

ALVERNIA UNIVERSITY

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary for Undergraduate Programs 2014-2015

MAJOR: _____ Sport Management _____

DEPARTMENT: _____ Business _____

1. List Student Learning and/or General Education Outcomes Assessed

The following Student Learning Outcomes and/or General Education Outcomes were assessed in AY 2014 – 2015:

SLO 2: Demonstrate effective and professional communication and collaboration skills, including effective use of information technology in business situations.

- Related GeSLO: 2, 3

SLO 3: Demonstrate an understanding of analysis, formulation and implementation of strategy at the corporate or entrepreneurial level.

- Related GeSLO: 4, 5, 6

SLO 5: Demonstrate awareness of economic, ethical and legal contexts of global business practice.

- Related GeSLO: 1, 4, 6

2. Summary of Assessment Results

SLO 2, (GeSLO 2,3): Demonstrate effective and professional communication and collaboration skills, including effective use of information technology in business situations.

BUS 305

Assessment tool: final exam

Target: 80% of students score a “C” or better on the final exam

*Result: **Target Met***

<i>2012-13</i>	<i>87% of students earned a “C” or better</i>
<i>2013-14</i>	<i>88% of the students scored a “C” or better</i>
<i>2014-15</i>	<i>100% of the students scored a “C” or better</i>

ANALYSIS:

Students are meeting the benchmark assessment criteria for SLO 2. The final exam continues to be an appropriate measure of their achievement because it is a comprehensive and practical instrument. The business department evaluates in nine student learning outcomes on a rotating basis, therefore three years of data is available for each student learning outcome. This process helps to identify trends over multiple data points. Their achievement level is trending in an appropriate direction. A caution is advised however, since the traditional students had a lower success rate than the evening students.

PROPOSED CHANGES:

Accounting Information systems is part of the accounting curriculum because it is necessary to for accounting majors to accumulate, understand and analyze business information. It is the language of business. The department should consider a comprehensive pre-post exam to capture data from all students since the department continues to struggle to collect data from adjunct professors.

BUS 311

SLO 2, (GeSLO 2, 3): Demonstrate effective and professional communication and collaboration skills, including effective use of information technology in business situations.

Assessment tool: final exam

Target: 80% of students scored a "C" or better on the final exam

*Result: **Target Met***

Assessment Tool: Final Exam (used for both SLO 2 and SLO 9)

Target: 80% of students earn a "C" or better

2012-2013: 100% of all students scored a "C" or better

2013-2014: Final assessment information from the adjunct professor was not provided despite repeated requests for the spring course. For the fall course, 17 out of 19 earned a 73 or better for a total of 89%. The measure was met and the students are learning as expected.

2014-2015: Target met for the year in all sections individually and as a whole. Overall, 98% of students earned a "C" or better. In the individual sections, the students in 3 of the sections met the measure at a rate of 100% and in the last section 89% of the students earned a C or better, also meeting the measure.

BUS 311 is a required course for all business majors other than accounting majors. Accounting majors enroll in Management Information Systems, BUS 305. The final exam has been used as the assessment measure in this course, but in many cases the final exam is on discrete topics that don't necessarily measure the students overall understanding of Management Information Systems. The department is expected to implement a program specific exam that is given upon entrance to and exit from the program that will include assessment of the core concepts in Management Information Systems. This general

knowledge pre-post testing should be a better barometer of success since the department is having difficulty both collecting data from adjuncts as well as ensuring that a consistent measure is used in courses.

Summary of Assessment Results

Because of the lack of data from the adjunct in the Adult Education section of the course, there was no way to measure the degree of consistency between the two sections of the course over the year. As indicated below, the target was met overall for this course, but when the population was divided, the target was not met in the Traditional day course in AY 2012-13 but was met in the adjunct taught evening course.

Because the traditional day course did not meet the target last year, the full time instructor revised the assessment measure for AY 2012-2013 to include a final exam in which tests the cumulative concepts of the course rather than just the last 2 or 3 chapters. The students met this measure in the traditional day course which seems to be a better indicator of mastery of the material and outcomes for the course.

Proposed changes

Pre-post testing may be used for the outcomes for this course rather than the current assessment measures. Until then, the existing measure will continue to be used and our students are meeting the measure.

BUS 426

Assessment tool: final exam

Target: 80% of students score a "C" or better on the final exam

*Result: **Target Met***

2013-14 100% of the students scored a "C" or better

Assessment tool: final exam

Target: 80% of students score a "C" or better on the final exam

*Result: **Target Met***

2014-15 88% of the students scored a "C" or better

ANALYSIS:

The trending information suggests that students have performed at a lower level than previously. It is important to realize that the assessment tool was changed from the team project to the final exam. It will take some time to establish a trend with the new tool in place. The target was met in the initial year of the change.

Prior changes included the addition of an in-class case analysis to help improve research and writing skills. In addition, a review of the enrollment continues to be a concern since it is an upper level class and enrollment trends at a rate double that of the university average.

PROPOSED CHANGES:

Although the target was met, it is suggested that, in evaluating the course assessment document that a course cap be introduced to ensure adequate interaction in an upper level course.

BUS 438

Assessment tool: Iliad Simulation

Target: 70% of students score above the 50th percentile

*Result: **Target Partially Met***

2013-14 55% of the students scored above the 50th percentile

2014-15 100% of the students scored a "C" or better

ANALYSIS:

The analysis indicated that the goal was not met in the initial launch of the Iliad project. The goal was met by the second year of use. The Iliad Simulation is an ethical decision making simulation that is playing a larger role in combining Alvernia's mission with our departmental goals. It may have an expanded role in department program assessment in the future.

PROPOSED CHANGES:

The performance will continued to be monitored to establish an appropriate baseline for students. Ethical decision making is an important component in the accounting profession. This tool is used for all business programs. Class size may be an issue in this course as the number of students enrolled in each section is approximately double the university average. A cap on enrollment will be considered by the department faculty.

SLO 3, (GeSLO 4, 5, 6): Demonstrate an understanding of analysis, formulation and implementation of strategy at the corporate or entrepreneurial level.

BUS 206

Assessment tool: final exam

Target: 70% of students score a "C" or better on the final exam

*Result: **Target Met***

2012-13 88% of students earned a "C" or better

2013-14 81% of the students scored a "C" or better

2014-15 81% of the students scored a "C" or better

ANALYSIS:

Since ACBSP requires finals to be a comprehensive exam, the final was redesigned to reflect written comprehensive knowledge of the Human Resource Planning Process

around which this course is designed. This was changed as the 2013-2014 assessment tool for BUS 206.

PROPOSED CHANGES:

The corresponding drop in scores (although above the target) upon the change to comprehensive final exam is evident in the scores. The impact of increasing class size may be a factor in achievement scores. A cap will be considered by the business department faculty.

BUS 426

Assessment tool: final exam

Target: 80% of students score a "C" or better on the team project

*Result: **Target Met***

2013-14 100% of the students scored a "C" or better

Assessment tool: final exam

Target: 80% of students score a "C" or better on the final exam

*Result: **Target Met***

2014-15 88% of the students scored a "C" or better

ANALYSIS:

The trending information suggests that students have performed at a lower level than previously. It is important to realize that the assessment tool was changed from the team project to the final exam. It will take some time to establish a trend with the new tool in place. The target was met in the initial year of the change.

Prior changes included the addition of an in-class case analysis to help improve research and writing skills. In addition, a review of the enrollment continues to be a concern since it is an upper level class and enrollment trends at a rate double that of the university average.

PROPOSED CHANGES:

Although the target was met, it is suggested that, in evaluating the course assessment document that a course cap be introduced to ensure adequate interaction in an upper level course.

SLO 5, GeSLO 1, 4, 6: Demonstrate awareness of economic, ethical and legal contexts of global business practice.

ECON 248

Assessment tool: final exam

Target: 80% of students score a "C" or better on the final exam

*Result: **Target Met***

2013-14 100% of the students scored a "C" or better

2014-15 100% of the students scored a "C" or better

ANALYSIS:

In the 2013-14 academic year the economics position and courses were transferred to the business department. With the change in economics, the department is able to track and analyze the appropriate student learning objectives linked to the economics courses. Prior to the change, economics was housed in the humanities department. The current target is being met.

PROPOSED CHANGES:

The department is currently in the process of hiring a fulltime faculty member to fill the vacant economics position. Upon the successful completion of the hiring process, the economics professor will conduct a review of the program assessments associated with the economics courses a make appropriate recommendations. Continued monitoring of the existing assessments will occur until changes are made to the assessment program.

ECON 249

Assessment tool: final exam

Target: 80% of students score a "C" or better on the final exam

*Result: **Target Met***

2013-14 88% of the students scored a "C" or better

2014-15 94% of the students scored a "C" or better

ANALYSIS:

In the 2013-14 academic year the economics position and courses were transferred to the business department. With the change in economics, the department is able to track and analyze the appropriate student learning objectives linked to the economics courses. Prior to the change, economics was housed in the humanities department. The current target is being met.

PROPOSED CHANGES:

The department is currently in the process of hiring a fulltime faculty member to fill the vacant economics position. Upon the successful completion of the hiring process, the economics professor will conduct a review of the program assessments associated with the economics courses a make appropriate recommendations. Continued monitoring of the existing assessments will occur until changes are made to the assessment program.

BUS 342

Assessment tool: final exam

Target: 80% of students score a "C" or better on the final exam

*Result: **Target Not Met***

<i>2012-13</i>	<i>68% of students earned a "C" or better</i>
<i>2013-14</i>	<i>77% of the students scored a "C" or better</i>
<i>2014-15</i>	<i>79% of the students scored a "C" or better</i>

ANALYSIS:

The students have not met the target. Improvement has been encouraging as students attempt this course. The material covered in the course may need to be broken into two courses to give students a greater opportunity for success.

PROPOSED CHANGES:

The business department faculty need to discuss the possibility of creating business law 1 & 2 in order to help students gain a greater command of the material.

However, data collection for adjunct professors continues to be a source of frustration. With the additional data, the target rate may be met overall but continued monitoring of the traditional students is necessary. A new assessment system that is outside of the course material may be necessary to ensure appropriate data is collected and evaluated.

SM 210

Assessment tool: article assignment

Target: 70% of students score a "C" or better on the article assignment

*Result: **Target Met***

<i>2012-13</i>	<i>100% of students earned a "C" or better</i>
<i>2013-14</i>	<i>100% of the students scored a "C" or better</i>
<i>2014-15</i>	<i>100% of the students scored a "C" or better</i>

ANALYSIS:

SM 210 a platform for students to discuss complex social issues in sports and communities such as gender, race, ethnicity, religion, and class. This course fulfills diversity requirement. The article assignment has been used as the assessment tool in this course, but the outcomes for the past three AYs showed all 100% satisfactory. This writing assignment was assigned as a group but the "free rider" issue was raised by instructors. In addition, the group writing was not a relevant tool to measure individual students' opinion on complex social issues in sports.

PROPOSED CHANGES:

Although the target was met, some changes recommended for the measurement. The course instructor addressed the imprecise description of the assessment tool and the writing project was not published in the target newspaper. So, the project is recommended changing to an individual “Final paper.”

3. Plans for data collection and assessment activity next AY 2015-2016

In 2015-2016, SLOs 6, 7 and 8 will be evaluated.

The evaluation of SLOs 6, 7 and 8 in this next cycle. This rotation cycle provides the department an opportunity to concentrate on three student learning objectives per year. Consequently, this system provides three years of data for each course assessment included in the program assessment. The Accreditation Council of Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP) require all business majors to have a command of basic core competencies which are dispersed throughout the business courses. The business department formalized the data collection process to provide a pathway for continuous program evaluation and assessment. The approved document is attached so that assessment committee members can see the seriousness with which the business department takes assessment. The document is attached.

The business department is considering a shift to a pre-post knowledge exam to measure internal program competencies since the department continues to have difficulty collecting data from adjunct instructors.

Summary

Although the difficulties remain in data collection from adjunct professors but the sport management students’ learning outcomes indicate students are meeting the requirements. The business department faculties continue discussing the assessment process and the major fields test (MFT) in business is considered as one of data collection methods. The enrollment in this program shows gender disparity and the issue should be addressed for the program development.

Business Department Assessment Steps

Approved by Business Department vote on 5/28/2013.

1. **Spreadsheet** – By the Friday after fall and spring graduation. Give Drena data for each course that is taught. Drena enters the data onto a master spreadsheet. Drena collects data from every professor for every course taught in every location including online. This spreadsheet will be stored on the S Drive under Business Department/Assessment Data/year/Spreadsheet.
2. **Business Department Course Summary Sheets.** By June 1st of each year. Each full time professor utilizes the data from the spreadsheet in step 1 above and completes a Course Summary Sheet for **each** course that such full time professor has oversight responsibility each year regardless of whether the course includes any SLO being analyzed that year. The Business Department Course Summary Sheets will be saved in the S Drive under Business Department/Assessment Data/year/Summary Sheets/course number (including undergraduate and graduate courses).
3. **Program Assessment.** By June 7th of each year. Each full time professor completes a Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary for the current year (located on the S Drive in the Assessment folder) for the major they have oversight for, for each of the SLO's being assessed that year (ie - Dr. Berret completes the Program Assessment Summary for HR for 2012-2013 for SLOs 6, 7 and 8 based on the Business Department Course Summary Sheets saved on the S Drive in step 2 above).
4. **TK20 Program Data.** By June 15th of each year. From the login screen on Alvernia.edu, each full time professor will login to TK20 and enter the Program Assessment data from Step 3 above for the major for which they have oversight.