

Indiana University Kokomo
School of Business
M.B.A. Program
Assessment Report
Academic Year 2009-2010

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 2009-2010, we continued assessment of general skills and focused on assessment of the presentation skills outcome in a core M.B.A. course. The faculty developed assessment forms and used benchmarks to evaluate individual student performance and establish whether the student achievement in an outcome is Exemplary, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory. 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.

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 2009-2010. There were 27 graduates taking the test and the mean performance for the cohort was at the 95th percentile compared to all institutions participating in the ETS testing nationally. The area scores for Marketing, Management, and Managerial Accounting were all at the 95th percentile level. The comparison sample includes 24,785 students at 499 institutions.

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
- Coverage of learning outcomes verified by periodic syllabi checks
- Other activities include periodic surveys of graduates

Goals and Outcomes Assessed in 2009-2010

In 2009-2010, the School assessed student performance on the following goals and outcomes. Assessment data were collected by course-embedded methods for outcome 2.2 (Present clearly and persuasively). Other outcomes were assessed with the ETS standardized test.

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.

Assessment Benchmarks

The Assessment Committee develops rubrics for assessing student achievement each outcome. Please refer to Appendix B to review the rubric used to assess outcome 2.2 (Present clearly and persuasively to a business audience). The rubric identifies the performance levels in the following fashion – Level I (Exemplary achievement of the outcome), Level II (Satisfactory achievement of the outcome), Level III (Unsatisfactory achievement of the outcome). 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.

Every graduate of the program also takes the ETS test. This allows us to measure the achievement of program outcomes at the conclusion of the program. 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 M.B.A. programs. In ETS 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.

Changes to Assessment Plan

Assessment in the M.B.A. program in 2009-2010 was performed as specified in the Assessment Plan.

II. ASSESSMENT METHODS

Course-embedded Assessment

The School used a system of course-embedded assessment to collect data on student achievement of the learning outcomes. We focused on assessment of the presentation skills outcome and had seven faculty members participate in the evaluation of presentation skills in a core M.B.A. course. The faculty used the assessment forms developed by the Assessment Committee and evaluated individual student performance in order to establish whether the student achievement was Exemplary, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory.

The course-embedded assessment of outcome 2.2 was performed in the M560 required M.B.A. course. The students were assigned individual presentations by the course instructor. Business faculty members were asked to attend the presentations and evaluate the student achievement of each component of the presentation skills outcome. Overall, seven faculty members participated. This assessment activity was separate from the course grades, and was recorded by the Assessment Committee and not the course instructor. Appendix B presents the rubric used in this assessment.

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 499 institutions.

III. DESCRIPTION OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

The summary of the assessment results for 2009-2010 is presented in the appendices A and C. Appendix A presents a summary of the course-embedded assessment of presentation skills. This summary shows the average student performance and the numbers of evaluations that achieved Level I (Exemplary achievement of the outcome), Level II (Satisfactory achievement of the outcome), and Level III (Unsatisfactory achievement of the outcome) for outcome 2.2 – “Present clearly and persuasively to a business audience.”

The achievement of component 1 (Organization and analysis) was excellent, as all 14 evaluations reached Level I or Level II with 11 of these reaching the highest Level I. For component 2 (Quality of Conclusion), all 14 evaluations reached Levels I or II, with 7 of these reaching Level I. Uneven performance was observed in component 3 (Voice Quality). This component reached the Satisfactory benchmark with 12 evaluations at Levels I and 2 evaluations at Level III. This was the only outcome with observed performance at Level III. For component 4 (Use of Media), all 14 evaluations again reached Levels I or II, with 11 students reaching Level I.

Overall, 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 three out of four components of the outcome. The only component that does not show excellent performance is component 3 (Voice Quality). The observed performance on this outcome is uneven, with two evaluations failing to reach Levels I or II, and reaching only Level III. Therefore, the program-level performance reached the Satisfactory benchmark as 100 percent of the students reach Levels I and II in outcomes 1, 2, and 4, while 86 percent reach Levels I and II in outcome 3.

The performance on the standardized ETS test taken by the graduates demonstrates Excellent performance of the 2009-2010 graduates. The results of the ETS test are presented in Appendix C. In particular, there were 27 graduates taking the test in Spring 2010, and the mean performance for the cohort was at the 95th 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 499 institutions. IU Kokomo School of Business graduates ranked in the top 5-percent in this national sample.

The ETS test results are further linked to the program outcomes assessed. For instance, in Spring 2010 the ETS test assessment indicators for outcomes in Marketing, Management, Finance, Managerial Accounting, and Strategic Integration all rank at or above the 85th 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 89% 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 85th 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 2009-2010, the assessment results from the course-embedded assessment indicate Satisfactory performance in presentation 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. In addition to evaluating the assessment results, the faculty and the Graduate Policy and Curriculum Committee (GPCC) of the School oversee the M.B.A. program for currency and coverage of program objectives. For instance, in 2009 the M.B.A. elective courses were separated from undergraduate courses eliminating cross-listing of elective courses. The Assessment Committee and GPCC continue the process of evaluation and improvement of the M.B.A. program.

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. The assessment results are periodically 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.

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. The current address of the School's assessment web page is:

<http://www.indiana.edu/~kowcms/academics/schools/business/programs/assessment/index.html>

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://www.indiana.edu/~kowcms/academics/ctla/assessment/results/index.html>

APPENDIX A. SUMMARY OF COURSE-EMBEDDED ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Assessment of Graduate Presentation Skills in M560

AY 2009-2010	Number	Average	Count of		
Overall for the cohort		(3.0 is Best)	Exemplary	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Organization and Analysis	14	2.6	11	3	0
Quality of Conclusion	14	2.3	7	7	0
Voice Quality	14	2.5	12	0	2
Use of Media	14	2.6	11	3	0

APPENDIX B. ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

Learning Outcome: “Present clearly and persuasively to a business audience”

Date: _____

Rater: _____

Course: M560

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.

COMPONENT	Unacceptable = 1.0	Acceptable = 2.0	Exemplary = 3.0	Score
Organization and analysis	Presentation failed to cover the required elements of the assignment in a logical and timely manner and/or the analysis is inadequate.	Presentation covers the required elements of the assignment in a logical and timely manner and the analysis is adequate.	Presentation covers the required elements of the assignment in a logical and timely manner and the analysis indicates optimal use of information and quantitative tools, attention to detail, and consideration of alternative interpretations.	
Quality of conclusion	Missing or poor. Not tied to analysis. Does not summarize points that brought the speaker to this conclusion.	Summarizes presentation's main points, and draws conclusions based upon these points.	Goes beyond "average" in delivering a conclusion that is well documented and persuasive.	
Voice quality	Often hard to understand. Voice is too soft, or too loud. Pace is often too quick or too slow.	Easily understood, appropriate pace and volume.	Excellent delivery. Modulates voice, projects enthusiasm, interest, and confidence.	
Use of media	Relies too heavily on electronic presentation or notes. Makes little eye contact. Electronic presentation contains too much information.	Electronic presentation parallels the presenter's content and does not prevent the speaker from connecting with the audience. However, the electronic content does not significantly improve the presentation.	Electronic presentation is used effortlessly to enhance the presentation.	

APPENDIX C. SUMMARY OF 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 499 institutions for 2005-2009.

	Spring 2005	Spring 2006	Spring 2007	Spring 2008	Spring 2009	Spring 2010
Percentile scores						
Number	15	15	24	13	19	27
Overall IUK Percentile	50	75	85	95	85	95
Marketing	25	70	85	95	80	95
Management	10	80	80	95	80	95
Finance	40	70	80	90	85	85
Managerial Accounting	70	65	75	95	90	95
Strategic Integration	55	60	85	95	80	90