



Report of Outcomes Assessment Results

Institution Shepherd University

Academic Business Unit Department of Business Administration

Academic Year 2017/2018

Outcomes Assessment Plan

Is the outcomes assessment plan that you submitted to the IACBE still current or have you made changes?

The outcomes assessment plan that we have previously submitted is still current.

Changes have been made and the revised plan is attached.

We have made changes and the revised plan will be sent to the IACBE by: _____

Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2017/2018

Section I: Student Learning Assessment

Student Learning Assessment for: <i>Name of Program 1</i>	
Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes (Program ISLOs)	
<i>1. Students will demonstrate knowledge of general business principles and practices which align with generally accepted standards of business education.</i>	
<i>2. Students will develop and apply analytical and critical thinking skills to evaluate decision choices, challenges, ethical issues, technical capabilities, methods and procedures necessary to successfully assess business viability and sustainability.</i>	
<i>3. Students will develop an understanding of diversity and global enterprise.</i>	
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:
1. <i>Direct Measure 1</i> Satisfactory completion of capstone project: ISLOs 1, 2, 3	All students completing the major in business administration have achieved a satisfactory level of attainment (70%) or greater according to the assessment rubric for the written components of the capstone project.
2. <i>Direct Measure 2</i> ETS Major Field Test (MFT) in Business: ISLOs 1,2,3	The Shepherd University mean score on the ETS Major Field Test (MFT) in Business will equal or exceed the national mean score, and the Business component scores in the nine sub---categories evaluated in the MFT----- Accounting, Economics, Management, Quantitative Analysis, Finance, Marketing, Law, IS, and International—will exceed the lesser of the national mean score or 50%, whichever is the lesser of the two.

Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Indirect Measures:
<p>1. <i>Indirect Measure 1</i></p> <p>BADM Survey: Students' end-of-course evaluation for the Capstone Course (Composite score for the questions contained in the Student Learning Section wherein students express that a significantly high level of learning was attained in the class.) ISLOs 1,2</p>	<p>The minimum mean composite score of all business administration students will be a 4.0 on a 5.0 scale and at least 80% of all students will report a composite score of 4.0 or better.</p>
<p>2. <i>Indirect Measure 2</i></p> <p>Peer reviews of presentations in the culminating/capstone courses of the general business and individual concentrations. ISLOs 3.</p>	<p>Using the peer-evaluation rubric, 80% of students in the capstone courses will receive satisfactory (70% or greater) ratings from their classmates/peers on presentations.</p>
<p>Learning Assessment Results: <i>Shepherd University Dept of Business Administration</i></p>	
<p>Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:</p>	
<p>1. <i>Summary of Results for Direct Measure 1: 100% of students during the study period achieved a score greater than 70% on the capstone project.</i></p>	

IACBE 2018 report DM1.xlsx

DIRECT MEASURE #1: Faculty review s of presentations in capstone course

Standard: 100% of students receive score of 70% or greater

RESULT: 100% of students received scores above 73%

		AVERAGE	
		Faculty score	Faculty w ghtd
30%	Content	81.17	24.35
20%	Clarity	82.38	16.48
15%	Comprehension	85.06	12.76
15%	Preparedness	87.20	13.08
10%	Graphics	82.39	8.24
10%	Spelling & Grammar	90.07	9.01
TOTAL SCORE			83.91
Total Peer score by presentation			
	2018 Spring Team 1	81.00	
	2018 Spring Team 2	83.50	
	2018 Spring Team 3	74.75	
	2018 Spring Team 4	85.00	
	2018 Spring Team 5	78.75	
	2018 Spring Team 6	73.25	
	2018 Spring Team 7	95.00	
	2018 Spring Team 8	83.50	
	2018 Spring Team 9	84.50	
	2018 Spring Team 10	89.00	
	2018 Spring Team 11	95.85	
	2018 Spring Team 12	92.25	
	2017 Fall Team 1	89.25	
	2017 Fall Team 2	94.75	
	2017 Fall Team 3	81.25	
	2017 Fall Team 4	89.75	
	2017 Fall Team 5	85.00	
	2017 Fall Team 6	87.25	
	2017 Fall Team 7	87.50	
	2017 Fall Team 8	95.50	
	2017 Spring Team 1	92.75	
	2017 Spring Team 2	82.65	
	2017 Spring Team 3	95.25	
	2017 Spring Team 4	95.00	
	2017 Spring Team 5	87.75	
	2017 Spring Team 6	83.75	
	2017 Spring Team 7	80.75	
	2017 Spring Team 8	89.50	
	2017 Spring Team 9	90.25	
	2017 Spring Team 10	77.00	
	2017 Spring Team 11	79.00	
	MINIMUM SCORE	73.25	
	MAXIMUM SCORE	95.85	

2. Summary of Results for Direct Measure 2: The three-semester mean score (151) on the MFT did not meet the national mean of 152. The score was well within one standard deviation of the mean which was reported to be 10.3.. In the three semester measure, scores met the established standard in all but one category.

DIRECT MEASURE #2: Mean Score on ETS Major Field Test														
Standard: Shepherd University mean score on ETS MFT equal or exceed national mean score of 152, St Dev 10.3														
Result: Shepherd University mean score : 151.0 (Well within 1 STD of the mean)														
STUDENT MFT SCORES														
	SPR 2018	FALL 2017	SPR 2017	FALL 2016	SPR 2016									
1	179	172	193	161	177									
2	166	166	170	158	168									
3	166	166	167	154	166									
4	165	163	166	152	163	SUB-category Assessment								
5	162	162	166	151	162	Shepherd								
6	162	161	165	151	160	Standard:								
7	161	161	163	149	160									
8	161	159	162	147	158									
9	161	158	161	147	155									
10	159	157	161	147	154	Subcategory Mean Scores								
11	159	157	159	146	153						5-Semstr	Assesment	STANDARD	
						SPR 2016	FALL 2016	SPR 2017	Fall 2017	Spr 2018	MEAN	MEAN	MET	
12	158	156	159	146	153	ACCT	39	45	49	44	45	44.40	41.3	YES
13	158	153	159	145	152	ECON	39	36	42	44	40	40.20	39.6	YES
14	157	152	158	144	152	MANG	56	58	64	65	67	62.00	54.1	YES
15	157	152	158	141	150	QUANT	31	30	33	33	32	31.80	36.3	NO
16	157	152	157	140	148	FIN	38	37	46	45	44	42.00	42.3	NO
17	156	150	157	140	148	MRKT	56	50	55	56	57	54.80	54.9	YES
18	154	150	156	140	147	BLAW	63	40	55	52	49	51.80	59.4	YES
19	153	150	156	140	147	IS/IT	43	50	57	54	52	51.20	49.9	YES
20	153	149	156	139	147	INTL	41	48	44	42	45	44.00	40.1	YES
21	153	149	156	138	147									
22	153	147	156	138	146									
23	152	146	154	121	146	Subcategory Mean Scores								
24	152	145	152		146						3-Semstr	Assesment	STANDARD	
						SPR 2016	FALL 2016	SPR 2017	Fall 2017	Spr 2018	MEAN	MEAN	MET	
25	151	145	152		145	ACCT			49	44	45	46.00	41.3	YES
26	151	144	151		144	ECON			42	44	40	42.00	39.6	YES
27	150	143	151		143	MANG			64	65	67	65.33	54.1	YES
28	150	143	150		143	QUANT			33	33	32	32.67	36.3	NO
29	149	143	150		142	FIN			46	45	44	45.00	42.3	YES
30	147	139	150		142	MRKT			55	56	57	56.00	54.9	YES
31	145		149		141	BLAW			55	52	49	52.00	59.4	YES
32	143		149		141	IS/IT			57	54	52	54.33	49.9	YES
33	143		149		139	INTL			44	42	45	43.67	40.1	YES
34	141		149		137									
35	139		147		136									
36	139		147		134									
37	138		145		133									
38	137		145		129									
39	134		144		125									
40	134		143											
41	130		141											
42			140											
43			139											
44			136											
MEA	152.1	153.0	154.4	145.0	148.2									
OVERALL MEAN (5 semsters):					151.0									

NOTES: Progress is being made as the number of subcategories not being met (highlighted in red) is going down from Spring 2017 (5 categories) to Spring 2018 (2 category), the specified measure of the aggregate three semester ETS MFT measure equal or exceeding the national average is not met in one area. The weaker area is the quantitative score across all three semesters.

Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:

1. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 1: 100% of student mean scores reported exceed 4.0.*

INDIRECT MEASURE #1:		Student end-of-course evaluations of capstone course						
Standard:		At least 80% of End-of-course evaluations will report composite score of 4.0 or higher						
Result:		100% of semester mean scores in all student Learning categories exceed 4.0						
STUDENT COURSE EVALUATION SCORES								
Student Learning	Fall 17	Fall 17	SPR 2017	SPR 2017	FALL 2016	FALL 2016	3 Semester	
Questions	Section 1	Section 2	Section 1	Section 2	Section 1	Section 2	MEAN	
Q6	4.5	4.8	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.3	
Q7	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.3	
Q8	3.5	4.6	3.0	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.0	
Q9	4.3	4.4	3.7	4.1	4.6	4.0	4.2	
Q10	4.1	4.5	3.9	4.0	4.6	4.5	4.3	
Q11	4.1	4.3	3.4	4.2	4.7	4.1	4.1	
Q12	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.8	4.5	4.5	
Q13	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.8	4.5	4.5	
Q14	4.7	4.9	4.5	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	
Q15	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.5	
Q16	4.5	4.7	3.9	4.3	4.7	4.5	4.4	
Q17	4.6	4.7	4.3	4.4	4.8	4.7	4.6	
Q18	4.5	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.7	4.8	4.6	
Q19	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.5	4.4	
Q20	4.7	4.5	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.6	4.4	
Q21	4.5	4.7	3.8	4.4	4.8	4.6	4.5	
Q22	4.5	4.7	4.2	4.1	4.7	4.4	4.4	
Q23	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.0	4.7	4.4	4.4	
MEAN	4.4	4.6	4.1	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.4	
OVERALL MEAN (3 semesters): Fall 17, Spr17, Fall 16							4.4	
No evaluation conducted in Spring 2018								
IACBE 2018 Report IM1								

2. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 2: 100% of peer evaluations of student projects exceed 70 .*

Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes:

Intended Student Learning Outcomes	Learning Assessment Measures							
Program ISLOs	<i>Direct Measure 1</i>	<i>Direct Measure 2</i>			<i>Indirect Measure 1</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 2</i>		
	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...			Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...		
1. <i>Students will demonstrate knowledge of general business principles and practices which align with generally accepted standards of business education.</i>	MET	NOT MET			MET	MET		
2. <i>Students will develop and apply analytical and critical thinking skills to evaluate decision choices, challenges, ethical issues, technical capabilities, methods and procedures necessary to successfully assess business viability and sustainability.</i>	MET	NOT MET			MET	MET		
3. <i>Students will develop an understanding of diversity and global enterprise.</i>	MET	NOT MET			MET	MET		

Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:

1. *Course of Action 1: Further development of quantitative course work. Courses have been added in analytics and project management beginning with the Spring term 2017. The results of these curricular improvements will not be measurable until for several assessment cycles.*

2. *Course of Action 2: Adjustments have been made in faculty, both tenure-track and adjunct, that should produce measurable improvements in student outcomes. We believe that if the trends identified in the data continue (appendix 2), these scores will continue to improve.*

3. *Course of Action 3: Consider and review the application of more specific direct measures for quantitative targets.*

4. *Course of Action 4*

Section II: Operational Assessment (Note: Complete this section only if you received first-time accreditation or reaffirmation of accreditation after January 1, 2011.) SECTION NOT REQUIRED

Operational Assessment	
Intended Operational Outcomes	
1. <i>Intended Operational Outcome 1</i>	
2. <i>Intended Operational Outcome 2</i>	
3. <i>Intended Operational Outcome 3</i>	
4. <i>Intended Operational Outcome 4</i>	
5. <i>Intended Operational Outcome 5</i>	
6. <i>Intended Operational Outcome 6</i>	
7. <i>Intended Operational Outcome 7</i>	
Assessment Measures/Methods for Intended Operational Outcomes:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Operational Assessment Measures/Methods:
1. <i>Operational Assessment Measure/Method 1</i> Intended Operational Outcomes Assessed by this Measure: <i>Outcomes List</i>	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Measure/Method 1</i>
2. <i>Operational Assessment Measure/Method 2</i> Intended Operational Outcomes Assessed by this Measure: <i>Outcomes List</i>	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Measure/Method 2</i>
3. <i>Operational Assessment Measure/Method 3</i> Intended Operational Outcomes Assessed by this Measure: <i>Outcomes List</i>	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Measure/Method 3</i>
4. <i>Operational Assessment Measure/Method 4</i> Intended Operational Outcomes Assessed by this Measure: <i>Outcomes List</i>	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Measure/Method 4</i>

5. <i>Operational Assessment Measure/Method 5</i> Intended Operational Outcomes Assessed by this Measure: <i>Outcomes List</i>	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Measure/Method 5</i>
6. <i>Operational Assessment Measure/Method 6</i> Intended Operational Outcomes Assessed by this Measure: <i>Outcomes List</i>	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Measure/Method 6</i>
7. <i>Operational Assessment Measure/Method 7</i> Intended Operational Outcomes Assessed by this Measure: <i>Outcomes List</i>	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Measure/Method 7</i>

Summary of Results from Implementing Operational Assessment Measures/Methods:

1. *Summary of Results for Measure/Method 1*
2. *Summary of Results for Measure/Method 2*
3. *Summary of Results for Measure/Method 3*
4. *Summary of Results for Measure/Method 4*
5. *Summary of Results for Measure/Method 5*
6. *Summary of Results for Measure/Method 6*
7. *Summary of Results for Measure/Method 7*

Summary of Achievement of Intended Operational Outcomes:

Intended Operational Outcomes	Operational Assessment Measures/Methods							
	<i>Operational Assessment Measure/ Method 1</i>	<i>Operational Assessment Measure/ Method 2</i>	<i>Operational Assessment Measure/ Method 3</i>	<i>Operational Assessment Measure/ Method 4</i>	<i>Operational Assessment Measure/ Method 5</i>	<i>Operational Assessment Measure/ Method 6</i>	<i>Operational Assessment Measure/ Method 7</i>	<i>Operational Assessment Measure/ Method 8</i>
	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...
1. <i>Intended Operational Outcome 1</i>								
2. <i>Intended Operational Outcome 2</i>								

3. <i>Intended Operational Outcome 3</i>								
4. <i>Intended Operational Outcome 4</i>								
5. <i>Intended Operational Outcome 5</i>								
6. <i>Intended Operational Outcome 6</i>								
7. <i>Intended Operational Outcome 7</i>								

Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Operational Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:

1. *Course of Action 1*
2. *Course of Action 2*
3. *Course of Action 3*
4. *Course of Action 4*