goals are being met at least once in some course. Lots of attachments.

<p align="center">**Master of Science in Project Management**</p>

1. *Do you understand what is being assessed, why it is being assessed, and how it is being assessed?*

   The stated objective is have students distinguish between relevant and non-relevant information regarding a business problem and develop a valid argument in support of a conclusion. This will be assessed using a common rubric, with students receiving a grade of below, meets, or exceeds standards.

2. *Do the findings, actions, and plan for continuous improvement make sense?*

   Findings and actions make sense, however, there are too few data points to make any informed changes semester-by-semester. Might be necessary to aggregate across several years.

3. *Is the assessment written in such that it is understandable and looks professional?*

   This was the most succinctly written piece assigned to me. Everything is clearly stated and well-written. Despite the fact that other assessment reports contained more detail, not much was lost with this report being so succinct.

4. *If an outside reviewer (SACS, AACSB, etc.) saw this assessment report, would it be something COBA is proud of showing?*

   Of my four reviews, I assign a # 2 ranking to Project Management.

Goal: The statement is a bit vague and implies that the degree is more about leadership than management. The two concepts are not entirely mutually exclusive, but a distinction is warranted here. I would also like to see each objective mentioned as a means to facilitate the goal.

Critical Thinking:

Objective: This is a solid overall statement of the elements of critical thinking. It fails to link closely to the goal as outlined here. A closer connection needs to be established. The criterions for critical thinking are clear here and are connected well to the indicator.

Indicator: This is very well done. I like that the rubric used is universal and used by all instructors. Good connection to the elements established in the objective.

Criterion: Well stated and easy to understand. No changes needed. Should be simple to implement via the rubric being used.

Finding: The statistics presented are compelling and easy to follow. I like the delineation between live and online courses. It is also useful to know that there are only nine students involved.

Action: This is a good start, but I think it would benefit from some additional information concerning how improvement will be achieved. This is particularly important considering the low percentage of students who meet or exceed several of the standards.

Communication:

Objective: This is acceptable and outlines the two criteria that will be measured. Again I fail to see a direct connection to the goal statement. A closer connection needs to be established.

Indicator: This is very well done. I like that the rubric used is universal and used by all instructors. Good connection to the elements established in the objective.

Criterion: Well stated and easy to understand. No changes needed. Should be simple to implement via the rubric being used.

Finding: The statistics presented are compelling and easy to follow. I like the delineation between live and online courses. It is also useful to know that there are only nine students involved.

Action: This is a good start, but I think it would benefit from some additional information concerning how improvement will be achieved. This is particularly important considering the low percentage of students who meet or exceed several of the standards.

Strategic Decision Making:

Objective: This is a good overall statement of the elements of strategic decision-making. Again I fail to see the connection (direct) to the goal statement. This needs to be established clearly. The criterions here are excellent and connect well to the indicator.

Indicator: This is very well done. I like that the rubric used is universal and used by all instructors. Good connection to the elements established in the objective.

Criterion: Well stated and easy to understand. No changes needed. Should be simple to implement via the rubric being used.

Finding: The statistics presented are compelling and easy to follow. I like the delineation between live and online courses. It is also useful to know that there are only nine students involved.

Action: This is a good start, but I think it would benefit from some additional information concerning how improvement will be achieved. This is particularly important considering the low percentage of students who meet or exceed several of the standards.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

This needs to be updated as it reflects 2013 and 2014. Those times have passed and data has now been collected. This needs to reflect what will be done in light of that collected data. This entire section needs to be reworked and updated.

<p style="text-align:center">General Comments</p>

The finding under each objective (critical thinking, communication, strategic decision-making) does not identify the classes that assessed the objective. Also, there are nine students in the program, but only eight were assessed. For communication, only three students were assessed, and for strategic decision-making only four students were assessed.

<p style="text-align:center">Overall Comments for all unit assessments</p>

Use a well-established framework (e.g., Bloom's Taxonomy) for overall assessment purpose

Method of assessment should be consistent (pretest-posttest, posttest only, etc.) across the entire college

Both the reliability and validity of the assessment methodology needs to be improved.

The college needs to develop a policy that is consistent (reliable) and accurate (valid) for assessing each of the stated objectives.

The assessment tools are inconsistent (some use quizzes, some exams, some projects, some cases). Some use M/C, other T/F, other open-ended responses

There is no consistency across the college in terms of number of courses used, number of questions used, number of students used, etc.

The stated goals and corresponding objectives are not aligned in many cases

The criterions used to assess a particular major cannot be used to assess a Department (GBA) or Program (PGM)

A table or chart should be used which has the actual items and the raw data included

The criterion used for assessment purpose must also be consistent. I would recommend that 70% be used

The objectives must be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time specific). Unfortunately, many were not SMART