

Assessment Report

Doermer School of Business & Management Sciences (DSBMS)

Academic Year 2006-2007

(submitted Feb 2008)

In order to assess student learning in its academic programs, the Doermer School employs multiple measures (both direct and indirect) focused on the stated learning objectives. Such measures include:

Direct measures are defined to include such internal measures of student performance as exam scores, evaluation of student projects and papers, performance in downstream courses, capstone course activities, student portfolios, and external validation of student performance such as field tests, comparative CPA Examination pass rates, student ‘consulting’ projects assembled for regional organizations, and forms of student competitions with business students from other institutions (e.g. Indiana CPA Society for accounting students and the Small Business Development Center sponsored competition for MBA students).

Indirect measures are defined to include evaluations from intern/co-op sponsors and all surveys (e.g. internal such as interim and exit surveys and our longitudinal survey of BSB students conducted 1, 3, and 10 years out from graduation date or external such as those of the Educational Benchmarking Institute (see below)),

Our professional accrediting agency, AACSB-International, prescribes a unification of local/internal learning goals and measures with external validation and benchmarking (Standards #15 thru #18 and #20 as taken from :

http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/process/documents/AACSB_STANDARDS_Revised_Jan08.pdf).

To this end, assessment of student learning and continuous improvement become critically important. While AACSB-International is exclusively concerned with baccalaureate and graduate degree programs, we recognize that we must eventually conduct a formal review of the learning outcomes of the neglected associate degree in business (ASB) as well.

In the fall of 2007, AACSB-International conducted its five-year review/audit and campus visitation for our application for reaffirmation of our accreditation. Prior to their audit and visitation, DSBMS had prepared an extensive ‘self-study’ report speaking to their standards. Much of what follows in this annual assessment report is a synopsis of that which was assembled for the ‘self-study’ report as it relates to “assurance of learning” in the 2006-’07 A.Y. A synopsis of their evaluation of our assessment processes appears on page 15 of this document. In the spirit of open disclosure to all stakeholders of the school, the school website now contains a link { <http://www.ipfw.edu/bms/about/learning.shtml> } to the school assessment processes.

DSBMS Approach to the Assurance of Student Learning

The Doermer School of Business and Management Sciences is committed to achieving the learning goals for the Bachelor of Science in Business (BSB) and the Master of Business Administration (MBA). The School has a three-step program for assessing student learning.

Step 1: Establish the competency of our students in areas related to desired learning goals.

Step 2: Integrate the results of the departmental instruments, and external measures such as field testing, student competitions, benchmarking, and other methods.

Step 3: Use the results to celebrate student achievement, refine desired learning outcomes, and improve the business curricula.

With respect to Step 1 above, in academic year 2006-07, the School used data from field tests and students performance in competitions to assess acquisition of learning and skills from the baccalaureate and MBA programs. Educational Testing Services (E.T.S.) Field Exams were administered to undergraduate and MBA students in each of Fall 2006 and Spring 2007. We also involved our students in competitions in which teamwork and communication skills were tested. The ability to integrate, apply, and extend business learning were also assessed in these formats. In addition, each undergraduate concentration has an assessment tool (either operational or pending approval) and a process for evaluating achievement of learning goals specific to the concentration.

In order to accomplish the above, each department and the MBA program policy committee have reevaluated, and restructured as needed, their previous assessment processes. This involves the determination of multiple learning objectives, with measures and processes, for each BSB concentration and the MBA program. Each of the five undergraduate concentrations, the BSB common core, and the MBA program have each successfully identified its specific learning objectives, developed its curriculum mapping, and designed its assessment instruments.

Collective Overview of DSBMS Assessment Measures

Table 1 below provides an overview of the school's assurance of learning process and identifies the methods involved in this integral dimension of our educational mission. After Table 1, the following recent assessment reports are included, each with its respective metrics and interpretations: 1) BSB common core, 2) Accounting concentration, 3) Finance concentration,, 4) Economics concentration, 5) Management concentration, 6) Marketing concentration, and 7) MBA program.

Benchmarking:

Over time, DSBMS has used multiple benchmarking measures (e.g. indirect: EBI and direct: ETS and student competitions) to assess student learning. The decision by DSBMS to participate in the Educational Benchmarking Institute (EBI) project, at both the BSB and MBA levels, provides access to a powerful tool to facilitate vital internal assessments of our operating processes for issues ranging from resource allocation to learning outcomes and curriculum innovation. From the EBI database of more than 100 contributing business schools, DSBMS is able to extract data from six similar schools, providing a needed frame of reference for the interpretation of the internal assessments. The EBI results enable direct comparison of DSBMS undergraduate responses to those of business students at:

- i) the peer group of institutions ("Select 6"), and
- ii) all participating Carnegie II institutions

This form of factual-based analysis enables us to better recognize our relative strengths and weaknesses, which allows us to build on the best practices of comparable institutions and, in turn, continue to improve upon the quality of the educational service we provide. Through a continuing relationship with the benchmarking project, DSBMS benefits from substantive, externally validated data concerning how educational initiatives, which we undertake, compare with peer schools over time. One downside to the interpretation of comparative results is that the "Select 6" pool acknowledged above is not necessarily stable from year-to-year (as institutions move in and out of active participating status with EBI).

Due to expense, this instrument has been used bi-annually since 2001. This indirect assessment tool was not used in the 2006-'07 A.Y. and may have to be discontinued in the future for simple cost reasons. The direct benchmarking measure, ETS, may well be a more useful deployment of limited funding for assessment.

Assurance of Learning

- Table I: Summary of [How We Assess Student Learning](#) Within the Doermer School of Business and Management Sciences

Program	Concentration (Major)	Direct Method Instrument	Direct Method Competition	Direct Method Corporate Liaisons	Indirect Method
Bachelor of Science in Business (BSB)	BSB Program (common core)	ETS Field Test	Business Strategy Game	Survey of Corporate Liaisons in Curriculum Connection Strategic Initiative	EBI/AACSB Exit Exam EBI/AACSB Alumni Survey Annual School of Business Alumni Survey Co-op Education Survey of Employers
-	Accounting	Departmental Instrument	Indiana CPA Society Case Competition (Fall)	-	-
-	Economics	Departmental Instrument	Fed Challenge	-	-
-	Finance	Departmental Instrument	Fed Challenge	-	-
-	Management	Departmental Instrument	Business Strategy Game Ethics Competition	Survey of Corporate Liaisons in Curriculum Connection Strategic Initiative	-
-	Marketing	Departmental Instrument	{specific competition yet to be identified}	-	-
MBA	MBA Program	ETS MBA Field Test Assessment Instrument	Ohio MBA Case Competition Univ San Francisco Business Plan Competition	Survey of Corporate Liaisons in Curriculum Connection Strategic Initiative	EBI/AACSB Exit Exam EBI/AACSB Alumni Survey

Selected Assessment Results for A.Y. 2006-‘07

- **Baccalaureate Program Core**

Given that the BSB Core is not offered by one department, but rather is the joint offering and responsibility of three departments, the assessment of the learning objectives of the BSB Core is the responsibility of the school-wide Undergraduate Policy Committee (UPC). The School website for the “Assurance of Learning” for the baccalaureate program {see <http://www.ipfw.edu/bms/about/learning/assessment/bac.shtml>} provides a description of the Educational Testing Service (ETS) Field Exam, the undergraduate student competitions (Business Simulation Game, Fed Challenge, Indiana CPA Society Case Contest) with results, the Curriculum Connection Strategic Initiative, and the concentration specific assessment plans. A key direct measure that spans all five undergraduate concentrations is the Educational Testing Service’s Field Test in Business.

The following summary of those results indicates a strong comparative performance by the Doermer School seniors.

Richard T. Doermer School of Business and Management Sciences Major Field Test in Undergraduate Business Seniors Only Assessment

Spring 2007 (Fall 2006 in parens) Results in BSB Field Areas

Field Area	Assessment Indicator Title	DSBMS Mean Percent Correct	DSBMS Score as a National Percentile *
1	Accounting	61 (57)	90th (80th)
2	Economics	55 (55)	85 (85)
3	Management	68 (72)	95 (95)
4	Quantitative Business Analysis	52 (71)	75 (95)
5	Finance	66 (49)	95 (40)
6	Marketing	65 (55)	95 (55)
7	Legal and Social Environment	53 (60)	85 (95)
8	Global Issues	64 (54)	85 (49)

* comparative baseline: 181 participating institutions in Fall 2006.

Interpretation of Above Results Regarding the BSB Core

While Doermer School seniors, participating in the ETS Field Exam during the Fall of 2006 and the Spring of 2007, performed well in each of the eight “Assessment Indicator Titles” (a.k.a. ‘academic disciplines’) and overall, relative to national norms, care must be exercised in drawing strong inference from these results. The ETS exam is primarily discipline based knowledge, so it aligned with only the first School learning objective. In this deployment of the ETS field test, we did not obtain student scores broken out by student’s concentration, thus we cannot identify performance in specific academic disciplines with the School’s concentration of the same name; consequently, we only view these results relative to the BSB core. In the future, we hope that a question-specific analysis is available to be associated with the student’s concentration, then ETS results will be even more viable metrics for assessing learning at the concentration level.

What-We’ve-Learned & Suggestions

1. Only national aggregate ETS data were used for our initial comparisons. In the future, customized comparative data can be purchased so we can compare our students’ performance to those of our peer schools.
2. Though it was claimed that ETS Major Field Test went beyond assessing students’ understanding of concepts, principles, and knowledge in specific areas, there were not enough data to evaluate students' ability to analyze and solve problems, understand relationships, and interpret material as ETS claimed. More detailed data should be available for further analyses.
3. To refine our curriculum in the future, we should address Accounting, Economics, Finance, Marketing, and International Issues. Instructors of these areas should review student performance on the ETS Major Field Tests regarding teaching, enhancement, and coverage issues.
4. Other assessment tools are needed to address other learning objectives.

Learning Objectives	ETS coverage
1. be able to integrate fundamental principles of business theory and practice	Addressed by ETS
2. be able to solve problems by modeling, analyzing data (qualitative and numeric), and using critical thinking skills	Addressed by ETS, Quantitative Business Analysis & Information system area
3. be able to understand the global and cultural implications of business decisions	Addressed by International Issues in Business
4. be able to understand ethical considerations in business decision	<i>Not addressed by ETS</i>
5. be able to understand the relationship between the community and business	<i>Not addressed by ETS</i>
6. be able to demonstrate effective communication and teamwork skills	<i>Not addressed by ETS</i>
7. be prepared for life-long learning in a dynamic environment	<i>Not addressed by ETS, Should encourage more interdisciplinary efforts to keep pace with the ever-changing business environment.</i>

Complementary metrics are warranted to address learning objectives beyond discipline content. Such complementarities are the collective role of the other methods acknowledged in Table 1 above, such as student competitions and newly adopted departmental instruments for assessment.

Of particular value to the BSB program may be the Business Strategy Game (BSG) {see <http://www.ipfw.edu/bms/about/learning/assessment/undergrad/bsg.shtml>} which is used in all sections of the capstone business course. The BSG is an online competition among 9000+ teams of students ($n > 30,000$) representing 349 schools in 25 countries who must make strategic decisions for a company in a highly competitive and interdependent industry; the impact of such decisions will be manifest in numerous corporate performance outcomes. This simulation addresses numerous stated student learning objectives.

Commencing in 2007, the BSG included a 'Learning Assurance Report', showing percentile rankings for each student on eight skill/proficiency measures relative to students at other business schools around the world. Such direct comparative measures on such issues as "Leadership Skills" and "Collaboration & Teamwork" among others, will correlate well with SBMS learning objectives beyond discipline content. In spring 2007, DSBMS seniors were evaluated both individually and as a group against a population of 30,213 students and 9,799 groups. National rankings were achieved by DSBMS senior teams on repeated occasions during 2007. The actual percentile scores (available from the instructor) reveal relative strengths to be "Financial Analysis", "HR Management", and "Strategic Analysis & Planning" and relative weaknesses to be "Leadership Skills" and "Collaboration & Teamwork". The Undergraduate Policy Committee will certainly track this data through time to identify any recurring patterns that warrant curricular examination of the BSB core. Additional elements of the 2007 core curriculum assessment by the Undergraduate Policy Committee follow.

**DSBMS Undergraduate Policy Committee
Business Core Curriculum
Program of Continuous Assessment and
Benchmark Assessment as of the Year 2007**

**Recent BSB Core Curricular Changes and Pending Issues
Resulting from the Assessment of Student Needs:**

1. Changes concerning the BSB core package of:

L200 – Elements of Business Law;

W100 – Principles of Business Administration; and

J300 – Business Forum

The faculty identified specific concerns with each of these courses. L200, a one-hour course, was determined to be too intense for the level. Students were often unable to absorb the material, as assessed by both the instructor and reflected in student evaluations. In order to provide adequate coverage of the necessary concepts, it was decided the course should be returned to its original 3 credit hours. W100, a 3-hour course, was considered by the instructors and the students to be a good General Education course as an overview of business for the purpose of recruiting students, but was not meeting the learning goals of the program. J300 was an excellent forum to present important topics, including diversity, to the students, but the lack of credit gave no student accountability. Therefore, through a recommendation of the Undergraduate Policy Committee, the School's faculty raised L200 to a 3-hour course, raised J300 to a one-hour course, and moved W100 exclusively into the General Education curriculum and outside the BSB requirements effective Fall 2006.

2. Introduction of J100 into the General Education Syllabus

Based on feedback that had been received from incoming students and their parents and drawing upon findings of the National Student Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) about how freshmen learn, the school's Undergraduate Policy Committee endorsed the idea of a required freshmen business course. After attending a one day orientation and registration session during the summer, incoming students still felt lacking and ill-equipped to deal with university life. Faculty voiced concerns as well about students being generally more needy (i.e. not knowing what resources were available to them, not knowing how to manage their time, inappropriate behavior in class, and making poor choices, etc.). The Director of the DSBMS Student Center supplied data from national research that showed the number of first generation college students is increasing – almost forty percent of most student populations. First generation students generally need a little more guidance in adjusting to the university. Based on the information being received from various constituents, it was decided by the DSBMS faculty that, effective Fall 2007, all business majors should complete a one credit hour course that would not only continue their orientation to college and to the world of business..

3. Changes being considered for W204 – Societal, Legal, and Ethical Implications of Business Decisions:

Concerns raised by the instructors of W204 have been taken into consideration by the Management and Marketing Department, and the department is considering requesting that the course be raised to a fourth year capstone course. The concern is that students entering W204 do not yet have enough “academic infrastructure” in functional areas to make business decisions with an understanding of either the ethical context or the various consequences of their decisions. Examination of this issue continues.

4. Concerns about Math 229 – Calculus for the Managerial, Social, and Biological Sciences I

Students and faculty have expressed concerns about the rigor of this 3 credit course and with the consistency of content across adjunct instructors used by the Math Department. This issue will be part of the considerations of the Undergraduate Policy Committee during the Spring 2008 semester.

DSBMS Concentrations

Assessment for the A.Y 2006-2007

Each of the five concentrations within the BSB submitted detailed reports concerning their own assessment results for the AACSB ‘self-study’ report. For space considerations, these are not included here, but are available through the office of the DSBMS Associate Dean (J. Moore). Rather, the following table summarizes the measures used (direct and indirect) by each reporting unit and their results:

	Direct	Indirect	Data	Recognized Outcome
BSB Core		EBI results (2001, 2003, 2005, no \$\$ for 2007)	EBI Reports	DSBMS shows improvement over time. Comparison with "Select 6" Institutions finds very close match on all relevant Learning Objectives.
	multiple stakeholder perspectives			i) confirmation of BSB learning objectives, ii) BSB core package change: L200, W100, J300
	national profile of incoming freshman		NSSE data summary	Introduction of J100 into BSB Gen Ed requirements
	Business Strategy Game Simulation (BGS)		student performance v. world-wide competition	Strengths: "Fin Analysis", "Strategic Analysis & Planning" => global ranking! Weaknesses: Collaboration & Teamwork", "Leadership" => consider more team projects w/in BSB curriculum
	faculty survey		survey results	Learning Objective coverage; identification of learning activities
	ETS field test (Sp'06, F'06 & Sp'07)		ETS Reports	Strengths: first 2 (of 7) Learning Objectives (Integration & Analysis) Weaknesses: #3 (of 7) Learning Objectives (Global Implications)
ACCT	CPA exam pass rate		AICPA data	rate exceeds the national average => success above expectations
	A424 Auditing Project		projects	need additional modules on Risk Analysis need additional work with analytical procedures
	A424 Auditing Exam results		exams	need additional emphasis on Risk Analysis
		changes in accounting profession; feedback from employers		curriculum revisions effective fall 2004
FIN	F420 project		projects	stress global issues improve communication skills improve analysis skills
		Tower Bank hired 10 students within past 3-4 years		External recognition of quality of Finance program
ECON	Competition: Fed Challenge 2006 & 2007		annual scoring data	recognition that Econ majors take Intermediate Macroeconomics too late in their curriculum
	Portfolio review (E321 & E322)		Sp 2007 data Fall 2007 data	Recommendations to UPC to: i) increase Econ concentration from 12 to 15 cr. hrs, ii) include a senior level capstone course (ECON 406)
MGT	course embedded assessments in D300, K327, Z440, Z444		Fall 2006 data Sp 2007 data	Concluded i) students have inadequate business framework <u>at the 200 level</u> to deal w/ ethical implications of decisions => recommend Ethics to be repositioned later in curriculum, and ii) we need to bolster the quantitative preparation of students => rec
MKT	course embedded assessments in D300, M303, M426, M450		Fall 2006 data Sp 2007 data	Concluded i) students have inadequate business framework <u>at the 200 level</u> to deal w/ ethical implications of decisions => recommend Ethics to be repositioned later in curriculum, and ii) we need to bolster the quantitative preparation of students => rec
MBA		EBI results (2001, 2003, 2005, no \$\$ for 2007)	EBI Reports	
	Competitions: i) Ohio SBDC Case Comp (annually since 2002) ii) U. San Francisco Bus. Plan Compet		competition scoring on website	Outcomes: i) recurring placement within top 3. Strengths: Teamwork; Communication & Presentation skills ii) advanced to the final rounds; Strengths: Analysis & Communications
	ETS field test (Sp'06, F'06 & Sp'07)		ETS Reports	top half of participating AACSB schools; see below
	M590 Capstone: Portfolio eval & client eval			Weakness: Research methods

Selected MBA Program Assessment Results for 2006-'07

The newly adopted [MBA Assessment Plan](#) clearly articulates the learning objectives (n=7), lays out the curriculum mapping of just where within the nine-course core each learning objective is to be addressed, and precisely identifies which assessment measure(s) is/are appropriate for course/objective combination. The plan is administered by the DSBMS Graduate Policy Committee (GPC). The MBA assessment plan includes both direct:

- 1) Student Portfolio in M590 - Strategic Management
- 2) ETS MBA Field Test
- 3) Assessment of Projects by 'Clients'
- 4) Assessment of student performance in components of MBA courses by teaching faculty.

and indirect measures:

- 1) EBI Alumni Surveys
- 2) EBI Exit Surveys of Students.

Portfolio Assessment of M590 Spring 2007

BUFW M590 is a capstone course designed as a comprehensive and integrated analysis of strategic management and competitiveness, with emphasis on the development of effective organizational strategies. Assessment of students in Strategic Management involves multiple methods; however, the prime measure is of the portfolio that each student group compiles during their work with clients. Each group works with a client that has specific needs. The instructor assesses MBA Program Goals 1, 2, 5, and 6, using input from the client as a major determinant. A subcommittee, consisting of two Graduate Policy Committee members, also rated the final reports, focusing on part of Program Goal 5: written presentation skills.

Clients were asked to assess the group's work using an instrument, based on responses to questions asking whether they agreed with statements about the work. For example, they were asked whether the MBA team demonstrated the ability to solve problems innovatively and replied using a Likert scale of 1 to 5, with 1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree. The subcommittee scored each of the final reports, using a scale of 1 to 3 (1=unsatisfactory; 2=satisfactory; 3=excellent), consistent with other Management and Marketing Department measures. Table 2 below shows the results of the subcommittee assessment. Discussion of those results revealed consistency with the client and instructor ratings, although scales are different. Table 1 shows the results of Program Goal Assessment.

Both client and instructor assessments indicate satisfactory achievement in Program Goals, with room for improvement, particularly in the case of Goal 2 -- Ability to transcend functional boundaries, synthesizing and integrating information to make complex, short-term decisions with limited information, as well as conduct the research, competitive analysis, and environmental scanning necessary for long-term strategic decisions. This indicates that students may need more guidance to integrative approaches during the basic courses in the MBA Program, focusing on development research skills. This would suggest the need for a basic research methods course in the MBA program. In addition, basic courses in the Program should require more written deliverables, wherever possible.

ETS MBA FIELD TEST

“The Major Field Test for Master of Business Administration (MFT-MBA) consists of 124 multiple-choice questions, half of which are based on short case-study scenarios. Some questions employ such materials as diagrams, graphs, and statistical data. Mathematical operations do not require the use of a calculator.”

“Most of the questions require knowledge of specific information drawn from marketing, management, finance, and managerial accounting, or a combination of these, referred to as “strategic integration.” The test also includes questions that focus on international business, information technology, the legal and regulatory environment of business, ethics and social responsibility in business, statistical analysis, and managerial economics.”

“A unique feature of the MFT-MBA is that **all of the questions on the test measure critical thinking ability; that is, the ability to interpret data, to apply concepts and ideas, and to analyze data, theories, and relationships deductively and inductively.** The overall scaled score can be considered a measure of a student’s critical thinking and reasoning within the domain of a standard MBA curriculum.”

Source: Educational Testing Services

Table 1 presents the results of the MBA Field test that was administered to MBA students enrolled in M590 (Strategic Management) in March 2006, December 2006 and May 2007.

Table 1: ETS MBA Field Test Results *

Assessment Field	March 2006		December 2006		May 2007	
	Mean Percent Correct	Percentile:	Mean Percent Correct	Percentile:	Mean Percent Correct	Percentile:
		AACSB Accredited Institutions** (12)		AACSB Accredited Institutions** (12)		AACSB Accredited Institutions** (12)
Marketing	63.9	55	68	75	59	50
Management	64.7	65	69	80	63	50
Finance	54.0	75	63	90	51	55
Managerial Accounting	64.6	80	72	95	60	75
Strategic Integration	61.5	75	67	80	57	50
Total Scaled Score Mean	260.8	75	268	80	257	50
	n=21		n=14		n=35	

* Based on data from February 2005 to December 2006

****The 12 AACSB accredited schools are:**

Appalachian State University
California State University, Fullerton
Clark Atlanta University
Eastern Illinois University
Indiana University, Northwest
Indiana University, Southeast
Indiana University, South Bend
Murray State University
Penn State University, Erie
Southwest Missouri State University
University of Michigan, Flint
University of Texas, Tyler

Interpretation:

In May 2007, Doermer MBA students answered 63% of the questions in Management correctly. The Mean Percent Correct of 63% placed them in the 50th percentile when compared to the performance of MBA students in 12 AACSB accredited schools which are similar to the Doermer School.

In all five fields our students placed in the 50th percentile or higher when compared to a peer group of 12 AACSB accredited schools in all three periods. This affirms that our MBA program is at least on par with MBA programs offered by our peer institutions. However, the performance of our students appears to have declined in May 2007 from the two earlier periods. While we do well in Managerial Accounting and Finance, there is scope for significant improvement in Marketing, Management and Strategic Integration.

Portfolio Evaluations / Competition Assessments / Client Project Evaluations:

The detailed assessment report for 2006-'07 (including portfolio evaluations, inter-collegiate competition assessments, and client project evaluations) of the Graduate Policy Committee to the AACSB Self-Study report is available from the DSBMS Associate Dean (J. Moore)

DSBMS Assessment Summary for A.Y 2006-'07

- The DSBMS assessment process is a mosaic – made up of many diverse components
- Use of direct and indirect measures. Student satisfaction with learning experiences in the BSB Program is important to us. Hence the various satisfaction surveys.
- Perceptions of the outcome/utility/relevancy of the BSB change as the student moves from undergraduate to graduate to alumni to first career placement and beyond. Hence the alumni surveys (AACSB/EBI and internal alumni survey) in years 1,3,& 10 after graduation are important to us. In time, this will help with assessment of life-long learning - meaning the learning of the BSB has longevity in its utility to the career span of our alumni.
- We use data. The handout contains a brief picture of what we collect from indirect and direct measures and note trends in time. We document improvements where needed over time.
- We use benchmarking with AACSB/EBI results, with the ETS Field Survey, and with peer schools including AACSB accredited schools. The AACSB database provides some information for this purpose.
- We confirmed the learning goals are relevant with various stakeholders' input including external parties.
- We relate the learning goals to mission, that is, achievement of excellence in education that includes learning well. The competitions are venues in which both acquisition of learning and excellence (winning, placing, honorable mention) may be demonstrated simultaneously.
- We also incorporate the manner in which student learn well. This is the reason for use of the NSSE data. The important conclusion from this survey is that students learn well when they are connected early, meaningfully, and with the principals (fellow students, faculty, administrators, alumni). This how we used the NSSE data and incorporated J100 into the BSB curriculum.
- What we learned so far:

What we learned from process	Source
Student need improvement in communications skills especially in writing and presenting	Undergraduate competitions
Redundancies in the BSB curriculum (W100)	Stakeholders views
Learning of concepts is reinforced with application and problem solving	Projects of the Curriculum connection
Students need to be better (more skilled) in teamwork	Projects the Curriculum Connection and competitions
Student need to improve ability to analyze business situations, data, problems.	Projects the Curriculum Connection and competitions
Students need to improve leadership skills	Business Simulation Game
We need course base assessment for assuring specific learning skills. All measures are not equally effective.	Stakeholders including DSBMS faculty, in May 2007 faculty meeting.
We need portfolios to assess higher level learning goals.	Stakeholders including DSBMS faculty, in May 2007 faculty meeting.
Field tests and AACSB/EBI tests have limited utility and may be reduced in frequency.	Stakeholders including DSBMS faculty, in May 2007 faculty meeting.

The above processes and findings were extensively reviewed by the AACSB-International visitation team during their November 2007 on-site audit. Their evaluation of our assessment process offered several useful and constructive perspectives. They felt we were taking a very comprehensive approach to the “assurance of learning” standards; perhaps even to a fault. We realize that our initial ‘shotgun’ collection of metrics is not a collection that can/will be sustained in its entirety into the indefinite future. Rather, DSBMS wanted to initially explore numerous metrics and look for useful feedback, corroboration, and cost effectiveness as we establish a baseline for the future. This ‘culling’ process is currently underway as we seek to identify an effective subset of the metrics initially explored; this will be consistent with the focus (“minimization of redundancy”) recommended by AACSB. Their recommendation also involved more “data sharing”; such future integration of metrics across various concentrations / programs and their learning goals will hopefully streamline the process of meaningful assessment of student achievement for DSBMS.

Doermer School of Business & Management Sciences
Academic Year: 2006- 2007

Criterion	Y / N	Comments/recommendations
All departments / programs have assessment plans	Y	<p>The B.S.B. Core, each of the five concentrations within the B.S.B. degree program, the Associate of Science in Business (A.S.B.), and the MBA program each have a formal assessment plan. All were operational during A.Y. 2006-'07 except for that of the A.S.B.</p> <p>Since AACSB-International does not review associate degree programs, the A.S.B. program was neglected during 2006-'07 in our assessment process, as all efforts were channeled to the AACSB standards. The A.S.B. is offered jointly by the three departments in SBMS and consequently must be reviewed by faculty at the school level rather than at the department level. This responsibility is acknowledged and accepted by the DSBMS Undergraduate Policy Committee and will be accomplished for campus program review.</p>
Assessment measures are linked to program goals	Y	<p>The BSB program has delineated a set of six learning objectives for the business core curriculum (published in the <u>Bulletin</u>). Each of the five concentrations then <u>compliments</u> the school-level learning objectives with additional learning objectives unique to their concentrations.</p> <p>The new MBA program has an articulated set of seven strategic learning goals for graduates of the program; the formal assessment plan for this program is deliberately tied to these seven stated goals.</p>
Assessment Plan Standards in Paragraph III.B.1. of SD 98-22 have been followed.	Y	DSBMS implementation of plan development, data collection and interpretation has actively involved the IPFW Assessment Director to ensure compliance with SD 98-22 as well as other pragmatic considerations.

		DSBMS 2006-'07	pg.2
All departments / programs submitted reports	N	As acknowledged above, the A.S.B. program has a formal assessment plan but it has yet to be operationalized, consequently, there was no formal report for that program in 2006-'07. Enrollment management has been the focus of A.S.B. reviews to date. The DSBMS Undergraduate Policy Committee submitted a report for the BSB Core. All five concentrations within the B.S. Business program, as well as the MBA program, submitted reports. These seven unit were compiled into the AACSB self-study report dated September 2007.	
Departments / programs use assessment for program improvement (please include examples from each program)	Y	<p>Each program's continuing intent is to use meaningful assessment measures to drive program / concentration improvement. For the B.S. Business program, during AY '06-'07, a package of three courses (W100 , L200, and J300) spanning two SBMS departments, was reconfigures in terms of the focus, content, and credit hours of this set of courses reflected a definitive 'cooperative-package' outcome for this assessment-driven review. 2006-'07 saw the design and adoption of J100 as a freshman orientation course, in response to the union of NSSE findings and stakeholder input.</p> <p>The newly configured MBA curriculum has been collecting and evaluating data on student learning from the ETS field tests, competitions, client project evaluations, and capstone portfolios. One area of concern that has surfaced and is being discussed by the DSBMS Graduate Policy Committee is the content of A524 (economic foundations). A second issue under review is the waiver policy for incoming MBA students with undergraduate background in a specific functional area.</p>	
Depts / programs base recommendn's on data	Y	SBMS programs continue to have a strong empirical orientation / factual basis (including both qualitative as well as quantitative data) for curricular review and redesign. Both the BSB and MBA curricular revisions mentioned above and those currently under review are grounded in previously collected data (often from multiple corroborating sources).	
Prior year recommend'ns were implemented	Y	The implementation of both i) the collective repackaging of W100 {removal from BSB program}, L200 {change from 1 to 3 credits}, and J300 {change from 0 to 1 credit}, and ii) the adoption of J100, and iii) the new MBA program are the direct outgrowth of "completing the loop" for a cycle of planning, assessment, redesign, and implementation that extends back in time a year or more.	

		DSBMS 2006-'07 pg. 3
School support for assessment requested / needed	Likely in the future	As previously reported, the Educational Benchmarking Institute (EBI) instruments are quite expensive (exceeding \$3000). The initial EBI of '00-'01 was funded through an account which is now closed. The spring 2003 and summer 2005 EBI surveys were each funded by SBMS on 'soft monies'. The start-up of ETS field testing severely stretches the existing budgets. While, it would be valuable to perform both the EBI exit survey and the ETS field test for graduating students <u>annually</u> , such an ambitious plan would necessitate a supplemental source of funding.
School-level rewards for continuous improvement	Y	Recognition for innovation and continuous improvement is a self-driver for most faculty. Within DSBMS, the MBA <u>students</u> recognize instructional and motivational prowess through their annual "Excellence in MBA Teaching" award. Delta Sigma Pi business fraternity announced plans to recognize annually a business faculty member for instructional excellence. Unfortunately, at this time there is no formal recognition or award for contributions to <u>curricular</u> assessment and innovation.
Plan for school-level leadership	Y	An <i>ad hoc</i> Assessment task force, representing each academic department, has been constituted annually for reviewing the component reports and providing feedback to the units. Collectively, these individuals, together with the Undergraduate Policy Committee, could provide the leadership for an aggregate/program level assessment and review of the ASB and BSB programs. The DSBMS Graduate Policy Committee provides the leadership for MBA assessment.
Recommended changes to department/program plans	Y	Given the suggestions of the AACSB-International visitation team (November 2007), to move to more " data sharing, and minimization of redundancy ", with respect to assurance of learning, the various units within DSBMS are examining ways to streamline and better integrate their relatively independent plans.
Recommendations to Assessment Council	Y	We need to continue to foster and nurture the message that assessment is a process toward an end, but not an end in itself.

