

**Indiana University Kokomo
School of Business
M.B.A. Program
Assessment Report
Academic Year 2010-2011**

I. BRIEF SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT PLAN

Highlights of the Assessment Plan

The School of Business established a set of program goals and learning outcomes and collects assessment data to measure student achievement of these outcomes. In 2010-2011, we continued assessment of general skills and focused on assessment of writing skills and critical thinking skills in a core M.B.A. course. We also assessed area-specific knowledge in Economics following a change in the Economics component of the M.B.A. curriculum. The faculty developed assessment forms and used benchmarks to evaluate individual student performance and establish whether the student achievement in an outcome is Excellent, Acceptable, or Needs Improvement. The results of this assessment were very strong as at least fifty percent of the students achieved the Exemplary level in each component of the outcome.

As an additional assessment mechanism, the School also used the ETS Major Field Test for M.B.A. to measure the knowledge and skills of all graduates. The results of this national standardized ETS test allow for comparison of our graduates to national norms. Overall, the School's graduates performed very strongly on this national test in 2010-2011. There were 11 graduates taking the test and the mean performance for the cohort was at the 90th percentile compared to all institutions participating in the ETS testing nationally. The area scores for Finance, Managerial Accounting, and Strategic Integration were all at the 90th percentile level. The comparison sample for this test includes 24,785 students at 230 institutions worldwide.

The following are assessment highlights:

- Mission, Program Goals and Learning Outcomes are established and reviewed
- Course-embedded assessment data is collected every school year
- External standardized testing with the ETS Major Field Test for M.B.A.
- Assessment Committee oversees all assessment activities
- Assessment results reviewed by all faculty in regular faculty meetings
- Assessment process was reviewed in Fall 2010 by the accreditation maintenance team from AACSB (Association for Advancement of Collegiate Schools of Business)
- Other activities include periodic surveys of graduates

Goals and Outcomes Assessed in 2010-2011

In the academic year 2010-11, the School assessed student performance on the following goals and outcomes. Assessment data were collected by course-embedded methods for outcomes 1.1-1.3 (Problem-solving skills), outcome 2.1 (Write clearly and effectively for a business audience), as well as outcomes 6.3-6.4 (Economics knowledge and skills). Other outcomes were assessed with the ETS standardized test. Appendix A presents the curriculum map of all goals and outcomes and identifies the courses in which each outcome is assessed.

A graduate of the Master in Business Administration program should be able to:

Goal 1. Critically and analytically reason and solve problems.

Outcome 1.1 – Provide identification and formulation of problem

Outcome 1.2 – Develop problem solution techniques

Outcome 1.3 – Interpret and implement solution results

Goal 2. Communicate effectively.

Outcome 2.1 – Write clearly and effectively for a business audience.

Outcome 2.2 – Present clearly and persuasively to a business audience.

Outcome 2.3 – Work in and lead teams.

Goal 3. Anticipate and analyze trends in the business environment.

Outcome 3.1 – Recognize the effects of change in the economic and political environment.

Outcome 3.2 – Recognize the effects of change in culture and demographics.

Goal 4. Approach organizational decisions in ethical, legal and socially responsible manner.

Outcome 4.1 - Describe the concept of ethics and its applications.

Outcome 4.2 - Describe the impact of the legal and regulatory environment on business.

Outcome 4.3 - Describe the social responsibility of business.

Goal 5. Operate in dynamic and complex domestic and global organizational environments.

Outcome 5.1 – Describe organizational synergies resulting from partnerships and alliances including mergers and acquisitions.

Outcome 5.2 – Describe gains to trade and barriers to trade.

Outcome 5.3 – Describe the international monetary system and the role of exchange rates.

Outcome 5.4 – Describe the opportunities and threats that accompany globalization.

Goal 6. Demonstrate knowledge in the functional areas of business.

Outcome 6.1 – Use financial statements to guide decision making.

Outcome 6.2 – Apply cost behavior to solve business problems.

Outcome 6.3 – Perform analysis of supply and demand and evaluate market outcomes.

Outcome 6.4 – Evaluate the effects of fiscal and monetary policies.

Outcome 6.5 – Describe the importance of quality and technology to gain a competitive advantage.

Outcome 6.6 - Apply quantitative models and technology to support managerial decision making.

Outcome 6.7 – Utilize valuation models in order to estimate the price of financial assets.

Outcome 6.8 – Describe capital budgeting theory and the theory of capital structure.

Outcome 6.9 – Develop a marketing mix to appeal to target markets.

Outcome 6.10 – Describe marketing management and strategic market planning processes.

Outcome 6.11 – Describe high performance Human Resources practices.

Outcome 6.12 – Discuss current trends in organizational behavior and leadership concepts.

Goal 7. Integrate theory and application from various functional areas in an interdisciplinary approach.

Outcome 7.1 – Perform an internal analysis of an organization, using tools and concepts from various related disciplines.

Outcome 7.2 – Describe how functional areas interact to derive cross-functional synergies.

Outcome 7.3 – Integrate economic thinking and accounting data to make financial decisions.

II. ASSESSMENT METHODS

Course-embedded Assessment

The School used a combination of course-embedded assessment tools and an external nationally standardized test. In 2010-2011, we continued assessment of general skills and focused on assessment of writing skills and critical thinking skills in a core M.B.A. course. We also assessed area-specific knowledge in Economics following a change in the Economics component of the M.B.A. curriculum.

The Assessment Committee develops rubrics and benchmarks for course-embedded assessment of student achievement for each outcome. For instance, please refer to Appendix B to review the rubric used to assess outcome 2.1 (Write clearly and effectively for a business audience). The rubric identifies the performance levels in the following fashion – Level I (Excellent achievement of the outcome), Level II (Satisfactory achievement of the outcome), Level III (Needs Improvement). The program-level benchmark for Excellence is set for 100 percent of students that completed the course with a passing grade to achieve Level I or Level II performance. The program-level benchmark for Satisfactory performance is set for 80 percent of students that completed the course with a passing grade to achieve Level I or Level II performance.

The course-embedded assessment of outcome 2.1 was performed in the F542 required M.B.A. course. The students were assigned individual written projects by the course instructor. The rubric was used to assess the achievement of the outcome in three components. This assessment activity was separate from the course grades, and was recorded by the Assessment Committee. Appendix B presents the rubric used in this assessment as well as a summary of the results.

Course-embedded assessment of outcomes 1.1-1.3 (Problem-solving skills) and outcomes 6.3-6.4 (Economics knowledge and skills) was performed in the E542 required M.B.A. course. The assessment results were also recorded separately from course grades and appear in Appendix B.

National Standardized Test

All graduates also took the standardized Educational Testing Service (ETS) exam for M.B.A. testing the knowledge in the functional areas of Business. The ETS test was administered in the capstone course. This exam was listed as a requirement for completion of the course. The scores on this exam are analyzed by the Assessment Committee and may serve to identify potential problem areas in the curriculum. The Assessment Committee and the faculty teaching in the different areas worked to link the assessment indicators provided by the ETS to the individual learning outcomes. A grid summary of these links is available in the Assessment Plan. The ETS test provides an opportunity to compare student performance to a highly competitive national sample of M.B.A. programs that included 24,785 students at 230 institutions.

We expect our students to perform better than at the national average level. This is a high expectation, as the comparison sample for the ETS Major Field test for M.B.A. includes the results of test-takers from highly selective national and international M.B.A. programs. In ETS test assessment, the first program-level benchmark for Excellence is to have 75 percent of the graduates exceed the national average scores individually. The benchmark for Satisfactory performance is to have 60 percent of students exceed the national average score.

A second program-level benchmark for Satisfactory performance is to have program-level mean scores for each of the five business-area assessment indicators above the national average. The benchmark for Excellence is to have program-level mean scores for each of the five area assessment indicators above the 75th percentile of all institutions participating in the M.B.A. ETS testing.

III. DESCRIPTION OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

The summary of the assessment results for 2010-11 is presented in appendices B and C. The course-level assessment results are presented in appendix B, while ETS test results are summarized in Appendix C.

For outcome 2.1 “Write clearly and effectively for a business audience” the results demonstrate that student performance reaches the level of the faculty’s expectations. The benchmark of 100 percent of the students reaching Levels I or II is satisfied for all three components of the outcome. The mean performance for component 1 (Organization) was at 2.83 on the scale where 1.0 means “Needs Improvement” and 3.0 means “Excellent”. The mean performance for component 2 (Spelling and Grammar) was at 2.80, while the mean performance for component 3 (Sufficiency and Quality of Research and Evidence) was at 2.60. Dr. Cox who performed this assessment concluded: “The rubric categories of “Needs Improvement”, “Acceptable”, and “Excellent” are based on my standards for MBA students. I consider a score of 2 (acceptable) to be the equivalent of B grade level of work. Historically, I find this assignment well done and this year was no exception. The average grade on the project was 86/100. The average score on the three categories were well above acceptable. I should note that the “Sufficiency of Evidence” category probably reflects each student’s knowledge of finance more than his or her writing skills. Overall, I find this group’s writing skills (at least on a formal paper) to be excellent.”

Assessment of critical thinking outcomes linked to goal 1 “Critically and analytically reason and solve problems” was performed in E542. For outcome 1.1 – “Provide identification and formulation of problem” – the mean performance was at 94.0%. For outcome 1.2 – “Develop problem solution techniques” the mean performance was at 96.7%. For outcome 1.3 – “Interpret and implement solution results” the mean performance was at 94.0%. The data were collected in course projects, including case study analysis, regression analysis, profit maximization problems.

Knowledge and skills in Economics was assessed following recent changes to the Economics curriculum on the graduate level. Outcome 6.3 “Apply demand and supply theory and the concept of elasticity to managerial decisions” saw mean performance at 83.0%. For outcome 6.4 “Analyze pricing strategies used by firms in different market structures” the mean performance was at 86.7%.

The performance on the standardized ETS test taken by the graduates demonstrates Excellent performance of the 2010-11 graduates. The results of the ETS test are presented in Appendix C. In particular, there were 11 graduates taking the test in Spring 2011, and the mean performance for the cohort was at the 90th percentile compared to all institutions participating in the M.B.A. ETS testing. This is an excellent level of performance, as the national sample includes many competitive

M.B.A. programs, with a total sample of 24,785 students at 230 institutions. IU Kokomo School of Business graduates ranked in the top 10-percent in this national sample.

The ETS test results are further linked to the program outcomes assessed. For instance, in Spring 2011 the ETS test assessment indicators for outcomes in Marketing, Management, Finance, Managerial Accounting, and Strategic Integration all rank at or above the 80th percentile nationally.

The ETS test allows us to get external validation of student performance. We expect our students to perform individually at better than the national average level. We also expect the program to have overall mean scores that are above the national average. The first benchmark for Excellence for the program is to have 75 percent of the graduates exceed the national average scores individually. This benchmark is satisfied as 91% of the graduates demonstrated individual performance that was better than the national mean level. A second program-level benchmark for Excellence is to have program-level mean scores for each of the five area assessment indicators above the 75th percentile of all institutions participating in the M.B.A. ETS testing. This benchmark for Excellence is also satisfied as each of the area indicators was at or above the 80th percentile level in the national sample. Overall performance on the ETS standardized test is Excellent.

IV. USING ASSESSMENT FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Program improvement in response to the assessment results is an important part of the overall assessment plan. If the benchmark is not reached for a particular outcome, the faculty teaching the course will consider changes to the course, and submit an outline of the proposed changes to the Assessment Committee of the School. A similar process is successfully used in the assessment of the undergraduate Business program.

In 2010-11, the assessment results from the course-embedded assessment indicate Excellent performance in writing and critical thinking skills, while the ETS test results indicate Excellent student performance in the areas of Business. There were no specific changes to the program, but the process for incorporating improvement is in place.

The School's Assessment Committee also works to review the assessment process itself based on the results collected. Academic year 2010-11 completed a four-year cycle of data collection for the goals and outcomes of the M.B.A. program. During this cycle each program-level goal and outcome was assessed at least once in various points in the program according to the curriculum map. This cycle was an effort to establish whether the satisfactory level of performance was sustained. As part of the Accreditation Maintenance visit from the School's accrediting body, the AACSB (Association for Advancement of Collegiate School of Business) in Fall 2010, the Assessment Committee of the School met with the members of the accreditation team and reviewed the assessment plan and assessment results. A number of suggestions were provided by the accreditation team. The Assessment Committee will work to incorporate these suggestions into the assessment process in 2011-12. For instance, the accreditation team suggested that the School consider reducing the number of goals and outcomes assessed, and shorten the time of the assessment cycle. The current assessment cycle takes five years for the School to assess each and every goal and outcome. The committee has the review of goals and outcomes on its agenda for 2011-12 and will consider a restructuring of the assessment cycle in an attempt to shorten it.

V. DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS

The School disseminates assessment results to stakeholders in several ways. A summary of assessment activities is presented to the School's faculty and staff at School of Business meetings.

In the past, the assessment results have been reported in the meetings of the School's advisory board that include stakeholders from the community. In addition, a copy of this report is submitted to the IU Kokomo office of Academic Affairs. These copies are filed and are publicly available to the stakeholders of the School, including web access through the university's web site.

The School also maintains an assessment web site with complete information on the School's assessment activities. The information on this web site includes assessment highlights for the undergraduate Business program and the M.B.A. program, the list of learning outcomes for the undergraduate and M.B.A. programs, and the results of ETS testing of graduates. The School was one of the first on campus to develop a complete web summary of assessment and continues to enhance the web availability of assessment documents. The current address of the School's assessment web page is:

<http://www.iuk.edu/academics/majors/business/resources/assessment.shtml>

Highlights of the assessment activities were also provided to the campus Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (CTLA) for dissemination to stakeholders. This information is now available at the CTLA web site:

<http://iuk.edu/academics/ctla/assessment/results/index.shtml>

APPENDIX A. CURRICULUM MAP

Objectives/Outcomes		(Spring) D542	(Fall) E542	(Spring) F542	(Fall) J542	(Spring) J560	(Fall) M560	(Spring) M570	(Fall) Z542
CRITICAL/ANALYTICAL REASONING									
Identification and formulation of problem	1.1		X	X					
Develop problem solution techniques	1.2		X	X					
Interpret solution results	1.3		X	X					
COMM AND ORG MGMT SKILLS									
Write clearly and effectively	2.1		X	X					
Present clearly and persuasively	2.2		X	X					
Work in and lead teams	2.3				X	X			
ANALYZE TRENDS IN BUS ENVIRONMENT									
Economic and political change	3.1					X			
Change in culture and demographics	3.2					X			
ETHICAL, LEGAL, SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY									
Concept of ethics	4.1				X				
Legal and regulatory environment	4.2				X				
Social responsibility of business	4.3				X				
DYNAMICS OF DOMESTIC AND GLOBAL ORGANIZATIONAL ENVIRONMENT									
Synergies resulting from partnerships	5.1					X			
Gains to trade, barriers to trade	5.2		X						
Globalization and competitive advantage	5.3					X			
ORGANIZATIONAL AND FUNCTION-RELATED STRATEGIES									
Financial statements in decision making	6.1	X							
Cost behavior	6.2	X							
Supply and demand	6.3		X						
Pricing in market structures	6.4		X						
Quality, technology	6.5							X	
OM concepts and techniques	6.6							X	
Valuation models	6.7			X					
Capital budgeting theory	6.8			X					
Segment product-markets / marketing mix	6.9						X		
Marketing management / strategic market planning	6.10						X		
High performance Human Resources practices	6.11								X
Organizational behavior	6.12								X
INTEGRATIVE / INTERDISCIPLINARY									
Internal analysis of an organization	7.1					X			
Interaction of functional areas	7.2					X			
Economic reasoning and accounting data in decisions	7.3	X							

Appendix A.

Curriculum Map for M.B.A. program. The grid indicates courses used for collection of assessment data for each learning outcome.

APPENDIX B. COURSE-EMBEDDED ASSESSMENT RESULTS

of students = 15 (all students assessed)

Scores based on parts 1 – 4 of the following assignment:

Paper/Presentation

The purpose of the paper/presentation is to provide an opportunity to consider application of the topics of market risk, the weighted average cost of capital, and valuation. This 100-point paper/presentation will be graded based on content, analysis, discussion, writing, and presentation quality. The assignment is to select one publicly traded company and perform the following:

1. Market Risk: Collect stock price and dividend information and calculate monthly rates of return for the equity holders. Compare your return with the market's return over the same period. Calculate *Beta* and compare your measure of risk to publicly available measures. Speculate as to the cause of the difference. (20 points)
2. Weighted Average Cost of Capital: Estimate the cost of capital the company should use for capital budgeting projects that expand capacity in its core business. First, you must calculate the relative weights of each form of financing in the firm's current capital structure. That is, what portion of the firm is financed from debt and equity? Next, you must calculate the approximate required return from each form. (20 points)
3. Valuation: Support what you believe is the "fundamental" value of this firm's stock. How does this price compare to the current price? Comment on your evaluation of the firm's overall prospects. Would you invest in its stock? (20 points)
4. Paper: The paper should be no more than ten pages in length including exhibits. Points in this section will be allocated based on the overall look and feel of the paper including writing mechanics. Use a cover page but do not use any type of binder. (20 points)
5. Presentation: The presentation (March 29th and April 5th) should last no more than 15 minutes. The focus should be on the choices that were made during the analysis and your interpretation of the results. Allow a few minutes for questions from the class. (20 points)

Scoring below based on the rubric shown on the final page of this document.

Student	Organization	Spelling/Grammar	Evidence
001	2.5	3	3
002	3	3	2.5
003	2.5	2.5	2
004	2.5	3	2.5
005	3	2.5	3
006	3	2.5	2.5
007	3	2.5	3
008	3	3	3
009	3	3	3
010	3	3	2.5
011	3	3	2
012	3	3	3
013	3	2.5	2.5
014	2.5	3	2.5
015	2.5	2.5	2
Mean	2.83	2.80	2.60
Standard Deviation	0.24	0.24	0.37

Comments:

The rubric categories of “Needs Improvement”, “Acceptable”, and “Excellent” are based on my standards for MBA students. I consider a score of 2 (acceptable) to be the equivalent of B grade level of work. Historically, I find this assignment well done and this year was no exception. The average grade on the project was 86/100. The average score on the three categories were well above acceptable. I should note that the “Sufficiency of Evidence” category probably reflects each student’s knowledge of finance more than his or her writing skills. Overall, I find this group’s writing skills (at least on a formal paper) to be excellent.

Outcome: "Students will write effectively" Rater: _____ Course: _____ Student: _____

Instructions to the evaluator: For each of the four components, enter a score in the far right column that reflects your evaluation. You can use up to one decimal place (i.e. 2.3). All scores must fit into the range from 1.0 to 3.0.

Date: _____

COMPONENT	Needs Improvement = 1.0	Acceptable = 2.0	Excellent = 3.0
Organization	Uneven and ineffective overall organization, unfocused introduction or conclusion.	Develops unified and coherent ideas within paragraphs with generally adequate transitions; clear overall organization relating most ideas together, good introduction and conclusion.	Develops ideas, organizes them logically with paragraphs and connects them with effective transitions. Goes beyond "average" in delivering a conclusion that is well documented and persuasive.
Spelling and Grammar	Writing contains frequent spelling and grammar errors which interfere with comprehension	While there may be minor errors, the writing follows normal conventions of spelling and grammar throughout and has been carefully proofread.	The writing is essential error-free in terms of spelling and grammar.
Sufficiency and Quality of Research and Evidence	Most ideas unsupported, confusion between personal and external evidence, reasoning flawed.	Presents ideas in general terms, support for ideas is present but may need clarification.	Supports most ideas with effective examples, references, and details, makes key distinctions

IU Kokomo School of Business Assessment Data Form

Course: E542

Semester: Fall 2010

Faculty: CHULKOV

Please include your evaluation of the aggregate student performance measured for the assessment outcomes in the course. If you use a numerical measure in your assessment (for example, the percentage of correct answers on a test) include it under "Score". Also include your evaluation by placing a checkmark in the appropriate area.

Goal	Score	Evaluation		
		Excellent	Acceptable	Needs Improvement
Provide identification and formulation of problem	94.0%	X		
Develop problem solution techniques	96.7%	X		
Interpret and implement solution results	94.0%	X		
Apply demand and supply theory and the concept of elasticity to managerial decisions.	83.0%		X	
Analyze pricing strategies used by firms in different market structures.	86.7%		X	

Comments: (attach additional material if necessary)

All assessment was done in the Fall 2010 E542 course with a sample size of 10 students.

Outcome 1 was assessed with a case study problem (Memo 2)

Outcome 2 was assessed with a regression analysis and maximization problem homework

Outcome 3 was assessed with a case study analysis assignment (Memo 4)

Outcome 4 was assessed with a quiz

Outcome 5 was assessed with an analytical homework problem

APPENDIX C. ETS MAJOR FIELD TEST RESULTS

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING THROUGH ETS MAJOR FIELD TEST

The data represents results of IU Kokomo MBA students in Educational Testing Service's standardized field test for MBA. The test is taken by graduating students in the capstone course in the Spring semester. The numbers are percentile rank scores for all categories and for each category separately for a given semester. The percentile ranks are in relation to the national comparative data sample received from the ETS. This sample includes 24,785 students from 230 institutions for 2005-2009.

	Spring 2006	Spring 2007	Spring 2008	Spring 2009	Spring 2010	Spring 2011
Percentile scores						
Number	15	24	13	19	27	11
Overall IUK Percentile	75	85	95	85	95	90
Marketing	70	85	95	80	95	80
Management	80	80	95	80	95	85
Finance	70	80	90	85	85	95
Managerial Accounting	65	75	95	90	95	90
Strategic Integration	60	85	95	80	90	90