University of Louisiana at Lafayette

Detailed Assessment Report
2015-2016 MBA
As of: 11/04/2016 11:39 AM CENTRAL
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked *One-Time, Recurring, No Request*.)

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 2: Utilize technology for productivity purposes.

Demonstrate the ability to analyze the strategic use of information systems in organizations.

BSAT 518

Related Measures

M 6: Case Analysis

Students were required to conduct a case analysis.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
At least 75% of students will attain a score of at least 2 on the rubric.

Connected Document
BSAT 518 Assessment and Rubric

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met

Students were required to conduct a case analysis. The case presented information pertaining to Zara's CIO facing a decision about whether to upgrade the retailer's out-of-date IT infrastructure and capabilities. The case question that was used for assessment purposes is as follows:

How would you advise Salgado to proceed on the issue of upgrading Zara's POS systems? Should the company upgrade the POS terminals to a modern operating system?

The entire population of MBA students (35) enrolled in the BSAT 518 Management of Information Technology graduate class during the spring 2016 semester were asked to answer the preceding question (among several other questions) while conducting the case analysis. Each of the students who submitted the assignment within the online submission system (n=29) was assessed.

The student products were assessed with a rubric that was agreed upon by the BSAT 518 faculty members. (Please see Appendix to view the assessment rubric.) The rubric was designed to rate the level of knowledge of students on the following scale: 1 = poor; 2 = adequate; and 3 = superior. The defining characteristics of each level were agreed upon by BSAT 518 faculty members in order to ensure validity of the scoring instrument.

Seventy-nine percent (79%) or 23 of the 29 students earned 2 or more points on the scoring rubric. There were 15 students who received a score of 3, 8 students who received a score of 2, and 9 students who received a score of 1.

Thus, the evaluation criterion was met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Review of Learning Objective

The Faculty members of BSAT 518 will meet with the Director of the MBA Program, the Assessment Coordinator, and other members of the graduate faculty to consider revising the learning objective to be more reflective of program (MBA) content.

Established in Cycle: 2014-2015
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Case Analysis | **Outcome/Objective:** Utilize

technology for productivity purposes.

New BSAT 518 textbook

The Faculty members of BSAT 518 will meet to select a new textbook for the course, which will be employed to facilitate increased achievement of the course learning objective.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Case Analysis | **Outcome/Objective:** Utilize technology for productivity purposes.

SLO 3: Understand Dynamic Environment

Understand and identify the culturally dynamic environments in which organizations operate.

IBUS 540

Related Measures

M 3: Computer Simulation Performance Evaluation

As the graduate level introduction to International Business in the MBA program, IBUS540 (International Business) provides an introduction to the vocabulary, theories, and practices of international business to include a cross-disciplinary perspective of the complexities of global management and competition. It emphasizes fundamental aspects of international business to include management, marketing, accounting, finance, operations management, personnel management, and the growing areas of globalized information technology.

To address the objective of inter-disciplinary applied learning as a supplement to the theoretical text learning objectives, IBUS 540 utilizes the CESIM Global Challenge competitive computer simulation to create competitive global management environment which includes fluid, market oriented management strategy, decision making, accounting control, financing, and adaptation. The simulation is used as an out of class applied learning tool to supplement the in-class theory, text-based learning, and case studies which are integrated into the syllabus.

The CESIM simulation is played on the internet and students compete in groups against each other. The simulation requires student groups to form themselves into a management team in a dynamic organizational environment with inter-disciplinary responsibilities. The evaluation of each group's Cumulative Total Shareholder Value Return (CTSR) at the end of the simulation is used to determine if the students effectively understand the dynamic environments in which organizations operate.

The Cumulative Total Shareholder Value Return (CTSR) performance indicator/metric is a consolidated metric which takes into account stock price, market share, key financial ratios, future investments, and shareholder returns. It is therefore an ideal,

metric to provide a measurable understanding of the dynamic environments in which organizations operate. A positive CTSR implies that the group of students was successful at formulating and adapting strategy, market oriented pricing and product management, profitable production management and development, effective accounting and financial management, and ultimately provided positive shareholder return through the simulation in a fluid, competitive environment similar to managing a real organization.

The instructor administers the game and the actual assessment will take place by reviewing the "Cumulative Total Shareholder Value Return" of each team at the conclusion of the game.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:

At least 50% of the students assessed should achieve a positive CTSR.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Raise Assessment Standard

We will consider raising the standard for success.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
> **Measure:** Computer Simulation Performance Evaluation |
> **Outcome/Objective:** Understand Dynamic Environment

Raise standard

The standard will be evaluated to determine if it should be raised.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
> **Measure:** Computer Simulation Performance Evaluation |
> **Outcome/Objective:** Understand Dynamic Environment

Responsible Person/Group: MBA director and instructor
Additional Resources: none

Better preparation for simulation

This is the second year that we have not achieved the target achievement rate. After assessing students using a less challenging set of simulation parameters (Parameter Set 1) in 2010, 2011, and 2012, we implemented a more challenging simulation parameter set (Parameter Set 2) in Spring 2013 which included finished goods inventory and personnel management. These two additions added significantly to the already quite complex set of decisions required to succeed at a high level within this simulation. As 2013 was an initial experience using the more challenging decision parameter set, it was difficult to ascertain an appropriate achievement rate. Following the

2013 assessment, we determined that 50% achievement utilizing Parameter Set 2 was a challenging but achievable objective, as opposed to a 65% achievement rate utilizing the less challenging Parameter Set 1.

In the Spring 2014 assessment, we failed to reach the targeted achievement, but only slightly with an achievement rate of 42% of the class reaching competence, when the target was 50%. Nevertheless, we believe this is an appropriate target and will implement additional measures to insure students achieve it in the future whenever Parameter Set 2 is utilized. Some remedial measures that have been identified are a) the implementation of a simulation decision guide quiz prior to starting the simulation and b) integrating Balanced Scorecard strategic planning theory and application within the simulation exercise. Both of these measures are intended to encourage students to better prepare strategically for the more challenging Parameter Set 2, but also to create an even more competitive market place between the groups.

As noted previously, in order to mix up the business management environment between class sections, we intend to run both parameter sets in the future. For example, when the original simulation parameters (Parameter Set 1) is run, the achievement target will be 65% as originally set. However, when the more challenging parameters which included personnel management and finished goods inventory (Parameter Set 2), the target will be a challenging, but more realistic 50%.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
> **Measure:** Computer Simulation Performance Evaluation |
> **Outcome/Objective:** Understand Dynamic Environment

Responsible Person/Group: MBA director and instsructor

Increased the difficulty of the parameters for assessment

This is the second year that we have not achieved the target achievement rate. After assessing students using a less challenging set of simulation parameters (Parameter Set 1) in 2010, 2011, and 2012, we implemented a more challenging simulation parameter set (Parameter Set 2) in Spring 2013 which included finished goods inventory and personnel management. These two additions added significantly to the already quite complex set of decisions required to succeed at a high level within this simulation. As 2013 was an initial experience using the more challenging decision parameter set, it was difficult to ascertain an appropriate achievement rate. Following the 2013 assessment, we determined that 50% achievement utilizing Parameter Set 2 was a challenging but achievable objective, as

opposed to a 65% achievement rate utilizing the less challenging Parameter Set 1.

In the Spring 2014 assessment, we failed to reach the targeted achievement, but only slightly with an achievement rate of 42% of the class reaching competence, when the target was 50%. Nevertheless, we believe this is an appropriate target and will implement additional measures to insure students achieve it in the future whenever Parameter Set 2 is utilized. Some remedial measures that have been identified are a) the implementation of a simulation decision guide quiz prior to starting the simulation and b) integrating Balanced Scorecard strategic planning theory and application within the simulation exercise. Both of these measures are intended to encourage students to better prepare strategically for the more challenging Parameter Set 2, but also to create an even more competitive market place between the groups.

As noted previously, in order to mix up the business management environment between class sections, we intend to run both parameter sets in the future. For example, when the original simulation parameters (Parameter Set 1) is run, the achievement target will be 65% as originally set. However, when the more challenging parameters which included personnel management and finished goods inventory (Parameter Set 2), the target will be a challenging, but more realistic 50%.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
      Measure: Computer Simulation Performance Evaluation |
      Outcome/Objective: Understand Dynamic Environment

BSAT 518 change in assessment

The Faculty members of BSAT 518 will meet with the Director of the MBA Program, the Assessment Coordinator, and other members of the graduate faculty to consider revising the learning objective to be more reflective of program (MBA) content.

Established in Cycle: 2014-2015
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
      Measure: Computer Simulation Performance Evaluation |
      Outcome/Objective: Understand Dynamic Environment

Projected Completion Date: 05/2016
Responsible Person/Group: MBA director and instructors in BSAT 518
Additional Resources: none

IBUS 540 assessment

We believe this is an appropriate target and will implement additional measures to insure students achieve it in the future whenever Parameter Set 2 is utilized.
Some remedial measures that have been identified are a) the implementation of a simulation decision guide quiz prior to starting the simulation and b) integrating Balanced Scorecard strategic planning theory and application within the simulation exercise. Both of these measures are intended to encourage students to better prepare strategically for the more challenging Parameter Set 2, but also to create an even more competitive market place between the groups. As noted previously, in order to mix up the business management environment between class sections, we intend to run both parameter sets in the future. For example, when the original simulation parameters (Parameter Set 1) is run, the achievement target will be 65% as originally set. However, when the more challenging parameters which included personnel management and finished goods inventory (Parameter Set 2), the target will be a challenging, but more realistic 50%

Established in Cycle: 2014-2015
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
> **Measure:** Computer Simulation Performance Evaluation |
> **Outcome/Objective:** Understand Dynamic Environment

Projected Completion Date: 05/2016
Responsible Person/Group: MBA director and instructor in the course.
Additional Resources: none

SLO 4: Evaluate managerial decisions

Evaluate managerial decision making processes to develop effective organizational theory-based solutions. MGMT 525

Related Measures

M 4: Team Organizational Project Evaluation

Students in Management 525 were required to complete an organizational behavior project. Students were placed in teams of six or seven to complete this project. Teams were selected by the instructor which helps insure some level of member diversity. Teams were required to write a project paper and present their topic to the class.

Team members were required to assess each member's performance on several factors ranging from overall contribution to team project, team leadership skills, understanding of team topic, and teamwork skills.
Students were asked to provide a ranking from 1-100 for each team member on each of the dimensions.

Assessments were based on the rubric included in this document.

MBA Team Project Peer-Review Form

Instructor _____

Course _____

DATE_____

On a scale of 1-100, please rate yourself and your team members on each of the dimensions identified in the table below.

Names	Overall Contribution to Team Project	Team Leadership Skills	Mastery and Understanding of Topic	Teamwork Skills and Participation

Please write any comments your have regarding the project or the Team process. This feedback will be used only by the instructor for assessment purposes. We will continue to assess in MGMT 525 in one semester a year.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:

Means:

> **Students in Management 525 were required to complete an organizational behavior project. Students were placed in teams of four to six to complete this project. Teams were selected by the instructor which helps insure some level of member diversity. Teams were required to write a project paper and present their topic to the class.**

Assessment:

> **Team members were required to assess each member's performance on several factors ranging from overall contribution to team project, team leadership skills, understanding of team topic, and teamwork skills. Students were asked to provide a ranking from 1-100 for each team member on each of the dimensions.**

Procedure:

> **Assessments were based on the rubric. It was determined in advance that the minimum acceptable score was 95% and that 90% of students assessed would earn that minimum score. This was the measure of "Overall Contribution to Team Project."**

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met
The target was met. 88% of the 18 students who were peer-evaluated achieved at least a 95% average score on contribution to productivity. Hence, this goal was achieved. Each student was evaluated by three to six peers.

> The mean peer-evaluation score was 98%; the median was 100%; and the mode was 100%. The range of peer evaluation scores was 60% to 100%. Range restriction issues compelled us to establish the minimally acceptable peer rating at 95%

> Spring of 2016 data indicated that 88% (16 of the 18) of the students evaluated achieved an average peer rating of 95% on the productivity ("Overall Contribution to Team Project") measure. Other results from the recently expanded peer-review form are as follows:

88 % of students achieved at least a 95% on the *Effectively Evaluated the Case* criterion.

88% of students achieved at least a 95% on the *Effectively Contributed to Theory-Based Recommendations* criterion.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Revision of Peer Review Process

Because the original peer review form was limited to assessing contributions to productivity, it was revised/expanded and discussed with the MGMT 525 professor who agreed to implement it beginning in the Spring of 2007. The evaluation form was revised to ensure the baseline results were valid and accurate, and to establish reliability with a single cohort of MBA students.

Based on this revised evaluation, we will have to continue our effort to guard against attributions of success based on students' leniency bias when evaluating their peers. However, the lower percentages show that instructor efforts to remind the class the importance of accurately and critically evaluating each group member and differentiating between peers making varying degrees of contribution appears to be yielding positive results.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
        Measure: Team Organizational Project Evaluation |
        Outcome/Objective: Evaluate managerial decisions

Raise standard
We will consider raising the standard for suceess.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
        Measure: Team Organizational Project Evaluation |
        Outcome/Objective: Evaluate managerial decisions

Responsible Person/Group: MBA director and instructor

determine focus of future assessments
Although MGMT faculty members are aware of the leniency bias that may be reflected in the peer evaluations, steps have been taken in the past years to ensure students understand the importance of accurately and critically evaluating each group member and differentiating between

peers making varying degrees of contribution. In light of this and the positive results on this and recent assessments , it will be necessary to make determinations as to whether or not this objective should be retired or if further assessment is needed. Should this objective be retired, MGMT faculty members will work to set a new objective for the next round of assessment.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
        Measure: Team Organizational Project Evaluation |
        Outcome/Objective: Evaluate managerial decisions

New instructor assessment
WE have a new instructor in MGMT 525 therefore we will continue to use the same rubric for the assessment. Once we have assessed for two years under the new instructor and we have met our goals we will review the goal and assessment for revision.

Established in Cycle: 2014-2015
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
        Measure: Team Organizational Project Evaluation |
        Outcome/Objective: Evaluate managerial decisions

Projected Completion Date: 06/2016
Responsible Person/Group: MBA director and instructor in MGMT 525
Additional Resources: None

SLO 5: ETS EXAM

Demonstrate competence in the fundamental disciplines of business (accounting, economics, finance, management, marketing, legal issues and quantitative analysis).

ETS

Related Measures

M 7: ETS EXAM
The ETS Exam is a comprehensive test of fundamental knowledge in all major disciplines of Business

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target:
The Current standard is that aggregate scores in each major area will be at or above the 50th percentile when compared to all other schools that use the ETS.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

How were assessment results shared and evaluated within the unit?
All of the instructors of BSAT 518 and the MBA director met to review the results and evaluate the goal. Further, the MBA Committee reviewed the results ad revised the goal.

The use of the ETS in assessment has just begun. The results will be evaluated in the next

cycle.

The results were reviewed by the instructor, MBA director, and the MBA committee.

Identify which action plans [created in prior cycle(s)] were implemented in this current cycle. For each of these implemented plans, were there any measurable or perceivable effects? How, if at all, did the findings appear to be affected by the implemented action plan?

The MBA committee met and revised the goal evaluated by BSAT 518.

The use of the ETS in assessment has just begun. The results will be evaluated in the next cycle.

What has the unit learned from the current assessment cycle? What is working well, and what is working less well in achieving desired outcomes?

The assessments have indicted that the students are meeting the goal assessed in BSAT 518. The goal was revised and assessments under this revised goal will be assessed in the next cycle.

The use of the ETS in assessment has just begun. The results will be evaluated in the next cycle.

The students in IBUS 540 were not meeting the targets. The instructor has changed the content of the course. The students now compete in an international simulation. the goal and the method of assessment has been revised. The students met the goal under the new assessment.

The assessment in MGMT 525 was continued. We have a new instructor in the course and we wished to compare his students performance to students in the past. They have performed very well and we will continue to monitor.