

2018 – 19 Departmental Executive Summary

Department: Business and Mathematics	Date: 6/28/19
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: A. Langewisch, C. Beck	
See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for: a) <i>Student Outcome</i> ; b) <i>Background</i> ; c) <i>Question(s)</i> ; d) <i>Methodology</i>	
Analysis of artifacts: 1). PERFORMANCE CRITERIA * - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> We looked at the end-of-semester Business Strategy (BSG) team scores, which reward knowledge and analysis and punish directionless decision-making. Good scores correlate with persistent, careful analysis, understanding, and integration of fundamental business concepts.	
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Are students proficient at analysis and application of their core business topics as they seek to perform well in the capstone course Business Strategy Game? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. (A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.)</i> 63% of the students had composite scores of 70 or higher. Two teams had scores of 69, so 74% had scores of 69 or higher. The performance target is that 80% of the student teams finish with scores of 70 or higher. 3). INTERPRETATION * - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The results show that we are not reaching our performance target. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).</i> The way the game is designed, once a competitive advantage is established, it is hard for teams that are in a hole to make up ground. Those who do best perform well at the expense of others. The losing teams may well be analyzing and integrating, but from a tough competitive position.	
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 6/28/19 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> Email <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> A. Langewisch, T. Heidorn, C. Beck, T. Johnson, S. Leinen, J. Moberly	
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION *- <i>How will what the department learned from the assessment impact:</i> a. <i>Teaching:</i> In future terms, students will hear from the outset that this comprehensive exercise is similar to the "real world" of business in that it is a competitive environment, and that analysis and integration of concepts are best demonstrated early on, and the company managers need to continually adapt their implementation strategies in order to be successful. b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> The Business Strategy Game will continue to be used in BUS 446 Strategic Management. c. <i>Program:</i> All business-related majors will continue to take BUS 446 as their capstone experience. d. <i>Assessment:</i> We will continue to monitor these scores over the years. 2. IMPACT *- <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> While we hope that students will heed the admonitions, it is apparent that no matter how much emphasis and assistance is given to the students, they ultimately are responsible for their own work, and many students still need to learn from disappointing results. 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION*</i> None	
<i>If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.</i>	
<i>What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future?</i> The same question	
Submitted by: A. Langewisch	Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 7/10/19
Department Chair notified/additional action needed: na BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 7/10/19	