

Program Assessment: *Annual Report*

Program: Part-time MBA Program

Department:

College/School: Chaifetz School of Business

Date: August 2020

Primary Assessment Contact: Dr. Brett Boyle, Program Director

25. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

Learning Outcomes 1 - 5

26. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

1. Knowledge of key business function was assessed for the previous two years using an CSB-designed exit exams (see attached results)
2. Problem solving and analysis is assessed via a project in ITM 6400 requiring creation and use of dashboards in Excel and Tableau to analyze problems and suggest solutions
3. Global trends /local practices is assessed via a qualitative examination of essay questions on the mid-term and final exams in IB6000
4. Written communication skills are assessed via a mid-term essay in the capstone course (MGT 6006)
5. A case study assigned in MBA 6003 (Legal, Ethical and Professional Environment of Business) will be analyzed on four components of ethical judgment and corporate social responsibility

27. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?

NOTE: *If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.*

1. Multiple choice exam questions were scored.
2. ITM6400 course instructor grades these projects as part of the course, and uses a rubric to separately assess the quality of decision-making based on 3 criteria.
3. Essay questions are embedded in course exams, which are scored as part of the course by the instructor of record. Specified questions are also judged against a 3-criteria rubric for learning outcome assessment.
4. Essay questions are scored as part of two in-class exams, and are separately judged for: structure/outline; content development/analysis; grammar, punctuation, and spelling; and, professionalism as part of program assessment on written communication.
5. A legal case is examined and the response is judged based on a 4-attribute assessment rubric.

All results are computed by course instructors; raw data or summary data are submitted to Program

Director for course and program assessment, results are passed along to Associate Dean for archiving.

28. What did you learn from the data? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.

NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.

The main findings from the current assessment data are:

(1) Over the past two years, results from the exit exam have been poor. In 2019, a majority of students met or exceeded expectations in only two content areas (MGT6003, ITM6000). In all other areas, the majority of students fell into the Needs Improvement Category. Speculation about this and a potential remedy is discussed below.

(2) Students scored very well on their problem-solving skills: Percent meeting or exceeding expectations on the following criteria: 1) understood the problem in the context of data analysis (100%), identify and apply specific analytical techniques (95%); develop specific solutions to solve the problem (84%)

(3) On the three attributes being assessed, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was 100%, 91%, and 85%.

(4) Overall, students generated high-quality written responses. Scores on professionalism exceeded expectations (only 1 student demonstrated a need for improvement in this area). For the remaining three attributes, between 85% and 90% of students met or exceeded expectations.

(5) The case analysis assessment indicated that students could successfully identify the ethical component of the subject matter (moral awareness) – 100%; could utilize multiple ethical judgment frameworks – 90%; could cogently present and support their position – 100%; and demonstrated an understanding of CSR – 100%

29. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

We speculate the poor performance on the exit exam is due to timing and lack of strict sequencing in the PMBA program. It is possible that a student could be taking a tested content area course concurrently with the timing of the exit exam and thus not have exposure to all of the content. Alternately, it is possible for a student to have successfully completed a course during the first semester of their program, but then not take the exit exam for another 7 – 10 semesters, thus requiring significant content recall over a long period of time. Beginning in Fall 2020, the individual content area assessments will be collected at the end of the semester when students take that particular course.

(2) We are pleased with our students' current level of proficiency in decision-making and analytics, and we will attempt to continuously update the data-analytics programs and languages that we are exposing students to in order to stay current with contemporary business demands and trends.

(3) Although students performed well on both the global rubric and the decision-making rubric, the lowest category for both assessments dealt with the ability of students to provide specific, feasible solutions to real-world business problems. We will be investigating ways to teach better brainstorming and creative decision-making techniques to guide students toward generating a wider array of potential solutions to problems.

30. Did you follow up (“close the loop”) on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? *(For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?)*

- (1) Several new one credit-hour professional development courses have been developed to allow students to learn and practice directly applicable skillsets for business (e.g., Having Difficult Conversations; Coaching and Mentoring; Power, Politics, Influence, and Negotiation; etc.). We believe the effectiveness of these courses is being demonstrated through the high scores on communication and especially the improved professionalism of the students.
- (2) A revision to the program curriculum is being considered. This is in response to market demand, increased demands for flexible course offerings and delivery modalities, as well as adjustment the credit-hour requirement to be more in-line with our regional competitors.
- (3) Prior to the pandemic, we were in the process of making more courses available online in order to offer more flexible options for working adults. Now that the pandemic forced the creation of online content for the majority of our PMBA courses, we will continue to expand our online offerings and make these available under normal circumstances such that a distance-delivered SLU PMBA is a possibility. To strengthen this approach, SLU has implemented a Distance Learning Policy to assure that the quality of remote-learning courses remains rigorous and meets strict design standards. This policy will go into effect in 2021. Many of our faculty have participate in the online teaching seminars offered by the Reinert Center

IMPORTANT: Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.

**PMBA Knowledge Assessment Test Results
Spring 18 & Spring 2019***

	Needs Improvement (< 70%)	Meets Expectation (70% or 80%)	Exceeds Expectations (90% or 100%)	# of Testers
FIN 6000 (Q 1-10)	17	3	1	21
	26	3	0	29
ITM 6000 (Q 11-20)	5	15	1	21
	8	16	5	29
IB 6000 (Q 21-30)	12	9	0	21
	24	5	0	29
MKT 6000 (Q 31-40)	21	0	0	21
	27	2	0	29
MGT 6000 (Q 41-50)	13	6	2	21
	16	13	0	29
MGT 6003 (Q 51-60)	12	8	1	21
	11	9	9	29
MGT 6006 (Q 61-70)	12	5	4	21
	15	10	4	29
ITM 6400 (Q 71-80)	12	8	1	21
	23	3	3	29

*

Spring 18 Test results appear in the top half of each cell (shaded), Spring 19 results are in the