

# University of Louisiana at Lafayette

## Detailed Assessment Report 2015-2016 Management BSBA

As of: 10/10/2016 01:44 PM 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 1: Evaluate Human Resources Practices**

Evaluate human resource practices in terms of their effectiveness and legality.

#### Related Measures

##### **M 1: Application Blank Questions**

Human resource management focuses on recruitment of, management of, and providing direction for the people who work in the organization. Even in organizations with human resource departments, many of the traditional human resource activities are also performed by line managers. Therefore, regardless of their selected career all management majors need to have knowledge of how deal with all the people aspects of business. To assess their understanding of human resources, specifically recruitment and the related laws, students will be given a list of questions/items, and will be asked to identify which inquiries are appropriate and legal. During the initial pilot of the instrument, three questions were eliminated thus 12 questions remained on the assessment tool. The assessment instrument was further revised in the last assessment cycle to increase clarity.

The legal issues in the Human resources employment process has been a continuing problem in assessment. We have not met this goal in the past and have changed the curriculum to include a new required course in Human Resources for all Management majors. Now we are changing from an open ended exercise to multiple choice questions to improve inter rater reliability. This cycle all Management majors in two Mgmt 365 Personnel class were evaluated.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

#### **Target:**

It was decided that at least 70% of the students assessed would get 70% correct. This means that 70% of students should correctly answer at least 10 of the application blank questions.

#### **Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

The 3 year cycle did not call for assessment this year.

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

##### **Course Content Change and Curriculum Change**

These results combined with those from previous assessments indicate the need to include MGMT 365 as a required part of the management curriculum. However, limited funding currently prevents the hiring of additional faculty to meet the demand of offering this course for all Management majors. Nevertheless,

in not reaching this objective, faculty will consider the revision of course content for Management 365. Emphasis must be placed on legal requirements concerning all staffing decisions, especially hiring. Results indicate that non-Management majors also enrolled in Management 365 did not perform significantly better. This finding appears to provide data supporting a necessary course content change as well as previous action plan for making Management 365 a requirement for all Management majors. This assessment will be reassessed spring 2011.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Application Blank Questions |

**Outcome/Objective:** Evaluate Human Resources Practices

### **Investigate Course Curriculum**

Although this course has been added as a required course for all Management majors, students are still failing to successfully complete this assessment exercise even 2 semesters out from this change. Therefore, all instructors of Management 365 will meet to discuss possible curriculum changes including text and material consistencies.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Application Blank Questions |

**Outcome/Objective:** Evaluate Human Resources Practices

### **Revision to Assessment Instrument**

It is recommended that while the goal is important, the assessment instrument should be revised because of its continuing ambiguity. We recommend that a new assessment instrument with more clear cut right and wrong answers be devised for the next round of assessment.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Application Blank Questions |

**Outcome/Objective:** Evaluate Human Resources Practices

## **SLO 2: Decision Making**

Identify key issues and considerations in effective decision making.

**Strategic Plan Associations**

**College of Business Administration, B.I. Moody III**

1.4.4 Decision-Making

### Related Measures

**M 2: Simulation Assignment**

Decision-making is an essential and critical component of managing a business. MGMT 490 is a capstone senior-level class. As such, students should be able to have a rational understanding of the situation, be able to understand the underlying issues, and make a recommendation or recommendations that are reasonable. They should also make suggestions in the context of team structures. Students in MGMT 490 are in charge of running an athletic shoe company for 10 years of operation via a team based simulation exercise. As a team, they are responsible for making all decisions related to marketing, operations management, human resource management, finance and the accounting of their firms. Failure to acknowledge any area would/will have detrimental effects to their firm's viability as the simulation scores them based on metrics of each area.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

#### **Target:**

BSG-Online.com houses the simulation assignment for which each member of Management 490 enrolls. Each member of each team is required to access and make decisions in the software relating to every facet of running a business. The software then produces a learning assurance report detailing how students rank in their decision making ability relative to other students running the simulation throughout the country. The percentiles are generated. An excerpt from the report is quoted below. As we are concerned with the decision making ability pertinent to the management discipline, we used the human resources management assessment scores, which is an "Assessment of the group's proficiency in workforce management and controlling labor costs. Based on work- force compensation, workforce productivity, and labor costs per unit sold." As this is a percentile ranking across the entire United States, we determined that a minimum of 70 percent of the students should rank in the 60th percentile or higher regarding human resource decision making. "The Learning Assurance Report is useful in two very important respects. One, it provides you the instructor with a clear overview of how well your students rank relative to students at other schools who have gone through the competition-based simulation exercise. Two, because the report provides highly credible evidence regarding the caliber of business understanding and decision-making prowess of your students, it can be used to help assess whether your school's academic curriculum in business is providing students with the desired degree of business understanding and decision-making acumen." (bsg-online.com, learning assurance report)

#### **Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met**

Of the 31 students assessed in MGMT 490-001, 23 met the minimum percentile standard. The percentage was roughly 74% and the findings were met.

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

##### **Changed Assessment Process**

Given the lack of motivation by some students to complete the assignment, discussions will take place among all instructors of MGMT 320 to ensure that the assignment is a graded assignment for all future assessments. This should lead to higher performance levels as students are motivated to receive better grades. Additionally, faculty are considering the possibility of conducting this assessment in a pre-test/post-test

format. Discussions will continue.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Simulation Assignment | **Outcome/Objective:**  
Decision Making

#### **Move Assessment to MGMT 490**

Rather than assessing management at the beginning of the junior year, it was decided to assess them towards the end of their undergraduate education in the capstone course MGMT 490. All business students in 3 sections were given extra-credit points to complete the exercise. For the all 78 business students, the pass rate was 82%. However, when the 18 management majors were assessed only 12 passed this exercise. Because this assessment round had a relatively small sample, no interventions are recommended at this time. However, these results suggest that management majors are behind other business majors in their decision making capabilities.

---

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Simulation Assignment | **Outcome/Objective:**  
Decision Making

#### **Changed method of assessment**

Although still pertinent to Management 490, the assessment of decision making was changed from a case assignment to an analysis of the decisions involved in a semester long simulation assignment. The students form teams and compete with one another running a fictitious company for 10 years of operations.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Simulation Assignment | **Outcome/Objective:**  
Decision Making

#### **Not met findings of 2012-2013**

The first assessment of the new simulation method of decision making was not met. Although very close at over 68%, it still fell short of the goal of 70% in the class. As discussed by faculty, a number factors could have contributed to this. First, in the semester assessed, student counts were down in each section of 490 as more sections were offered. Also, as this was a new assignment and method, there should be some learning curves expected in the first round. As the student and instructor become more familiar with the software and intricacies of the assignment, we expect the number to rise to met levels.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Simulation Assignment | **Outcome/Objective:**  
Decision Making

**Not met findings regarding decision making**

Although very close for the first two runs at the new assessment method, both cycles have been not met. The faculty had chosen 60th percentile and 70 percent met rate as targets for meeting the objective. Research is planned this summer to determine whether these are both appropriate benchmarks for the students. Since many schools across the country use this specific simulation instrument, faculty will seek input from colleagues at other institutions who have successfully implemented this simulation as an assessment tool.

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Simulation Assignment | **Outcome/Objective:**  
Decision Making

**Revised threshold for met findings moving forward**

Although our students met the 70% threshold this assessment period, upon departmental meetings we have conferred to raise the minimum percentile floor to 75% moving forward in MGMT 490.

**Established in Cycle:** 2014-2015

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Simulation Assignment | **Outcome/Objective:**  
Decision Making

**SLO 3: Understand Business Environments**

Demonstrate an understanding of the context and environments in which organizations operate.

**Related Measures**

**M 3: Stakeholder Map**

The goal was assessed with 7 questions that were specific to stakeholder identification based on theory and two short paragraphs.

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

**Target:**

The achievement target was that at least 80% of the sample must correctly answer 80% of the stakeholder identification questions.

**Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

This finding is on the 2nd non-measure year in a 3 year rotation.

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

**Change Assessment Process & Course Content**

This was the first time this objective was assessed in Management 400: Business & Society. We feel that this is the correct location for this assessment. However, since the objective was not achieved, the course will be altered to include additional discussions of the task and general business environments. Additionally, this was the first assessment utilizing the revised instrument. Finally, although this objective was achieved in previous assessments, this assessment round included increased performance expectations. Previously students were expected to correctly identify only 4 external and 2 internal factors. That standard was raised to 5 and 3, respectively. It will take additional alterations to the course content and a possible examination of the newly revised instrument to reach the improved performance.

This assessment process has been altered and will take place in MGMT 400 for the third round of assessment. This course specifically addresses issues concerning stakeholder theory, as well as task and general environments. This objective will be reassessed spring 2011.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Stakeholder Map | **Outcome/Objective:**  
Understand Business Environments

**Increase performance expectations & return assessment to MGMT 400**

It had been previously recommended that this learning objective be assessed in MGMT 400. Because this course was not taught in the spring semester, it was decided to assess this in MGMT 320 using extra-credit points to encourage motivation. The textbook in this course specifically covers stakeholders, and instructors have been encouraged to reinforce this through lectures. It is recommended in the next cycle, however, that the assessment return to MGMT 400 and that the standard be raised to 70%.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Stakeholder Map | **Outcome/Objective:**  
Understand Business Environments

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**How were assessment results shared and evaluated within the unit?**

Results of assessments were discussed at the annual departmental strategic retreat in August 2016.

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

We determined that the assessments for Human Resource were not providing appropriate data to determine if students were, in fact, learning and retaining the concepts. Therefore, the revision of the learning objectives for this area will include dual assessments taken during the introductory course (Mgmt 365) as well as a similar, higher level assessment given during the advanced course (Mgmt 465).