BUS495 Assessment Report Form 2018-19

Assessment reports will be completed through Qualtrics to make it easier to share and compile data across campus. The reporting questions are similar to the questions used in the past, but with some additional detail requested in some areas to help us in collecting and analyzing college and institution-wide data on assessment practices. Your assessment reports will be maintained on file electronically on a password secure site (SharePoint). Other individuals on campus will have access to your reports.

Please complete one Assessment Report per learning outcome that you are reporting on.

Please identify your department or program and the name of your assessment liaison:

Department/Program: Business
Assessment Liaison: Michele Gee
Report Prepared by: Qian Ye

1. What learning outcome did you assess for this report? (Reminder - If you assessed multiple learning outcomes this academic year, you should complete a separate report for each outcome.)

PLLG2. Students can write effectively about a business problem or issue.
PLLG3. Students can make an effective oral presentation on a business problem or issue.

2. Which of the institution-wide shared learning goals does this outcome connect to?
➢ **Communication (1)**
➢ **Reasoned Judgment (2)**
➢ **Social and Personal Responsibility (**3)
➢ Other (4)

3. Is this the first/initial assessment of the selected learning outcome? (select one):
➢ Yes
➢ **No**

If you answered yes, please skip Question 4 and move to Question 5. If you answered no, please move to question 4.

4. Which of the following best describes this assessment report (select one):
➢ Follow-up assessment related to curricular changes (closing-the-loop).
➢ Follow-up assessment to address issues with the previous assessment process (e.g. collect more data, redesigned the assessment tool, etc.).
➢ **Routine assessment of the outcome** ~~to verify previous findings (no curricular changes)~~.

5. What assessment tool(s) or method(s) did you utilize? (Check all that apply)
- ➢ Survey (1)
- ➢ Standardized exam (2)
- ➢ **Exam from a course or courses (3)**
- ➢ **Assignment from a course or courses (4)**
- ➢ Student portfolios (5)
- ➢ **Direct observation of student work or performance – Student Presentations(6)**
- ➢ Other (7) _____

6. What type of measurement did you utilize?
- ➢ **Direct (asking students to demonstrate their learning) (1)**
- ➢ Indirect (asking students to self-report their perceived level of learning) (2)
- ➢ A combination of the above (3)

7. What delivery mode did you use to collect your data? (Check all that apply)
- ➢ **Face to face course(s) (1)**
- ➢ **Online course(s) (2)**
- ➢ Hybrid course(s) (3)
- ➢ Flex Option (Competency Based) course(s) (4)
- ➢ Not tied to a course (5)
- ➢ Other: Please Specify: _____

8. What was the approximate sample size of this assessment (i.e. number of students assessed)? Fill in your answer here: **44**

Fall 2018: F2F: 20   Online: 55
Spring 2019: F2F 23 Online 39
Total: F2F 43; Online 94

9. Beyond the general details provided above, what student work was collected and how was it evaluated? The purpose of this question is to allow you to elaborate on the previous questions, and present the scope of the assessment and its relationship to student attainment of the specified learning outcome. Please reference the curriculum map, if used.

In BUS495: Capstone Course of Strategic Management, students learn how to analyze internal and external organizational environments; formulate generic and business strategies; and write a strategic proposal drawn from a case study. Four individual exams were used to assess students' knowledge in the subject matter. A rubric with 10 categories was used to categorize student performance on presentations. A final written paper was used to assess students' learning goal of writing a strategic plan.

10. What were the results of this assessment? Please attach any supporting documents that you feel would be useful to the reviewers.

The following tables show the absolute number of students and percentages of students for each rubric dimension.

Online Students:

Rubric Dimension	1 Unsatisfactory <70%	2 Satisfactory 70%-80%	3 Proficient 80%-90%	4 Distinguished >90%	TOTAL
Course Requirement Completeness	1	8	37	48	94
Depth in Analysis	1	8	37	48	94
Knowledge of Subject matter: Strategic Management	1	8	37	48	94
Correctness of Knowledge Application	1	8	37	48	94
Logic of Reasoning & Structure	1	8	37	48	94
Mechanics	1	8	37	48	94

Face to Face Students:

Rubric Dimension	1 Unsatisfactory	2 Satisfactory 70%-80%	3 Proficient 80%-90%	4 Distinguished >90%	TOTAL
Completeness	1			42	43
Depth in Case Analysis	1	1	14	27	43
Knowledge of Strategic Management	1	1	14	27	43
Correctness of Knowledge Application	1	1	14	27	43
Logic of Reasoning & Structure	1	1	14	27	43
Mechanics	1		15	27	43
Interest of Presentation: Visuals			16	27	43
Delivery/ Professionalism			16	27	43
Handle Questions and Discussion		1	15	27	43
Group Work	1		14	27	43

Only one student is in the unsatisfactory category for both online and F2F modes of delivery. Students in the unsatisfactory category failed to complete the project: strategic planning for the assigned case for an organization. Students receive high rates on assessment categories because they first study the materials well and achieve high scores on exams, complete the project and meet the expectations of learning objectives.

(2) Compare the performance of online students versus F2F students. Comment on whether there are significant differences overall or in any rubric dimension between online and F2F students. Based on these comments, what strategies can help improve the performance of online students and F2F students.

Face to face students are assessed on presentation skills but online students not.
F2F students have opportunities to closely work with the professor when practicing group exercises in the classroom, so that they know well about the professor's expectations for analytical technique and applications. On the other hand, online students only have written instructions for the project. A strategy used to improve the online students' performance is to use a bi-weekly group discussion so that each individual participates in group exercises (just as the face-to-face students' classroom exercises), apply analytical technique step by step, and then they receive detailed written feedback from the professor so that they master each technique related to strategic planning and are able to use them in the final project.

11. How were other instructors (faculty, lecturers, and adjuncts) involved with the assessment process?

In the Business Management program, Dr. Ye and Dr. Gee teach courses the cover on learning goals related to strategic management, creating strategic plans and presentations of the strategic plan. Dr. Ye and Dr. Gee discussed the results compiled by Dr. Ye. These results will be shared with the department in a future department meeting with the Business faculty and will be submitted to AACSB.

12. As a result of this assessment, were any changes proposed? If yes, please describe and indicate the projected timeline. Please comment on any barriers to implementation.

No changes are planned at this point, since student performance in these PLLGs is excellent.

Appendix A: Rubric to Measure Student Performance for PLLG2 and PLLG3

	Criteria				Points
	1	2	3	4	
Completeness	The project is not completed	The project is completed but major parts are missing	The project is completed but does not meet the full requirement	The project is fully completed and meet the full requirements (See syllabus page.4)	
Depth in Case Analysis	No strategic analysis in the case; Students does not have grasp of information; Presentation does not show analysis; student cannot answer questions about subject. All analyses are built on personal opinion; Student cannot answer questions about subject.	• Student demonstrates limited ability of analysis on the case; • Student apply analysis tools but not in depth • Most arguments, decisions, and conclusions are built on personal opinion. • No sources of solid data and information. • Student fails to elaborate. • Student is uncomfortable with information and is able to answer only rudimentary questions.	• Student demonstrates good ability of analysis on the case; • Be able to apply strategic analysis tools but not in depth with limited details and elaborations • Student is at ease with content • Presentations shows data and information, but not in depth	• Student demonstrates strong ability of analysis on the case; • Be able to apply strategic analysis tools including external and internal such as environmental analysis, industrial analysis, SWOT analysis, 3-circle analysis, value chain analysis, and/or RBV • Presentation shows explanations and elaboration in great detail. • Presentation, argument, and conclusions are built on solid data and information, no personal conjecture and guess • Strong ability of explanations and elaboration.	

Knowledge of Strategic Management	Students does not have Strategic Management view point; evaluation and analysis are based upon personal common sense or guess	Students shows some sort of Strategic Management knowledge, but concepts are not clear; evaluation and analysis are based upon limited information or evidence gathered	Student shows knowledge about subject matter—Strategic Management view point and the company selected, but some specific view points and information gathered are not clear	Student shows full knowledge about subject matter—Strategic Management view point and the company selected	
Correctness	Student cannot apply knowledge	Student applies knowledge with many errors	Students demonstrates good knowledge application with limited errors	Student demonstrates full knowledge application—apply knowledge correctly and precisely	
Logic	• Subject and purpose are not clearly defined; • No introduction of the case and the company • No agenda of case analysis • No analysis questions • Very weak or no support of subject through use of examples, facts, and/or statistics; • Totally insufficient support for ideas or conclusions • Major ideas left unclear, audience left with no new ideas.	• Attempts to introduce the case and the company; • The research questions are not answered • Weak examples, facts, and/or statistics, which do not adequately support the analysis and conclusion; • Includes very thin data or evidence in support of ideas or conclusions; • Major ideas may need to be summarized or audience is left with vague idea to remember.	• Has some success defining purpose and subject; • Has agenda of case analysis • Analysis questions are not clear • Introduce analysis tool for analysis • Some examples, facts, and/or statistics support the subject; • Includes some data or evidence which supports conclusions or ideas; • May need to refine summary or final idea. • The logic leads to the summary or conclusion is vague.	• Clear purpose and subject (introduction of the case and the company); • Clear agenda of case analysis • Has clear analysis questions • Introduce strategic tools for internal & external analysis • Pertinent examples, facts, data and/or statistics; • Conclusions/ideas are supported by evidence; • Major ideas summarized and audience left with full understanding of presenter's position.	
Visuals	Student used no visuals.	Student occasional used visuals that rarely support text and presentation.	Visuals related to text and presentation.	Student used visuals to reinforce screen text and presentation.	

Mechanics	Student's presentation had four or more spelling errors and/or grammatical errors.	Presentation had three misspellings and/or grammatical errors.	Presentation has no more than two misspellings and/or grammatical errors.	Presentation has no misspellings or grammatical errors.	
Delivery/ Professionalism	Student mumbles, incorrectly pronounces terms, and speaks too quietly for students in the back of class to hear. No professional delivery.	Student's voice is clear and demonstrated satisfied professionalism in presentation.	Student's voice is clear and demonstrated great professionalism in presentation.	Student used a clear voice and demonstrated high professionalism in presentation.	
Handle Questions and Discussion	Student did not prepare for any leading discussion and could not answer questions.	Student prepared some discussion questions and answer questions but not precisely.	Student prepared some discussion questions and answer questions well.	Student well prepared for leading discussion in depth of the case and answer questions very well.	
Group Work	Work does not demonstrate a team work; each member does not have a clear role in the team; work is done by one or small group of members; each student does not understand other's work in the same team; demonstrate conflicts and hostile	Work demonstrates a sort of team work; each student has a role in decision making and responsibilities but not clear; work is still done by each team member, but students do not understand team projects well; each team member only knows his/her part of work; demonstrate no consensus on the project objective; no team member assistance	Work demonstrates a good team work; each student has a clear role in decision making and responsibilities; team members understand team project well, but not clear about other's work in the same team; demonstrate a consensus on the project objective; team members can help each other to some extent	Work demonstrates an excellent team work. Each student has a clear role in decision making and responsibilities; Each team member understands team project very well; demonstrate a consensus on the project objective; demonstrate a team member assistance –each team member can help others and answer all questions.	
				Total---->	
A= 36-40	B=32-35	C=28-31	D= 24-27	F<24	
				Total score out of 20	