

Eastern New Mexico University
College of Business

Academic Assessment Report for 2010-2011

Interim Dean: Chris Taylor
Phone: 575-562-2033
Email: chris.taylor@enmu.edu

Assessment Coordinator: John Luhman
Phone: 575-562-2066
Email: john.luhman@enmu.edu

Key Achievements and Results

- Curriculum changes were made during the fall semester of 2010 in both the BBA and the BSIS programs given an analysis of resource constraints and student learning outcomes of 2009-2010. Changes involved increasing the standard mandatory business foundation while decreasing the inconsistency created by unfocused electives.
- The accounting faculty attended a conference for accounting educators provided by the Texas Society of CPA's, which included a tax update session sponsored by AARP.
- Seven tenured faculty members submitted their APE while four tenure-track faculty members and two resource faculty members submitted their review file to the Faculty Evaluation Committee. However, the faculty failed to meet during the fall 2011 semester to adopt changes to the, or re-adopt the existing, teaching performance standards.
- The faculty attended various workshops during spring 2011 and summer 2011 to be trained in the use of Mediasite for the distance education program.
- A request was made to the New Mexico Collegiate Business Articulation Consortium that BUS 151 be re-instated into the articulation matrix as it is now a required course for the BBA and the BSIS degrees.
- A new set of policies and procedures to help the faculty effect change within their business curriculum, in relation to feedback from their assessment practices, were approved by the faculty during a spring 2011 meeting.
- Due to the financial constraints of 2010-11, no program level surveys were conducted.
- Two faculty members voluntarily shared information on their course level assessment activities. Although the sharing of this information will be mandatory next year, the faculty has not yet determined a process of reporting and analyzing the data. And course level assessment activities have yet to be related to the curriculum map of learning outcomes.
- The overall class average percentile ranking for the undergraduate business Major Field Test was below the 50th percentile for fall 2010 at 25th (n=14) while the overall class average percentile was above the 50th percentile for spring 2011 at 55th (n=32). The weighted average was at 46th.

- For the fall semester, only Information Systems met the target of 50th percentile target for sub-field class percentile rankings while for the spring 2011 semester, all but Economics, Marketing, and International met the target of 50th percentile. However, a weighted average for all sub-field indicators of the two semesters demonstrates that only Accounting, Quantitative, and Information Systems met that target of 50th percentile sub-field class rankings.
- The BBA Capstone Team Presentation Evaluation rubric was 3.1 for fall 2010 and 3.1 for spring 2011.
- The BBA “GLO-BUS” Team Simulation class average percentiles were above the 50th percentile: for fall 2010 the average was at the 56th percentile; and for spring 2011 the average was at the 53rd percentile.
- The Accounting Comprehensive Exam class average percent correct score was at 73% for the spring 2011 testing while all of the sub-area percent correct scores were well above 50 percent.
- The BSIS Capstone Team Presentation average scores on the rubric were above the target of 3.0 at 3.38 and 3.75. The Information System Analyst exam class average score was at the 38th percentile which was well below the target of above the 50th percentile. However, the fall 2010 sub-field indicator for Info Systems was exactly at the 50th percentile, while spring 2011 was at the 65th percentile. The weighted average for both semesters equals the 60th percentile which is also above the target.
- The MBA Integrative Experience was conducted from fall to summer: 7 out of 10 students passed in fall 2010; 9 out of 17 passed in spring 2011; and 12 out of 15 passed in summer 2011. That equals a weighted average pass rate of 67% which is well below the target of 75%.

Summary of Assessment Efforts

Our explanation of the assessment efforts of the College of Business (hereafter COB) follows a basic open systems model of taking inputs from the environment, transforming those inputs given the organization’s structure and practices, creating outputs for the organization’s stakeholders, and gathering and using feedback mechanisms to improve all activities.

The *inputs* that relate to teaching in the COB are fourfold: (a) following the guidelines set by our accreditation body, the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs, as well as by the ENMU Graduate School policies, in terms of faculty qualifications to teach courses and subject areas; (b) establishing a coherent and credible program curriculum that not only meets the needs of stakeholders but is deliverable given any resource constraints; (c) providing opportunities for professional development to the faculty; and (d) establishing, and adhering to, a set of policies and procedures for the evaluation of faculty performance in the classroom.

The *transformation process* that relates to teaching in the COB is also fourfold: (a) understanding the differences in terms of methods and techniques for the different course delivery modes – traditional face to face, interactive television, purely online via the web, or a hybrid between traditional and online delivery; (b) effectively using the available course technology given the delivery mode; (c) establishing clear and rational course learning outcomes that are supported by the course content and learning materials; and (d) utilizing effective course assessment tools that relate to and measure the course learning outcomes.

The *outputs* that relate to teaching in the COB are the data items listed in the College's "Plan and Report for Student Learning Outcomes" (see below) that are to be gathered and compared against set standards, such as the Major Field Test for undergraduate business students, the BBA Capstone Team Presentation, the Accounting Comprehensive Exam, or the MBA Integrative Experience. Finally, the *feedback* mechanisms that help the COB to improve its inputs are mainly the analysis of any survey given to our stakeholders to measure their satisfaction and ask for input on our program curriculum (i.e. exiting undergraduate surveys, alumni surveys, and employer surveys). The mechanisms that help the faculty to improve the transformation process in the classroom are: (a) the use of student teaching evaluations feedback (i.e. the ENMU evaluation); (b) the analysis of course assessment tools (e.g., tests, homework, case studies, research projects, etc.); (c) the use of peer observation in the classroom; and (d) the writing of an "reflective essay" on teaching performance for the faculty evaluation process.

Use of Assessment to Improve Teaching

Inputs

Faculty Qualifications

The COB follows the guidelines set by our accreditation body, the Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs, to determine the qualifications of faculty to teach courses and subject areas. These guidelines are set in *section five* of the ACBSP Standards and Criteria for Demonstrating Excellence in Baccalaureate/Graduate Degree Schools and Programs. The COB submitted its bi-annual review in the spring of 2010 and it was "accepted without comments" by ACBSP, therefore, the COB was in compliance with these guidelines. The COB will be required to submit another bi-annual review in the spring of 2012 to confirm that we continue to be in compliance with these guidelines. In addition, the Graduate School of our university determines the qualifications of COB faculty to teach graduate level courses.

Program Curriculum

The COB follows the guidelines set by our accreditation body, ACBSP, to establish a coherent and credible program curriculum that meets the needs of our stakeholders. Curriculum guidelines are set in *section six* of the ACBSP Standards and Criteria for Demonstrating Excellence in Baccalaureate/Graduate Degree Schools and Programs. The COB submitted its bi-annual review in the spring of 2010 and it was "accepted without comments" by ACBSP, therefore, the COB was in compliance with these guidelines. The COB will be required to submit another bi-annual review in the spring of 2012 to confirm that we continue to be in compliance with these guidelines.

The COB did make curriculum changes during the fall semester of 2010 in both the Bachelor of Business Administration program and the Bachelor of Information Systems program. The changes were initiated by an analysis of resource constraints (i.e. faculty

employment) and by an examination of the AY 2008-09 “Plan and Report for Student Learning Outcomes.” The COB Undergraduate Curriculum Committee refined both the Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) program and the Bachelor of Information Systems (BSIS) program which will be instituted in the 2011-2013 Undergraduate Catalog. These changes involved increasing the standard mandatory business foundation for all Business degrees while decreasing the inconsistency created by unfocused electives. This has given way to more streamlined programs that should be more learning outcomes oriented. These changes should help enhance the areas where students had not performed up to expectations by providing less disjointed plans of study across the fields.

Professional Development

ENMU provides opportunities for professional development in relation to teaching to the faculty at the beginning of every academic year. These opportunities involve training on the New Faculty Orientation, the Mediasite Faculty Workshops, and the Learning Communities Faculty Workshops. Due to resource constraints, no specific workshops were provided to the COB faculty and no COB faculty were sent to professional meetings that entailed pedagogical development or improvement, for AY 2010-11 with one exception. The Accounting faculty attended a conference for accounting educators provided by the Texas Society of CPA's, which included a tax update session sponsored by AARP.

Faculty Evaluation

Each fall semester, the COB faculty reviews, refines and adopts a set of policies and criteria to evaluate the teaching performance of resource and regular faculty. According to this document, all faculty members with classroom teaching assignments must undergo a performance evaluation – resource faculty are reviewed annually and regular faculty are reviewed annually if they are tenure-track. Tenured faculty submitted their Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation report to the dean of the College. For AY 2010-11, seven tenured faculty members submitted their APE, four tenure-track faculty members and two resource faculty members submitted their review file to the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

The COB faculty failed to meet during the fall 2011 semester to adopt changes to the, or re-adopt the existing, COB teaching performance standards.

Transformation Process

Course Delivery Modes

With the installation of “Mediasite” technology at ENMU, the COB faculty attended various workshops during the spring 2011 semester and summer 2011 break to be trained in the use of ENMU's newest course delivery mode for the distance education program.

Course Technology

With the exception to Mediasite training, there not any formal pedagogical training provided to the COB faculty during AY 2010-11 to improve their teaching effectiveness in terms of using the available technology for a given delivery mode. However, Ms. Ellen Gardiner, Instruction Technology Specialist for Distance Education and Outreach, provided on-the-job training for COB faculty working with our learning management system (i.e. Blackboard).

Course Learning Outcomes & Course Assessment Tools

At the fall 2010 and the spring 2011 meetings of the New Mexico Collegiate Business Articulation Consortium, work continued on refining the “core competencies” of all courses listed in the articulation matrix, and work began on how to assess those core competencies. The ENMU courses that are currently in the articulation matrix are: ACCT 201; ACCT 202; ACCT 305; BUS 230; BUS 317; ECON 221; ECON 222; IS 151; MKT 201; and STAT 213. The COB requested that BUS 151 be re-instated into the articulation matrix as it is now a required course for the BBA and the BSIS degrees. This request should be completed during AY 2011-12.

In compliance with SB 161 passed by the New Mexico Legislature, Eastern New Mexico University includes reports on all general education courses. The University has a five-year rotation to assure that all general education courses that are part of the statewide transferable core are regularly assessed, while reporting the results to the Higher Education Department and using the results to enhance student learning. No general education business courses were scheduled for assessment during AY 2011-12.

The COB faculty at a fall 2010 meeting requested that the Assessment Coordinator and Dr. Gerry Huybregts formulate a set of policies and procedures to help the faculty report on their own course improvements and how they achieve their course learning outcomes. These policies were developed, discussed, and approved by the faculty during a spring 2011 meeting. A copy of these policies is available in **Appendix A**.

Outputs

Student Learning Outcomes

The student learning outcomes for the COB are reported below in the “**Plan and Report for Student Learning Outcomes**.” The tools used to collect student learning outcomes during AY 2010-11 were: (a) the Major Field Test for undergraduate business students; (b) the BBA Capstone Team Presentation Evaluation rubric; (c) the Capstone Team Simulation rankings; (d) the Accounting Comprehensive Exam; (e) the Information Systems Analyst Exam; (f) IS Capstone Team Presentation Evaluation rubric; and (g) the MBA Integrative Experience.

Feedback

Program Surveys

The feedback mechanisms that help the College to improve its inputs are mainly the analysis of any survey given to our stakeholders to measure their satisfaction and ask for input on our program curriculum (i.e. exiting undergraduate surveys, alumni surveys, and employer surveys). Due to financial constraints, during AY 2010-11 no program surveys were conducted.

Student Teaching Evaluations

According to the COB faculty evaluation policies, all faculty members with classroom teaching assignments must examine their student evaluation results: resource faculty and regular faculty who are tenure-track do this through their FEC review file while tenured faculty submit their Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation report to the dean of the College. For AY 2010-11, seven tenured faculty members submitted their APE, four tenure-track faculty members and two resource faculty members submitted their review files. The COB utilizes the ENMU student evaluation instrument. The performance standard established by the COB requires that on average (across all classes taught) ENMU scores fall within the historical trend of the COB. In addition, students have the opportunity to provide written comments on the ENMU Surveys (including the online survey). The performance standard established by the COB requires an overall trend over time that is generally positive, and that the negative comments are substantially addressed in the “reflective essay” of the resource and tenure-track faculty.

Course Level Assessment Activities

Two COB faculty members, Dr. Gene Smith and Ms. Ira Kaye Frashier, engaged in the assessment of their course learning achievements. Two other faculty members, Dr. John Stockmyer and Dr. John Luhman, shared their plans for future assessment of their course learning achievements. At this time the COB has not yet determined a process of reporting, or a method of analyzing, the assessment of individual course learning achievements. To that point, the information provided by the faculty members is simply recorded in **Appendix B**.

Classroom Visitation Appraisals

Peer evaluations, consisting of classroom visitations and review of syllabi and related classroom materials, were conducted for each resource faculty member and each tenure-track faculty member during the 2010-2011 academic year. The normal process is that during the first year at ENMU, all classes have a peer review. After the first year, at least one class per semester has a peer evaluation, although peer reviews of all classes is recommended. Peer evaluators complete the “Classroom Visitation Appraisal” form which the resource faculty and tenure-track faculty includes in their Faculty Evaluation Review file.

PLAN AND REPORT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES FOR AY 2010-2011

Measure = Intended student learning outcome
Outcome = Result

Performance Criteria = Standard against which performance is assessed
Action Taken = Use of results to improve student learning

NOTE: Please attach all rubrics used for each learning objective.

Learning Outcome #1: PLAN		
All BBA students demonstrate a substantial understanding of business knowledge and business analytical skills.		Gen Ed. Competency? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Competency Number _____
Measures	Performance Criteria	Timeline / Population
<p>1a. Overall class average percentile ranking on the Major Field Test for business students (nationally normalized scores).</p> <p>1b. Sub-field indicator class percentile ranking on the Major Field Test for business students (nationally normalized scores).</p>	<p>1a. The MFT's overall class average percentile is above the 50th percentile. To balance differences in class sizes, a weighted average of $[(n1 \times N1) + (n2 \times N2)] / (n1 + n2)$ will be used for the academic year.</p> <p>1b. All of the MFT's sub-field indicators class average percentiles are above the 50th percentile. To balance differences in class sizes, a weighted average of $[(n1 \times N1) + (n2 \times N2)] / (n1 + n2)$ will be used for the academic year.</p>	<p>1a. All BBA students take the MFT as part of the BUS 453 capstone course which is delivered fall, spring and summer.</p> <p>1b. All BBA students take the MFT as part of the BUS 453 capstone course which is delivered fall, spring and summer.</p>
Learning Outcome #1: REPORT		
Outcome(s)	Action(s) Taken	Timeline for Action(s)
<p>1a. For this academic year we tested the students in BUS 453 in the fall 2010 and spring 2011 semesters. Our overall class average percentile ranking was below the 50th percentile for fall 2010 at 25th with a class size of 14, while the overall class average</p>	<p>1a and 1b. The COB faculty established a set of policies and procedures to help the faculty report on their own course improvements and how they achieve their course learning outcomes.</p>	<p>1a and 1b. The COB Undergraduate Curriculum Committee refinement of the BBA program will be instituted in the 2011-2013 Undergraduate Catalog.</p>

<p>percentile was above the 50th percentile for spring 2011 at 55th with a class size of 32. The weighted average for fall and spring was below the 50th percentile at 46th. This is a major concern for the COB faculty. See Appendix C.</p> <p>1b. There is a marked difference between the fall 2010 and the spring 2011 sub-field class percentile rankings. For the fall semester, only Information Systems met the target of 50th percentile. For the spring 2011 semester, all but Economics, Marketing, and International met the target of 50th percentile. However, a weighted average for all sub-field indicators of the two semesters demonstrates that only Accounting, Quantitative, and Information Systems met that target of 50th percentile. This is a major concern for the COB faculty. See Appendix C.</p>	<p>In addition, the COB Undergraduate Curriculum Committee refined the BBA program by increasing the standard mandatory business foundation for all Business degrees while decreasing the inconsistency created by unfocused electives. This has given way to more streamlined programs that are more learning outcomes oriented. These changes should help enhance the areas where students had not performed up to expectations by providing less disjointed plans of study across the fields. Two specific changes the BBA curriculum was adding BUS 151 Introduction to Business to the business foundation, and adding MGT 314 Human Resources Management to the business core.</p>	
--	--	--

Learning Outcome #2: PLAN		
All BBA students demonstrate a substantial level of business professionalism and team problem-solving skills.		Gen Ed. Competency? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Competency Number _____
Measures	Performance Criteria	Timeline / Population
<p>2a. Team average scores on the Capstone Team Presentation Evaluation rubric (internally developed).</p> <p>2b. Overall team average percentile ranking on the Team Simulation for business students (nationally normalized scores).</p>	<p>2a. All team average scores on the Capstone Team Presentation Evaluation rubric are above 3 on a 1 to 5 scale with 5 being the highest score.</p> <p>2b. The Team Simulation class average percentile is above the 50th percentile.</p>	<p>2a. All business students participate in Capstone Team Presentation as part of the BUS 453 capstone course which is delivered fall, spring and summer.</p> <p>2b. All business students take part in the Team Simulation as part of the BUS 453 capstone course which is delivered fall, spring and summer.</p>
Learning Outcome #2: REPORT		
Outcome(s)	Action(s) Taken	Timeline for Action(s)
<p>2a. For fall 2010 the team average score on the Capstone Team Presentation Evaluation rubric was 3.1, and for spring 2011 it was 3.1. See Appendix D for the results and Appendix E for a copy of the rubric.</p> <p>2b. The “GLO-BUS” Team Simulation class average percentiles were above the 50th percentile: for fall 2010 the average was at the 56th percentile; and for spring 2011 the average was at the 53rd percentile. See Appendix F.</p>	<p>2a. No action to be taken at this time.</p> <p>2b. No action to be taken at this time.</p>	<p>2a. Not applicable.</p> <p>2b. Not applicable.</p>

Learning Outcome #3: PLAN		
All Accounting major students demonstrate a substantial understanding of accounting knowledge and accounting analytical skills.		Gen Ed. Competency? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Competency Number ____
Measures	Performance Criteria	Timeline / Population
3a. Class average percent correct on the Accounting Comprehensive Exam for accounting students (externally developed instrument). 3b. Class average on sub-area percent correct on the Accounting Comprehensive Exam for accounting students (externally developed instrument).	3a. The ACE class average percent correct score is above 50 percent. 3b. All of the ACE sub-area percent correct scores are above 50 percent.	3a. All accounting students take the ACE as part of the ACCT 422 course which is delivered in the spring. 3b. All accounting students take the ACE as part of the ACCT 422 course which is delivered in the spring.
Learning Outcome #3: REPORT		
Outcome(s)	Action(s) Taken	Timeline for Action(s)
3a. The ACE class average percent correct score was at 73% for the spring 2011 testing. 3b. All of the ACE sub-area percent correct scores were above 50 percent: Financial Accounting at 75%; Managerial Accounting at 68%; Government and Not-for-Profit at 73%; International Accounting at 78%; Income Taxation at 70%; and Auditing at 79%.	3a. No action to be taken at this time. 3b. No action to be taken at this time.	3a. Not applicable. 3b. Not applicable.

Learning Outcome #4: PLAN		
All BSIS students demonstrate a substantial understanding of information systems knowledge and analytical skills.		Gen Ed. Competency? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Competency Number _____
Measures	Performance Criteria	Timeline / Population
<p>4a. Team average scores on the presentation in capstone course based on an internally developed rubric.</p> <p>4b. Class average percent on the Information Systems Analyst (ISA) exam for IS students (externally developed instrument).</p> <p>4c. Class percentile ranking on the Information Systems Sub-field indicator on the Major Field Test for business students (nationally normalized scores).</p>	<p>4a. All team average scores on the presentation rubric are above 3 on a 1 to 4 scale with 4 being the highest score.</p> <p>4b. The ISA exam class average score is above 50th percentile.</p> <p>4c. The MFT's IS sub-field indicator class average percentiles is above the 50th percentile.</p>	<p>4a. All IS students give this presentation as part of the IS 460 course which is delivered in spring.</p> <p>4b. IS students take the ISA exam as part of the IS 460 course which is delivered in the spring.</p> <p>4c. All BBA students take the MFT as part of the BUS 453 capstone course which is delivered fall, spring and summer.</p>
Learning Outcome #4: REPORT		
Outcome(s)	Action(s) Taken	Timeline for Action(s)
<p>4a. The two team's average scores on the presentation rubric were 3.38 and 3.75. See Appendix G for a copy of the rubric and scores.</p> <p>4b. The ISA exam class average score was at the 38th percentile which was well below the target of above the 50th percentile. See Appendix H.</p> <p>4c. The Fall 2010 sub-field indicator for Info Systems was exactly at the 50th percentile, while spring 2011 was at the 65th percentile. Both individual semesters met the target. In addition, the weighted average for both semesters equals the 60th percentile which is also above the target. See Appendix C.</p>	<p>4a. None at this time.</p> <p>4b. None at this time.</p> <p>4c. None at this time.</p>	<p>4a. Not applicable.</p> <p>4b. Not applicable.</p> <p>4c. Not applicable.</p>

Learning Outcome #5: PLAN		
All MBA students demonstrate a substantial understanding of business knowledge and business analytical skills.		Gen Ed. Competency? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Competency Number _____
Measures	Performance Criteria	Timeline / Population
5a. Take the MBA Integrative Experience (internally developed instrument).	5a. At least 75% of students pass the Integrative Experience.	5a. All MBA students take the Integrative Experience toward the end of their degree program.
Learning Outcome #5: REPORT		
Outcome(s)	Action(s) Taken	Timeline for Action(s)
5a. The MBA Integrative Experience was conducted from fall to summer with the following results: 7 out of 10 students passed in fall 2010; 9 out of 17 passed in spring 2011; and 12 out of 15 passed in summer 2011. That equals a weighted average pass rate of 67% which is well below the target of 75%. See Appendix I for a copy of the exam instructions and exam rubric.	5a. No action taken at this time.	5a. Not applicable.

CURRICULUM MAP OF LEARNING OUTCOMES 2010-2011

Enter course numbers for your department across the top of the matrix. In the column below, indicate where the targeted outcome is “introduced,” “emphasized,” “reinforced,” or “assessed.”

I = Outcome is introduced E = Outcome is emphasized R = Outcome is reinforced A = Outcome is assessed

Courses	Key General Education Courses	Business Foundation Courses	Business Core Courses	BBA Capstone Course	BSIS Capstone Course	MBA Capstone Course
	Outcomes	ENG 102, 104 or COMM 102; IS 151; MATH 119; STAT 213	ACCT 201, 202; BUS 151, 230; ECON 221, 222; IS 281; MKT 201	BUS 317, 330, 381; FIN 315; IS 301; MGT 313, 314	BUS 453	IS 460
Learning Outcome 1: All BBA students demonstrate a substantial understanding of business knowledge and business analytical skills.	I	I, E	E, R	R, A	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Learning Outcome 2: All BBA students demonstrate a substantial level of business professionalism and team problem-solving skills.	I	I, E	E, R	R, A	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Learning Outcome 3: All Accounting major students demonstrate a substantial understanding of accounting knowledge and accounting analytical skills.	Not Applicable	I, E	E, R, A	R, A	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Learning Outcome 4: All BSIS students demonstrate a substantial understanding of information systems knowledge and analytical skills.	I	I, E	E, R	A	R, A	Not Applicable
Learning Outcome 5: All MBA students demonstrate a substantial understanding of business knowledge and business analytical skills.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	E, R	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	E, R, A

IMPROVEMENTS TO PLAN AND ACADEMIC PROCESSES FOR 2011-2012

Listed below are the improvements in the program over the past year that have resulted from the above assessment findings. Please use these items to indicate changes based on your assessments, or use the narrative discussion option on page 1.

Changes to Plan:

Revise Student Outcome Objective(s) Collect / Analysis Additional Data and Information Change Timetable for Data Collection
 Revise Measurement Approach(es) Change Method(s) of Data Collection Other planned change(s)

Details for each checked item:

- *A new set of policies and procedures to help the faculty effect change within their business curriculum, in relation to feedback from the COB assessment practices, were approved by the faculty during a spring 2011 meeting. A copy of these policies is available in Appendix A. No other major revisions to our assessment plan were decided during the same meeting.*

Changes to Academic Processes:

	Changes Planned	Changed Implemented
Modify Frequency or Schedule of Class Offerings		
Make Technology Related Improvements		
Make Personnel Related Changes		

	Changes Planned	Changes Implemented
Implement Additional Training		
Revise Advising Standards or Processes		
Revise Admission Criteria		
Other Implemented/planned change(s)		

Details for each checked item:

- *No major revisions to our assessment plan were decided during a spring 2011 semester meeting of the COB faculty.*

Changes to Curriculum:

	Changes Planned	Changed Implemented
Revise and/or Enforce Prerequisites		
Revise Course Sequence		
Revise Course Content		

	Changes Planned	Changes Implemented
Add Course(s)		
Delete Course(s)		
Other implemented / planned change(s)		

Details for each checked item:

- *No major revisions to our assessment plan were decided during a spring 2011 semester meeting of the COB faculty.*

APPENDICES FOR AY 2010-2011

Appendix A: COB Assessment Policies for AY 2011-2012

OVERVIEW

These procedures and criteria are established for use in the 2011-2012 Academic Year, and this document shall then continue to represent the College of Business assessment process until changed by a majority vote of the COB faculty at the beginning of each academic year. The process described in this document is applicable to all College of Business (COB) courses and programs.

The primary purpose of assessment at Eastern is to improve student learning. Assessment must contribute not only to those processes by which members of our faculty examine their teaching and student learning, but also to those processes by which we try to improve programs and services.

The process of assessment for the College of Business is best represented as open systems model where we take inputs from our environment, transform these inputs given our structure and practices, create outputs for our stakeholders, and gather and use feedback mechanisms to improve all of our teaching activities.

The inputs that relate to teaching in the College of Business are fourfold: (a) following the guidelines set by our accreditation body, the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs, as well as by the ENMU Graduate School policies, in terms of faculty qualifications to teach courses and subject areas; (b) establishing a coherent and credible program curriculum that not only meets the needs of stakeholders but is deliverable given any resource constraints; (c) providing opportunities for professional development to the faculty; and (d) establishing, and adhering to, a set of policies and procedures for the evaluation of faculty performance in the classroom.

The transformation process that relates to teaching in the College of Business is also fourfold: (a) understanding the differences in terms of methods and techniques for the different course delivery modes – traditional face to face, interactive television, purely online via the web, or a hybrid between traditional and online delivery; (b) effectively using the available course technology given the delivery mode; (c) establishing clear and rational course learning outcomes that are supported by the course content and learning materials; and (d) utilizing effective course assessment tools that relate to and measure the course learning outcomes.

The outputs that relate to teaching in the College of Business are the data items listed in the College's *Plan and Report for Student Learning Outcomes* that are to be gathered and compared against set standards, such as the Major Field Test for undergraduate business students, the BBA Capstone Team Presentation, the Accounting Comprehensive Exam, or the MBA Integrative Experience.

Finally, the feedback mechanisms that help the College to improve its inputs are mainly the analysis of any survey given to our stakeholders to measure their satisfaction and ask for input on our program curriculum (i.e. exiting undergraduate surveys, alumni surveys, and employer surveys). The mechanisms that help the faculty to improve the transformation process in the classroom are: (a) the use of student teaching evaluations feedback (i.e. the ENMU evaluation); (b) the reporting and analysis of each course assessment tools (e.g., tests, homework, case studies, research projects, etc.); (c) the use of peer observation in the classroom; and (d) the writing of an "reflective essay" on teaching performance for the faculty evaluation process.

There are two levels of assessment activities that the College of Business is concerned with in this document: Course Level Assessment (i.e. transformation process activities); and Program Level Assessment (i.e. output activities, and feedback activities). The academic programs of the COB are the BBA – Bachelor of Business Administration, the BSIS – Bachelor of Science in Information Systems, and the MBA – Master of Business Administration.

COURSE LEVEL ASSESSMENT

Course level assessment is concerned with the measurement of learning achieved by students in each course: What knowledge was learned? What skills were developed or improved? What attitudes were changed? The individual faculty member is responsible for ensuring a high level of quality teaching in each course, and that a common body of learning outcomes is achieved. The COB faculty member must establish clear and rational course learning outcomes that are supported by the course content and learning materials, and utilize effective course assessment tools that relate to and measure the course learning outcomes. Beyond the faculty's own professionalism, the COB must follow learning outcomes mandates of the New Mexico Collegiate Business Articulation Consortium, the Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs, and the state government of New Mexico.

Establishment of Course Level Assessment

At this point COB faculty use their professional judgment on how to assess the effectiveness of their teaching based on data they collect from each of their assigned courses during the academic year.

Other mechanisms that help the faculty to improve their classroom performance are the: (a) use of the ENMU student teaching evaluation; (b) use of peer observations reports; and (c) writing of a "reflective essay" on teaching performance for the faculty evaluation process.

Reporting of Course Level Assessment

Each faculty member will provide a 'narrative' of (a) what they learned from their course level assessment procedure and (b) how they implemented changes in their instruction to improve their classroom performance. This narrative (with or without supporting data analysis) will be submitted as part of either (1) the faculty member's FEC Review File (for tenure-track faculty and resource faculty) or (2) the faculty member's APR document (for tenured faculty).

PROGRAM LEVEL ASSESSMENT

Program level assessment is concerned with the measurement of learning retained by students in each program, and with the measurement of satisfaction of students, alumni, and employers. The COB faculty as a whole must ensure the quality of each program curriculum, and know if it meets the needs of our primary stakeholders. Beyond the faculty's own professionalism, the COB must follow the Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs mandate to provide evidence of comparative data collection and analysis as well as evidence of feedback processes.

Establishment of Program Level Assessment

The COB faculty will establish their student learning outcomes for each undergraduate and graduate program. The COB faculty will direct the COB Assessment Coordinator to collect and analyze the desired student learning outcome data. At present these data items can include:

- Major Field Test for undergraduate business students overall results
- Major Field Test for undergraduate business students sub-field results
- BBA Capstone Team Presentation results
- BBA Capstone Team Simulation results
- Accounting Comprehensive Exam results
- BSIS Information Systems Analyst Exam results
- BSIS Capstone Team Presentation results
- MBA Comprehensive Exam results

The COB faculty will also establish their program effectiveness measures for the college. The COB faculty will direct the COB Assessment Coordinator to collect and analyze the desired program level data. At present these data items can include:

- COB undergraduate exit survey findings
- COB undergraduate alumni survey findings
- COB graduate alumni survey findings
- COB employer survey findings
- ENMU Graduating Senior Satisfaction Survey findings
- ENMU Alumni Satisfaction Survey findings

Reporting of Program Level Assessment

The report of all program level assessment data and analysis is contained in the annual *COB Assessment Report* which is written by the COB Assessment Coordinator.

ORGANIZATIONAL PROCESS

Selection of Assessment Coordinator

The Assessment Coordinator of the College of Business will be appointed each academic by the college Dean.

Duties of Assessment Coordinator

The duties of the COB Assessment Coordinator are to: (a) report to the Dean and to the Curriculum Committees on the findings of assessment data; (b) submit the annual *COB Assessment Report* to the university's Assessment Committee; and (c) act as an *ex officio* member of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Curriculum Committee.

Assessment Process of the Undergraduate and the Graduate Curriculum Committees

Membership on either Committee will be for a two year appointment. Either Committee will have an "**off year**" and an "**on year**" which are defined:

- An "off year" is when a catalog is not being reviewed for changes;
- An "on year" is when a catalog is being reviewed for changes.

When a Curriculum Committee is in its "**off year**" it will be required to examine the data findings provided by the Assessment Coordinator and to then write a report of suggested changes to the program curriculum. These reports will be reviewed by the COB faculty for input prior to the end of the academic year.

When a Curriculum Committee is in its "**on year**" it will be required to review COB curriculum for appropriateness and conformity with (a) ACBSP standards and (b) the report of findings from all assessment data analyses. The Committee will then make recommendations on all curriculum change proposals as per university policies and schedule practices.

Appendix B: Course Level Assessment Activities of the COB Faculty during AY 2010-11

From: Smith, Gene
Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2011 9:50 AM
To: Luhman, John
Subject: Assessment-Summer Courses

Good morning John:

For both ACCT202 and BUS453, the course assessment consisted of a pre-course and post-course test. My goal for each course was two fold:

- 1) The average class score on the post-course test should be at least 70%
- 2) The average class score on the post-course test should be 50% greater than the average class score on the pre-course test.

Results:

ACCT202

Average post-test score=68%

Improvement from pre-course test=70%

BUS453

Average post-test score=66%

Improvement from pre-course test=54%

Conclusion/Action Steps

ACCT202 was a WWW course. I provided a 15 minute video on each chapter during the semester supplementing the textbook authors. The next time the COB offers ACCT202 as a WWW course, I will also communicate directly with the students every two weeks through Skype.

BUS453 was a WWW course, also. There were only eight students in the class. BUS453 is taken during the student's last semester. It appears, two of the students did not give their best when taking the post-course assessment. If I teach the course again during a summer semester, I will re-emphasize the importance of the post-course assessment.

Gene Smith

ACCT 201 - Spring 2011 - Frashier

<u>Student</u>	<u>Assessment Test #1</u>	<u>Number Correct</u>	<u>Assessment Test #2</u>	<u>Letter Grade</u>
1		11	23	B
2		16	38	A
3		21	27	B
4		23	28	C
5		16	23	B
6		20	45	A
7		22	31	A
8		19	26	B
9		22	28	A
10		19	20	C
11		30	43	A
12		23	40	C
13		28	45	A
14		16	40	A
15		18	46	C
16		19	31	A
17		21	36	A
18		25	44	A
19		29	25	A
20		18	32	A
21		17	27	A
22		25	29	A
23		33	45	A
24		19	40	B
25		22	40	A
26		11	20	F
27		31	29	B
28		14	39	A
29		20	28	B
30		17	23	A
31		24	39	A
		649	1030	
		21.63	34.33	
Average Score		43.27%	68.67%	

Average score increased 25.4%

ACCT 201 - Summer 2011 - Frashier

Student

1	Number Missed	36	10	
	Number Correct	14	40	
	% Correct	28.00%	80.00%	Score increased 52%
2	number missed	35	31	
	number correct	15	19	
	% correct	30.00%	38.00%	Score increased 8%
3	number missed	34	13	
	number correct	16	37	
	% correct	32.00%	74.00%	Score increased 42%
4	Number Missed	24	11	
	Number Correct	26	39	
	Percentage Correct	52.00%	78.00%	Score increased 26%
5	Number missed	24	12	
	Number correct	26	38	
	Percentage correct	52.00%	76.00%	Score increased 26%
6	Number missed	36	20	
	Number correct	14	30	
	Percentage correct	28.00%	60.00%	Score increased 22 %
		37.00%	67.67%	Average score increased 30.67%

From: Stockmyer, John
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2011 4:19 PM
To: Luhman, John
Subject: RE: Assessment Report - Please participate!

Here's one from my MKT 201 – Principles of Marketing course:

Learning outcome #1

Based on poor student performance on the learning outcome dealing with an understanding of pricing and elasticity of demand, I have removed the in-class exercise I developed two years ago for my MKT 201 –Principles of Marketing class. The in-class exercise was developed and used in an attempt to give students hands-on experience with pricing decisions, in the hope that they would better understand the effects of price changes on quantity demanded/sales. This is a perennial problem area for Principles of Marketing students. Assessment scores for the pricing objective actually dropped last year, therefore, I am pulling the in-class exercise. This year I am spending more class time (approximately 45-60 minutes) discussing the basics of elasticity of demand. I also am giving a short quiz over pricing and elasticity concepts.

This change is also necessary due to the fact that the BBA curriculum (2011-2013) changed so that an Economics course is not automatically required of all students entering MKT 201. The additional class review time and additional incentive of the quiz is expected to boost scores in the area.

The results from this design change are pending.

John L. Stockmyer, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Marketing
Eastern New Mexico University
College of Business
575-562-2352
John.Stockmyer@enmu.edu

From: Luhman, John

Sent: Friday, September 16, 2011 3:02 PM

To: Burusnukul, Pattarapong; Cunha, Tim; Frashier, Ira.Kaye; Hayes, Paul; Hemley, David; Huybregts, Gerry; Maguire, Trish; Mitchell, Byron; Parboteeah, Veena; Ramakrishnan, Thiagarajan; Smith, Gene; Snipes, Michael; Stockly, Sue; Stockmyer, John; Taylor, Chris

Subject: Assessment Report - Please participate!

Hello Everyone,

It is that time of year when we need to get started on writing the annual COB Assessment Report as it is due by November 15th. Attached is a copy of last year's report.

I already have the BBA major field test results (which I shared with all of you recently). I already have the Accounting major data. And I have requested data from others. To that end, our graduate assistant Xiaoqian (Ann) is helping me.

In addition, I would like to request that you send in any short narratives you might have on course level assessment you completed or started last year. As a member of the FEC, I read over several reflective essays that contained discussions on how some of you have engaged in course assessment. I would like you to share that in our report.

Here are our five student learning outcomes which you can relate your course assessment to:

Learning Outcome 1: All BBA students demonstrate a substantial understanding of business knowledge and business analytical skills.

Learning Outcome 2: All BBA students demonstrate a substantial level of business professionalism and team problem-solving skills.

Learning Outcome 3: All Accounting major students demonstrate a substantial understanding of accounting knowledge and accounting analytical skills.

Learning Outcome 4: All BSIS students demonstrate a substantial understanding of information systems knowledge and analytical skills.

Learning Outcome 5: All MBA students demonstrate a substantial understanding of business knowledge and business analytical skills.

For example, I included this text in my Annual Performance Review which could be listed as relating to #1:

Based on the poor performance of our undergraduate students with the Management discipline questions in the BBA Major Field Test, I decided to implement multiple choice quizzes in all my MGT 313 and MGT 314 courses. The idea being that more practice with multiple choice type questions will help improve their performance with the Major Field Test. Results from this design change are pending.

Or this one could relate to #5:

Based on the poor performance of our graduate students with the MBA Comprehensive Integrative Experience, I decided to implement the teaching and use of case studies in my MGT 513 and MGT 501 courses. I provided readings on how to undertake and write a case study analysis, and I required all students to complete two case study reports for MGT 513 and one case study report for MGT 501. Results from this design change are pending.

Thank you for your time.

John

Appendix C: BBA Major Field Test Results for AY 10-11

Fall 2010

Individual Scaled Scores

	Individual Percentile	
	Scaled Score Range	9/10 to 3/11
200	0	
195-199	0	
190-194	0	
185-189	0	
180-184	0	
175-179	0	
170-174	0	
165-169	1	85-65
160-164	1	75-65
155-159	2	65-50
150-154	2	50-40
145-149	3	35-25
140-144	3	20-15
135-139	1	10-5
130-134	0	
125-129	1	1
120-124	0	

Spring 2011

Individual Scaled Scores

	Individual Percentile	
	Scaled Score Range	9/10 to 3/11
200	0	
195-199	0	
190-194	0	
185-189	0	
180-184	1	95
175-179	2	90-95
170-174	1	90-85
165-169	3	85-65
160-164	3	75-65
155-159	2	65-50
150-154	8	50-40
145-149	5	35-25
140-144	3	20-15
135-139	1	10-5
130-134	2	5-1
125-129	1	1
120-124	0	

Group Scaled Score

Mean	Standard Deviation	Institutional Percentile 9/10 to 3/11
148	10	25
	n=14	

Group Scaled Score

Mean	Standard Deviation	Institutional Percentile 9/10 to 3/11
154	14	55
	n=32	

Institutional Percentile Weighted Average
Fall 10 & Spring 11

46

Group Sub-Field Indicators

	Mean Percent Correct	Institutional Percentile 9/10 to 3/11
Accounting	42	30
Economics	41	15
Management	54	15
Quantitative	41	40
Finance	42	35
Marketing	51	15
Legal/Social	54	20
Info Systems	51	50
International	51	25

Group Sub-Field Indicators

	Mean Percent Correct	Institutional Percentile 9/10 to 3/11
Accounting	50	65
Economics	43	25
Management	61	55
Quantitative	47	85
Finance	45	55
Marketing	56	40
Legal/Social	60	60
Info Systems	53	65
International	52	30

54
22
43
71
49
32
48
60
28

Appendix D: BBA Capstone Team Presentation Results AY 2010-2011

Fall 2010 Capstone Presentations

Average Score Per Item

Items	Teams	A	B	C	D					Item Average
A.1. Strategy		4.17	1.80	3.62	4.30					3.47
A.2. Marketing		4.50	2.10	2.50	4.30					3.35
A.3. Operations		3.16	2.25	2.25	3.67					2.83
A.4. Accounting		3.67	2.50	2.50	4.17					3.21
A.5. Economics		2.83	2.25	2.25	3.50					2.71
A.6. Finance		4.50	2.37	2.37	3.83					3.27
A.7. Integration		4.67	2.00	2.37	4.50					3.39
B.1. Text Slides		3.83	3.33	4.00	3.67					3.71
B.2. Graphs		4.17	3.12	3.60	3.67					3.64
B.3. Delivery Skills		4.00	3.00	3.43	3.17					3.40
B.4. Argument		4.50	2.12	3.00	3.50					3.28
B.5. Q & A		4.60	2.12	2.70	4.50					3.48
Team Average		4.05	2.41	2.88	3.90					3.31

Overall
Class
Average
3.31

Spring 2011 Capstone Presentations

Average Score Per Item

Items	Teams	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Item Average
A.1. Strategy	There is no data available for individual items per team. There is only the team average.									
A.2. Marketing										
A.3. Operations										
A.4. Accounting										
A.5. Economics										
A.6. Finance										
A.7. Integration										
B.1. Text Slides										
B.2. Graphs										
B.3. Delivery Skills										
B.4. Argument										
B.5. Q & A										
Team Average		2.50	3.10	3.20	3.20	3.30	2.50	4.30	4.40	3.31

Overall
Class
Average
3.31

Appendix E: BBA Capstone Team Presentation Rubric

BUS 453 — BUSINESS STRATEGY & POLICY

**Capstone Team Presentation
Evaluation Form**

Evaluator Name: _____ Team Name: _____

Rating System

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Cannot Determine
5	4	3	2	1	X

A. Demonstration of Business Knowledge						
A.1. The team members demonstrate a clear understanding of <i>strategic management</i> , specifically in relation to their team’s competitive advantage and their future prospects for growth.	5	4	3	2	1	X
A.2. The team members demonstrate a clear understanding of <i>marketing</i> principles, such as in relation to forecasting sales and promoting their product.	5	4	3	2	1	X
A.3. The team members demonstrate a clear understanding of <i>operations management</i> principles, such as in relation to inventory control and production management.	5	4	3	2	1	X
A.4. The team members demonstrate a clear understanding of <i>accounting</i> principles, such as in relation to cash flow management.	5	4	3	2	1	X
A.5. The team members demonstrate a clear understanding of <i>economic</i> principles, such as in relation to price elasticity.	5	4	3	2	1	X
A.6. The team members demonstrate a clear understanding of <i>finance</i> principles, such as in relation to developing an optimal financial structure.	5	4	3	2	1	X
A.7. The team members demonstrate a clear understanding of the importance of <i>integrating all business functions</i> in order to succeed in a complex market environment.	5	4	3	2	1	X

B. Demonstration of Business Skills						
B.1. The team members demonstrate an exceptional level of professionalism in the textual and visual style of their electronic slides.	5	4	3	2	1	X
B.2. The team members demonstrate an exceptional level of professionalism in the quality of their numerical graphs and figures in their electronic slides.	5	4	3	2	1	X
B.3. The team members demonstrate an exceptional level of professionalism in the delivery of their presentation (i.e. verbal skills and non-verbal skills).	5	4	3	2	1	X
B.4. The team members demonstrate an exceptional level of persuasiveness in the delivery of their presentation (i.e. they made their argument well).	5	4	3	2	1	X
B.5. The team members demonstrate an exceptional level of persuasiveness during their question and answer time.	5	4	3	2	1	X

C. Print Comments if Any:

Appendix F: BBA Team Simulation Results AY 2010-2011

GLO-BUS Learning Assurance Report

Industry 1 BUS 453 Fall 2010

Percentile Ranking vs. All Simulation Players Worldwide Over the Last 12 Months

(Population statistics: Students = 23,682, Companies = 6,988, Schools = 210, Countries = 19)

	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7	A8	A9	Average
1	34	47	12	52	44	55	14	46	67	41
2	39	47	63	52	44	55	14	46	67	47
3	89	62	63	52	44	55	14	46	67	55
4	39	91	63	79	48	74	87	91	71	71
5	11	13	89	61	46	60	41	50	40	46
6	39	47	19	52	44	55	14	46	67	43
7	54	47	63	79	48	74	87	91	71	68
8	92	91	89	79	48	74	87	91	71	80
9	54	32	89	61	46	60	41	50	40	53
10	6	5	19	79	48	74	87	91	71	53
11	89	99	34	59	69	54	69	72	46	66
12	89	91	99	59	69	54	69	72	46	72
13	66	47	19	61	46	60	41	50	40	48
14	11	10	89	61	46	60	41	50	40	45
Class Average	51	52	58	63	49	62	50	64	57	56

GLO-BUS Learning Assurance Report

Industry 2 BUS 453 Spring 2011

Percentile Ranking vs. All Simulation Players Worldwide Over the Last 12 Months

(Population statistics: Students = 27,560, Companies = 8,149, Schools = 223, Countries = 18)

	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7	A8	A9	Average
1	91	93	57	79	18	82	67	94	38	69
2	91	93	99	79	18	82	67	94	38	73
3	91	93	99	84	60	82	53	94	61	80
4	19	11	57	32	31	18	9	46	65	32
5	21	28	57	25	34	45	6	53	66	37
6	38	28	33	32	40	16	14	54	35	32
7	62	57	57	32	31	18	9	46	65	42
8	94	102	57	67	21	57	66	84	32	64
9	67	63	57	67	21	57	66	84	32	57
10	34	57	83	53	83	51	23	41	80	56
11	38	63	83	60	24	20	17	83	79	52
12	34	15	33	53	83	51	23	41	80	46
13	102	96	83	84	60	82	53	94	61	79
14	67	63	99	67	21	57	66	84	32	62
15	97	99	33	53	83	51	23	41	80	62
16	21	33	83	84	60	82	53	94	61	63
17	16	17	83	25	34	45	6	53	66	38
18	67	93	83	67	21	57	66	84	32	63
19	21	33	99	25	34	45	6	53	66	42

20	53	47	83	32	40	16	14	54	35	42
21	53	63	83	60	24	20	17	83	79	54
22	53	47	99	25	34	45	6	53	66	48
23	38	28	8	60	24	20	17	83	79	40
24	91	93	99	79	18	82	67	94	38	73
25	38	47	57	67	21	57	66	84	32	52
26	34	63	99	84	60	82	53	94	61	70
27	91	93	99	79	18	82	67	94	38	73
28	53	33	19	32	40	16	14	54	35	33
29	34	13	99	60	24	20	17	83	79	48
30	44	38	83	32	31	18	9	46	65	41
31	62	57	83	32	31	18	9	46	65	45
32	21	17	83	32	40	16	14	65	35	35
Class Average	54	56	73	54	37	47	33	70	56	53

LEGEND

A1: Leadership Skills

Assessment of the individual's leadership and independent thinking skills. Based co-managers' answers for items 4,5,6,7,10 on the peer evaluation exercise.

A2: Collaboration & Teamwork

Assessment of the individual's collaborative skills, teamwork, and ability to work well with others. Based on co-managers' answers for items 1,3,8,9,11 on the peer evaluation exercise.

A3: Financial Analysis

Assessment of the individual's skills in analyzing financial ratios and financial statements. Based on the individual's answers to selected questions from Quiz #2.

A4: Financial Management

Assessment of the group's ability to apply financial management principles. Based on the company's ROE, credit rating, and stock price performances.

A5: Operations Management

Assessment of the group's ability to manage production operations and control production costs. Based on the company's production cost competitiveness as measured by production costs per unit (adjusted for product quality and product line breadth).

A6: Marketing Management

Assessment of the group's ability to effectively market the company's product and control marketing costs. Based on the company's market image and marketing costs per unit sold.

A7: Human Resources Management

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.

A8: Strategic Analysis & Planning

Assessment of the group's strategic planning and strategic thinking skills. Based on scores achieved on the 3-Y Strategic Plan exercise.

A9: Corporate Social Responsibility

Assessment of group's awareness of and commitment to operating the company in a socially responsible manner and being a "model corporate citizen". Based on the % of company revenues spent on the six corporate social responsibility initiatives.

Appendix G: Information Systems Capstone Team Presentation Rubric and Scores

	1	2	3	4
ORGANIZATION	The presentation is disorganized and confusing.	The presentation was coherent, but required more organization.	The material is mostly presented in a logical, fluid, and coherent manner.	All material is presented in a logical, fluid, and coherent manner.
SUBJECT KNOWLEDGE	Students demonstrate a minimal understanding of the material.	Students demonstrate an understanding of the material.	Students demonstrate a detailed understanding of the material.	Students show a highly detailed understanding of material.
CONTENT	Presentation has four or more spelling errors and/or grammatical errors.	Presentation has three misspellings and/or grammatical errors.	Presentation has no more than two misspellings and/or grammatical errors.	Presentation has no misspellings and/or grammatical errors.
USE of MEDIA	Media only minimally aids in the audience's understanding of the topic.	Media aids somewhat in the audience's understanding of the topic.	Media serves as an effective aid in the audience's understanding of the topic.	Media serves as a highly effective aid in the audience's understanding of the topic.
GRAPHICS	Students used superfluous or no graphics.	Students occasionally used graphics that rarely support text or presentation.	Students' graphics relate to text or presentation.	Students' graphics explain and reinforce text or presentation.
SUPPORT	Presentation did not address relevant issues and did not provide support for major points.	Presentation mostly addressed relevant issues and provided adequate support for major points.	Presentation addressed relevant issues and provided support for major points.	Presentation addressed highly relevant issues and provided excellent support for major points.
CREATIVITY	Material and issues were not presented in an innovative and interesting manner.	Material and issues were mostly presented in an innovative and interesting manner.	Material and issues were presented in an innovative and interesting manner.	Material and issues were presented in a highly innovative and interesting manner.
COLLABORATION	The team did not work well together.	The team worked well together.	The team worked really well together.	The team worked extremely well together.

Spring 2011	TEAM 1	TEAM 2		
ORGANIZATION	3	4		
SUBJECT KNOWLEDGE	3	3		
CONTENT	4	4		
USE of MEDIA	4	4		
GRAPHICS	4	4		
SUPPORT	4	4		
CREATIVITY	3	3		
COLLABORATION	2	4		
TOTAL	27	30		
AVERAGE	3.38	3.75		

Appendix H: ISA Exam Spring 2011 Results

Center for Computing Education Research A Division of the ICCP Education Foundation						
Model Curriculum Skill Analysis Eastern New Mexico University Spring 2011						
Information Systems 2002 Curriculum Standard - Exit Exam (05/01/2011 thru 05/31/2011)						
Student	Raw Score	Percent Score	Institution Rank	Institution Percentile	Overall Rank	Overall Percentile
1	158	61	3	75	111	57
2	106	41	6	38	191	26
3	173	67	1	100	67	74
4	168	65	2	88	82	68
5	74	29	9	0	234	9
6	93	36	7	25	208	19
7	118	46	5	50	174	32
8	89	34	8	13	214	17
9	136	53	4	63	150	42
Average						38
	LOCAL	ALL				
Mean	123.89	133.79				
Standard Deviation	34.45	11.38				
Range	74-173	43-195				

Key:
 Raw Score: Actual count out of 258 items over two exams
 Percent Score: Percentage calculated Raw Score/258 *100
 institution Rank: Rank of person within school's cohort of students
 Institution Percentile: Percentile location within school's cohort of students
 Overall Rank: Rank of student within all schools testing in this version of the exam
 Overall Percentile: Percentile location of student within all students in all universities in this version of the exam

Appendix I: MBA Integrative Experience Instructions and Rubric

Scoring Criteria Boeing Case (Spring 2011) & Nokia Case (Summer 2011)

The assignment:

As newly minted MBAs, the students were asked by management to perform a strategic analysis on the above company starting in 2010 and looking 3 -5 years into the future. Complete the analysis using the strategic process model from the text, one provided by the instructor (Attachment A), or one available from another source (to be cited by the student). You also have the Guide to Case Analysis available from the simulation web page.

Other information:

Use the APA style manual for paper structure and the referencing of materials –title page, Table of Contents, figures, tables, etc. Good cases in the past have been 30+pages in length not including appendices. Use the model in the text, that provided by the instructor, or a model developed by another author. This is to provide structure and to keep you on track.

Grading:

The authors of the cases will remain anonymous to the graders until the grade has been assigned. The case is to be graded Pass/Fail. The graduate faculty will be combined into groups of three (3), and each group will be randomly assigned roughly the same number of papers, that number being determined by the number of faculty groups and the number of papers submitted. The three readers will have to agree on the grade. If agreement cannot be reached, then the dean will mediate. Students are also required to have an oral interview primarily to assist in determining that they are the author of the paper. The graders/readers of the papers will be interviewing the writers of their assigned papers.

Attached is a grading rubric. Please note that it is divided into 2 parts: (a) Demonstration of ability to apply the skills and knowledge developed through courses taken in the MBA program to develop a strategic plan for a publicly listed company; and (b) Demonstration of the technical skills required to prepare a well written and documented report.

Scoring Criteria for the MBA Integrative Experience

Case: _____ Pass / Fail

Weight	Area Points:	(0)	(1)	(2)	(4)	(5)	Weighted Points
(.90)	Demonstration of Application:	No evidence	Minimal Evidence of understanding a process model and of the company.	Demonstrated understanding of a model and the company but omitted some steps.	Demonstrated understanding of the process model and of the company, and completed all steps.	Demonstrated exceptional understanding of a process model and the company, and completed all steps.	
.15	Strategy Formulation (Overall)						
.10	a. SWOT Analysis						
.10	b. Select Appropriate strategy(-ies)						
.15	Strategy Implementation (Overall)						
.10	a. Timeline						
.10	b. Budgets						
.15	Strategy Evaluation and Control (Overall)						
.05	a. Feedback loops						
(.10)	Technical Skill:	Not acceptable	Acceptable with major revisions	Acceptable with minor revisions	Acceptable with no revisions	Exceptional	
.05	Presentation						
.05	Grammar						
						Total:	
Appropriate evidence of use of functional area knowledge and skills							
Y/N	1. Accounting						
Y/N	2. Business Research						
Y/N	3. Ethics, Law, and CSR						
Y/N	4. Managerial Economics						
Y/N	5. Managerial Finance						
Y/N	6. POM & Quant						
Y/N	7. Organizational Behavior						
Y/N	8. Marketing Management						
Y/N	9. MIS						