

**Part One**

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?	b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?	d. What were the actual results?	e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?
1. Outcome 1.2 Students will have an understanding of the vocabulary and concepts associated with the management of people in the workforce.	(1) Performance on five selected questions on first in-class exam. (2) BUS 371	On each of the representative questions, 80% of students will answer the question correctly.	Q1 – 45% Q6 – 95% Q9 – 91% Q10 – 97% Q14 – 56%	(1) Kimberly LaGrange, Instructor. (2) Results will be kept on a department blackboard site and will be shared with program faculty during Fall 2016 Assessment Workshop
2. Outcome 2.2 Students will be able to evaluate the management effectiveness of the human resources in the workplace.	(1) Reflective peer evaluations given by students upon completion of a team project in a Leadership class (2) MGT 343-001	On each of three dimensions (Quality of Work, Quantity of Work, and Follows Norms) 80% of students will be rated by their peers as 4 or 5 on a 5 point scale.	Quantity: 5-55%, 4-40%, 3-3%, 2-2% Quality: 5-19%, 4-72%, 3-6%, 2-3% Follows Norms: 5-78%, 4-18%, 3-4%	(1) Kimberly LaGrange, Instructor. (2) Results will be kept on a department blackboard site and will be shared with program faculty during Fall 2016 Assessment Workshop
3. Outcome 2.3 Students will be able to assess the appropriateness of organizational structure in a business	(1) Exam given after students have been given three strategic plans from three universities. Questions are designed to measure students' ability to identify and differentiate organizational strategies (2) MGT 356	On this exam, all questions were pertinent to outcome 2.3, so the goal is based on total exam score. Target performance is that 75% of students will score 70% or better on the exam.	70% or better – 31 (79.5%) Less than 70% - 8 (20.5%)	(1) David Robinson (2) Results will be kept on a department blackboard site and will be shared with program faculty during Fall 2016 Assessment Workshop

4. Outcome 3.3 Students will demonstrate understanding of the cultural diversity context (domestic and international) of managing people in a work setting.	(1) Students were given mini-cases for strategic analysis which were set in multiple countries, and incorporated exploration and analysis of cultural factors (2) MGT 356	Teams will correctly identify contextual factors in mini cases impacting team structure, including cultural factors. Goal is that all teams will score 80% or better	All teams scored 80% or better on their case analysis projects.	(1) David Robinson (2) Results will be kept on a department blackboard site and will be shared with program faculty during Fall 2016 Assessment Workshop
---	---	--	---	--

## Part Two

**In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator's feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.**

- (1) On the first outcome (1.2) questions were selected to assess students' grasp of general management concepts and terminology. Some questions were possibly too easy or had been covered in other classes. The scoring service used to record and report responses offers point-biserial correlations for each question, so quality of the questions will be reviewed prior to their use in future assessments. The questions where students scored below expectation may have been difficult questions, but also could be good discriminators between students who generally did well on the exam and students who did not, so these questions will also be reviewed for quality and appropriateness. On the second outcome (2.2) students were asked to rate each other, using measures of management effectiveness which they had been taught to use. It is interesting to note that there were different scoring patterns on the three dimensions measured, indicating that students did recognize these as distinct attributes to be assessed independently. This measure will likely be kept and expanded on in future assessment cycles. For outcome 2.3, while the target was met, there is room for improvement. Data collected for outcome 3.3 indicates that students were very able to identify contextual factors in mini-cases with multiple international settings.
- (2) In BUS 371, the Management faculty are assessing the effectiveness of a program offerings, even though students are from all majors. Separating out only management majors might have yielded different results, but in this cycle it was decided to leave all students in. Continuation of this type of measure will be discussed in the Fall 2016 AOL workshop. The two questions where students did poorly involved very general management concepts, so those subject areas (setting objectives and Mintzberg's managerial roles) will be emphasized in future sections of BUS 371. In MGT 343 (Leadership and Organizational Change) the methodology used is considered an indirect measure, since skills that students are supposed to learn are put to use. Such data is somewhat more difficult to quantify due to other factors impinging on results, but the exercise was considered to be productive in this cycle. Again, continued use of this measure will be discussed in the Fall, 2016 AOL workshop. Upon reflection of these results from outcome 2.3 in the Fall 2016 AOL workshop, MGT program faculty may decide to devote more time to teaching basics of strategy and more practice identifying strategies implied in real world organizations. Outcome 3.3 was measured with group metrics, which is useful, but can be improved on in the next cycle where this outcome is measured by selecting a measure that uses the individual as the unit of analysis.
- (3) In the 2017-17 Cycle, the following outcomes will be assessed: 1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2.

**Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University**

Degree Program: BS in Management Date: 7.12.16

	<b>Level 0 – Undeveloped</b>	<b>Level 1 – Developing</b>	<b>Level 2 – Mature</b>	<b>Level 3 – Exemplary</b>
<b>1. Student Learning Outcomes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> An Outcomes Library was provided.  <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific and measurable.  <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are student-centered.  <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, and student-centered.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals.  <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed.  <input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, student-centered, and span multiple learning domains. <b>Most are specific....</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization).  <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.)  <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.

				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
<b>2. Measures &amp; Performance Goals</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.  <input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.  <input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are not specific.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sufficient information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.  <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct.  <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.  <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some <a href="#">high impact practices</a> (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)  <input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.  <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided to demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what

				<p>students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.</p>
<p><b>3. Results</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity of the assessment process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.</p>
<p><b>4. Engagement &amp; Improvement</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are too vague to connect clearly to the results or to implement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific plans for improvement.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the</p>

		about previous results or plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<p>history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement.</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 0 – Undeveloped</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 1 - Developing</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 2 – Mature</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 3 – Exemplary</b>

## COMMENTS

### Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

#### 1. Learning Outcomes

Since we cannot measure “understanding,” outcome 1.2 should be revised so that it specifically explains the action students are expected to engage in— Define and explain the vocabulary? The others are clear and measurable (while 1.2 embeds the word “understanding,” the key action is “demonstrate”) and focus students on the knowledge and skills important to success in this major. I see from your curriculum map that you cover the outcomes thoroughly. Having a capstone course in which you reinforce all outcomes is an excellent approach!

#### 2. Measures & Performance Goals

You offer students some novel ways of achieving the program’s learning outcomes. The exam that students take after reading strategic plans truly measures what they know, not just what they’ve memorized. And assessing group projects via a reflective peer evaluation doubly reinforces the management effectiveness outcome. On another note, I was confused by your comment that the MGT 343 activity is an indirect measure??

#### 3. Results

While you have identified areas in which there is room for improvement, your students are meeting your expectations overall. I have no problem with your potential plan to separate scores for majors and non-majors, since doing so may help you identify ways to serve one or both groups. But I would encourage you to continue to collect and report on both of them. In all cases I would appreciate more evidence of the connection among the outcomes, measures, and results, which you easily could provide by offering more detail and giving me access to the keys, rubrics, and results you refer to. In general, I would like to know more about what the numbers mean—what exactly do students know/do well and less well?

#### 4. Engagement & Improvement

While I cannot gauge the extent of faculty, student, and stakeholder involvement in the learning assessment process, I can see that you take a proactive approach with your results, reviewing them very carefully, identifying reasons for students’ performance, and making plans to improve them. Is there evidence that learning has improved/is continuously improving?

Thanks for sharing this information about your assessment program. I look forward to learning more next year!