# MISSISSIPPI VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY

# ASSESSMENT PLAN/REPORT

# Educational Programs

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name: A. A. Farhad Chowdhury | Email: farhad@mvsu.edu | Assessment Period: AY 2018-2019 |
|  |  |  |
| Degree Program: Business Administration MBA | | Submission: Final Report |
|  |  |  |
| Program Mission Statement: | | |
| In support of the mission of the Department of Business Administration, the master of business administration (MBA) 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 required in the global business world. | | |
|  | | |
| Core Student Learning Outcomes: | | |
| Graduates of the MVSU MBA program should be able to:  1. Combine information across functional areas of business in today's global business environment in order to make comprehensive business decisions. 2. Identify opportunities, solve problems and make decisions by demonstrating their critical thinking skills. 3. Compose logical, relevant, professional, and qualitative assessment information from diverse business perspectives. | | |
|  | | |
| Link to Institutional Mission: | | |
| MBA Program’s student learning outcomes are directly linked to the University’s Mission Statement. “Mississippi Valley State University, as a Carnegie Classified Master’s University, provides comprehensive undergraduate and graduate programs in education, the arts and sciences, and professional studies. The University is driven by its commitment to excellence in teaching, learning, service, and research – a commitment resulting in a learner-centered environment that prepares critical thinkers, exceptional communicators, and service-oriented, engaged, and productive citizens. MVSU is fundamentally committed to positively impacting the quality of life and creating extraordinary educational opportunities for the Mississippi Delta and beyond.” | | |
|  | | |
| Faculty Involvement: | | |
| All faculty members in the MBA program actively participated in the process of developing the assessment plan and completing the assessment report through departmental meetings, MBA faculty meetings, sub-group meetings & discussions as necessary. | | |

## Student Learning Outcome 1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Description: Graduates will be able to combine information across the functional areas of business in today's global business environment to make comprehensive business decisions. | | | | | | |
| Student Learning Goal Supported: Discipline Mastery | | | | | | |
| ASSESSSMENT PLAN | | | | ASSESSMENT REPORT | | |
| Means of Assessment | Data Collection Plan | BenchmarksNumber & Description | | Data Collected | Benchmarks AchievedNumber & Description | |
| 1st: Students will be tested on course-embedded exercises those link to the concepts of multiple functional areas.  A grading rubric of a four-point scale will be used to determine the students’ achievement in the following functional areas:  1. Accounting  2. Finance  3. Marketing  4. Management  5. Strategic Integration  Grading rubric Scale for the assigned exercise:  Excellent: 4  Good : 3  Fair : 2  Poor :1 | During the Fall semester, data will be collected by assessing assigned assignments linked to the multiple functional areas in BA602 (Managerial Economics) by the designated instructor using the rubric. | 5 | Overall average of 3 or higher in the functional areas of:  1. Accounting  2. Finance  3. Marketing  4. Management  5. Strategic Integration | Data were collected as planned. | 1 | The average performance was 0.65 which is less than the required benchmark of 0.75. Students failed to achieve the benchmark score in all the functional areas other than the Management (0.77>0.75), see Appendix 1. The most unattainable area was Finance (0.52<0.75), followed by Strategic Integration (0.62<0.75), Accounting (0.63<0.75), and Marketing (0.73<0.75). The score of each of the functional areas are as follows:  Accounting: 0.63<0.75  Finance: 0.52<0.75  Marketing: 0.73<0.75  Management: 0.77>).75  Strategic Integration: 0.62<0.75. Data analysis indicates that 57% of the students scored 3(0.75) and above, not enough to attain an average benchmark score of 0.75. |
| The Major Field Test (MFT) for Master of Business Administration by ETS (Educational Testing Service). The test provides several assessment indicators for analysis;  1. overall mean and standard deviation for comparative analysis,  2. accounting,  3. finance,  4. marketing,  5. management, and  6. strategic integration. | In the spring semester, graduating candidates will take the ETS Major Field Test for MBA.  The test will cover Marketing (25%), Management (25%), Finance (25%), and Managerial Accounting (25%), respectively. | 6 | Quantitative assessment: Average score of national average ±  10% on MFT's six (6) measures provided by ETS:  1. overall mean,  2. accounting,  3. finance,  4. marketing,  5. management, and  6. strategic integration. | Data was not collected as the MFT test was not administered. | 0 | Evaluate success of benchmarks |

## Student Learning Outcome 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Description: Graduates will be able to identify opportunities, solve problems and make a decision by demonstrating their critical thinking skills. | | | | | | |
| Student Learning Goal Supported: Critical Thinking - General | | | | | | |
| ASSESSSMENT PLAN | | | | ASSESSMENT REPORT | | |
| Means of Assessment | Data Collection Plan | BenchmarksNumber & Description | | Data Collected | Benchmarks AchievedNumber & Description | |
| 1st: Students will be asked to work on individual/team projects or on a case study. A grading rubric of a four-point scale will be used with the following performance criteria:  1. Identification and explanation of issues.  2. Collection of Information.  3. Recognition of context and assumptions.  4. Evaluation and synthesis of information.  5. Conclusions and related outcomes.  Grading rubric Scale for the assigned Project/case:  Excellent: 4  Good : 3  Fair : 2  Poor : 1 | Describe data collected During the Fall and Spring semesters, data will be collected from the assigned individual/team projects in the capstone course of BA655 (Strategic Management) by the designated instructor using the rubric. | 5 | Overall average of 3.0 or higher in the categories of:  1. Identification and explanation of issues.  2. Collection of Information.  3. Recognition of context and assumptions.  4. Evaluation and synthesis of information.  5. Conclusions and related outcomes. | Data were collected as planned. | 4 | The average performance of the students exceeded the benchmark (0.84>0.75). Students were able to reach the benchmark in all categories of performance criteria except one (collecting information from sources sufficient to develop a comprehensive analysis and synthesis, 0.68<0.75), see Appendix 2. Student’s scores in the performance criteria are as follows:  1. Identification and explanation of issues: 0.99>0.75  2. Collection of Information: 0.68<0.75  3. Recognition of context and assumptions: 0.84>0.75  4. Evaluation and synthesis of information: 0.85>0.75  5. Conclusions and related outcomes: 0.86>0.75. Of the total, 87% of the students scored 3 (0.75) and above. |
| 2nd: Students will be assigned a case study/project on an individual or team basis in any of the following courses either in the Fall or Spring semester:  BA 602: Managerial Economics  BA 645: Information Technology Management  BA 634: Marketing Management  BA 642: Operations Management  A grading rubric of a four-point scale will be used having the following performance criteria to evaluate:  1. Evaluating information.  2. Creative thinking.  3. learning and problem solving  4. communication  Grading rubric Scale for the assigned Project:  Excellent: 4  Good : 3  Fair : 2  Poor : 1 | In the Spring semester, data will be collected from the assigned individual case study in BA645 (Information Technology Management) by the designated instructor using the rubric. | 4 | Overall average of 3.0 or higher in the areas of:  1. evaluating information,  2. creative thinking,  3. learning and problem solving, and  4. communication. | Data were collected as planned. | 3 | The average performance of the students exceeded the benchmark (0.79>0.75). Students were able to reach the benchmark in all categories of performance criteria except one (thinking creatively to come up with the unique idea to create new knowledge that crosses the boundaries by integrating alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives, 0.73<0.75), see the Appendix 3. Data analysis indicates that 80% of the students scored above the benchmark score of 3 (.75). Students’ scores in the performance criteria are as follows:  1. Evaluating Information: .78>.75  2. Creative thinking: .73<.75  3. Learning and problem solving: .83>.75  4. Communication: .80>.75 |

## Student Learning Outcome 3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Description: graduates will be able to compose a logical, relevant, professional, and qualitative assessment of business information from diverse business perspectives. | | | | | | |
| Student Learning Goal Supported: Communication - Writing Proficiency | | | | | | |
| ASSESSSMENT PLAN | | | | ASSESSMENT REPORT | | |
| Means of Assessment | Data Collection Plan | BenchmarksNumber & Description | | Data Collected | Benchmarks AchievedNumber & Description | |
| Cohorts will be asked to work on an article summary, individual/team projects, or a case study.  A grading rubric of a four-point scale will be used with the following performance criteria:  1. Context of and purpose of writing  2. Content development.  3. Disciplinary conventions.  4. Sources and evidence  5. Control of syntax and mechanics.  Grading rubric scale for the assigned Project/case:  Rubric scale  Excellent: 4  Good : 3  Fair : 2  Poor : 1 | Data will be collected by the designated instructor by evaluating the cohort’s assigned case study in BA602 (Managerial Economics) during the Fall semester using the rubric. | 5 | Overall average of 3.0 or higher in the categories of: 1. Context of and purpose for writing 2. Content development, 3. Disciplinary conventions, 4. Sources and evidence, 5. Control of syntax and mechanics | Data were collected as planned. | 0 | None of the criteria of Communication skills reached the benchmark. The average score was 0.59 compared to the required benchmark of 3 or 0.75. The data analysis (see Appendix 4) indicates that 58% of the students scored below the benchmark score of 3 (0.75) whereas 42% scored 3 and above, not enough to reach the benchmark of 0.75. It is also observed from the data analysis that out of the performance criteria applied to measure students' Communication skills, the least performance criterion was control of syntax and mechanics in writing (.59<.75), followed by content development (.58<.75), genre and disciplinary conventions (.58<.75), the context of and purpose for writing (.63<.75), and sources and evidence (.63<.75)  Summary of the Benchmarks:  Context of and purpose of writing: .63<.75  Content Development: .58<.75  Genre and disciplinary Conventions: .58<.75  Sources and evidence: .6<.75  Control of syntax and mechanics: .54<.75 |
| 2nd: Students will be asked to work on individual/team projects, case studies, or on a Term paper.    A grading rubric of a four-point scale will be used with the following performance criteria:  1. Organization  2. Language  3. Delivery.  4. Supporting material  5. Central message  Grading rubric scale for the assigned Project/case study/term paper:  Rubric scale  Excellent: 4  Good : 3  Fair : 2  Poor : 1 | During the Fall and Spring semester, data will be collected by the designated instructor by assessing a term paper in the capstone course of BA655 (Strategic Management) using a rubric. | 5 | Overall average of 3.0 or higher in the categories of: 1. Organization 2. Language 3. Delivery 4. Supporting material 5. Central message. | Data were collected as planned. | 4 | Students achieved the overall benchmark (0.79>0.75). Although the overall benchmark was achieved, students missed the benchmark score of supporting material performance criteria (0.69<0.75). The data analysis (see appendix 5) indicates that 79% of the students scored above the benchmark 3, whereas 21% were below it. Summary of the Benchmarks:  1. Organization: .85>.75  2. Language: .79>.75  3. Supporting material: .69<.75  4. Central Message: .83>.75 |

**ACTION PLAN FOR CHANGE**

Agree on the needed change; Document the action plan; Consider how the changes will be assessed in the next assessment cycle; Share the action plan; Put the action plan in motion

|  |
| --- |
| (1) Student Learning Outcome#1: Assessment outcome of means of assessment #1 unveils that the student demonstrates deficiencies to combine information across the functional areas in today’s global business environment to make a comprehensive business decision. To overcome this, the instructional strategy should be changed to involve students to work intensively on the projects and case studies that relate to cross-functional-based decision-making.  (2) Students Learning Outcome #3: Assessment outcome of means of assessment #1 unveils students’ deficiencies to compose a logical, relevant, professional, and qualitative assessment of business information from diverse business perspectives in the context of and purpose for writing, Content development, disciplinary conventions, sources and evidence, and control of syntax and mechanics. To overcome this:  (a) Instructional method should engage students to do assignments (project, term paper, case study) focusing more on their lacking areas of communication skills.  (b) Instructional methods should ensure timely feedback on the students' assignments to give them the opportunity to improve their deficient areas. |

## IMPROVEMENTS OBSERVED DURING THE ACADEMIC YEAR

| ASSESSMENT REPORT | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | SLO: Graduates will be able to identify opportunities, solve problems, and make a decision by demonstrating their critical thinking skills. | Year: AY 2017-18 |
| Student Learning Goal: Critical Thinking - General | Improvement Category: Improvements in means of assessment |
| Description of Improvement #1:  Identification and explanation of issues, recognition of context and assumptions and carefully evaluating the relevance of contexts before presenting a point of view, evaluation and synthesis of information and conclusions and related outcomes. | |
| **2** | SLO: Graduates will be able to identify opportunities, solve problems, and make a decision by demonstrating their critical thinking skills. | Year: AY 2017-18 |
| Student Learning Goal: Critical Thinking - General | Improvement Category: Improvements in means of assessment |
| Description of Improvement #2:  Evaluating information to determine its relevancy and reliability, constructing a clear and insightful problem statement with contextual factors, use of appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject. | |
| **3** | SLO: Insert SLO | Year: Indicate Year SLO was Undertaken |
| Student Learning Goal: Select Learning Goal | Improvement Category: Improvement Type |
| Description of Improvement #3: | |
| **4** | SLO: Insert SLO | Year: Indicate Year SLO was Undertaken |
| Student Learning Goal: Select Learning Goal | Improvement Category: Improvement Type |
| Description of Improvement #4: | |
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