

BAM Annual Learning Results 2014 to 2015

The following table summarizes the assessment of PLOs for the Bachelor of Arts in Management program over two assessment cycles (2014 to 2015). This process is conducted regularly as part of the annual learning results assessments, which measure two or three PLOs for each program each year.

Program	Bachelor of Arts in Management
Assessment Year	2014
Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)	<p>PLO 1: Demonstrate the ability to apply management and leadership theory and principles to the global business environment.</p> <p>PLO 2: Demonstrate the ability to integrate biblical concepts and principles in the management and leadership decision-making process.</p> <p>PLO 7: Demonstrate the ability to evaluate and implement ethically sound and legal decisions while accounting for cultural diversity.</p>
Standards of Success	<p>Eighty percent of artifacts will meet PLO 1, PLO 2, and PLO 7 at the 'Satisfactory' level as measured by the 'Direct Assessment' rubrics developed for each assessment.</p> <p>Percentage benchmarks at U.S. universities used to measure competency range from 70-80 percent. Hence, a benchmark of 80% is consistent with major universities committed to academic excellence. See such documentation for Syracuse University at: http://falk.syr.edu/SocialWork/documents/CSWE-DataReports/BSSW-Spring%202013-Instructor.pdf</p>
Evidence	<p>PLO 1: Signature Assignment for MGT 460.</p> <p>PLO 2: Signature Assignment for MGT 460.</p> <p>PLO 7: The average of the five objective quizzes learners complete for MGT 270.</p>
Assessment Tool	<p>PLO 1: Direct-Assessment Rubric for evaluating the Signature Assignment.</p> <p>PLO 2: Direct-Assessment Rubric for evaluating the Signature Assignment.</p> <p>PLO 7: Analysis of raw scores for the five quizzes.</p>
Assessors	<p>PLO 1: Dr. Jeff Slattery (Discipline Chair), Dr. Michael Hartsfield (Adjunct Lecturer), and Dr. Lisa Renz (Adjunct Lecturer)</p> <p>PLO 2: Dr. Jeff Slattery (Discipline Chair), Dr. Michael Hartsfield (Adjunct Lecturer), and Dr. Lisa Renz (Adjunct Lecturer)</p> <p>PLO 7: Ms. Elnora Farmer (Adjunct Lecturer) and Dr. Jeff Slattery (Discipline Chair)</p>
Results	<p>PLO 1: Assessed per the following 5 categories: (1) management theories and principles (85%); (2) leadership theories and principles (87.3%); (3) global business environment (84.5%), (4) biblical concepts and principles (93.8%) and (5) decision-making processes and integration (86%).</p>

	<p>PLO 2: Assessed per the following 5 categories: (1) management theories and principles (85%); (2) leadership theories and principles (87.3%); (3) global business environment (84.5%), (4) biblical concepts and principles (93.8%) and (5) decision-making processes and integration (86%).</p> <p>PLO 7: The following results derive from the quizzes in three sections of MGT 270 offered during 2014. The analysis includes the results of 40 students completing a total of five quizzes per course. The combined average for the three sections equaled 81.2 (77%), with a median score of 85.3 (85%) and a mode score of 95 (91%).</p>
Discussion of Results	<p>PLO 1: According to the grading rubric and rating scales for each of the 5 categories, the evidence clearly indicated that the process has met PLO #1 at the satisfactory level or above.</p> <p>PLO 2: According to the grading rubric and rating scales for each of the 5 categories, the evidence clearly indicated that the process has met PLO #2 at the satisfactory level or above.</p> <p>PLO 7: The results from the combined scores indicate learners are meeting PLO #7 at the satisfactory level or above. The 3% difference between the section averages does not represent a significant deviation.</p>
Proposed Changes	<p>PLO 1: As evidenced by the rubric scores, learners are performing at or above the proficiency level and no changes are warranted at this time. The next step would be to increase the sample size to confirm the results prior to changing the delivery methods of the artifact or rating methods.</p> <p>PLO 2: As evidenced by the rubric scores, learners are performing at or above the proficiency level and no changes are warranted at this time. The next step would be to increase the sample size to confirm the results prior to changing the delivery methods of the artifact or rating methods.</p> <p>PLO 7: None</p>
Rationale for Proposed Changes	<p>PLO 1: No proposed changes at this time.</p> <p>PLO 2: No proposed changes at this time.</p> <p>PLO 7: No proposed changes at this time.</p>
Financial Resources Required	<p>PLO 1: Reliability testing will require additional funds for interrater reliability training and artifact assessment.</p> <p>PLO 2: Reliability testing will require additional funds for interrater reliability training and artifact assessment.</p> <p>PLO 7: No requested funds at this time. The course is scheduled for a review and update in 2015/16.</p>
Annual Learning Report for BAM Approved	<p>Educational Effectiveness Committee, October 7, 2015 meeting</p>
Follow Up (Closing the Loop)	<p>PLO 7: The BUS 270 course underwent a minor revision to clarify instructions for the discussion and assignments in weeks 1 and 3; the revised course was launched in SU2 2016.</p>

Program	Bachelor of Arts in Management
Assessment Year	2015
Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)	<p>PLO 5: Identify, evaluate, and utilize culturally diverse management concepts, knowledge and information in business operations.</p> <p>PLO 6: Demonstrate the technical skills and competencies required to effectively manage the functional areas of global business operations.</p>
Standards of Success	<p>Eighty percent of artifacts will meet PLO 5 and PLO 6 at the 'Satisfactory' level as measured by the 'Direct Assessment' rubrics developed for each assessment.</p> <p>Percentage benchmarks at U.S. universities used to measure competency range from 70-80 percent. Hence, a benchmark of 80% is consistent with major universities committed to academic excellence. See such documentation for Syracuse University at: http://falk.syr.edu/SocialWork/documents/CSWE-DataReports/BSSW-Spring%202013-Instructor.pdf</p>
Evidence	<p>PLO 5: Signature Assignment in MGT 450; 7 artifacts were assessed.</p> <p>PLO 6: Signature Assignment in MGT 380; 17 artifacts were assessed.</p>
Assessment Tool	<p>PLO 5: Direct-Assessment Rubric for evaluating the Signature Assignment -- the artifact to measure fulfillment of PLO 5. Inter-rater Reliability exercise conducted.</p> <p>PLO 6: Direct-Assessment Rubric for evaluating the Signature Assignment -- the artifact to measure fulfillment of PLO 5. Inter-rater Reliability exercise conducted.</p>
Assessors	<p>PLO 5: Dr. Jeff Slattery (FT Lecturer), Dr. Roberto Castaneda (Adjunct Lecturer), and Dr. Amanda Wynn (Adjunct Lecturer), as a tiebreaker</p> <p>PLO 6: Dr. Jeff Slattery (FT Lecturer), Dr. Amanda Wynn (Adjunct Lecturer), and Dr. Roberto Castaneda (Adjunct Lecturer), as a tiebreaker</p>
Results	<p>PLO 5: 7 artifacts were assessed; 4 (57%) received a 'satisfactory' (or higher) using the direct-assessment rubric. The outcome was not successfully achieved.</p> <p>PLO 6: 17 artifacts were assessed; 10 (59%) received a 'satisfactory' (or higher) using the direct-assessment rubric. The outcome was not successfully achieved.</p>
Discussion of Results	<p>PLO 5: The sample size may be too small to draw conclusive results/patterns/trends from the data. Students work on the assignment throughout the course. The assignment is a group assignment. Perhaps students should be given the opportunity to do a self-evaluation. Student groups are created at the beginning of week 2; if the instructor can, he/she puts complementary students in the same group. Group instructions hold members accountable. The assignment rubric is available to learners from the start of class. There may be some value to evaluating the artifacts that failed to determine common patterns/characteristics.</p>

	<p>PLO 6: Assignment was a valid reflection of the PLO. The assignment met the web-centric standards of the rubric. Assignments were lacking in the organization and other content and an adequate level of detail was generally lacking.</p>
Proposed Changes	<p>The BAM program is scheduled to go through a program review, beginning late Summer, 2017. As part of that more comprehensive review, any proposed changes to the assessed PLOs will be a result of the program review. The program review will take into consideration this document when determining appropriate next steps for PLO improvement.</p>
Rationale for Proposed Changes	<p>The BAM program is one of the oldest programs UC offers, and is scheduled to go through a program review. Due to administrative adjustments to the workloads of various ADs, the BAM program has been under the supervision of Dr. Washatka for about 1 ½ years (mid-year 2015 through 2016) and Dr. Wayne Herman (beginning 2017). As a result, the program has not benefited from the leadership of a single AD for any period of time that has permitted a comprehensive review.</p>
Financial Resources Required	<p>TBD in the BAM Program Review process.</p>
Annual Learning Report for BAM Approved	<p>Educational Effectiveness Committee, August 2, 2017 meeting</p>
Follow Up (Closing the Loop)	