

Report of Student Learning and Achievement
Azusa Pacific University School of Business & Management
 For Academic Year: 2015-16

Mission of the APU School of Business & Management
<i>Mission Statement: We are a Christ-centered community of scholars and professionals pursuing academic excellence to advance the work of God in the world, developing students of character and competence as difference-makers in business and society</i>

Student Learning Assessment for BA and BS Business Degrees
Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes
1. Competent Business Knowledge
2. Critical Thinking Ability
3. Christian Business Ethics
4. Capable Communication Skills
5. Collaborative Teamwork Ability
6. Comprehensive Global Awareness
Intended Student Learning Outcomes
1. <i>Learning Outcome 1: Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge in multiple business disciplines, including management, finance, marketing, accounting and economics.</i>
2. <i>Learning Outcome 2: Students will be able to identify and solve business problems using analytical and critical thinking skills.</i>
3. <i>Learning Outcome 3: Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to evaluate business decisions based on a Christian perspective.</i>
4. <i>Learning Outcome 4: Students will be able to convey ideas clearly through professional written communication. Students will also be able to express ideas effectively through professional oral presentations.</i>
5. <i>Learning Outcome 5: Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to function as an effective business team member.</i>

6. <i>Learning Outcome 6: Students will be able to identify cultural, economic and political aspects of business in a global environment.</i>	
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:
1. <i>ETS Major Field Test for Business (BUSI450)</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 1	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 1: A score of 70% or better on the ETS MFT.</i>
2. <i>Case Study Analysis (BUSI450)</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 2	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 2: An average score of 3 (4 point scale) on the Critical Thinking Rubric for each student.</i>
3. <i>Senior Seminar Paper (BUSI496)</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 3	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 3: An average score of 3 (4 point scale) on the Christian Character Rubric for each student.</i>
4. <i>Senior Seminar Paper (BUSI496)</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 4	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 4: An average score of 3 (4 point scale) on the Written and Oral Communication Rubrics for each student.</i>
5. <i>Team Work Inventory (BUSI450)</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 5	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 5: A score of 70% or better on the Team Simulation Survey.</i>
6. <i>International Business Final Exam (BUSI370)</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 6	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 6: An average score of 3 (4 point scale) on the Global Awareness Rubric for each student.</i>
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Indirect Measures:
1. <i>Indirect Measure 1: Alumni Survey</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 1-6	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Indirect Measure 1: 70% of the respondents report effective preparation for each of the 6 Program SLO areas.</i>
2. <i>Indirect Measure 2: Employer’s Survey</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 1-6	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Indirect Measure 2: 70% of the respondents report effective preparation for each of the 6 Program SLO areas.</i>

Assessment Results: BA and BS Business Degrees

Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:

1. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 1:*

Trait	Students Mean Scores	Target (National Mean)
<i>Accounting</i>	40	41.5
<i>Economics</i>	41	39.8
<i>Management</i>	58	54.3
<i>Quantitative Analysis</i>	35	36.4
<i>Finance</i>	41	42.4
<i>Marketing</i>	59	55
<i>Legal & Social</i>	60	59.5
<i>Information Systems</i>	44	50.1
<i>International Issues</i>	45	40.3
Overall	150	150.3

Summary of Data:

Overall, the students performed well with 80% of the students scoring 70% or better on the ETS Business MFT. Only 20% of the students scored

below 70% on the MFT. As a whole, the students scored at the National mean (150.30) for the entire test. Students performed above the National mean in 5 of the 9 subject areas and well above the national mean in the subjects of Management (3.70 above the national mean), Marketing (4.00 above the national mean) and International Issues (4.70 above the national mean).

Analysis:

Overall, students performed at a satisfactory level on all areas measured by the ETS Major Field Test, however, marked improvement was shown in the International Issues score at +4.70 above the national mean versus -5.80 below the national mean the year before. This may be due to the recent addition of full-time instructors teaching BUSI370 International Business this past assessment period.

Generally speaking, one limitation of using the ETS Business MFT to measure business knowledge is that the questions on the test may not be representative of what actually is taught in our curriculum, therefore students are being tested on material that they were not required to learn in our program. It may be helpful to evaluate the questions on the Business MFT and exclude those questions that are not applicable to obtain a more accurate score for assessment purposes. Another alternative would be to develop our own business knowledge content test, as other schools have, to ensure that the questions are representative of what is taught and deemed important to our program.

2. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 2:*

<i>Trait</i>	<i>Mean Score</i>	<i>Target (%)</i>	<i>Students Meeting Target (%)</i>
<i>Problem Identification</i>	3.03	135 (100)	111 (82)
<i>Evaluates Quality of Evidence</i>	3.06	135 (100)	103 (76)
<i>Business Analysis</i>	3.03	135 (100)	94 (70)
<i>Concepts and Interpretations</i>	3.23	135 (100)	95 (71)
<i>Communicates Effectively</i>	3.03	135 (100)	103 (76)

<i>Point of View</i>	3.06	135 (100)	111 (82)
Totals	3.07	135 (100)	103 (76)

Overall, students performed well when measured for critical thinking ability with 76% of the students meeting or exceeding expectations. Mean score for the 6 critical thinking criteria was 3.07 (4 point scale) indicating that overall, students met the SBM expectations for critical thinking ability. However, of the 6 critical thinking areas measured, Business Analysis and Concepts and Interpretations seemed to be the weakest abilities, with 30% and 29% of the students (respectively) performing at a level needing improvement.

It would seem that students are proficient in their critical thinking abilities with the exception of their ability to perform Business Analysis (Does the student undertake appropriate quantitative and/or qualitative analysis?) and in the area of Concepts and Interpretations (Does the student identify and accurately explain/use the relevant key concepts/follow evidence and reason in order to obtain thoughtful, logical conclusions and/or solutions?). Weakness in the area of Business Analysis may be correlated to the Subject Assessment scores from the ETS Business MFT results that indicated that our students performed below the national mean in areas that were quantitatively related, specifically Accounting, Finance and Quantitative Analysis. Continued weakness in the area of Concepts and Interpretations may be due to course curriculum indicate a need for additional instruction in that subject area.

3. Summary of Results for Direct Measure 3:

Trait	Mean	Superior (%)	Meets Expectations (%)	Needs Improvement (%)
<i>Ethical Self Awareness</i>	3.82	52 (76)	16 (24)	0
<i>Understanding of Ethical Perspectives</i>	3.71	48 (71)	19 (28)	1 (1)
<i>Ethical Issue Recognition</i>	3.80	51 (75)	17 (25)	0

<i>Application of Christian Ethical Perspectives</i>	3.36	29 (43)	34 (50)	5 (7)
<i>Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives</i>	3.45	32 (47)	33 (48)	3 (5)
Totals	3.63	41 (60)	24 (35)	3 (5)

Summary of Data:

Overall, students performed well when measured for ethical reasoning ability with 93% of the students meeting or exceeding expectations. Mean score for the 5 ethical reasoning criteria was 3.63 (4 point scale) indicating that overall, students met the SBM expectations for ethical reasoning ability. Results for this period were very similar to the previous collection period.

Analysis:

The results indicate that students are proficient in their ethical reasoning ability and their ability to Apply Christian Ethical Perspectives (Student can independently apply Christian ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, and is able to consider full implications of the application). These results may indicate that a change in the requirement to apply Christian ethical perspectives and concepts to improve the clarity of the assignment parameters have consistently enabled students to more adequately address this component in the signature assignment.

4. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 4:*

Trait	Mean	Superior (%)	Meets Expectations (%)	Needs Improvement (%)
<i>Creates a Clear Central Assertion</i>	3.79	52 (76)	16 (24)	0

<i>Demonstrates Strong Argumentation & Reasoning Skills</i>	3.55	37 (55)	29 (43)	2 (2)
<i>Chooses Significant Source Material</i>	3.38	31 (46)	32 (47)	5 (7)
<i>Develops Logical Coherence and Flow</i>	3.71	47 (69)	21 (31)	0
<i>Analyzes and Integrates Source Material</i>	3.33	25 (37)	40 (59)	3 (4)
<i>Uses Engaging & Clear Language</i>	3.75	50 (74)	16 (24)	2 (2)
<i>Uses Correct Grammar & Style</i>	3.48	41 (60)	18 (26)	9 (14)
Totals	3.57	40 (59)	24 (35)	4 (6)

Summary of Data:

Overall, students performed well when measured for written communication ability with 92% of the students meeting or exceeding expectations. Mean score for the 7 written communication criteria was 3.57 (4 point scale) indicating that overall, students met the SBM expectations for written communication ability. Results for this period were very similar to the previous collection period. Overall, students performed well when measured for oral communication ability with 94% of the students meeting or exceeding expectations. Mean score for the 5 oral communication criteria was 3.65 (4 point scale) indicating that overall, students met the SBM expectations for oral communication ability. Results for this period were very similar to the previous collection period.

Analysis:

Students are more proficient in their written communication ability with improvement in their ability to Choose Significant Source Material (chooses important sources for reference & Incorporates support, detail, or research insightfully and effectively) and Analyze and Integrate Source Material (insightfully analyzes source material & demonstrates mastery over its effective incorporation to build argument). These results indicate that additional instruction in Choosing Significant Source Material and Analyzing and Integrating Source Material, may have improved their consistent ability to do so. Improvements in the Correct Use of Grammar and Style may have also improved due to the additional

instruction; however, there is room for improvement in this area. Students seem proficient in their oral communication ability and have improved their ability to Use Support Material (use of a variety of types of supporting materials {explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities} make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic) on a consistent basis. It seems that better instruction in the use of Source Material during oral presentations has produced consistently better results in this area.

Trait	Mean	Superior (%)	Meets Expectations (%)	Needs Improvement (%)
Organization	3.82	55 (81)	13 (19)	0
Language	3.79	54 (79)	14 (21)	0
Delivery	3.79	52 (76)	16 (24)	0
Supporting Material	3.35	23 (35)	43 (63)	2 (2)
Central Message	3.50	38 (56)	29 (43)	1 (1)
Totals	3.65	43 (63)	23 (35)	2 (2)

Summary of Data:

Overall, students performed well when measured for oral communication ability with 94% of the students meeting or exceeding expectations. Mean score for the 5 oral communication criteria was 3.65 (4 point scale) indicating that overall, students met the SBM expectations for oral communication ability. Results for this period were very similar to the previous collection period.

Analysis:

Students seem proficient in their oral communication ability and have improved their ability to Use Support Material (use of a variety of types of supporting materials {explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities} make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic) on a consistent basis. It seems that better instruction in the use of Source Material during oral presentations has produced consistently better results in this area.

5. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 5:*

Trait	Mean	Target (%)	Students Meeting Target (%)
Contributes to Team Meetings	3.24	68 (100)	64 (94)
Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members	3.27	68 (100)	63 (93)
Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings	3.33	68 (100)	64 (94)
Fosters Constructive Team Climate	3.29	68 (100)	64 (94)
Responds to Conflict	3.33	68 (100)	64 (94)
Totals	3.29	68 (100)	64 (94)

Overall, students performed very well when measured for teamwork ability with 96% of the students meeting or exceeding expectations. Mean score for the 5 teamwork criteria was 3.29 (4 point scale) indicating that students far exceeded the SBM expectations for teamwork ability.

Once again it would appear from the data that the students excelled in every measure of teamwork ability, however, it is quite possible that the scores were inflated due to the fact that the students were asked to evaluate their peers and may have been generous in their assessment (thinking that the scores may adversely affect their fellow student's grade).

6. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 6:*

Trait	Mean	Target (%)	Students Meeting Target (%)
Demonstrates an Understanding of Factors Affecting the Globalization of Business	3.06	77 (100)	73 (95)
Demonstrates an Understanding of International Trade	2.16	77 (100)	65 (84)
Analyzes & Solves Foreign Exchange Business Problems	3.06	77 (100)	74 (96)
Evaluates Different Modes of International Business	2.78	77 (100)	72 (94)
Makes Sound Decisions Regarding Functional Areas of International Business	2.62	77 (100)	73 (95)
Totals	2.74	77 (100)	71 (92)

Overall, students performed adequately when measured for global awareness with 92% of the students meeting or exceeding expectations. Mean score for the 5 global awareness criteria was 2.74 (4 point scale) indicating that overall, students met the SBM expectations for global awareness.

Marked improvement was shown in Understanding of International Trade, with 84% of the students meeting or exceeding expectations, versus 12% from the prior year. Evaluating Different Modes of International Business and Making Sound Decisions Regarding Functional Areas of International Business and were also greatly improved over the prior year, with 94% and 95% (respectively) of the students meeting or exceeding expectations, versus 34% and 63% (respectively).

It would seem that students demonstrate an adequate understanding of global awareness with the possible exception of the ability to Demonstrate an Understanding of International Trade (an understanding of international trade flows and applies this understanding to business decisions in the international context {International Trade Theory, Foreign Direct Investment, Regional Economic Integration}). While the number of students meeting or exceeding expectations has improved in this aspect of global awareness, continued changes to the curriculum in BUSI 370 International Business would likely have the greatest impact in improving the understanding of international trade.

Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:

1. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 1: No data collected for this assessment period.*
2. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 2: No data collected for this assessment period.*

Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes:

Intended Student Learning Outcomes	Learning Assessment Measures							
General Program ISLOs	Direct Measure 1	Direct Measure 2	Direct Measure 3	Direct Measure 4	Direct Measure 5	Direct Measure 6	Indirect Measure 1	Indirect Measure 2
	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...
1. <i>Program Learning Outcome 1</i>	Met						NA	NA
2. <i>Program Learning Outcome 2</i>		Met					NA	NA
3. <i>Program Learning Outcome 3</i>			Met				NA	NA
4. <i>Program Learning Outcome 4</i>				Met			NA	NA
5. <i>Program Learning Outcome 5</i>					Met		NA	NA
6. <i>Program Learning Outcome 6</i>						Not Met	NA	NA

Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:

1. *Course of Action for Core ISLO 1:*
 - 1) *Continue to revise the Business Core curriculum to provide opportunities for review and retention of key accounting, economics and finance concepts.*
 - 2) *Begin testing students at the point of learning to determine if adequate formative learning is occurring. If not, adjust course curriculum to improve comprehension and ability.*
 - 3) *Develop and implement a Business Content Test to more accurately measure the business knowledge taught in the SBM. Portions of the test*

<i>should be administered throughout the degree program as well as at the completion of the degree program to measure both formative and summative subject specific learning.</i>
<p>2. <i>Course of Action for Core ISLO 2:</i></p> <p>1) <i>Consider requiring accounting, finance and quantitative analysis tutorials before enrolling in BUSI 450 Strategic Management.</i></p> <p>2) <i>Continue to revise the Business Core curriculum to provide opportunities for review and retention of key accounting, finance and quantitative analysis concepts.</i></p> <p>3) <i>Continue to revise BUSI 450 course curriculum to ensure adequate coverage of Business Analysis and Concepts and Interpretations principles for use in management simulations.</i></p>
<p>3. <i>Course of Action for Core ISLO 3:</i></p> <p>1) <i>Continue to include a specific requirement to apply Christian ethical perspectives/concepts and include instruction to ensure proper application as a part of the BUSI 496 Senior Seminar: Business Ethics course curriculum.</i></p> <p>2) <i>Continue to review and revise Business Core curriculum to include requirements and instruction to apply Christian ethical perspectives and concepts in other courses in the degree program.</i></p>
<p>4. <i>Course of Action for Core ISLO 4:</i></p> <p>1) <i>Continue to supplement the BUSI 496 Senior Seminar: Business Ethics' course curriculum with a library research module taught by university research librarians.</i></p> <p>2) <i>Continue to supplement the BUSI 496 Senior Seminar: Business Ethics' course curriculum with assistance from the University Writing Center.</i></p> <p>3) <i>Consider the addition of the BUSI 405 Business Report Writing course, which includes curriculum to develop oral communication skills, to the Business Core as a required course.</i></p>
<p>5. <i>Course of Action for Core ISLO 5:</i></p> <p><i>Reevaluate the teamwork measure and the administration of the instrument to ensure an accurate assessment of the students' teamwork ability. Make changes as appropriate.</i></p>
<p>6. <i>Course of Action for Core ISLO 6:</i></p> <p><i>Continue to include additional instruction, assignments and exercises focusing on Demonstrating an Understanding of International Trade in the BUSI 370 International Business curriculum.</i></p>

Student Learning Assessment for MBA Degree
General Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes
1. Cross Disciplinary Integration

2. Global Perspective	
3. Critical Thinking	
4. Character	
5. Communication	
6. Collaboration	
Intended Student Learning Outcomes	
1. <i>Learning Outcome 1: To demonstrate knowledge of multiple business disciplines, including, accounting, finance, marketing, management, and strategic integration.</i>	
2. <i>Learning Outcome 2: To develop business strategies that respond to emerging opportunities and challenges in the global environment.</i>	
3. <i>Learning Outcome 3: To quickly and accurately identify and anticipate valid business problems/opportunities using analytical, quantitative, and critical thinking skills.</i>	
4. <i>Learning Outcome 4: To demonstrate the ability to give voice to and defend personal values.</i>	
5. <i>Learning Outcome 5: To create and deliver professional oral business presentations.</i>	
6. <i>Learning Outcome 6: To develop the skills necessary to successfully lead and contribute to a team in a dynamic competitive environment.</i>	
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:
1. <i>ETS MBA Test</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 1	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 1: Students will perform better than the National Average (Mean % correct) on the ETS MBA Test.</i>
2. <i>Case Study Analysis (BUSI548)</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 2	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 2: 80% of students will either meet or exceed expectations according to the Global Perspective rubric.</i>
3. <i>Market Analysis (BUSI527)</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 3	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 3: 75% of students will either meet or exceed expectations according to the Critical Thinking rubric.</i>
4. <i>Leadership Reflection Paper (BUSI581)</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 4	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 4: 80% of students will either meet or exceed expectations according to the Character rubric.</i>

<p>5. <i>Marketing Research Presentation (BUSI515)</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 5</p>	<p><i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 5: 80% of students will either meet or exceed expectations according to the Communication rubric.</i></p>																		
<p>6. <i>Simulation Teams Analysis (BUSI527)</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 6</p>	<p><i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 6: 75% of students will either meet or exceed expectations according to the Collaboration rubric.</i></p>																		
<p>Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:</p>	<p>Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Indirect Measures:</p>																		
<p>1. <i>Indirect Measure 1: Alumni Survey</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 1-6</p>	<p><i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Indirect Measure 1: 70% of the respondents report effective preparation for each of the 6 Program SLO areas.</i></p>																		
<p>2. <i>Indirect Measure 2: Employer’s Survey</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 1-6</p>	<p><i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Indirect Measure 2: 70% of the respondents report effective preparation for each of the 6 Program SLO areas.</i></p>																		
<p align="center">Assessment Results: MBA Degree</p>																			
<p>Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:</p>																			
<p>1. <i>Summary of Results for Direct Measure 1:</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Area</th> <th>Target (National Mean)</th> <th>ETS MBA Results</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Marketing</td> <td>57.4</td> <td>54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Management</td> <td>58.5</td> <td>53</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Finance</td> <td>43.9</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Accounting</td> <td>46.5</td> <td>39</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strategic Integration</td> <td>51.3</td> <td>48</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Area	Target (National Mean)	ETS MBA Results	Marketing	57.4	54	Management	58.5	53	Finance	43.9	40	Accounting	46.5	39	Strategic Integration	51.3	48
Area	Target (National Mean)	ETS MBA Results																	
Marketing	57.4	54																	
Management	58.5	53																	
Finance	43.9	40																	
Accounting	46.5	39																	
Strategic Integration	51.3	48																	

Students did not meet our target for any of the 5 subject areas on the ETS MBA exam. It should be noted that the sample size was 11 and may not be representative of the entire program. Regardless, there is certainly room for improvement in each of the subject areas.

2. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 2:*

Area	Target	Results
Identification of global business opportunities	80%	86%
Analysis of global business challenges	80%	89%
Development of global business strategies	80%	100%

Students performed well in each area of global perspective.

3. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 3:*

Area	Target	Results
Situation assessment	75%	75%
Opportunity analysis	75%	65%
Master of data and analytic process	75%	80%

Overall, student performance has slightly improved over last year. While target met in two areas, 35% of students were below expectation in 'Opportunity Analysis.'

4. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 4:*

Area	Target	Results
Utilization of faith based content	80%	93%
Formulation of Christian worldview	80%	93%
Application of faith-based concepts	80%	100%

Students performed well in each area of character and faith integration.

5. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 5:*

Area	Target	Results
Introduction	80%	86%
Enthusiasm	80%	71%
Visual aid	80%	95
Conclusion	80%	79%
Professionalism of presentation	80%	79%

The class was below the target in Professionalism of presentation and Conclusion. The low enthusiasm scores resulted from the class taking the oral presentation less seriously than the report and exam that was also due. Nonetheless, it was overall acceptable (82%).

6. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 6:*

Area	Target	Results
Goal and action oriented	75%	75%

Conflict management	75%	85%
Substantive contributor	75%	85%

Like last year, students continue to do well reflecting on missed leadership opportunities. At the same time, some of them continue to struggle with actionable ideas for improving both their interpersonal team dynamics and translating what they know about leadership into action. Students continue to do a nice job reflecting on opportunities to improve their leadership behaviors.

Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:

1. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 1: No data collected for this assessment period.*
2. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 2: No data collected for this assessment period.*

Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes:

Intended Student Learning Outcomes	Learning Assessment Measures							
General Program ISLOs	Direct Measure 1	Direct Measure 2	Direct Measure 3	Direct Measure 4	Direct Measure 5	Direct Measure 6	Indirect Measure 1	Indirect Measure 2
	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...
1. <i>Program Learning Outcome 1</i>	Not Met						NA	NA
2. <i>Program Learning Outcome 2</i>		Met					NA	NA
3. <i>Program Learning Outcome 3</i>			Met				NA	NA
4. <i>Program Learning Outcome 4</i>				Met			NA	NA
5. <i>Program Learning Outcome 5</i>					Met		NA	NA
6. <i>Program Learning Outcome 6</i>						Met	NA	NA

Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:

1. *Course of Action for Core ISLO 1:*
We have shifted the instructors for our MBA course from primarily adjunct faculty to primarily full-time faculty to ensure continuity of content and expectations. Plans are underway to implement a pre-test and post-test model to identify areas for improvement earlier in the program. In

addition, plans to increase the number of students taking the ETS MBA exam have been proposed.
2. <i>Course of Action for Core ISLO 2:</i> <i>No changes</i>
3. <i>Course of Action for Core ISLO 3:</i> To increase program representation in the MBA assessment process, we have moved the measurement of this goal to BUSI 521 Managerial Economics for the 2014-2015 academic year.
4. <i>Course of Action for Core ISLO 4:</i> We have dropped measuring this goal in BUSI 509 Worldview Leadership Formation, as its retreat style made it suboptimal to measure this goal. We are adding a 360 degree assessment of individual students to establish a fuller picture of where students fall short in satisfying this goal.
5. <i>Course of Action for Core ISLO 5:</i> <i>No changes</i>
6. <i>Course of Action for Core ISLO 6:</i> We met and discussed where concrete skills for diagnosing and resolving interpersonal conflict and team leadership can be further instilled in the program. We decided to add new content for high performance teams and best practices for collaboration to BUSI 516 Organizational Behavior and BUSI 581 Strategic Leadership.

Student Learning Assessment for the <i>Masters of Management Degree</i>
General Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes
1. Cross Disciplinary Competence
2. Analytical and Critical Thinking/Deciding
3. Character
4. Communication
5. Collaboration
Intended Student Learning Outcomes
<i>1. Learning Outcome 1: Students will demonstrate knowledge and application of management theories, concepts and practices.</i>

2. <i>Learning Outcome 2: Students will recommend strategic solutions to ambiguous business problems using analytical and critical thinking skills.</i>	
3. <i>Learning Outcome 3: Students will exhibit an understanding of leadership and ethics based on a Christian worldview.</i>	
4. <i>Learning Outcome 4: Students will compose professional written business communications that are clear, concise, and compelling. Students will create and deliver professional oral business presentations.</i>	
5. <i>Learning Outcome 5: Students will exhibit the ability to engage in a collaborative effort.</i>	
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:
1. <i>Applied Research Project (MGMT570)</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 1	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 1: 80% of the students will meet or exceed expectations in each Competency trait area.</i>
2. <i>Research Report (MGMT597)</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 2	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 2: 80% of students will either meet or exceed expectations in each Critical Thinking trait area.</i>
3. <i>Leadership Paper (MGMT581)</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 3	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 3: 80% of the students will meet or exceed expectations in each Character trait area.</i>
4. <i>Research Report (MGMT597)</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 4	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 4: : 80% of the students will meet or exceed expectations in each Communication trait area.</i>
5. <i>Applied Research Project (MGMT570)</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 5	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 5: 80% of the students will meet or exceed expectations in each Collaboration trait area.</i>
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Indirect Measures:
1. <i>Indirect Measure 1: Alumni Survey</i> General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 1-6	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Indirect Measure 1: 70% of the respondents report effective preparation for each of the 6 Program SLO areas.</i>
2. <i>Indirect Measure 2: Employer’s Survey</i>	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Indirect Measure 2: 70% of the respondents</i>

General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 1-6

report effective preparation for each of the 6 Program SLO areas.

Assessment Results: MAM Degree

Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:

1. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 1:*

Trait:	Target:	Result:
Knowledge	80%	68%
Comparison	80%	68%
Application	80%	59%
Ramification	80%	45%
Analysis	80%	50%

Insights: The class approached standards in the area of knowledge of theories, concepts and practices (68%) and also the ability to compare and contrast between same (68%). However, students did not fare as well in the areas of application (59%), understanding appropriateness of application (45%), and analyzing (50%).

Based on indirect assessment (observation and feedback), students may take MGMT570 prior to taking those courses which provide the foundational knowledge required to complete this course. Students who register for advanced courses without having the proper foundation are not equipped with the necessary skills, knowledge, and ability required and therefore not prepared for the rigors of this course.

Based on indirect assessment, a number of students who entered the program with limited or deficient academic or business foundation were not able to meet classroom assignment standards and felt overwhelmed and unequipped for the rigors of the course. Some students indicated this was the first time they encountered a course requiring this much rigor.

2. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 2:*

Trait:	Target:	Result:
Opinions and Logic	80%	83%
Viewpoint	80%	92%
Bias and Judgment	80%	83%
Choices	80%	75%

Insights: The class, as a whole, met standards but few exceeded standards in the area of accurately identifying valid business problems. The weakest performance areas were bias, judgment, and choices. Students put forth limited choices; their writing and research did not reflect much creativity or originality. The class was willing to dissect, diagnose, and analyze at the "meet standards" level but there was no indication of critical thinking beyond that level.

3. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 3:*

Trait:	Target:	Result:
Identification of Personal Leadership	80%	55%
Structure & Communicating with Clarity	80%	66%
Evidence of Depth of Thought	80%	77%

Insights: The students in this class represented a wide range of ability. Overall, this group was more diverse than usual in competence levels and ability to grasp the conceptual principles associated with graduate level study.

Moreover, the entire group tended to be less verbal and expressive. A great percentage lacked the initiative and incisive competence generally associated with graduate level students. However, in performance a few student groups showed good depth of thought, and ability to integrate principles into their context.

Overall, a number of students appeared quite incapable of engaging and did not achieve a level of integration expected. In particular, writing skills were quite weak in some students. Additionally, conceptual and thinking skills were also inadequate. The disparity between the superior students and the other students was the most noticeable to date.

4. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 4:*

Trait:	Target:	Result:
Nonverbal skills	80%	65%
Enthusiasm	80%	64%
Intro	80%	54%
Clarification	80%	57%
Time	80%	85%

Visuals	80%	77%
Professionalism	80%	58%
Interesting	80%	74%

Insights: The majority of oral presentations were middle of the road (average). The two weakest areas were the introduction and conclusion. The strongest areas were time, professionalism, visuals, and interesting. With the later, students did very well with PPT or Prezi to make the presentation interesting. More work is needed on improving scores from average to above average.

The majority of oral presentations were below average on all categories except time. These students had been trained and assessed previously in this area with the same rubric. The issue was the topic. It is an academic, quantitative topic. Nonetheless, they are expected to make it interesting and engaging, that didn't happen. Moreover, students indicated this is the first time they required this much rigor in their course.

Trait:	Target:	Result:
Problem Stmt	80%	75%
Lit Evaluation	80%	54%
Methods	80%	65%
Results	80%	71%
Summary	80%	60%
Organization	80%	80%
Tone	80%	81%
Sent Structure	80%	63%
Word Choice	80%	57%
Writing Mechanics	80%	78%
Length	80%	100%
APA	80%	60%
Use of Refs	80%	75%

Insights: The meat of the paper --literature review, methods, results, and summary-- were fairly weak. This is a hard paper to write (similar to a thesis); however, graduate students are expected to write at this level. Often writing skills were simple, choppy, or wordy. The research was adequate but required lots of hand holding. It didn't seem they could do it on their own without help. Students need help finding current quality, scholarly references. They struggled with this in class.

The weakest areas --literature reviews and quality of references-- go hand-in-hand. Students showed a lack of understanding in how to do quality research--

specifically finding top quality journal articles using library resources. Writing mechanics (grammar, punctuation), sentence structure, and word choice were all below standards.

5. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 5:*

Trait:	Target:	Result:
Communication	80%	68%
Positive Attitude	80%	91%
Contribution	80%	64%
Performance	80%	64%
Skills	80%	32%
Attitude	80%	32%
Leadership	80%	32%

Insights: The majority of students are experienced with group work and communicating through different and various communication channels. However, the majority of the groups did not perform as well as possible due to lack of skill in raising and resolving conflict. In fact, the lack of ability to raise and resolve conflict was poor (32%). In conjunction, the attitude in conflict resolution was also poor overall (32%). Additionally, the leadership ability in understanding and mediating conflict was poor (32%). Interestingly, many of the students seemed unaware of basic group dynamics and conflict management theories, concepts, and practices.

Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:

1. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 1: No data collected for this assessment period.*
2. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 2: No data collected for this assessment period.*

Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes:

Intended Student Learning Outcomes	Learning Assessment Measures							
	Direct Measure 1	Direct Measure 2	Direct Measure 3	Direct Measure 4	Direct Measure 5	Direct Measure 6	Indirect Measure 1	Indirect Measure 2
General Program ISLOs	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...
1. <i>Program Learning Outcome 1</i>	Not Met						NA	NA
2. <i>Program Learning Outcome 2</i>		Met					NA	NA

3. <i>Program Learning Outcome 3</i>			Not Met				NA	NA
4. <i>Program Learning Outcome 4</i>				Not Met			NA	NA
5. <i>Program Learning Outcome 5</i>					Not Met		NA	NA
Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:								
<p>1. <i>Course of Action for Core ISLO 1:</i> <i>Here are the following recommendations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Introduce course sequencing as recommendation by the MAM committee.</i> <i>Introduce concepts of application in prior coursework (somewhere in the course content during the program). This would include how to analyze pros and cons, understand the ramifications of models, theories, concepts, etc., and application.</i> 								
<p>2. <i>Course of Action for Core ISLO 2:</i> <i>Here are the following recommendations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Introduce course sequencing as recommendation by the MAM committee.</i> <i>Require coursework to bring conditional students up to senior level undergraduate academic expectations in skills, knowledge and abilities. Provide assistance for students needing basic skills in business communications and basic management knowledge.</i> 								
<p>3. <i>Course of Action for Core ISLO 3:</i> <i>Here are the following recommendations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Require coursework to bring conditional students up to senior level undergraduate academic expectations in skills, knowledge and abilities.</i> <i>Provide assistance for students needing basic skills in business communications and basic management knowledge.</i> 								
<p>4. <i>Course of Action for Core ISLO 4:</i> <i>The following are programmatic recommendations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Require students to complete a Written Communication (including presentations) Orientation prior to entering the program. Orientation should include information and demonstration of knowledge of writing and presenting skills.</i> <p><i>During Orientation consider video taping students so they can get feedback on their presentation. This may help them to better understand where they are falling short.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Consider having continuity in professor assignments.</i> <i>Introduce more scholarly type research papers with APA formatting throughout the program.</i> <i>Consider a mandatory library orientation and research orientation for incoming students. This would include understanding how to research, locate scholarly sources (beyond Google), APA, use of references, and other researched oriented and writing skill areas.</i> 								

- *Ensure that all students meet basic admission standards.*
 - *MAM Program Committee to routinely (quarterly) review the progress of conditional students.*
- Produce coursework to bring conditional students up to expectations.*

5. *Course of Action for Core ISLO 5:*

Here are the following recommendations:

- *MAM Committee recommends course assignments be made with Program Chair and Committee to ensure courses are assigned to qualified instructors.*
- *Consider reviewing assignments in all courses to ensure adequate coverage of topics. Ensure that syllabi cover all required theories, concepts and practices as outlined by the MAM Program Committee.*

Move the collection of collaboration data to MGMT 561. Consider video taping the student so they can get feedback on their group, conflict, and feedback skills. This may help them to better understand where they are falling short.