MVSU/ASSESSMENT PLAN/REPORT
FOR
ACADEMIC PROGRAM

Business Administration | **Baccalaureate**

Academic Year 2012 – 2013
(Assessment Period Covered)

Records for Document Processing

Planning Document ( ) **Final Report (X)**

Submitted By:

Date Submitted: 6/28/2013

Reviewed By: **Chair: Dr. Jay Kim**

Forwarded To:
Date:

Please submit this completed form to your immediate unit supervisor (chairperson) who will then forward all docs in the department to the Dean of the College, with e-copy to the Office of The Assistant Provost/Accreditation Office. We strongly recommend that this document be reviewed by proofreaders in your program/unit before it is submitted, as it goes into the permanent record for accreditation (SACS)

This form is expandable; please use as much space as you need. If you are working on hard copy, it is recommended that you expand the form before you print, so that you will have enough space. Please remove all additional spaces, check for repeated headings etc (esthetics) before saving and emailing your final copy.

MVSU - ASSESSMENT **PLAN / REPORT**
FOR ACADEMIC UNIT

Business Administration | **Baccalaureate**
(Instructional Degree Program) | **(Degree Level)**

August 2012 – July 2013
(Assessment Period Covered)

Faculty Involvement:

How Were Faculty Involved in Planning and Assessment Activities?

All faculty members in the Department actively participated in the process of developing the assessment plan through department meetings and sub-group meetings guided by the chair and sub-group leaders. Sub-group leaders for academic year of 2012-2013 are: Dr. Mary Shepherd (Business Administration), Ms. Jessica Barnes (Accounting), and Dr. Jimmie Warren (MBA). Faculty members in each sub-group (BA, Accounting, and MBA) also had informal meetings many times during the academic year to discuss SLO assessment.

Unit Mission Statement: In support of the College of Professional Studies mission, the mission of the Department of Business Administration is to prepare the graduates for careers in business, non-profit and governmental organizations and for continuing professional education programs. The undergraduate business administration program aims to produce outstanding graduates by providing them with unique opportunities for personal and professional growth based on increasing their knowledge, understanding, and skills in functional areas of business required in global world of business.

Linkage of "Institutional Mission and Goals" to this Unit:

Use verbatim passages from the Vision, University Mission and Goals

Institutional Mission/Goals: Mississippi Valley State University, located in Leflore County, is a Carnegie Master's I institution, which provides accessible, relevant and quality academic and public service programs…offers concentrated study in arts**, business**, education, humanities, public services, pre-professional health services, social sciences, sciences, social work and technology**.**

ASSESSMENT PLAN / REPORT: OUTCOME #1
FOR

Business Administration (Instructional Degree Program)

Baccalaureate (Degree Level)

August 2012 – July 2013
(Assessment Period Covered)

Student Learning Outcome #1

Graduates will be able to demonstrate sufficient proficiency in functional areas of business.

First Means of Assessment for Outcome #1

Describe Means of Assessment:

Overall results of the Educational Testing Service's (ETS) Major Field Test (MFT) in business. The ETS's Major Field Tests are comprehensive undergraduate outcomes assessment designed to measure the critical knowledge and understanding obtained by students in a major field of study. From August 2006 to June 2013, over 685 colleges and universities in the U.S. employ the MFT in Business for student achievement and curriculum evaluation. ETS offers comprehensive national comparative data for the MFT, enabling us to evaluate our students' performance and compare our program's effectiveness to programs at similar institutions nationwide.

Describe Data Collection Plan:

Each semester, graduating senior candidates will take the MFT in business by ETS (Educational Testing Service). The MFT covers nine major areas: Accounting, Economics, Management, Quantitative Business Analysis, Finance, Marketing, Legal and Social Environment, Information Systems, and International Issues. The total score as well as scores of each of the MFT's eight content areas provided by ETS will be collected and analyzed to assess graduates' proficiency in these functional areas of business.

Define Criteria for Success with Rationale:

Quantitative assessment: Equal to or above 48% on the MFT in business will be considered a success. The rationale for selecting this score this academic year is based upon the national average on the MFT in business from September 2010 to June 2012.

	National (80,708 examinees from September 2010 to June 2012)*
Mean	152 (at 48% or below)
Standard deviation	14

*Source: ETS' Score Distribution Comparative Data

Describe Data Collected

The Major Field Test in Business was administered to 29 graduating BA major seniors from 9:00 to 12:00 a.m. on Thursday, April 4, 2013. Copies of the test and answer sheets were sent to the ETS and the Department received the test results from ETS in April.

Describe Data Analysis Conducted

The departmental roster, as well as individual students' reports provided by ETS, were examined by the faculty led by Dr. Jay Kim. The departmental roster includes demographic summary, summary of total test and sub-scores, summary of assessment indicators, and individual student's score reports. (See Table 1.)

Table 1: Summary of Major Field Tests (Department of Business)

Mississippi Valley State University

Test Date : Thursday, April 4, 2013
Students tested : (29 graduating seniors)

Part A: TOTAL SCORES

Scaled Score Range	Number in Range	Percent Below*
200-150	0	
145-149	2	93
140-144	2	86
135-139	6	66
130-134	7	41
125-129	8	14
120-124	4	0
Mean	132	
Standard Deviation	7	

* ETS' Score Distribution Comparative Data:the lower limit of the score interval

Part B: Summary of Assessment Indicators

Assessment Indicator Title	Mean Percent Correct
1. Accounting	28
2. Economics	29
3. Management	33
4. Quantitative Business Analysis	36
5. Finance	30
6. Marketing	36
7. Legal and Social Environment	44
8. Information Systems	34
9. International Issues	32

Describe Whether Criteria for Success Were Met

Our students' overall performance was not successful this year. The mean of scaled score average was below the score during the academic year 2010-2011's with lower standard deviation. The average mean percentile score of our students this year, however, was 34% percentile, which is 14% lower than the national average.

	MVSU (35 examinees in 2010- 2011)	MVSU (29 examinees in 2012-2013)
Mean	137 (at 48% or below)	132 (at 34% or below)
Standard deviation	11	7

Describe How Assessment Results Were Used to Improve Instructional Program:
The Major Field Test of Business covers nine major areas: Accounting, Economics, Management, Quantitative Business Analysis, Finance, Marketing, Legal and Social Environment, Information Systems, and International Issues. Summary of assessment indicators provided by ETS showed relative weakness in Accounting, Economics, Finance, and International Issues. It is interesting to note that there was a substantial decline in Management (10% decline), Marketing (9% decline), and International Issues (10% decline) areas from the academic year 2010-2011 to this year. Our students' performance improved in the area of Quantitative Business Analysis and remained the same in Finance.

Faculty discussed assessment results and reviewed their syllabi to ensure that they reflect all topics/materials to be covered in each subject area so that our students will be able to gain the proficiency in the curriculum. It was recommended that faculty who are in charge of classes in the areas of Accounting, Economics, Finance, and International Issues examine their course syllabi, textbook selection, and teaching methods to improve our students' performance in these areas for coming years.

Second Means of Assessment for Outcome #1

Describe Means of Assessment
In-house developed senior exit exam.

Describe Data Collection Plan
Each semester, graduating senior candidates will take the In-house developed senior exit exam. Due to transitions in departmental dministration, there was no progress in developing second means of assessment. Finalizing the development of second means of assessment for SLO #1 with data collection and analysis plan must be one of the faculty's top items for the Fall of 2013.

Define Criteria for Success with Rationale
N/A

Describe Data Collected
No data was collected.

ASSESSMENT PLAN / REPORT: OUTCOME #2

FOR

Business Administration | **Baccaulaureate**

(Instructional Degree Program) | **(Degree Level)**

August 2012 – July 2013

(Assessment Period Covered)

Student Learning Outcome #2

Upon graduation, students will be able to competently use computer application software that is commonly used in business, specifically word processing, spreadsheets, and presentation tools.

First Means of Assessment for Outcome #2

Describe Means of Assessment

Test results from the scoring rubrics on the in-house developed Technology Competency Test.

Describe Data Collection Plan

Each semester, graduating senior candidates will take the Technology Competency Test. The Technology Competency Test was developed in the department led by Dr. Jeanette Roberts and validated externally by a panel of experts. See documents/files in "Technology Competency Test" directory for the details of the process of developing and validating the test. Technology Competency Test focuses on areas such as writing a research paper, completing spreadsheet related works, preparing a presentation document, and getting involved in internet activities to measure the proficiency in technology commonly used in business.

Define Criteria for Success with Rationale

An average of 66% or higher in each area (Microsoft Word, Excel, PowerPoint) from scoring rubrics will be considered a success. The rationale is based upon the "Cut Score" of MOS (Microsoft Office Specialist) certification. Data will be collected at the end of each semester.

Describe Data Collected

No data was collected.

Second Means of Assessment for Outcome #2

Describe Means of Assessment

Grading results with scoring rubrics for individual/team projects in senior level courses that require intensive use of computer application software.

Describe Data Collection Plan

Individual/team projects in senior level courses that require the intensive use of computer application software will be evaluated. Computer application software experts in the Department as well as given course's instructor will participate in evaluating. Scoring rubrics are developed for related individual/team projects. Each rubric is validated externally by panel of experts. In these rubrics, scoring categories regarding the use of word processor, spreadsheets, presentation software, and internet activities are included. All related rubrics will use the same scoring scale ranging from 1 to 10 for reliable data collection and analysis. Data will be collected at the end of each semester.

Define Criteria for Success with Rationale

An average of 70% or higher in each area (Microsoft Word, Excel, PowerPoint) from scoring rubrics will be considered a success. The rationale is based upon our students' performance from previous year. . It was 68% from Management Information System and 67% from Strategic Management in academic year 2009-2010.

Describe Data Collected:

No data was collected

ASSESSMENT PLAN / REPORT: OUTCOME #3

FOR

Business Administration | **Baccaulaureate**

(Instructional Degree Program) | **(Degree Level)**

August 2012 – July 2013

(Assessment Period Covered)

Student Learning Outcome #3

Graduates will be able to communicate effectively as evidenced by their written and oral presentation.

First Means of Assessment for Outcome #3

Describe Means of Assessment

Grading results from scoring rubrics for individual/team written projects in senior level courses.

Describe Data Collection Plan

Rubrics are developed for related individual/team written projects. Each rubric is validated by panel of experts. Related project course rubrics will use the same scoring scale ranging from 1 to 10 for reliable data collection and analysis. Individual/team written projects in related courses will be evaluated by each instructor. The rubrics will be calibrated and tested for reliability among instructors in the courses and/or colleagues who have similar teaching background in the Department. Data will be collected and studied for analysis at the end of each semester.

Define Criteria for Success with Rationale

Overall average of 64% or higher will be considered success. The rationale is based upon our students' overall performance in previous years. Our students' performance in writing skills improved from 60% in academic year of 2008-2009 to 64% in academic year of 2009-2010.

Describe Data Collected

No data was collected

Second Means of Assessment for Outcome #3 (Recommended)

Describe Means of Assessment

Grading results from scoring rubrics for individual/team oral presentation projects in senior level courses.

Describe Data Collection Plan

Individual/team oral presentation projects in related courses will be evaluated by each instructor. Rubrics are developed for related oral presentation projects in senior level courses. Each rubric is validated externally by panel of experts. Related project rubrics will use the same scoring scale ranging from 1 to 10 for reliable data collection and analysis. Individual/team oral presentation projects in related courses will be evaluated by each instructor. The rubrics will be calibrated and tested for reliability among instructors in the courses and/or colleagues who have similar teaching background in the Department. Scores from categories in oral presentation rubrics will be collected and studied for analysis at the end of each semester.

Define Criteria for Success with Rationale

Overall average of 66% or higher will be considered success. The rationale is based upon our students' overall performance in previous years. Our students' performance in writing skills improved from 65% in academic year of 2008-2009 to 66% in academic year of 2009-2010.

Describe Data Collected:

No data was collected