Appendix A
Assessment of Student Learning
Department and Program Report

Please enter the appropriate information concerning your student learning assessment activities for this year.

Academic Year of Report: ___2013-2014______ College: __Business__________________
Department: _Management______________________  Program: _B.S.B.A._____________

1. What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?

In answering this question, please identify the specific student learning outcomes you assessed this year, reasons for assessing these outcomes, with the outcomes written in clear, measurable terms, and note how the outcomes are linked to department, college and university mission and goals.

The learning objectives for the Department of Management are to provide Accounting and Business Administration students with knowledge and competency in marketing, organizational management and human resources management. This is done in the core classes.

The Department of Management is responsible for providing the following skills: written communication, oral communication, teamwork, critical thinking and ethics. The Department of Management is responsible for including outcomes for written communication and ethics in MKT 362 and MGT 382, respectively. All College of Business outcomes are assessed in MGT 489, the capstone course for all Accounting and Business Administration students. Further, all MGT 489 students complete the Business Major Field Test (MFT, provided by ETS) for assessment of business knowledge and competency.

Each of the outcomes and assessments has been identified as important by the College of Business accrediting body, AACSB.

2. How were they assessed?

In answering these questions, please concisely describe the specific methods used in assessing student learning. Please also specify the population assessed, when the assessment took place, and the standard of mastery (criterion) against which you will compare your assessment results. If appropriate, please list survey or questionnaire response rate from total population.

A) What methods were used?

The College of Business uses the Business Major Field Test (MFT, provided by ETS) which is administered in the capstone class (MGT 489) to test knowledge in finance, quantitative business analysis, and information systems, as well as marketing and management.

The Department of Management uses rubrics to evaluate students on written communication, teamwork, oral communication, ethics, and critical thinking. Each rubric evaluates student performance on a number of criteria. These skills are assessed in the capstone course MGT 489.
B) Who was assessed?

All Accounting and Business Administration majors are assessed with the MFT/ETS test.

All Accounting and Business Administration majors are assessed with the rubrics for written communication, oral communication, teamwork, critical thinking and ethics. Graduating seniors are assessed on these skills with a case study in MGT 489. A subset of 25% of all cases is assessed by at least two College of Business faculty.

C) When was it assessed?

Graduating seniors are tested with MFT/ETS in MGT 489 which is offered every quarter.

The Department of Management use rubrics every quarter in the MGT 489 to assess written communication, oral communication, teamwork, critical thinking and ethics.

3. What was learned?

In answering this question, please report results in specific qualitative or quantitative terms, with the results linked to the outcomes you assessed, and compared to the standard of mastery (criterion) you noted above. Please also include a concise interpretation or analysis of the results.

The mean correct scores in most categories have declined. However, some of these declines appear to be consistent across schools. The trend for CWU students is mixed when compared to all institutions. In performance relative to other institutions, CWU has dropped in economics, legal and social, international and marketing. Other areas a steady, and quantitative business analysis has improved, the likely result of several years effort increasing the quantitative skills of our students.

The college attempted to conduct an item-by item analysis of the ETS to better understand the areas where performance has declined. However, unless and until specific questions are made available for review, little can be learned. Item information available is limited to broad categories, limiting specific efforts to improve student performance in those areas.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CWU F’06-S’09 Avg. Mean % Correct (Exam 4CMF)</th>
<th>F’06-S’09 Avg. scores % at/below CWU (ETS ’06-09 %)</th>
<th>CWU F’12-S’13 Avg. Mean % Correct (Exam4GMF)</th>
<th>F’12-S’13 scores % at/below CWU (based on Sept. ’10 to June ’13)</th>
<th>CWU F’13-S’14 Avg. Mean % Correct avg. over individuals (Exam 4GMFC)</th>
<th>F’13-S’14 institutional scores % at/below CWU (based on Sept. ’13 to June ’14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Overall 157</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Accounting 58.4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Finance 60.9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The assessment of students skills (by rubric) are shown below. New data has not been assessed since spring 2011. Data will be assessed in advance of our AACSB re-accreditation process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>W09</th>
<th>Sp09</th>
<th>F09</th>
<th>W10</th>
<th>Sp10</th>
<th>F10</th>
<th>W11</th>
<th>S11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Avg.</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Avg.</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Avg.</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer/Teamwork Avg.</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking Avg.</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **What will the department or program do as a result of that information?**

In answering this question, please note specific changes to your program as they affect student learning, and as they are related to results from the assessment process. If no changes are planned, please describe why no changes are needed. In addition, how will the department report the results and changes to internal and external constituents (e.g., advisory groups, newsletters, forums, etc.).

We continue to conduct a program by program review of our curriculum. In the coming year. We will review our Human Resource Management program. We have formed an advisory board for our Marketing program that will provide additional external review of our program. Further, we are exploring bringing our communications requirement in house. This move is promoted by a desire to see increased improvement in both the written and oral presentation skills of our students.

We are also working to integrate student professional development into and beyond the curriculum. We will likely be modifying our MGT 200 course and perhaps adding additional 1-2 credit courses in professional development as part of the program.
We will be launching a new ethics module into all sections of MGT 382 in the coming year. The Department also continues to actively serve on the College Assessment of Learning Committee where ethics pedagogy and assessment continue to be reviewed.

5. **What did the department or program do in response to last year’s assessment information?**

In answering this question, please describe any changes that have been made to improve student learning based on previous assessment results. Please also discuss any changes you have made to your assessment plan or assessment methods.

Most of our assessment tools have been in place for a few years, so we have not made major changes recently. We have launched a new Leadership and Management program at all three of our locations (Ellensburg, Lynnwood, Des Moines) this year. We have just completed a review of our Marketing Curriculum that will result in three groups of elective courses to enhance the core; digital marketing, international marketing and sports marketing. We have developed an Ethics module that will be taught in all sections of MGT 382. That module is being field tested this year with the intent to fully incorporate it in all sections of MGT 382 in AY 15-16.

6. **Questions or suggestions concerning Assessment of Student Learning at Central Washington University:**

None