

Template
Academic Programs
Assessment Plan
University of New Mexico

Instructions:

This template is a suggested guideline for creating assessment plans to assess academic program-level student learning outcomes. An assessment plan can span one, two, or three assessment cycles. Alternative formats (e.g., those used by specialized accreditors) may be acceptable; please check first with the Office of Assessment.*

Assessment plans should include clear differentiations between degrees (i.e., concentration, certificate, bachelor, master's, and/or doctoral).

Assessment plans should be reviewed and approved at the college/school/branch level by the College Assessment Review Committee (CARC) or the equivalent.

All assessment plans should be made available to students and the broader UNM community for review via the website of the college/school/branch.

*If you have any questions, please contact the Office of Assessment at assess@unm.edu or 277-4130.

Please delete this cover page before submitting.

Template
Academic Programs
Assessment Plan
The University of New Mexico

A. College, Department and Date

1. College: *Anderson School of Management*
2. Department: *Anderson School of Management*
3. Date: *1/27/2016*

B. Academic Program of Study*

B.B.A.

C. Contact Person(s) for the Assessment Plan

Shawn Berman, Associate Dean, sberman@unm.edu; Deirdre Markham, Program Specialist, dmarkham@unm.edu

D. Broad Program Goals & Measurable Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

1. Broad Program Learning Goal(s) for this Degree/Certificate Program

A. Management Functional Knowledge: Graduates have a broad knowledge of functional management areas including accounting, finance, marketing, operations management, organizational behavior, and quantitative methods.

B. Management Perspective Knowledge: Graduates have a broad knowledge of the environment in which businesses operate including specific knowledge of business law, diversity, economics, and ethics.

C. Management Integrative Knowledge: Graduates are able to integrate functional and perspective knowledge in areas that include global issues, strategy, and technology.

D. Communication Skills: Graduates have requisite oral and written communication skills for typical business communication scenarios including correspondence, reports, presentations, and interaction with internal and external constituents.

E. Team Work: Graduates have experience in completing complex managerial tasks as a team member.

F. Critical Thinking: Graduates have critical thinking skills, suitable to entry-level management positions, which enable them to find and classify relevant information, generate

* Academic Program of Study is defined as an approved course of study leading to a certificate or degree reflected on a UNM transcript. A graduate-level program of study typically includes a capstone experience (e.g. thesis, dissertation, professional paper or project, comprehensive exam, etc.).

Adapted from Kansas State University Office of Assessment

alternatives, prioritize decision-making criteria, and generate and justify appropriate decisions.

2. List of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for this Degree/Certificate Program

A.1. Management Functional Knowledge:

Objective #1: Demonstrate and understanding of the difference between cash and accrual accounting, conduct basic financial statement analysis and use accounting information to measure, monitor, manage and improve the financial performance of organizations. (measured in MGMT 202 & 303)

Objective #2: Demonstrate an understanding of fundamental finance processes and the concepts underlying these processes and are able to apply them to solve finance problems and make financial decisions. (measured in MGMT 326)

Objective #3: Demonstrate a broad knowledge of the role and application of marketing principles in business and society. (measured in MGMT 322)

Objective #4: Demonstrate a working knowledge of the role that the operations manager plays in delivering products and services to customers. (measured in MGMT 300)

Objective #5: Demonstrate understanding of the basic concepts related to effective management of people in organizations. (measured in MGMT 306)

Objective #6: Use quantitative skills to solve applied operations and financial problems (measured in MGMT 300 & 326).

B.1. Management Perspective Knowledge:

Objective #1: Demonstrate an understanding of the legal system and common legal principles, with the focus on topics relevant to business such as contracts, torts, and employment law. (measured in MGMT 310)

Objective #2: Demonstrate the impact of workforce diversity on management and in organizations. (measured in MGMT 306).

Objective #3: Demonstrate and understanding of an organization's stakeholders, classify stakeholders using various typologies, the differences between ethical and unethical behavior and identify the functions of ethical values and standards for individuals and societies. (measured in MGMT 308)

C.1. Management Integrative Knowledge:

Objective #1: Demonstrate an understanding of the impact of micro and macro environmental variables on global business transactions and operations. (measured in MGMT 328)

Objective #2: Demonstrate an understanding of external and internal determinants of competitive advantage. (measured in MGMT 498)

Objective #3: Apply information systems principles and practice with those from other functional areas to analyze and recommend business and management decisions. (measured in MGMT 450)

D.1. Communication Skills:

Objective #1: Effectively communicate management concepts, plans and decisions in an oral presentation.

Adapted from Kansas State University Office of Assessment

Objective #2: Effectively communicate management concepts, plans and decisions in a written report.

(Above objectives measured in courses with writing and oral communications, rubrics attached.)

E.1. Teamwork:

Objective #1: Effectively participate in a cross-functional team.

F.1. Critical Thinking:

Objective #1: Organize information to provide alternative solutions or answers to business situations.

Objective #2: Identify a business problem and/or opportunity and generate alternatives to solve or take advantage of it.

Objective #3: Identify and defend arguments for opposing viewpoints.

Objective #4: Identify assumptions, implicit as well as explicit, in an argument.

(Above objectives measured in courses with writing and oral communications, rubrics attached.)

E. Assessment of Student Learning Plan

All programs are expected to measure student learning outcomes annually and to measure all program student learning outcomes at least once over one, two, or three assessment cycles. Each unit determines which of its student learning outcomes to assess during an assessment cycle. Describe the program’s one, two, or three year plan for assessing program-level student learning outcomes by addressing 1 thru 4 below.

1. Student Learning Outcomes Matrix

[Insert all student learning outcomes that will be assessed by the unit over the next one, two, or three assessment cycles.]

Relationship to UNM Student Learning Goals (insert the program’s SLOs and check all that apply):

University of New Mexico Student Learning Goals				
Program SLOs	Knowledge	Skills	Responsibility	Program SLO is conceptually different from university goals.
Management Functional Knowledge		X		
Management Perspective Knowledge		X	X	
Management Integrative Knowledge		X		
Communication Skills		X		
Teamwork		X		
Critical Thinking		X		

2. How will learning outcomes be assessed? (Address Ai thru Aiii individually or complete the table below)

A. What:

- i. Currently, Management Functional, Perspective and Integrative Knowledge are measured in the courses listed with each objective through embedded test questions in quizzes and exams given to students. Faculty teaching in these courses are asked to complete the “Closing the Loop” form at least once each academic year to evaluate the results and make adjustments to the course, course materials or tests as indicated by their evaluation. The results are collected by the Associate Dean’s Office.

Communication Skills and Critical Thinking are evaluated at least once per year in courses that have writing assignments or presentations. The rubrics used for these evaluations are attached. These evaluations are completed by Master’s or Ph.D. students with the departments of English and Communications & Journalism.

Teamwork Skills are evaluated periodically in courses that have teamwork activities through a peer-evaluation rubric.

- ii. Management Functional, Perspective and Integrative Knowledge are measured through direct measures. Communication Skills and Critical Thinking are measured directly and indirectly. Teamwork Skills are measured through direct measures.
- iii. Rubrics used for measuring communication skills and critical thinking are attached. When the School completes the update of the learning assessment process, criteria for success will be established.

Assessing Student Learning Goals			
Program SLOs	Assessment Measures	Direct or Indirect	Criteria for Success
Management Functional Knowledge	Embedded testing	Direct	To be established
Management Perspective Knowledge	Embedded testing	Direct	To be established
Management Integrative Knowledge	Embedded testing	Direct	To be established
Communication Skills	Evaluated using established rubrics	Direct	To be established
Teamwork	Peer evaluation	Direct	To be established
Critical Thinking	Evaluated using established rubrics	Direct	To be established

B. Who: State explicitly whether the program’s assessment will include evidence from all students in the program or a sample. Address the validity of any proposed sample of students. **[NOTE: Although one size does not fit all and it does depend on the assessment method, sampling should not be taken lightly. Best practices indicate that sampling approx. 20% of a course’s student population (or student enrollment) is valid and reliable if the number exceeds 99. Otherwise, a valid rationale has to be provided for samples that are less than 20% of the course’s student population.]**

Within the courses that complete assessment, all students participate in the evaluations.

3. When will learning outcomes be assessed? When and in what forum will the results of the assessment be discussed?

[Briefly describe the timeframe over which your unit will conduct the assessment of learning outcomes selected for the one, two, or three year plan and/or complete the following table. For example, provide a layout of the semesters or years (e.g., 2014-2015, 2014-2016, and 2014-2017), list which outcomes will be assessed, and which semester/year the results will be discussed and used to improve student learning (e.g., discussed with program faculty, interdepartmental faculty, advisory boards, students, etc.)]

In Fall 2015, the Anderson School began reviewing current learning assessment activities in order to bring its current activities in line with guidelines from its accrediting body (AACSB, Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business) and current UNM practices. While the current assessment process does effectively assess learning in core courses, that data is not effectively linked to and used to complete comprehensive programmatic assessment. The table below outlines the current process which will continue until a new process is in place; this process was described in the assessment plan submitted in January 2015. The School expects to establish a new position, assurance of learning coordinator, in Spring 2016; this position will manage all assessment activities and reporting. (This position was established in March 2016. Two faculty members will share the position with each person having individual ownership of specific programs.) The School’s undergraduate and graduate curriculum committees have developed new programmatic goals; the undergraduate goals have been approved by faculty and the graduate goals have been presented to the faculty for approval. These approvals should be completed in Spring 2016 (The graduate program goals have been approved). Once all the goals have been approved, the AOL coordinators will work with faculty to design a new assessment process.

Program SLOs	Year/Semester Year
Management Functional Knowledge	Fall and Spring assessment, core course review at least once yearly
Management Perspective Knowledge	Fall and Spring assessment, core course review at least once yearly
Management Integrative Knowledge	Fall and Spring assessment, core course review at least once yearly
Communication Skills	Fall and/or Spring assessment
Teamwork	To be determined
Critical Thinking	Fall and/or Spring assessment

4. What is the unit’s process to analyze/interpret assessment data and use results to improve student learning?

Briefly describe:

- 1. who will participate in the assessment process (the gathering of evidence, the analysis/interpretation, recommendations).*

Adapted from Kansas State University Office of Assessment

2. *what is the process for considering the implications of assessment/data for change:*
 - a. *to assessment mechanisms themselves,*
 - b. *to curriculum design,*
 - c. *to pedagogy*
...in the interest of improving student learning.
3. *How, when, and to whom will recommendations be communicated?*

The outcomes are assessed at the course level by faculty teaching the course; the goal for course assessment is at least once per academic year. The results of the assessment and description of the process and outcomes are captured in the “Closing the Loop” document, a sample response and the “Closing the Loop” template are attached.

Critical Thinking and Written Communication Skills are generally evaluated in MGMT 498 as the capstone courses for undergraduate students. The assessment is completed by a Master’s or Ph.D. English department student who serves as the writing GA for the Anderson School during the previous semester. The rubric currently being used is below.

Written Communication Rubric

	0 – Unsatisfactory	1 -- Satisfactory	2 -- Superior	Score
Organization & Development of Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ No, or poorly communicated, introduction ▫ No clear thesis ▫ Little or no logical connection from one idea to the next ▫ Basic or little understanding of topic. ▫ Little evidence of author’s original thinking. ▫ Conclusion (when needed) absent or perfunctory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Introduction implies but does not clearly state thesis, purpose and/or organization of paper ▫ Thesis present but not fully developed ▫ Generally thoughtful development of argument with some gaps in logic or reasoning. ▫ Competent understanding of topic. ▫ Some evidence of author’s original thinking ▫ Conclusion (when needed) briefly summarizes paper but does not tie it into a coherent whole. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Clear introduction states thesis, purpose and organization of paper ▫ Thesis clear and well-developed ▫ Logical arguments and analysis are easy to follow ▫ Thorough understanding of topic. ▫ Significant evidence of author’s original thinking (e.g. persuasive synthesis of information) ▫ Conclusion (when needed) is clear and comprehensive. 	

	0 – Unsatisfactory	1 -- Satisfactory	2 -- Superior	Score
Tone & Word Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Tone overly informal. ▫ Incorrect/inappropriate word choice often interferes with communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Tone generally professional. ▫ Word choice generally correct/appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Tone consistently professional. ▫ Word choice precise, correct and appropriate. 	
Spelling & Punctuation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Frequent errors (average 3 or more per page) ▫ Errors interfere with communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Occasional errors (average 1-2 per page) ▫ Errors do not substantially interfere with communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Very few errors (av. fewer than 1 per page) ▫ Errors do not interfere with communication 	
Grammar, Sentence & Paragraph Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Sentences regularly contain grammatical errors or other problems that interfere with communication ▫ Many paragraphs do not contain a topic sentence ▫ Paragraphs generally lack focus ▫ Quotations are often irrelevant ▫ Quotations often interrupt the flow of writing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Sentences are generally grammatically correct but occasionally awkward ▫ Most paragraphs contain a topic sentence ▫ Paragraphs generally focused and coherent. ▫ Quotations generally add value ▫ Quotations occasionally interfere with flow of writing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Sentence structure makes paper easy to read ▫ Each paragraph contains a topic sentence ▫ Paragraphs are focused and coherent ▫ Quotations add value ▫ Quotations are integrated seamlessly. 	

	0 – Unsatisfactory	1 -- Satisfactory	2 -- Superior	Score
Sources & References	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Sources for facts, quotations and ideas not properly indicated. ▫ Sources do not support the author's points. ▫ Too few sources used. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Where appropriate, sources for most facts, quotations and ideas are properly indicated. ▫ Sources generally support the author's points. ▫ More or a greater variety of sources should be used. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Where appropriate, sources for all facts, quotations and ideas are properly indicated. ▫ Sources consistently support author's points. ▫ Appropriate variety of sources. 	
				Total:

CRITICAL THINKING RUBRIC

	Needs work (0)	Average (1)	Accomplished (2)	Score
Assimilate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊙ Fails to include relevant information ⊙ Includes excessive irrelevant information ⊙ Misinterprets or mischaracterizes information ⊙ Fails to include or is confused by information from a variety of viewpoints 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊙ Includes some relevant information ⊙ Minimal amount of irrelevant information ⊙ Generally interprets information accurately ⊙ Includes some disparate and potentially conflicting information from a variety of viewpoints 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊙ Includes most relevant information ⊙ Does not include irrelevant information ⊙ Consistently interprets information accurately ⊙ Effectively includes disparate and potentially conflicting information from a variety of viewpoints 	
Evaluate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊙ Demonstrates no or little independent/creative thought ⊙ Is unable to or superficially uses general principles to create reasonable solutions and/or predictions ⊙ Is unable to or superficially uses specific examples to support analysis ⊙ Does not evaluate alternative perspectives (e.g., functional, short/long term, strategic/tactical, internal/external) ⊙ Exhibits close-mindedness or hostility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊙ Demonstrates some independent and creative thought ⊙ Limited use of general principles to create reasonable solutions and/or predictions ⊙ Limited use of specific examples to support analysis ⊙ Some evaluation of alternative perspectives (e.g., functional, short/long term, strategic/tactical, internal/external) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊙ Consistently demonstrates independent and creative thought ⊙ Effectively uses general principles to create reasonable solutions and/or predictions ⊙ Effectively uses specific examples to support analysis ⊙ Effectively evaluates alternative perspectives (e.g., functional, short/long term, strategic/tactical, internal/external) 	

	Needs work (0)	Average (1)	Accomplished (2)	Score
Conclude	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ⓢ No decision Ⓢ Decision not based on or only superficially based on sound evidence and prior evaluation Ⓢ Decision not supported with persuasive arguments Ⓢ Does not acknowledge other potential outcomes Ⓢ Decision based on biased information/reasoning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ⓢ Irresolute decision Ⓢ Decision somewhat based on sound evidence and prior evaluation Ⓢ Decision somewhat supported with persuasive arguments Ⓢ Acknowledges other potential outcomes, does not effectively persuade they are less desirable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ⓢ Clear decision Ⓢ Decision clearly based on sound evidence and prior evaluation Ⓢ Decision clearly supported with persuasive arguments Ⓢ Effectively persuades that other potential outcomes are less desirable 	
Source: Montana State University				Total:

Oral Communication Skills are generally evaluated in MGMT 300, 306, 498, 506 and/or 598. The assessment is completed by a Master's or Ph.D. Communications and Journalism department student who serves as the oral communications GA for the Anderson School during the previous semester. The rubric currently being used is below.

PRESENTATION Group Name:
TIME:

Scale: 0 = Missing 1 = Poor 2 = Fair 3 = Average 4 = Good 5 = Excellent

<u>Organization</u>	<u>X/25</u>
Introduction (Attention getter, preview of main points)	0 1 2 3 4 5
Seems to follow a logical organizational pattern	0 1 2 3 4 5
Main points well selected, key ideas well placed	0 1 2 3 4 5
Use of Transitions between speakers	0 1 2 3 4 5
Conclusion (Review of main points, memorable closing strategy)	0 1 2 3 4 5
<u>Content</u>	<u>X/20</u>
Uses of supporting material (technical data, testimonials, case studies, samples, stories, examples, statistics)	0 1 2 3 4 5
Effective use of engaging language (humor, personal accounts/testimonials, metaphors, analogies)	0 1 2 3 4 5
Credibility: knowledgeable/competent	0 1 2 3 4 5
Well cited sources	0 1 2 3 4 5
<u>Mechanics (if applicable)</u>	<u>X/15</u>
Graphics are appropriate in reinforcing/explaining points	0 1 2 3 4 5
Presentation free of grammatical and spelling errors	0 1 2 3 4 5
Obviously prepared for presentation/adequately rehearsed	0 1 2 3 4 5
<u>Group Cohesion</u>	<u>X/15</u>
Individuals displayed respect for group members (credibility)	0 1 2 3 4 5
Attentiveness to fellow speakers	0 1 2 3 4 5
Presentation flowed seamlessly between group members	0 1 2 3 4 5

Template for “Closing the Loop” Form

ASSURANCE OF LEARNING CLOSING THE LOOP FORM

As a condition of our accreditation, the AACSB requires that Anderson perform a learning outcomes assessment. As part of this process, we need to “close the loop” wherein we assess the data collected, attempt to interpret it and strategize about different approaches to change our delivery or course structure in the coming semesters. Please complete this form for each core course in order for us to internally document this process and provide a record should we ever be called upon to provide documentation of this process.

CORE COURSE # MGT _____

COURSE TITLE _____

DATE _____

DEPARTMENT _____

INSTRUCTORS INVOLVED IN THIS DISCUSSION:

Provide a brief overview and explanation of LAT results (i.e., 72% of students performed well on questions about breakeven analysis as we added content to MGT 303 to reinforce this concept, etc.)

Brainstorm possible methods/changes to content/delivery to improve future performance. List a few options below.

What will you do differently the next time this course is taught to improve the student experience/learning.

Thank you! As you know, documentation of this process is of the utmost importance and we simply need to demonstrate what we are doing to improve learning outcomes—while it is nearly impossible to predict what will WORK, documenting our change in approach provides data for next year’s assessment and “loop closing” process.