

**Curriculum Management Report**

**Summer 2016–Spring 2017**

**Table of Contents**

[I. Overview](#_Toc420393638) 3

[II. Curriculum Development and Review 3](#_Toc420393639)

[III. Assurance of Learning Process 6](#_Toc420393640)

[IV. Assurance of Learning in the BBA (AACSB) 10](#_Toc420393641)

V. Assurance of Learning in the BS-IS (AACSB/HLC)...............................................................................................................................25

[VI. Assurance of Learning in the MAcc (AACSB/HLC) 2](#_Toc420393642)6

[VII. Assurance of Learning in the MBA (AACSB/HLC)](#_Toc420393643) 34

[VIII. Assurance of Learning in Majors (HLC #8)](#_Toc420393644) 45

IX[. Assurance of Learning in the BS/BA in Economics (HLC)](#_Toc420393645) 52

[X. Assurance of Learning in the UCA Core](#_Toc420393646) 54

# I. Overview

The academic year 2016-2017 included a variety of new changes in Curriculum Management (CM) within the College of Business. In both major areas of CM, curriculum development and assurance of learning (AOL), there were some significant changes and improvements. This report will examine both of these areas.

# II. Curriculum Development

There were a host of curricula development items that were approved over the course of the past academic year. The primary purpose of these changes were to provide a “current, responsive, and innovative curriculum” [COB Vision].

Below are highlights:

**Major Curricula Highlights (2016-2017)**

**Major Curricula Changes Past Year**

* New program approved at state level: BBA in Logistics & Supply Chain Management
* Nine programs approved for fully online delivery
* Reduced the number of learning objectives
* Modified the General Business minor
* Electronic Delivery: nine courses approved for online delivery

1. **New Program Approved: Bachelor of Business Administration in Logistics and Supply Chain Management.** This program was approved at the Arkansas Department of Higher Education (ADHE). It will officially begin as a new major in Fall 2017. This program resulted from substantial involvement with the transportation industry in Arkansas, in particular the trucking industry. The city of Conway is fortuitously located in the middle of the I-40 corridor, along with major trucking companies. The Marketing and Management Department received a $3,000,000 grant in part to start this major.

2. **Nine Programs Approved for Online Delivery:** nine BBA programs were approved at the state level (ADHE) for a fully online delivery. These programs include Accounting, Business Administration, Economics, Finance, Innovation & Entrepreneurship, Insurance/Risk Management, Management, Marketing, and Management Information Systems. Only two of these programs are currently offered completely online: Business Administration and Insurance/Risk Management. The others have some required courses that are not yet offered online, but with this approval, these courses can be converted as resources allow.

3. **Reducing the Number of Learning Goals/Objectives in the BBA Program**: in an extremely significant move, the number of learning goals/objectives was reduced. The BBA programs had seven learning goals and eleven learning objectives. This was reduced to six goals and seven objectives. This action was taken with due diligence that came about as a result of several recommendations from outside constituents. Some faculty took part in some extensive training conferences on assessment, held by both Higher Learning Commission (HLC) and AACSB; these conferences all promoted 4-6 as an optimum number of learning goals to set for the BBA program. In addition, both of the previous two Peer Review Teams from AACSB recommended a reduction in the number of goals/objectives. The Master of Accountancy program underwent a similar reduction last year, going from 13 objectives to 7. The problem is that too many objectives leads to a dilution of effort in improving student learning. The COB has certainly experienced this in the past several years. The large number of goals/objectives in the BBA comes with a large overhead in scheduling, organizing and supporting Improvement Teams, and making meaningful improvements.

This proposal was initially examined by a sub-committee of the COB Curriculum and Assessment Committee (CAC). It included half the members of CAC, one from each department. This sub-committee began its deliberations by examining the vision and mission of the college, with the conviction that any change must be in accordance with the vision/mission (V/M). The sub-committee examined goals/objectives from peer institutions and scrutinized all of the AOL data from all of the current goals/objectives. The members of the committee met with departmental colleagues to discuss what our V/M meant in terms of goals and objectives. After much discussion, the sub-committee brought its recommendation to the full CAC; they recommended eliminating one goal and five objectives. CAC discussed this at length, and voted to recommend eliminating one goal and four objectives; the objective in disagreement was BBA 2a Awareness of Global Business Environment. The global business environment weaves its influence throughout the curriculum and so this goal was deemed critical by the entire CAC. The proposal was then passed to all faculty, where it received positive endorsement. The proposal next passed to the Executive Committee, where after much discussion, the committee concurred with the recommendations of the CAC, and approved by the Dean. It was noted throughout that objectives eliminated were not unimportant! The following lists the objectives of both types:

**Goals/Objectives Kept: Goals/Objectives Eliminated:**

1a Critical/Analytical Thinking 1b Quantitative Skills

2a Global Awareness 3b Legal Environment

3a Ethical Awareness 6a Business Software

4a Written Communications 6b Role of Information Systems

4b Oral Communications

5a Teamwork

6a Business Concepts

4. **General Business Minor Modified**. The minor in General Business was modified to make it more inter-disciplinary. Prior to this, a student could take only Economics and Accounting courses and complete the minor (by taking all twelve elective hours in these fields). The modified plan mandates that a student takes courses in three other disciplines, including Finance, Management, Marketing, Insurance, or MIS.

5. **Electronic Delivery**. In support of the approved online programs, nine new courses were approved for online delivery. While only two programs are currently completely online (General Business and Insurance), others will be coming. UCA continues to make significant progress in online technology and delivery, hiring two more online specialists to work with faculty. The training and certification program to approve online courses continues.

6. **Other Changes**. There were several other more minor curricula changes, including modifying prerequisites and changing course titles.

# III. Assurance of Learning Process

The AOL process consists of assessing each learning objective twice in a five year window. The first assessment results are examined by an appropriate Improvement Team, which makes recommendations for both systematic and direct learning improvements. Improvement team members, typically one from each department, are faculty experts in the specific area and frequently teach some of the pertinent courses where learning occurs for an objective. The team recommendations flow to all faculty, the college Curriculum & Assessment Committee, the Executive Committee and to the Dean for input and approval. The approved changes are put in place. The second assessment then occurs, and the Improvement Team again examines the data. Changes that worked (enhanced learning) are institutionalized (“closing the loop”). The team again makes improvement recommendations, and the process continues. This process of continual improvement helps ensure that assessment data is used as it should be--to improve student learning.

The COB has eighteen Improvement Teams. About half are teams that consider objectives that apply to only a single department, such as MAcc objectives, BS/BA in Economics, BS in Information Systems and the advanced knowledge objective within each individual major (labeled HLC-7). The others are objectives that apply to all departments, including all of the BBA and MBA objectives. The teams are listed in the below table.

**Reporting Assessment Information**

**Improvement Teams – College of Business**

**BBA/MBA/MAcc**

* Critical and Analytical Thinking (BBA 1a)
* Global Perspectives (BBA 2a/MBA 1a)
* Ethical Issues (BBA 3a/MAcc 2a/MBA 2a)
* Written Communications (BBA 4a/MAcc 3a/MBA 3a)
* Oral Communications (BBA 4b/MAcc 3b/MBA 3b)
* Teamwork (BBA 5a/MAcc 3c/MBA 5b)
* Business Concepts (BBA 6a)
* Accounting Standards (MAcc 1a/1b)
* Information Management (MBA 4a)
* Leadership (MAcc 4a/MBA 5a)

**------------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

**Specialized Knowledge**

* Accounting (HLC-7)
* Economics (HLC-7; BS & BA 1a/2a/2b/3a)
* Finance (HLC-7)
* Innovation & Entrepreneurship (HLC-7)
* Insurance (HLC-7)
* Management (HLC-7)
* Marketing (HLC-7)
* MIS/IS (HLC-7 MIS; BS-IS 1a/2a/3a/4a/4b/4c/5a)

The assessment process within the College of Business is essentially the same, regardless of where the information might be reported. We conduct assessments to monitor student learning and use the assessment data to develop ways to improve such learning. We do not do assessment in order to report it to some external body. That said, there are external accrediting bodies that do receive assessment reports. For this reason, we divide the AOL sections that follow (Sections IV-X) according to the accrediting body and program, as outlined in the table below:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Accrediting Body** | **AACSB** | **HLC (Specific Degree Programs)** | **HLC** |
| Programs Assessed | * Bachelor of Business Administration  (single degree) * Bachelor of Science-Information Systems * Master of Accountancy * Master of Business Administration | * Bachelor of Business Administration (by distinct major) * Bachelor of Science in Information Systems * Master of Accountancy * Master of Business Administration * Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Arts in Economics | * General Education (UCA) Core Courses |

## 1. Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)

AACSB examines assessment at the programmatic level, including BBA, BS, MAcc, and MBA. It does not examine assessment at the particular major level (such as Accounting or Finance), unless the program and the major are the same (which is true for the BS-IS, MAcc and MBA). All majors within the BBA degree are treated as one. Two years ago***,*** the BS-Information System was approved and formally started in Fall 2015. The AACSB Peer Review Team, which visited in February 2016, assessed this new program and stated that it should be considered “an accredited CoB degree”. The BS-IS Assessment Plan was approved this past year, and is included as its own section. Sections IV-VII examines AACSB assessment for the BBA, BS-IS, MAcc, and MBA programs.

**2. Higher Learning Commission (HLC-Specific Degrees Programs)**

The current HLC learning goals and objectives for the College of Business programs include the same goals and objectives as reported to AACSB with the following differences:

* An additional learning goal (and objective) is added to each BBA major. Thus each major has one discipline-specific objective. The additional goals and objectives were formalized in Spring 2013 (2015 for the BS-Information Systems) and are labeled HLC #7 (it is both the BBA and BS-IS 7th goal). This objective used to be called HLC-8, but has been renamed with the renaming of the BBA learning goals.
* The BS/BA in Economics has its own set of learning objectives as it is not assessed under the AACSB program. These goals and objectives were formalized in Spring 2013, and are delineated in Section IX.
* The Master of Accountancy assessment for AACSB and HLC are identical.
* The Master of Business Administration assessment for AACSB and HLC are identical.

Assessment details for HLC-Specific Degrees programs are provided in Sections VIII-IX.

**3. Higher Learning Commission (HLC-General Education Core Courses)**

The UCA Core, the general education program at UCA, is outlined at www.uca.edu/core. It is a two tiered program with 11 objectives at both the lower-division and upper-division level. More detail is provided in Section X.

In the following seven sections, which cover AOL in the various programs, each section is divided into two basic areas. First the section lists all objectives which were assessed in the past year. The second section examines Improvement Team actions. It lists all teams that met this past year, and a synopsis of activity. For objectives on which the team actions were completed this past year (i.e., recommendations approved by the Dean), there is a detailed report. It is recognized that at times a team may meet in one academic year and the recommendations not be approved until the following year. These are noted as Objectives in Progress.

# IV. Assurance of Learning in the BBA (AACSB)

For the BBA program, there are six goals and seven learning objectives. The goals/objectives are summarized in the table below, along with the measure, course(s) used, and benchmark.

## Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) Assurance of Learning Plan

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal** | **Objective: Students will be able to** | **Measure: Students will** | **Course** | **Benchmark** |
| 1. Our graduates shall possess critical thinking and analytical thinking skills | 1a. Use appropriate analytical techniques to identify and frame problems, generate and compare alternatives, and use knowledge and reasoning skills to optimize organizational performance. | Students will demonstrate learning and mastery of subject matter through their performance on the Capstone © Business Simulation. Specifically, the objective will be measured using the Critical Thinking area, which includes the Balanced Scorecard (four dimensions, plus an overall) and Board Queries (eleven dimensions). | MGMT 4347 | The College’s mean score will be in the 50th percentile or above. |
| 2. Our graduates shall possess awareness of the global business environment | 2a. Identify cultural/global perspectives among stakeholders. | Students will demonstrate learning through a written assignment, which will be assessed using the same rubric for both courses. | ECON 2310  MKTG 3350 | Students at the lower division level (ECON 2310) shall attain a score of 70% (8.4 of 12 points). Students at the upper division level (MKTG 3350) shall attain a score of 75% (9 of 12 points). |
| 3. Our graduates shall possess ethical reasoning abilities | 3a. Be aware of ethical issues inherent in business decisions and articulate the manner in which they arrived at an ethical decision. | Students will complete an assignment (business case or other writing assignment) dealing with ethical decision making or the social responsibility of business. The assignment will be assessed with the Ethical Decision Making/Social Responsibility Rubric. | MGMT 3340 | Mean score of students assessed with the rubric will be 75% (15 of 20 points). |
| 4. Our graduates shall possess effective communication abilities | 4a. Produce professional quality written documents. | Prepare a report, paper, or case analysis on a discipline-specific topic in the writing intensive course designated in their major. | MGMT 4348, ECON 4380, INSU 4320, ACCT 4317, MGMT 4376, MIS 4328, MKTG 4355, FINA 4336 | Mean rubric score of students assessed will be nine (9) points or greater, of the fourteen (14) available points. |
| 4b. Deliver professional quality oral presentations. | Give an oral presentation on a business topic. | MKTG 2376, MGMT 2301 | Students shall attain a score of at least 75% (52.5 of the 70 available points) on the rubric. |
| 5. Our graduates shall possess effective collaborative skills | 5a. Work in teams to solve business problems. | Complete a group project as part of the Capstone© Business Simulation. Use Capstone's internal teamwork assessment process, which includes the areas of self-management/accountability and quality of work/contextual performance. The peer evaluation after the final round will be used for this assessment. | MGMT 4347 | The cumulative mean score will be ≥ 70% on Capstone’s teamwork assessment. |
| 6. Our graduates shall possess an understanding of a broad range of business disciplines | 6a. Demonstrate comprehension of key concepts and theories in various functional areas of business, and demonstrate the ability to draw on knowledge and insights from a variety of disciplines when analyzing and formulating solutions to problems and opportunities. | Students will demonstrate learning and mastery of subject matter through their performance on the Capstone © Comp-XM examination. This includes average performance for each of the six discipline areas (accounting, finance, marketing, strategy, operations and HR) as well as overall average. | MGMT 4347 | Mean score of all students completing the exam will be ≥ 50%. |

The following objectives were assessed in the past year in the BBA program:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Learning Objectives Assessed |  |
| Summer 2016 | **Fall 2016** | **Spring 2017** |
|  | BBA 1a Critical Thinking | BBA 1a Critical Thinking |
|  | BBA 2a Global | BBA 5a Teamwork |
|  | BBA 5a Teamwork | BBA 6a Business Concepts |
|  | BBA 6a Business Concepts |  |

The following objectives included an Improvement Team improvement cycle in the past year:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Improvement Team Actions | | |
| Program | **Objective** | **Term Met** | **Approved?** |
| BBA Objectives | **1a Analytic Skills** | Fall 2016 | Summer 2017 |
| **2a Global** | Spring 2016 | Summer 2017 |
| **4a Written Communications** | Spring 2016 | Fall 2016 |
| **5a Teamwork** | Fall 2016 | Summer 2017 |
| **7a Business Concepts** | Fall 2016 | Summer 2017 |

**Objectives Completed**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **BBA 1a Critical & Analytical Thinking Skills** | | | |
| **Learning Objective** | | | Students will be able to use appropriate analytical techniques to identify and frame problems, generate and compare alternatives, and use knowledge and reasoning skills to optimize organizational performance. |
| **Improvement Team Members** | | | **List all faculty in the improvement team:**  Yuen Chan (M & M)  Mike Casey (EFIRM)  Steve Nelson (Accounting)  Kaye McKinzie (MIS-CAC Rep)  Jim Downey (CAC)-observer |
| **Term/Year of Improvement (when team meets)** | | | **Fall 2016** |
| **Term/Year Data Assessed** | | | **Fall 2011-Summer 2016** |
| **Improvement Team Recommendations** | | | |
| **Notes** | | Data were formally collected each semester between Fall 2011 and Spring 2013 (four semesters). This learning objective uses the Cap-Sim simulation for data collection, in MGMT 4347. The benchmark was not passed the first time, and some significant changes were instituted (see list below). The following three semesters, the benchmark was met. Still, there is some uncertainty over what was actually collected and none of the data were specific (all were in aggregate form). To better understand how students were doing, an ad-hoc collection was made from Cap-Sim for all course sections of MGMT 4347 from Spring (four sections) and Summer (two sections) 2016. This collection came from the AOL section of Cap-Sim, for “Critical Thinking” (see details below). The data include two things, a balanced scorecard (consisting of four areas) and Board Queries (which consist of eleven areas). Both of these measure critical thinking skills within these areas). The averages in the areas for both the balanced scorecard and Board Queries are given below. | |
| **Closing the Loop Activities** | | **Compare data with previous assessment(s) in light of improvements made:**  Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report. There were many improvements made after the first failure, as noted below. | |
| **Learning Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended improvements for learning:**  The overall averages from Fall 2011 to Spring 2013 were not useful, in that they were aggregated. Therefore these were not used for learning improvements. The other two data collections, however, for the balanced scorecard and the Board Queries broke down the data into areas, which could be used. The data were collected in Spring and Summer 2016. The balanced scorecard results averaged 71%; while these were considered for improvement, the team focused on the Board Queries, which had some lower averages. Of the eleven areas, three had averages below 50%: break-even analysis (34%), capacity analysis (38%) and TQM break-even analysis (46%). In order to assess these areas, they must be taught at some point within the BBA program, and so the team recommended that a curriculum map be prepared for these three topics. The team discussed when these topics might be taught to students (if at all), and could come up with only partial courses. If needed, based on future data collections, then the courses identified could be used to introduce/reinforce/emphasize these topic areas. In addition, one of the team members (Yuen Chan) will find out from Cap-Sim more about how these averages are calculated (just so we more fully understand the process). Further, it recommends that instructors of MGMT 4347 discuss in class the three topics early in the semester to raise student awareness. | |
| **System Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended system improvements:**  The team made a number of recommendations for system improvements:  1. Collect data using both the balanced scorecard as well as Board Queries in the future. This would include overall averages (balanced scorecard, Board Queries, and Overall Average), all four quadrants and medians for the balanced scorecard, and the eleven areas of Board Queries (based on the results of the curricula map). Discuss these topics early in each course section.  2. Collect this data from every course section of MGMT 4347, since it is a relatively painless process. This would remove this objective from the “formal” data collection schedule of twice every five years.  3. The team discussed benchmarks for this objective. Given the nature of the data (from an external source), external benchmarking is a possibility for this (as well as other objectives that that get data from Cap-Sim or GLO-BUS). The team recommends that this be considered by the benchmarking sub-committee of the Curriculum & Assessment Committee. | |
| **Improvement Champion(s)** | | Kaye McKinzie | |
| **Improvement Timeline(s)** | | Approve and implement in Spring 2017. | |
| **Chain of Submission/Approval** | | | |
| **CAC Endorsement** | The COB CAC met 10 Feb. 2017. The committee concurred with the recommendations of the Improvement Team, except that they did not discuss benchmarking, as a subcommittee is still examining this topic. It was agreed:  -to use the balanced scorecard, board queries and the overall average in assessing this objective  -instructors discuss in class the three topics that were weakest, of the eleven queries (capacity analysis, break even analysis, and TQM break even analyses); further, complete the curriculum map of these areas (courses in which they are taught)  -collect data every semester this course is taught, doing away with the twice each five year period data collection (because the collection effort is simple). | | |
| **Executive Committee Endorsement** | The Executive Committee met April 11, 2017. It endorsed the recommendations of the Improvement Team and CAC, including the idea of doing curriculum maps for objectives. | | |
| **Dean Approval** | **List of Recommendations to be approved:**  1. Collect data using the Balanced Scorecard as well as Board Queries. This requires changing the objective measure.  2. Construct a curriculum map for this objective (and all other objectives in the BBA); this should be a part of all Improvement Team resources and be used as appropriate to recommend improvements.  3. Collect data from Cap-Sim each time the course is offered; this eliminates the assessment schedule of two collections each five years.  Approved: June 6, 2017 | | |

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **BBA 2a Global Issues** | | | |
| **Learning Objective** | | | Identify cultural/global perspectives among stakeholders. |
| **Improvement Team Members** | | | **List all faculty in the improvement team:**  Lauren Maxwell (EFIRM)  Joe McGarrity (EFIRM—CAC Liaison)  Karen Oxner (Accounting)  Carla Barber (MIS)  Jim Downey (observer) |
| **Term/Year of Improvement (when team meets)** | | | **Spring 2016** |
| **Term/Year Objective Assessed** | | | **Fall 2012 and Spring 2013** |
| **Improvement Team Recommendations** | | | |
| **Notes** | | Data from ECON 2310 (the lower division course) were collected each of four semesters between Fall 2011 and Spring 2013. For all four semesters, the benchmark (of 70% on assignments) was passed (71%, 79%, 77% and 75%). For the three upper division courses, data were collected for four consecutive semesters between Fall 2013 and Spring 2015. In each case, the benchmark was met (significant difference between pre- and post-test).  The data collected in all these assessments were only in aggregate. That is, we do not have performance information on individual assignment (or test) items or questions. This makes it impossible to know the weak areas, even if all passed the benchmark. This will be resolved for the next cycle (see recommended system improvements below). | |
| **Closing the Loop Activities** | | **Compare data with previous assessment(s) in light of improvements made:**  Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report. | |
| **Learning Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended improvements for learning:**  There were no recommendations to directly improve student learning, given the lack of individual rubric items (see Notes above). Therefore it is not known specific areas of weakness for students. This information will be available in the future. | |
| **System Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended system improvements:**  1. The team recommends reducing the number of courses in which the global assessment occurs. Currently, this objective is assessed in ECON 2310, MGMT 3344, MKTG 3350 and ACCT 3315. In an effort to reduce the assessment load, it is recommended that MGMT 3344 and ACCT 3315 be eliminated. This would leave two courses, one lower division and one upper division, where this is assessed. All BBA majors must take both courses; the team feels no need to assess multiple times at the upper division level.  2. The team recommends eliminating the pre- and post-test methodology. Using this is quite problematic because students have little (or no) incentive on the pre-test (it is typically not part of their grade, after all). In addition, it is hard not to see significant improvement from the pre- to the post-test, which renders the data much less valuable. The team instead recommends that a rubric be used to assess at both levels. Using the same rubric for both upper and lower divisions allows the tracking of students as they progress from lower to upper division status.  3. The team recommends changing the existing University Core Upper Division Diversity course from MGMT 3340 to Marketing 3350. Both courses cover diversity adequately. But the proposed rubric for global issues can also be used for the Core Diversity Goal B: Analyze or compare diverse values, traditions, belief systems, and/or perspectives. By using the same rubric for both global and diversity assessments, we no longer need two courses.  4. Benchmark: the previous benchmark is no longer applicable. There were actually two, one for the lower division course (ECON 2310) and another for the upper division courses. The team proposes changing this to reflect the new rubric, and proposes that the benchmark for the upper division assessment to be higher than the lower division one. Here is the proposed wording:  *Students at the lower division level (ECON 2310) shall attain a score of 70% (8.4 of 12 points). Students at the upper division level (MKTG 3350) shall attain a score of 75% (9 of 12 points).* | |
| **Improvement Champion(s)** | | Joe McGarrity | |
| **Improvement Timeline(s)** | | Approve changes in Fall 2016. | |
| **Chain of Submission/Approval** | | | |
| **Departmental Comments** | **MIS**: MIS met 17 August 2016. The department concurred with the recommendations from the Improvement Team. They recommended eliminating the two courses used for assessment (MGMT 3344/ACCT 3315), using the revised rubric (instead of pre- and post-testing, using MKTG 3350 for the UCA Core, and changing the benchmark.  **EFIRM**: EFIRM met 17 August 2016. They reviewed the recommendations and concurred with them.  **M & M**: M & M met 17 August 2016. Concurred with recommendations.  **ACCT**: Accounting met 17 August 2016. The department concurred with the recommendations from the Improvement Team. | | |
| **CAC Endorsement** | CAC met 10/21/2016. The committee tabled this recommendation to provide Marketing Department more time to discuss. 4/14/2017: CAC met a second time to re-examine this action. The committee recommended endorsing the recommendations of the Improvement Team. This includes using a rubric instead of test questions (attached). It concurs in eliminating the two courses (MGMT 3344 and ACCT 3315) from the assessment and changing the UCA Core UD Diversity course from MGMT 3340 to MKTG 3350. | | |
| **Executive Committee Endorsement** | The Executive Committee met on 6/20/2017. The committee endorsed the recommendation to use a rubric instead of test questions and to eliminate the two courses from the assessment. This would leave two courses with which to assess this objective, ECON 2310 and MKTG 3350 (one more formative and one more summative assessment). The committee had a long discussion of the last recommendation, which would change the UCA Core UD Diversity course from MGMT 3340 to MKTG 3350. The paperwork to make this change was submitted this past spring to the UCA Core Council, where it was rejected, mostly because it was unclear from the submission how much diversity is taught in the course. The Marketing Department will reconsider putting this request in next fall. Whether they do (or not) has no impact on our assessment of this global issues objective. | | |
| **Dean Approval** | **List of Recommendations to be approved:**  1. Use the attached rubric for assessing BBA 2a Global Issues.  2. Assess this objective as scheduled using both ECON 2310 and MKTG 3350; this eliminates also assessing the objective in ACCT 3315 and MGMT 3344.  3. The Managing & Marketing Department should consider changing courses in the assessment of the UCA Core UD Diversity requirement, from MGMT 3340 to MKTG 3350. This is not an imperative, but if it makes sense, then do so.  Approved: June 22, 2017 | | |

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **BBA 5a Teamwork** | | | |
| **Learning Objective** | | | Our graduates shall possess effective collaborative skills. |
| **Improvement Team Members** | | | **List all faculty in the improvement team:**  Alex Chen (M & M)  David Mitchell (EFIRM)  Stephanie Watson (Accounting-CAC Liaison)  Summer Bartczak (MIS)  Jim Downey (CAC)-observer |
| **Term/Year of Improvement (when team meets)** | | | **Fall 2016** |
| **Term/Year Data Assessed** | | | **Fall 2013-Spring 2015** |
| **Improvement Team Recommendations** | | | |
| **Notes** | | For the four semesters in which data were collected, the benchmark was passed every time. The data came from the Cap-Sim simulation. However it is unclear exactly where the aggregate data came from. We do know that data came from the peer evaluations in Cap-Sim, which include 3 questions on Self-management/Accountability, 8 questions on Quality of work/Contextual performance, and 1 question on Quantity of work. The peer evaluations are mandated by the instructor and are an optional requirement for each round of the simulation. Faculty (the two teaching the course) differ on when to require peer evaluations. It has been done after each of the eight rounds, in two of the eight rounds, or just after the final round. One faculty stopped using peer evaluations entirely because of social loafing. | |
| **Closing the Loop Activities** | | **Compare data with previous assessment(s) in light of improvements made:**  Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report. | |
| **Learning Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended improvements for learning:**  1. The team questioned how expectations for teamwork were communicated to students in assessment classes. The team recommended that prior to the teamwork activity, the rubric (peer evaluation) questions be shared with the students along with an explanation of expectations with regard to individual effort, working with the group, and honesty in the evaluations of team members. Students should understand what is being assessed in the peer evaluation.  2. The team recommended that teamwork would be a great addition to extra-curricular activities. The COB clubs, for example, could reinforce teamwork ideals through guest speakers.  3. MGMT 4347 is used to assess teamwork in the BBA program. But what happens when we want to improve areas within teamwork? It would be critical to know when teamwork is covered in other courses within the BBA curriculum. The team recommends that a curriculum map be prepared so that it is understood when teamwork is introduced, reinforced and emphasized. This map can be used in future assessments to enhance teamwork training. | |
| **System Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended system improvements:**  1. The team noted that this course (MGMT 4347) is a UCA Core Capstone course and therefore has the requirement to assess both writing and a choice of oral communications or teamwork (teamwork is the choice in this case). Thus teamwork must be assessed in accordance with the Core schedule. So it makes sense to continue using this course and Cap-Sim to assess teamwork. That said, there must be a commitment on the part of all instructors of the course and the Management Department to continue using Cap-Sim and to mandate the use of teams to carry this out. Faculty must also require students to do the peer evaluation.  2. Standardize when and how often peer evaluations are required (this assumes #1 is approved). At a minimum, the team recommends that students must fill out the peer evaluation at the end of the last round. Should instructors wish to add a second (or more) round for peer evaluations, that is acceptable so long as it is standardized. If one instructor requires more peer evaluations, it may unduly influence the final peer evaluation that is used for assessment purposes.  3. There was a discussion of the built-in assessment in Cap-Sim (the peer evaluation). The peer evaluation is divided into three parts, as mentioned in the notes above. Both self-management and quality of work should be used. Quantity of work is meaningless for assessment purposes, because it is merely the percentage contribution of each team member and always adds up to 100%. The team recommends using these questions.  4. The team decided not to make any recommendation on benchmarks, given that a sub-committee of the CAC has been appointed to examine the issue. | |
| **Improvement Champion(s)** | | Stephanie Watson | |
| **Improvement Timeline(s)** | | Approve and implement in Spring 2017. | |
| **Chain of Submission/Approval** | | | |
| **CAC Endorsement** | The COB CAC met 10 Feb. 2017. The committee concurred with the recommendations of the Improvement Team, except that they did not discuss benchmarking, as a subcommittee is still examining this topic. It was agreed:  -Faculty who teach this class must use teams for the simulation and must require individuals to fill out the peer evaluation. This is currently not the case, as one faculty does not use teams in Cap-Sim (Dr. Chan). If this stipulation cannot be mandated, then the following recommendations are not applicable and the Improvement Team (and others) must determine another way to measure collaboration. **Collaboration must be assessed in a course in which teams are mandatory**.  -Standardize when peer evaluations are required of students; CAC recommends twice, once at the last round and once after the middle round.  -Use the Cap-Sim areas from the peer evaluation, self-management and quality of work, as part of the measure. The Measure should be changed to:  *Measure: Complete a group project as part of the Capstone© Business Simulation. Use Capstone's internal teamwork assessment process, which includes the areas of self-management/accountability and quality of work/contextual performance. The peer evaluation after the final round will be used for this assessment.*  -Instructors should share the peer evaluation questions with students, along with an explanation of expectations with regard to individual effort, working with the group, and honesty in the evaluations.  -Complete a curriculum map of teamwork (where collaboration is introduced, reinforced and emphasized in previous courses).  -Collect team data every semester Cap-Sim is used. This will eliminate the formal scheduling of collecting data twice every five years. | | |
| **Executive Committee Endorsement** | The Executive Committee met April 11, 2017. It endorsed the recommendations of the Improvement Team and CAC, including the idea of doing curriculum maps for objectives. The committee discussed the advantages and disadvantages of sharing rubrics or evaluation questions with students prior to the assessment. While mostly a positive step, it should be emphasized to students that such rubrics or questions may only constitute a part of one’s grade. | | |
| **Dean Approval** | **List of Recommendations to be approved:**  1. Continue to use Cap-Sim in MGMT 4347; instructors will use teams in the context of this course.  2. Use the Cap-Sim areas from the peer evaluations to assess this objective, including self-management and quality of work; change the measure as delineated. In every course, students should fill out the peer evaluation after a middle round and after the last round; the last round will be used for assessment purposes.  3. Construct a curriculum map for this objective (and all other objectives in the BBA); this should be a part of all Improvement Team resources and be used as appropriate to recommend improvements.  4. Collect data from Cap-Sim each time the course is offered; this eliminates the assessment schedule of two collections each five years.  5. Share with students questions that are part of the peer evaluation. This includes the three questions on self-management/accountability and the eleven questions under quality of work. This may aid student learning by reinforcement.  Approved: June 6, 2017 | | |

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **BBA 6a Business Disciplines** | | | |
| **Learning Objective** | | | Students will be able to use demonstrate comprehension of key concepts and theories in various functional areas of business, and demonstrate the ability to draw on knowledge and insights from a variety of disciplines when analyzing and formulating solutions to problems and opportunities. |
| **Improvement Team Members** | | | **List all faculty in the improvement team:**  Pat Cantrell (EFIRM)  Susan Myers (M & M—CAC Liaison)  Jeff Hill (MIS)  Paul Jensen (Accounting) |
| **Term/Year of Improvement (when team meets)** | | | **Fall 2016** |
| **Term/Year Objective Assessed** | | | **Fall 2013, Spring 2014, Fall 2014 and Spring 2015** |
| **Improvement Team Recommendations** | | | |
| **Notes** | | Data for this objective is gathered in MGMT 4347, using the Cap-Sim simulation. In the four semesters of data collection, the benchmark was passed each time. But these were aggregated scores, and does not provide any detail on specific areas. There is, however, additional information contained in the simulation. Cap-Sim breaks down individual student scores into six areas: accounting, finance, strategy, marketing, operations and human resources. Examining these six areas provides a more detailed analysis of how students performed. In the information provided to the Improvement Team (detailed below), students’ performance for the last five semesters in each area is presented. In all but two areas (Finance & Strategy), UCA’s average was higher than the national average (and in those two areas performance was almost the same). Comparing course sections which were taught online vs. face-to-face, there was no significant difference between scores in five of the six areas, suggesting that there was no difference in learning between the two media. | |
| **Closing the Loop Activities** | | **Compare data with previous assessment(s) in light of improvements made:**  Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report. | |
| **Learning Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended improvements for learning:**  1. Most of the content that is assessed in this course (MGMT 4347) is learned in previous courses. Therefore the team recommends a review sheet may be useful for the six disciplines as a refresher. This may help students remember concepts and ideas from earlier in the program. Ideally, faculty teaching in each discipline could provide this information to help remind students of the most important concepts.  2. Given that most content is learned in previous courses, it might be helpful to know how much time has passed when a student takes the core course and when the student takes MGMT 4347. This might provide information on how much material is forgotten. If there are time-related effects, then this might suggest avenues to improve course sequencing or ways to reinforcing learning. If time-related effects are negligible, then it might be useful to examine ways to improve learning in the core courses.  3. The team recommends asking students their perceptions of their familiarity with the six areas, as a kind of indirect measure. Perhaps this could be added to the capstone survey. | |
| **System Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended system improvements:**  1. Because the content is taught in earlier courses, it might be beneficial for the faculty who teach these areas in core courses to know what is being assessed in MGMT 4347. For example, what content is covered when Cap-Sim measures Strategy or HR? This might allow faculty to ensure the area is covered adequately (if appropriate) in those core courses. It might also influence what might or should be included in assessing this objective. If one of these six areas has content assessed in Cap-Sim which is not covered or is deemed inappropriate, then discussions of the assessment instrument are in order.  2. Disseminate student performance in each area of the simulation to faculty who teach the core courses in the areas. Keep trend data (perhaps a table) so that faculty can see whether content knowledge is improving (or not). | |
| **Improvement Champion(s)** | | Susan Myers | |
| **Improvement Timeline(s)** | | Approve changes in Spring 2017. | |
| **Chain of Submission/Approval** | | | |
| **CAC Endorsement** | The COB CAC met 10 Feb. 2017. The committee concurred with the recommendations of the Improvement Team, except that they did not discuss benchmarking, as a subcommittee is still examining this topic. It was agreed:  1. Given that most of the learning important in this objective occurs in prior classes, preparing students and faculty (who teach those courses) is important. The recommendations thus apply to two groups:  **For faculty**:  -Provide departments (for their faculty who teach prior courses) the content of the assessment in the Cap-Sim simulation; this can be done by providing sample questions from each of the six areas  -provide faculty who teach courses in one of the six disciplines, a table that plots trends for the six areas, to monitor these trends.  **For students**:  - Each of the six areas provide a recap sheet to students in MGMT 4347, via the 4347 instructors. This sheet should provide a refresher for concepts and ideas from these previous courses. This includes Management (for Strategy, Operations and HR), Finance (for Finance), Accounting (for Accounting) and Marketing (for Marketing).  2. Collect data every time the course is offered (and Cap-Sim is used); this would do away with the formal schedule of assessing twice every five years.  3. Conduct an indirect assessment each time the course is taught, using the already approved survey (this is already being done). | | |
| **Executive Committee Endorsement** | The Executive Committee met April 11, 2017. It endorsed the recommendations of the Improvement Team and CAC, including the idea of doing curriculum maps for objectives. | | |
| **Dean Approval** | **List of Recommendations to be approved:**  1. Created review sheets for each of the six disciplines covered, including accounting (Accounting Dept.), finance (Finance Dept.), marketing, strategy, operations, HR (Management & Marketing Dept.).  2. Provide sample Cap-Sim questions for each discipline to faculty who teach the discipline-specific courses.  3. Construct a curriculum map for this objective (and all other objectives in the BBA); this should be a part of all Improvement Team resources and be used as appropriate to recommend improvements.  4. Collect data from Cap-Sim each time the course is offered; this eliminates the assessment schedule of two collections each five years.  5. Continue collecting student perceptions of knowledge within the disciplines in the capstone courses (this commenced in Spring 2017).  6. Assess this objective using not just the overall average as before, but also by including the averages of the six discipline areas. This will allow the college to focus on the weak areas. Change the measure to reflect this.  Approved: June 6, 2017 | | |

**Objectives in Progress**

None.

# V. Assurance of Learning in the BS-Information Systems (AACSB/HLC)

The BS-Information Systems was formally approved by the state of Arkansas for a Fall 2015 start date. The degree has five goals and seven objectives:

**BS-IS Assessment Plan**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal** | **Objective: Students will be able to** | **Measure: Students will** | **Course** | **Benchmark** |
| 1. Our graduates shall possess quantitative analysis skills | 1a. Accurately apply the appropriate quantitative analysis skills to solve specific problems in managing IS resources. | Students will complete an assignment involving quantitative analysis—analyzing relevant information, appropriate quantitative solutions, and communicating results. | MIS 4328 | Mean score of students assessed with the rubric will be 75% or above |
| 2. Our graduates shall possess awareness of the global business environment | 2a. Identify and apply appropriate cultural/global perspectives among stakeholders. | Students will demonstrate awareness and the application of appropriate global and cultural perspectives on a written or oral assignment | MGMT 3340 | Mean score of students assessed with the rubric will be 75% or above |
| 3. Our graduates shall possess ethical reasoning abilities | 3a. Be aware of ethical issues inherent in business decisions and articulate the manner in which they arrived at an ethical decision. | Students will complete an assignment (business case or other writing assignment) dealing with ethical decision making or the social responsibility of business. | MIS 4355 | Mean score of students assessed with the rubric will be 75% or above |
| 4. Our graduates shall possess effective communication and collaboration abilities | 4a. Produce professional quality written documents. | Prepare a report, paper, or case analysis on a discipline-specific topic in the writing intensive course designated in their major. | MIS 4328 | Mean rubric score of students assessed with the rubric will be 75% or above |
| 4b. Deliver professional quality oral presentations. | Give an oral presentation on a business topic. | MIS 4355 | Mean rubric score of students assessed with the rubric will be 75% or above |
| 4c. Work in teams to solve business problems. | Students will complete a small-group semester-long team project, to achieve some agreed upon objective. | MIS 4355 | Mean rubric score of students assessed with the rubric will be 75% or above |
| 5. Our graduates will demonstrate a depth of knowledge of technology and of the IT field. | 5a. Effectively and professionally participate in and manage an IT project, from assessing technology requirements through prototyping or system delivery. | Students will work in teams in a semester-long project and be evaluated on their performance at each stage. | MIS 4328 | Mean score of students assessed with the rubric will be 75% or above |

This plan was approved this past year and assessment begins on a planned schedule starting in Fall 2017. It will be run the same as all other plans in the COB; an objective will be assessed twice in a five year period and improved between the assessments.

# VI. Assurance of Learning in the MAcc (AACSB/HLC)

The MAcc program has four learning goals and seven objectives. The plan is provided below:

**Master of Accountancy (MAcc) Assessment Plan**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal** | **Objective: Students will be able to** | **Measure: Students will** | **Course** | **Benchmark** |
| (1) Our graduates shall be competent in the theory and practice of accounting in a global environment. | (1a) Correctly apply accounting standards for financial accounting (U.S. & international), auditing, and tax. | Complete test questions or assignments in which research and/or application of authoritative literature is required | ACCT 6310  ACCT 6317  ACCT 6309 | 80% of students will score at least 80% (20 of 25 points) on the rubric |
| (1b) solve unstructured problems involving the application of accounting standards (U.S. & international) and practices. | write an individual solution to a business case problem | ACCT 6340 | 80% of students will score > 38 out of 55 on rubric. |
| (2) Our graduates shall be able to recognize ethical dilemmas and respond ethically. | (2a) identify ethical dilemmas and choose an appropriate course of action | complete an exam question or assignment related to an ethical issue | ACCT 6317 | 80% of students will score > 4 out of 6 on rubric. |
| (3) Our graduates shall be able to communicate effectively. | (3a) communicate effectively in writing | write a research paper on a financial accounting issue | ACCT 6310 | 80% of students will score > 11 out of 14 on rubric; 80% will receive no zeros. |
| (3b) communicate effectively in an oral presentation | make a presentation on an auditing standard | ACCT 6317 | 80% of students will score at least 80% (44 of 55 points) on the rubric |
| (3c) work effectively in teams | solve a business problem in a small group | ACCT 6340 | 80% of students will score > 14 out of 20 on rubric. |
| (4) Our graduates shall be able to demonstrate effective leadership. | (4a) demonstrate the qualities necessary for effective leadership | demonstrate whether they possess leadership qualities in classroom interactions | ACCT 6350 | 80% of students will score > 98 out of 140 on rubric. |

The following objectives were assessed in the past year in the MAcc program:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Learning Objectives Assessed |  |
| Summer 2016 | **Fall 2016** | **Spring 2017** |
| MAcc 1b Unstructured Problems | MAcc 1a Accounting Standards | MAcc 1a Accounting Standards |
| MAcc 3c Teamwork | MAcc 3a Writing Communications | MAcc 2a Ethics |
|  | MAcc 4a Leadership | MAcc 3b Oral Communications |

The following objectives included an Improvement Team improvement cycle in the past year:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Improvement Team Actions | | |
| Program | **Objective** | **Term Met** | **Approved?** |
| MAcc Objectives | **3a Written Communications** | Spring 2016 | Fall 2016 |
| **3c Teamwork** | Fall 2016 | Summer 2017 |
| **4a Leadership** | Spring 2016 | Summer 2017 |

**Objectives Completed**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MAcc 3a Written Communication Skills** | | | |
| **Learning Objective** | | | Students will be able to communicate effectively in writing. |
| **Improvement Team Members** | | | **List all faculty in the improvement team:**  Tom Oxner (Accounting)  John Bratton (EFIRM)  Mike Ellis (MIS-CAC Liaison)  Laci Lyons (M & M)  Jim Downey (CAC)-observer |
| **Term/Year of Improvement (when team meets)** | | | **Spring 2016** |
| **Term/Year Data Assessed** | | | **Fall 2011 to Fall 2014** |
| **Improvement Team Recommendations** | | | |
| **Notes** | | Data were collected each fall for four years. The first three assessments all failed. Numerous improvements were made to enhance learning and writing skills. These included stressing proper techniques, changing the admissions standards to the MAcc, and requiring students to get input from the UCA Writing Center. The fourth assessment (Fall 2014), this objective passed, suggesting that one or more of these improvements worked. The data have been stored as aggregate data, so information is not available to pinpoint weak areas (to be corrected next time). | |
| **Closing the Loop Activities** | | **Compare data with previous assessment(s) in light of improvements made:**  While there was no official improvement cycle, there were many improvements made over the last four years to enhance writing ability (noted in Notes above). These included stressing proper techniques, changing the admissions standards to the MAcc, and requiring students to get input from the UCA Writing Center. The fourth assessment (Fall 2014), this objective passed, suggesting that one or more of these improvements worked. | |
| **Learning Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended improvements for learning:**  There were no recommendations to directly improve student learning, because at this point we have only aggregate data. The learning improvements of the past have already been discussed. | |
| **System Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended system improvements:**  Specific system improvement recommendations follow:  1. **Rubric**: keep the same rubric.  2. **Benchmark**: the current benchmark is 80% of students will score at least 11 of 14 points (78.6%); 80% will get no zeros. This seems low. If 80% of students score the minimum (78.6%) and the other 20% score zero, this objective could pass with an overall score of 62.9%. The team had a lively discussion of benchmarks, not only for the BBA, but for MBA and MAcc as well. The team recommended the following benchmarks for the rubric:  BBA (all are upper-division courses): 10.5 of 14 (75%)  MACC: 11.2 of 14 (80%); 80% will receive no zeros on rubric items  MBA: 11.2 of 14 (80%); 80% will receive no zeros on rubric items  The team recommends eliminating the “double” benchmark (80% will score 78.6%) and go with a simple 80%. The team also recommends keeping the stipulation that 80% will get no zeros. | |
| **Improvement Champion(s)** | | Tom Oxner | |
| **Improvement Timeline(s)** | | Approve and implement in Fall 2016. | |
| **Chain of Submission/Approval** | | | |
| **Departmental Comments** | The Accounting Department met Aug. 17, 2017. The department recommended that double benchmarking be eliminated in the MAcc (e.g., 70% of students will score 80%). They recommended that they keep, however a percentage of zeros allowed. | | |
| **CAC Endorsement** | CAC met 10/21/2016; they concurred with the recommendation to keep the same rubric. They noted the benchmarking recommendation, and while agreeing, deferred to the sub-committee that is examining benchmarks. | | |
| **Executive Committee Endorsement** | The Executive Committee met on November 17, 2016. The committee concurred with the CAC recommendations. | | |
| **Dean Approval** | **List of Recommendations to be approved:**  1. Use the same rubric for assessing this objective.  2. Use the benchmark of 80% for rubric mean, with no less than 80% receiving any zeros. This eliminates the double benchmark in place. This may be adjusted when the CAC sub-committee on benchmarking makes their recommendations.  Approved: December 12, 2016 | | |

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MAcc 3c Teamwork** | | | |
| **Learning Objective** | | | Students will be able to work in teams. |
| **Improvement Team Members** | | | **List all faculty in the improvement team:**  Alex Chen (M & M)  David Mitchell (EFIRM)  Stephanie Watson (Accounting-CAC Liaison)  Summer Bartczak (MIS)  Jim Downey (CAC)-observer |
| **Term/Year of Improvement (when team meets)** | | | **Fall 2016** |
| **Term/Year Data Assessed** | | | **Fall 2013-Spring 2015** |
| **Improvement Team Recommendations** | | | |
| **Notes** | | Data for this objective have been collected thrice, in the Summer of 2012, 2013 and 2015. Each time the benchmark was passed. For the first two data collections, only aggregate data is available. For the last, we have item level data, though the sample size is only 9 students. | |
| **Closing the Loop Activities** | | **Compare data with previous assessment(s) in light of improvements made:**  Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report. | |
| **Learning Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended improvements for learning:**  1. The team questioned how expectations for teamwork were communicated to students in the assessment class. The team recommended that prior to the teamwork activity, the rubric (peer evaluation) questions be shared with the students along with an explanation of expectations with regard to individual effort, working with the group, and honesty in the evaluations of team members. Students should understand what is being assessed in the peer evaluation.  2. The team discussed ways to improve leadership, the lowest rated rubric item. It was noted that not all students got the opportunity to be a leader; one reason is class size. | |
| **System Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended system improvements:**  1. The team recommends continuing to use the same rubric.  2. The team recommends collecting data from two sections (over time) so that the sample size is larger.  3. The team did not discuss benchmarking, since a sub-committee of the CAC is currently discussing this topic. | |
| **Improvement Champion(s)** | | Stephanie Watson | |
| **Improvement Timeline(s)** | | Approve and implement in Spring 2017. | |
| **Chain of Submission/Approval** | | | |
| **CAC Endorsement** | The COB CAC met 10 Feb. 2017. The committee concurred with the recommendations of the Improvement Team. It was recognized that the data prior to 2015 were aggregated; it was only with the latest data collection effort that we got individual rubric item scores. This effort included a sample (class) size of 9, a relatively low number on which to make recommendations. Still, CAC proposes:  -to provide students with the rubric before the assessment, including an explanation of expectations with regard to individual effort, working with the group, and honesty in the evaluations of team members.  -to collect data from more course sections | | |
| **Executive Committee Endorsement** | The Executive Committee met April 11, 2017. It endorsed the recommendations of the Improvement Team and CAC. | | |
| **Dean Approval** | **List of Recommendations to be approved:**  1. Provide students with the rubric prior to the evaluation.  2. Share information with students on the expectations of being a productive team member; reinforce in class prior to the team project.  Approved: June 6, 2017. | | |

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MAcc 4a Leadership** | | | |
| **Learning Objective** | | | Students will be able to demonstrate the qualities necessary for effective leadership. |
| **Improvement Team Members** | | | **List all faculty in the improvement team:**  David McCalman (M & M-CAC Liaison)  David Mitchell (EFIRM)  Steve Nelson (Accounting)  Mark McMurtrey (MIS) |
| **Term/Year of Improvement (when team meets)** | | | **Fall 2016** |
| **Term/Year Data Assessed** | | | **Fall 2015** |
| **Improvement Team Recommendations** | | | |
| **Notes** | | Data for this was collected once, in Fall 2015. It was only collected once (and not twice, as normal) to align it with the MBA Leadership objective (5a), since the same team examines both. There were only ten students in this sample. The benchmark was passed, with 90% of students (9 of 10) scoring above the benchmark of 80% scoring above 70%. | |
| **Closing the Loop Activities** | | **Compare data with previous assessment(s) in light of improvements made:**  Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report. | |
| **Learning Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended improvements for learning:**  1. Stress “awareness” in leadership in the class. Specifically, these are the traits for this area measured in the rubric:  - Asks questions  - Listens before responding  - Helps others  - Stays on task  - Focuses and makes eye contact with speaker(s)  - Looks around and examines surroundings  - Pays attention to how others are acting and reacting  - Stays involved with school and community | |
| **System Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended system improvements:**  1. The rubric used does not align with the benchmark. The benchmark is currently 98 of 140 points (70%), but the rubric actually has 172 points. Revise the rubric. The recommended rubric is attached.  2. The team did not discuss benchmarking, since a sub-committee of the CAC is currently discussing this topic. | |
| **Improvement Champion(s)** | | Stephanie Watson | |
| **Improvement Timeline(s)** | | Approve and implement in Spring 2017. | |
| **Chain of Submission/Approval** | | | |
| **CAC Endorsement** | CAC met March 15, 2017. There was concurrence in the Improvement Team recommendations. The revised rubric is recommended. | | |
| **Executive Committee Endorsement** | The Executive Committee met April 11, 2017. It endorsed the recommendations of the Improvement Team and CAC, including the revised rubric. | | |
| **Dean Approval** | **List of Recommendations to be approved:**  1. Stress “awareness” in the course; this was the weakest area and additional coverage may aid student learning.  2. Use the revised rubric.  Approved: June 6, 2017. | | |

**Objectives in Progress**

None.

# VII. Assurance of Learning in the MBA (AACSB/HLC)

There are five learning goals and seven learning objectives in the MBA Program. The plan is provided below:

**Master of Business Administration (MBA) Assessment Plan**

| **Goals (*Our graduates shall possess)*** | **Learning Objectives  (*Students will be able to)*** | **Measure (*Students will)*** | **Course** | **Benchmark** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Dynamic thinking skills in a global environment | 1a. Provide organizations with effective executive management through decision making in uncertain, dynamic, global business situations | Students will compete in global organizations, under conditions of uncertainty requiring adaptation and innovation, in the GLO-BUS Strategy Simulation—a strategy simulation designed around a global industry setting in which student teams from many nations compete head-to-head—in MBA 6320. Assessment will include UCA averages for the eight skill areas as well as overall UCA average. | MBA 6320 | Student averages for the eight areas will be 50% or higher; the average for UCA overall will be 70% or higher. |
| 1. Ethical reasoning abilities | 2a. Provide organizations with effective executive management by choosing ethical courses of action and by articulating the manner by which they arrived at their decision | Complete an assignment (business case or other writing assignment) dealing with ethical decision making | MBA 6320 | Students shall attain a score of at least 80% (20 of 25 points) on the rubric |
| 1. Effective communication abilities | 3a. Provide organizations with effective executive management through their professional written communication skills | Students will prepare a report, paper, or case analysis on a business topic. The assignment will be assessed with the Written Communication Skills Rubric. | MBA 6308 | Students will score at least 80% (11.2 of 14 points) on the rubric. |
| 3b. Provide organizations with effective executive management through their professional oral communication skills | Students will give an oral presentation of a report, paper, or case analysis on a business topic. The assignment will be assessed with the Oral Presentation Rubric. | MBA 6308 | Students will score at least an 80% (44 of 55 points) on the rubric. |
| 1. Effective information management abilities | 4a. Comprehend the strategic role of information systems in support of business activities | Demonstrate sound, and well-informed decision making, on a written assignment (business case or other writing assignment) that reflects the ability to effectively collect and appropriately use information to make business decisions | MBA 6301 | Seventy percent of students will earn at least 70% or more of the possible points on the assignment |
| 1. Effective leadership/followership abilities | 5a. Provide organizations with effective executive leadership under conditions of uncertainty requiring adaptation and innovation | Students will demonstrate leadership skills in global organizations, under conditions of uncertainty requiring adaptation and innovation. The basis for assessment will be the leadership percentile score from GLO-BUS Simulation, including the items from the “co-manager” evaluations. | MBA 6320 | The mean score of all students will exceed the 50th percentile |
| 5b. Provide organizations with effective executive management by acting as team members and collaborators | Demonstrate collaboration skills in global organizations, under conditions of uncertainty requiring adaptation and innovation. The basis for assessment will be the peer evaluation from GLO-BUS Simulations, including all its items. | MBA 6320 | The mean score of all students will exceed the 50th percentile |

The following objectives were assessed in the past year in the MBA:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Learning Objectives Assessed |  |
| Summer 2016 | **Fall 2016** | **Spring 2017** |
| MBA 4a Strategic Role of IS | MBA 3a Writing Communications | MBA 1a Global |
| MBA 5b Teamwork | MBA 3b Oral Communications | MBA 2a Ethics |
|  |  | MBA 5a Leadership |

The following objectives included an Improvement Team improvement cycle in the past year:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Improvement Team Actions | | |
| Program | **Objective** | **Term Met** | **Approved?** |
| MBA Objectives | **1a Global** | Spring 2016 | Fall 2016 |
| **3a Written Communications** | Spring 2016 | Fall 2016 |
| **4a Information Management** | Spring 2017 | *In progress* |
| **5a Leadership** | Spring 2016 | Summer 2017 |
| **5b Teamwork** | Fall 2016 | Summer 2017 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MBA 1a Dynamic Thinking/Global Issues** | | | |
| **Learning Objective** | | | Students will be able to provide organizations with effective executive management through decision making in uncertain, dynamic, global business situations. |
| **Improvement Team Members** | | | **List all faculty in the improvement team:**  Lauren Maxwell (M & M)  Joe McGarrity (EFIRM—CAC Liaison)  Karen Oxner (Accounting)  Carla Barber (MIS)  Jim Downey (observer) |
| **Term/Year of Improvement (when team meets)** | | | **Spring 2016** |
| **Term/Year Objective Assessed** | | | **Fall 2012 and Spring 2013** |
| **Improvement Team Recommendations** | | | |
| **Notes** | | This objective is assessed using the GLO-BUS Strategy Simulation. It compares the “all companies” score from UCA teams to teams from around the world; the benchmark is that the average score of all UCA teams will be at or higher than the average score for all other global teams. This has been assessed each spring for four years. In each case, we did not meet the benchmark. The global average has been 84-86; in the four assessed semesters, UCA’s average was 69, 76, 61 and 66.  The real question is whether to continue to use GLO-BUS as the assessment tool. There are pros and cons. This objective really consists of two areas: dynamic decision making and global business issues. The simulation seems to measure this. On the downside, we have no way of knowing the composition of the thousands of other global teams with whom we are benchmarked against. | |
| **Closing the Loop Activities** | | **Compare data with previous assessment(s) in light of improvements made:**  The team noted that some improvements have been made previously. For example, one of the weak areas was reading financial statements, and an assignment was added to the course that incorporates this. Indeed, this particular area, which contributes to the overall UCA average, increased. The team recommends this assignment be maintained. | |
| **Learning Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended improvements for learning:**  Given the noted issues with GLO-BUS and this objective, the team focused more on system changes. Specifically, this included how we assess. | |
| **System Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended system improvements:**  The Improvement Team recognizes the functionality of using GLO-BUS as an assessment tool. It seems to measure both dynamic decision-making and global issues inherent in business decisions. There is also something positive about using an external benchmark. The problem, however, is using the current benchmark. The team recommends changing the benchmark. Instead of comparing UCA’s average to that of all the other teams, it recommends using historical trends benchmarking to examine and analyze UCA team’s performance over time, in the “all companies” average. Given the previous four years of data, with an average of 67.5, the team recommends a score of 70% as a starting point. The team also recommends examining each of the eight areas that comprise the simulation. The class average for these eight areas should be above 50%. The revised benchmark:  *The institutional score for “all companies” shall be greater than 70%; the average scores for the eight areas shall be greater than 50%.* | |
| **Improvement Champion(s)** | | Michael Rubach | |
| **Improvement Timeline(s)** | | Approve changes in Fall 2016. | |
| **Chain of Submission/Approval** | | | |
| **Departmental Comments** | **MIS**: MIS met 17 August 2016. The department concurred with the benchmarking recommendation from the Improvement Team.  **EFIRM**: EFIRM met 17 August 2016. They reviewed the recommendations and concurred with them.  **M & M**: M & M met 17 August 2016. They concurred with the recommendations.  **ACCT**: Accounting met 17 August 2016. The department concurred with the benchmarking recommendation from the Improvement Team. | | |
| **CAC Endorsement** | CAC met 10/21/2016. In general it concurred with the recommendations of the Improvement Team. Specifically:  1. Continue to use GLO-BUS to assess this objective; while there are downsides, the simulation is about making decisions in a global environment, which is our objective.  2. Use the eight areas in GLO-BUS as part of the assessment. This includes leadership, teamwork, analytical skills, financial management, operations management, marketing management, HR management and corporate social responsibility. These correspond to our learning objective, which includes “effective executive management through decision making in an uncertain, dynamic, global business situations”.  3. Benchmarking: the team discussed benchmarking at length. It noted that a benchmarking sub-committee has been formed to address the issue college-wide. But as an input, it does recommend that we eliminate the benchmark of comparing our overall average with the “all companies” average. Instead, let’s concentrate on improving our scores over time. It recommends including scores of the eight areas as well.  4. Collect data every long semester (fall/spring) this course (MBA 6320) is offered (currently this is each spring). This would do away with the formal data collection of twice each five years. | | |
| **Executive Committee Endorsement** | The Executive Committee met on November 17, 2016. The committee concurred with the CAC recommendations. | | |
| **Dean Approval** | **List of Recommendations to be approved:**  1. Continue to use GLO-BUS to assess this objective. Within GLO-BUS, use the eight areas covered as part of the assessment data (leadership, teamwork, analytical skills, financial management, operations management, marketing management, HR management and corporate social responsibility), as well as the overall average.  2. Collect data every long semester (fall/spring) the course is offered. Change the schedule accordingly).  3. Eliminate the current benchmark of the “all-companies” average. Instead, use a benchmark of 70% for the UCA company average (not comparing it to others around the world), and 50% for the eight areas covered. This may be adjusted when the CAC sub-committee on benchmarking makes their recommendations.  Approved: December 12, 2016. | | |

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MBA 3a Written Communication Skills** | | | |
| **Learning Objective** | | | Students will be able to provide organizations with effective executive management through their professional written communication skills. |
| **Improvement Team Members** | | | **List all faculty in the improvement team:**  Tom Oxner (Accounting)  John Bratton (EFIRM)  Mike Ellis (MIS-CAC Liaison)  Laci Lyons (M & M)  Jim Downey (CAC)-observer |
| **Term/Year of Improvement (when team meets)** | | | **Spring 2016** |
| **Term/Year Data Assessed** | | | **Fall 2011 to Fall 2014** |
| **Improvement Team Recommendations** | | | |
| **Notes** | | Data were collected each fall for four years. The first year the objective passed. The next two years it did not, but it was close (71.4 with a 75 benchmark). The last semester it failed by a wider margin (65.2). The major problem is that the data have been stored as aggregate data, so information is not available to pinpoint weak areas (to be corrected next time). We do not know what to really improve. | |
| **Closing the Loop Activities** | | **Compare data with previous assessment(s) in light of improvements made:**  Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report. | |
| **Learning Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended improvements for learning:**  There were no recommendations to directly improve student learning, because at this point we have only aggregate data. | |
| **System Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended system improvements:**  Specific system improvement recommendations follow:  1. **Rubric**: keep the same rubric.  2. **Benchmark**: the current benchmark is 75% of students will score at least 70% on the rubric (9.8 of 14 points. This seems low. If 75% of students score the minimum (70%) and the other 20% score zero, this objective could pass with an overall score of 52.5%. The team had a lively discussion of benchmarks, not only for the BBA, but for MBA and MAcc as well. The team recommended the following benchmarks for the rubric:  BBA (all are upper-division courses): 10.5 of 14 (75%)  MACC: 11.2 of 14 (80%); 80% will receive no zeros on rubric items  MBA: 11.2 of 14 (80%); 80% will receive no zeros on rubric items  The team recommends eliminating the “double” benchmark (75% will score 70%) and go with a simple 80%. The team also recommends adopting the 80% will get no zeros. | |
| **Improvement Champion(s)** | | Michael Rubach | |
| **Improvement Timeline(s)** | | Approve and implement in Fall 2016. | |
| **Chain of Submission/Approval** | | | |
| **Departmental Comments** | **MIS**: MIS met 17 August 2016. The department concurred with the benchmarking recommendation from the Improvement Team, including eliminating double benchmarks.  **EFIRM**: EFIRM met 17 August 2016. They reviewed the recommendations and concurred with them.  **M & M**: M & M met 17 August 2016. They concurred with the recommendations.  **ACCT**: Accounting met 17 August 2016. The department concurred with the benchmarking recommendation from the Improvement Team. Like for the MAcc, the department recommends eliminating double benchmarks. | | |
| **CAC Endorsement** | CAC met 10/21/2016; they concurred with the recommendation to keep the same rubric. They noted the benchmarking recommendation, and while agreeing, deferred to the sub-committee that is examining benchmarks. | | |
| **Executive Committee Endorsement** | The Executive Committee met on November 17, 2016. The committee concurred with the CAC recommendations. | | |
| **Dean Approval** | **List of Recommendations to be approved:**  1. Use the same rubric for assessing this objective.  2. Use the benchmark of 80% for rubric mean, with no less than 80% receiving any zeros. This eliminates the double benchmark in place. This may be adjusted when the CAC sub-committee on benchmarking makes their recommendations.  Approved: December 12, 2016. | | |

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MBA 5a Leadership** | | | |
| **Learning Objective** | | | Provide organizations with effective executive leadership under conditions of uncertainty requiring adaptation and innovation. |
| **Improvement Team Members** | | | **List all faculty in the improvement team:**  David McCalman (M & M-CAC Liaison)  David Mitchell (EFIRM)  Steve Nelson (Accounting)  Mark McMurtrey (MIS) |
| **Term/Year of Improvement (when team meets)** | | | **Fall 2016** |
| **Term/Year Data Assessed** | | | **Spring 2014 and Spring 2015** |
| **Improvement Team Recommendations** | | | |
| **Notes** | | This objective has been assessed twice, in Spring of 2014/2015. Both times it passed the benchmark, at 53% and 59% respectfully (the benchmark is 50%). The problem noted is that this assessment comes from peer evaluations in the GLO-BUS simulation. Peer evaluations may be a direct measure for collaboration, but probably not for leadership. | |
| **Closing the Loop Activities** | | **Compare data with previous assessment(s) in light of improvements made:**  Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report. | |
| **Learning Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended improvements for learning:**  There was not enough useful information to make any recommendations for learning improvements. The team noted that only aggregate data has been collected, and the measure is indirect. The recommendation is that item-level data be collected in the future to pinpoint weak areas on which to work. | |
| **System Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended system improvements:**  1. The Improvement Team discussed using student peer evals to measure leadership, using the GLO-BUS simulation. The discussion centered around direct vs. indirect measurements. The team believes the GLO-BUS measure is useful, and if it can be used, then it should be continued. In discussions with the instructor for this course, and the MBA Director, it is recommended that we continue to use the peer evaluations (called “co-manager” evaluations by GLO-BUS) for this assessment. Most MBA students are current managers and almost all are working professionals, who understand leadership, management, and followership.  2. The team did not discuss benchmarking, since a sub-committee of the CAC is currently discussing this topic. | |
| **Improvement Champion(s)** | | Michael Rubach | |
| **Improvement Timeline(s)** | | Approve and implement in Spring 2017. | |
| **Chain of Submission/Approval** | | | |
| **CAC Endorsement** | CAC met on March 15, 2017. In general, they agreed with the team’s recommendations. CAC recommends continuing to use GLO-BUS as the assessment tool. CAC also discussed in class vs. online assessments, noting that it is imperative that both media be assessed, provided each individual section is large enough to employ teams. The committee discussed indirect vs. direct measurement and agreed that this should be classified as a direct measure, especially given the make up of the student population (many are managers in business). | | |
| **Executive Committee Endorsement** | The Executive Committee met April 11, 2017. It endorsed the recommendations of the Improvement Team and CAC, including continuing to use GLO-BUS as the assessment tool. | | |
| **Dean Approval** | **List of Recommendations to be approved:**  1. Continue to use GLO-BUS as the assessment tool.  2. Use the items (questions) from the “co-manager” evaluations as part of the assessment, and not just the overall score. Change the measure as appropriate.  Approved: June 6, 2017. | | |

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MBA 5b Teamwork** | | | |
| **Learning Objective** | | | Provide organizations with effective executive management by acting as team members and collaborators. |
| **Improvement Team Members** | | | **List all faculty in the improvement team:**  Alex Chen (M & M)  David Mitchell (EFIRM)  Stephanie Watson (Accounting-CAC Liaison)  Summer Bartczak (MIS)  Jim Downey (CAC)-observer |
| **Term/Year of Improvement (when team meets)** | | | **Fall 2016** |
| **Term/Year Data Assessed** | | | **Fall 2013-Spring 2015** |
| **Improvement Team Recommendations** | | | |
| **Notes** | | Data were formally collected for the first time in Spring 2016. However because data are gathered from the simulation GLO-BUS, we used data from each spring semester from 2013-2016 (four total). For the two middle data collections, the benchmark (mean score > 50%) was passed. The first and last collections it was not (43% and 49% respectfully). The data is from GLO-BUS simulation’s “Assessment of the individual’s collaborative skills, teamwork, and ability to work well with others”. It is based on co-managers’ answers for items 1, 3, 8, 9 and 11 on the peer evaluation exercise. | |
| **Closing the Loop Activities** | | **Compare data with previous assessment(s) in light of improvements made:**  Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report. | |
| **Learning Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended improvements for learning:**  1. The team questioned how expectations for teamwork were communicated to students in the assessment class. The team recommended that prior to the teamwork activity, the rubric (peer evaluation) questions be shared with the students along with an explanation of expectations with regard to individual effort, working with the group, and honesty in the evaluations of team members. Students should understand what is being assessed in the peer evaluation. | |
| **System Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended system improvements:**  1. The team recommends continuing to use GLO-BUS for this assessment. Despite the data coming directly from students, it seems appropriate for this one objective that students are the appropriate graders. This is judged to be a direct assessment.  2. The team recommends collecting data from GLO-BUS every fall and/or spring semester, whenever the course is offered in the long semester. This would eliminate the need to schedule this assessment twice each five years. The Improvement Team schedule would not change.  3. The team did not discuss benchmarking, since a sub-committee of the CAC is currently discussing this topic. | |
| **Improvement Champion(s)** | | Michael Rubach | |
| **Improvement Timeline(s)** | | Approve and implement in Spring 2017. | |
| **Chain of Submission/Approval** | | | |
| **CAC Endorsement** | The COB CAC met 10 Feb. 2017. The committee concurred with the recommendations of the Improvement Team. These recommendations include:  -continue using GLO-BUS for this assessment  -share the rubric (peer evaluation) questions with the students along with an explanation of expectations with regard to individual effort, working with the group, and honesty in the evaluations of team members.  -collect data every long semester the course is offered; this will do away with the formal schedule of assessing twice every five years. | | |
| **Executive Committee Endorsement** | The Executive Committee met April 11, 2017. It endorsed the recommendations of the Improvement Team and CAC. | | |
| **Dean Approval** | **List of Recommendations to be approved:**  1. Continue using GLO-BUS for this assessment; use the five items that make up the Teamwork score as well. Change the measure as appropriate.  2. Collect data every long semester the course is offered, eliminating the need for data collection twice in every five year period.  3. Share the peer evaluation with all students prior to the start of the simulation, so that it is reinforced what constitutes a good team mate.  Approved: June 6, 2017. | | |

**Objectives in Progress**

**MBA 4a Information Management**

Team met in Spring 2017, and made multiple recommendations, including completely revising the measure. Team recommendations are set to be distributed to faculty for comment in early Fall 2017. Expected completion term: Fall 2017.

# VIII. Assurance of Learning in Majors (HLC #7)

**A. Program Goals, Objectives, Measure, and Benchmarks**

AACSB assesses by program (BBA, BS, MBA, MAcc). HLC assesses by major. The learning goals and objectives for both are exactly the same, except for one discipline-specific goal (i.e., major). This goal, associated with each of the majors, we label HLC #7 (note that it used to be labeled HLC 8). It examines the depth of one’s knowledge and is assessed summatively (at the end of one’s program). The list below includes all BBA goals, including the discipline-specific one, #7:

***Our graduates shall possess:***

1. Critical Thinking & Analytical Thinking Skills;

2. Awareness of the Global Business Environment;

3. Ethical Reasoning Abilities;

4. Effective Communication Abilities;

5. Effective Collaborative Skills;

6. Possess an Understanding of a Broad Range of Business Disciplines.

7. Knowledge Appropriate to the Practice of their Major Discipline.

**Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) and BS-Information Systems Assessment Plan: Discipline Specific Goal 7**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goals** | **Learning Objectives** | **Measure** | **Course** | **Benchmark** |
| 7. Our graduates shall possess knowledge appropriate to the practice of their major discipline. | 7a. Accounting graduates will demonstrate an understanding of accounting topics in the areas of financial, cost, tax, government/nonprofit, accounting information systems, and auditing. | Each student must pass a comprehensive accounting exam comprised of questions written by the accounting faculty. The exam covers the 6 major topics in accounting. | ACCT 4312 | 70% of all students who have completed or are concurrently enrolled in all other major required Accounting classes will score seventy percent or above. |
| 7a. Finance graduates will be able to value financial assets, analyze and manage financial risks in a business environment, and apply financial analysis techniques to diverse business situations, demonstrating a thorough knowledge of financial decision-making skills and financial markets. | Each student must pass a comprehensive finance exam comprised of questions written by the finance faculty. The exam covers the major topics in valuation, financial modeling, and financial decision-making aptitudes. | FINA 4336 | 70% of all students who have completed all other Finance classes will score seventy percent or above. |
| 7a. Insurance & Risk Management graduates will possess the skills and knowledge base necessary to effectively counsel clients about insurance and risk management strategies and products. | Students will take the UACIC Life and Health Exam as a final in INSU 3315. This exam is the first of two parts of obtaining the nationally recognized UAcIC (Undergraduate Associate Certified Insurance Counselor) designation. | INSU 3315 | UCA’s student median grade will equal the national median grade. |
| 7a. Management graduates will demonstrate the decision-making, organizing, and interaction knowledge and skills needed in the global business environment. | Management majors will prepare a research project on a management topic, which will embellish their knowledge and skills in a large number of skill areas. | MGMT 4348 | Mean score of students assessed will be 8.4 out of 12 or above on the MGMT 4348 Rubric. |
| 7a. Marketing graduates will demonstrate the promotion, retailing, sales, and marketing management knowledge and skill sets necessary to meet the requirements of the global business environment. | Students will prepare a research project on a marketing topic, which will assess their knowledge and skills in a large number of skill areas. | MKTG 4355 | Mean score of students assessed will be 75% (9.6 out of 12) or above on the MKTG 4355 Rubric. |
| 7a. Innovation & Entrepreneurship graduates will possess the interdisciplinary skills needed to start and operate a small business. | Students will create and present a thorough convincing business plan. | MGMT 4376 | The mean score of students assessed will be 140 out of 200 or above on the MGMT 4376 Rubric. |
| 7a. Economics graduates will possess the analytical skills to formulate an appropriate, discipline-specific question, research possible solutions, and provide accurate analysis. | Economics students will prepare a research paper demonstrating the analytical skills to formulate an appropriate, discipline-specific question, research possible solutions, and provide accurate analysis. | ECON 4380 | The mean of students’ points will be 7 (of 12) or greater on the ECON 4380 Discipline Specific Assessment Rubric. |
| 7a. Management Information Systems graduates will understand the key competencies that comprise the planning, analysis, design, and implementation of high-quality organization information systems. | Each student must pass appropriate questions in exams comprised of questions written by the MIS faculty. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the systems development life cycle and be able to apply the most appropriate methodologies and tools to resolve organization information systems issues and be able to effectively communicate appropriate solutions. | MIS 4328 | The mean score of students assessed will be 70 percent or higher on the assessment exam questions. |
| 7a. Information System graduates will effectively manage the process of information systems development, from requirements planning to system delivery. | Students will demonstrate sufficient understanding through objective responses to questions. | MIS 4355 | Mean score of students will be 75% or above. |

The following objectives were assessed in the past year for HLC-7 objectives:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Learning Objectives Assessed |  |
| Fall 2016 | **Spring 2017** |
| HLC-7 Accounting | HLC-7 Accounting |
| HLC-7 Marketing | HLC-7 Economics |
|  | HLC-7 Marketing |

The following objectives included an Improvement Team improvement cycle in the past year:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Improvement Team Actions | | |
| Program | **Objective** | **Term Met** | **Approved?** |
| HLC-7 Objectives | **Accounting** | Spring 2016 | Fall 2016 |
| **Innovation & Entrepreneurship** | Fall 2016 | Summer 2017 |
| **Insurance** | Fall 2016 | In progress |
| **Management** | Fall 2016 | In progress |
| **Finance** | Spring 2017 | In progress |
| **MIS** | Spring 2017 | In progress |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **HLC 7 Accounting Improvement Team** | | | |
| **Learning Objective** | | | Our graduates shall possess knowledge appropriate to the practice of their major discipline. |
| **Team Members** | | | **List all faculty in the improvement team:**  Stephanie Watson (CAC representative)  Steve Nelson  Karen Oxner |
| **Term/Year of Improvement (when team meets)** | | | Spring 2016 |
| **Term/Year Data Gathered** | | | Fall 2013, Spring 2014, Fall 2014, and Spring 2015 |
| **Improvement Team Recommendations** | | | |
| **Notes** | | **Compare data with previous assessment(s) in light of improvements made:**  For all four data collections/assessments, the benchmark failed by a wide margin. The benchmark is 70% of students will score a 70% or higher on the exam. The percentage of students who scored a 70% were 7%, 5%, 16% and 12%. The questions for this test are based on the content of ten upper division accounting courses. There seem to be multiple problems. Students have little incentive to do well, since this is an “extra” exam which counts nothing but a few bonus points. In addition, we have no information on which areas are weak. We don’t have average test scores (only the percentage who scored above 70%). | |
| **Closing the Loop Activities** | | Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report. | |
| **Learning Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended improvements for learning:**  The team recommends that students are provided review materials. Since the test questions come from material in ten (mostly) previous classes, having review material from these classes should aid students in preparing. This is what is done for the CPA Exam, so it is a common and proven best practice. | |
| **System Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended system improvements:**  1. There is not enough incentive for students to do well. It was resolved to make this worth points in the course, to add incentive.  2. The benchmark is too high. Only 50% of students taking CPA exam sections pass with a 75% or higher, so the team recommends lowering the benchmark to "50% of students will score 70% or higher.  3. Expand the question pool; it currently consists of four questions from each of the ten upper division Accounting courses. Increase this to 15 questions. Still, in the exam, students would answer only four questions. | |
| **Improvement Champion(s)** | | Stephanie Watson | |
| **Improvement Timeline(s)** | | Fall 2016 | |
| **Chain of Submission/Approval** | | | |
| **Departmental Comments** | The Accounting Department met 17 August 2016. They concurred with the Improvement Team that study guides for all ten areas be given to students. Two sample guides were presented to faculty; the other eight will be developed before the test is given in November. In addition, the department concurred with the recommendations that this exam count for points in the course and to expand the question pool. | | |
| **CAC Endorsement** | CAC met on 10/21/2016. It concurred with the recommendations of the Improvement Team and department. It noted that the benchmark will be examined by the CAC sub-committee on benchmarking. | | |
| **Executive Committee Endorsement** | The Executive Committee met on November 17, 2016. The committee concurred with the CAC recommendations. | | |
| **Dean Approval** | **List of Recommendations to be approved:**  1. Provide students with review material to cover all areas of the exam. Expand the question pool, as indicated.  2. Make the assessment test count for points to add incentive to the assessment.  3. Use a benchmark of 75%; this may be adjusted when the recommendation from the CAC sub-committee on benchmarking provides their input.  Approved: December 12, 2016, | | |

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **HLC 7 Innovation & Entrepreneurship Improvement Team** | | | |
| **Learning Objective** | | | Innovation & Entrepreneurship graduates will possess the interdisciplinary skills needed to start and operate a small business. |
| **Team Members** | | | **List all faculty in the improvement team:**  Susan Myers (CAC representative)  Dan Fisher  Bill Doshier |
| **Term/Year of Improvement (when team meets)** | | | Fall 2016 |
| **Term/Year Data Gathered** | | | Fall 2014 |
| **Improvement Team Recommendations** | | | |
| **Notes** | | This objective was assessed for the first time in Fall 2014. It was scheduled to be assessed in Fall 2015, but the rubric was deemed inappropriate by the faculty member teaching the course (MGMT 4376 New Venture Creation). It passed the benchmark of 140 of 200 points (168.5). | |
| **Closing the Loop Activities** | | Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report. | |
| **Learning Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended improvements for learning:**  The one time this was assessed, only aggregate numbers are available. This means there is no item-level analysis to pinpoint weak areas. Therefore, no learning improvement recommendations were made. | |
| **System Improvement Recommendations** | | **List any recommended system improvements:**  1. The previous rubric was quite extensive and complex, and did not sufficiently measure the objective. The team recommends a new rubric, which is shorter and more succinct; it is attached.  2. The team did not make a benchmarking recommendation, since this is being examined by a CAC sub-committee. | |
| **Improvement Champion(s)** | | Ron Duggins | |
| **Improvement Timeline(s)** | | Approve in Spring 2017 | |
| **Chain of Submission/Approval** | | | |
| **CAC Endorsement** | CAC met on March 15; recommended approval of Improvement Team suggestions. | | |
| **Executive Committee Endorsement** | The Executive Committee met April 11, 2017. It endorsed the recommendations of the Improvement Team and CAC. The committee suggests making a Business Plan for this course required. | | |
| **Dean Approval** | **List of Recommendations to be approved:**  1. Use a formal Business Plan to assess this objective.  2. Use the revised rubric to assess. In future improvement efforts, use each rubric item as a basis for improvement.  Approved: June 6, 2017. | | |

**Objectives in Progress**

**HLC 7 Insurance & Risk Management**

Team met in Fall 2016 and again in Spring 2017. The assessment artifact is an external test, the UACIC Exam. The team is figuring out how to get item-level data from the exam, and not just overall (aggregate) data. Expected completion time: Fall 2017.

**HLC 7 Management**

Team met in Spring 2017. They were unable to make any real recommendations because the instructor of the course (MGMT 4348) went on maternity leave mid-semester. This issue generated a proposal that Improvement Teams for HLC 7 objectives should have as a team member the course instructor (or at least a previous course instructor), if possible. This would eliminate the problem of needing additional faculty resources when teams meet. This proposal was approved by the Dean in June 2017. The team will reconvene in Fall 2017, when the instructor returns. Expected completion time: Fall 2017.

**HLC 7 Finance**

Team met in Spring 2017 and made recommendations. This was completed near the end of the semester, and so in early Fall 2017 it will be sent out to faculty for comment and then will go to CAC. Expected completion time: Fall 2017.

**HLC 7 Management Information Systems**

This objective is assessed in MIS 4328 Systems Analysis & Design. While the team was prepared to meet in Spring 2017, it did not because the instructor submitted her resignation letter (though she finished the semester). A new faculty member was hired, who will begin in Fall 2017 and teach the course. Given the change in faculty, it was considered prudent to have the new faculty member a part of the Improvement Team for this objective. Expected completion time: Spring 2018.

# IX. Assurance of Learning in the BS/BA in Economics (HLC)

**A. Program Goals, Objectives, Measure, and Benchmarks**

There are three goals in the BS/BA in Economics Assurance of Learning program.

***Our graduates shall possess:***

1. A knowledge base that helps students ask more informed questions and analyze complex situations

2. Effective communication abilities

3. Ethical reasoning abilities

For each Learning Goal, the COB has defined at least one corresponding Learning Objective. The result is 4 objectives assessed in 1 class (all summative measures). The program is summarized below.

## Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Science in Economics (BA/BS) Assurance of Learning Plan

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal: Our graduates shall possess** | **Objectives: Students will be able to** | **Measure: Students Will** | **Course** | **Benchmark** |
| 1. Knowledge base that helps students ask more informed questions and analyze complex situations | 1a.Students will be able to formulate an appropriate, discipline-specific question, research possible solutions, and provide accurate analysis | Students will prepare a research paper or other assignment on a discipline-specific topic | ECON 4380 | The mean of students’ points will be 8 (of 12) or greater on the UCA Critical Inquiry Rubric. |
| 2. Effective communication abilities. | 2a. Students will be able to produce professional quality research documents. | Students will prepare a report, paper, or case analysis on a discipline-specific topic in the writing-intensive course designated in their majors | ECON 4380 | Mean score of students assessed with the rubric will be eleven (11) points, or greater, out of sixteen (16) available on the UCA Communication-Written Rubric. |
| 2b. Students will be able to produce professional quality research presentations. | Students will present in class an analysis of a major research publication assigned by the instructor. | ECON 4380 | Mean score of students assessed with the rubric will be eleven (11) points, or greater, out of sixteen (16) available points on the UCA Communication-Oral Rubric. |
| 3. Ethical reasoning abilities. | 3a. Students will be aware of ethical issues inherent in decisions and articulate the manner in which they arrived at an ethical decision | Students will complete an assignment (business case or other writing assignment) dealing with ethical decision making or the social responsibility of business. | ECON 4380 | Mean score of students assessed with the rubric will be six (6) points, or greater, out of the available eight (8) points on the UCA Responsible Living Rubric (Goal 1 only). |

The following objectives were assessed in the past year for BS/BA Economics objectives:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Learning Objectives Assessed | |
| Fall 2016 | **Spring 2017** |
|  | BS/BA 1a Inquiry & Analysis |
|  | BS/BA 2a Writing Communications |
|  | BS/BA 2b Oral Communications |
|  | BS/BA 3a Ethics |

No objectives were improved in the BS/BA Economics program. All four objectives are scheduled to be improved in Fall 2017.

# X. Assurance of Learning in the UCA Core

Assessment in the UCA Core is evolving and is becoming a completely separate system, with its own processes and procedures. The beginning process (as of Summer 2017) is to use trained expert faculty to score (grade) the rubrics that are used in assessing an objective. Last year, for the first time, UCA Core courses in the area of Responsible Living were assessed. These artifacts (rubrics) will be scored by these expert faculty later this summer. While the COB has Core courses in Responsible Living, as of now, we will keep separate Core AOL and all the objectives reported in this Annual Report. If at some future time we couple these areas, this report will include Core assessments. Note that some of the Core objectives overlap; for example, Responsible Living has two objectives, of which one is ethics, the same as we have in almost all of our programs. We will continue to report on all of the objectives delineated herein, but not necessarily on those from the UCA Core.