Excerpt from AACSB Fifth Year Maintenance of Accreditation Report
College of Business, Eastern Michigan University
Submitted 14 December 2009

Assessment Tools and Procedures

The COB has six degree programs for which assessment is required: the BBA, MBA, MSA, MSIS, MSHROD and MSIMC. The full assessment plan for each including the learning goals, assessment plans and rubrics, ongoing schedule and curriculum mapping linking goals to courses is provided in Appendix VIII. The responsibility for assessment resides in either college-wide faculty committees or specific departmental faculty committees. The COB hired a full-time "Data Analyst" in 2007 to accumulate and organize assessment data. The assessment is primarily course embedded using direct assessment methods. Not all learning goals in each program have been assessed to date. However, some have been assessed in each program and the feedback loop has been closed for the goals assessed.

Prior to adopting the AACSB changes requiring the establishment and assessment of learning goals, the COB had a system of assessment based on a "Competency Model". Every program and major had a list of competencies. A variety of direct and indirect methods were used to assess whether or not students achieved these competencies. For example, when the undergraduate supply chain management major and minor were being developed, the faculty formulated a list of competencies that they thought would be appropriate. The competencies were then shared with the supply chain management advisory board members. Based on their input, a final list of competencies was established. These competencies were then grouped to determine the courses to be included in the major and minor. Advisory board members were again solicited for input and the final major and minor were submitted for university approval. This example is used to illustrate that assessment has had a long history in the COB and has been used to not only develop new majors, minors and programs, but to assess whether or not students achieved the "competencies".

BBA Assessment Status

The College of Business Assessment and Curriculum Committee (COBACC) is responsible for the assessment of the undergraduate BBA program. This committee consists of eight members, two from each department representing eight disciplines. The committee was initially established over ten years ago as a sub-committee of the Faculty Academic Committee (FAC). In AY 2005-2006 the committee became independent from the FAC. Members are elected for two year terms. The undergraduate learning goals were drafted and approved by COBACC after input was solicited from all faculty members.

The committee has established six learning goals and has assessed three of them to date and will have assessed all of them by the end of 2009. Following is an example of the outcomes

assessment and plan of action for one undergraduate learning goal. The results of all learning goal assessments are provided in Appendix VIII.

As an example, two learning goals were assessed in MGMT 490 Business Policy in Winter 2009. The learning goals, Interdisciplinary Business Knowledge and Global Knowledge in Business were assessed by using a multiple choice exam. The multiple choice scores were below the 70% threshold and were highly variable. Preliminary analysis suggests that the variable results may be due to adding the questions at the end of the exam. Before the next MGMT 490 assessment of these goals, COBACC will work with the MGMT 490 faculty in the beginning of the term to select questions. Therefore the questions will be a normal part of the testing and the instruction in the course itself. Adding questions late in the semester may unfairly indicate that the students did not learn the material.

In academic year 2006-2007, prior to the final determination of the BBA learning goals and assessment plan, COBACC assessed the core statistics course, DS 265. Based on examinations, student surveys, student lack of success in the course and assessed difficulties in courses dependent on DS 265 as a prerequisite, COBACC did a thorough review of not only the course, but also the math course prerequisites for it. As a result of its review, COBACC "closed the loop" and changed the math prerequisites and developed a new master syllabus for DS 265.

MBA Assessment Status

The Continuous Improvement MBA Committee (CIMBAC) is responsible for the assessment of the MBA program. The committee consists of ten members, three members from both the accounting and finance and management departments and two members from the computer information systems and marketing department. The committee was initially established over ten years ago as a sub-committee of the Faculty Academic Committee (FAC). In AY 2005-2006 the committee became independent from the FAC. Members are elected for two year terms. The name of the committee demonstrates that continuous improvement has been an objective of the committee for over ten years. Initially, a competency model was the basis for the assessment of the MBA program. A variety of direct and indirect methods were used in that process. The current learning goals were drafted and approved by CIMBAC after input was solicited from all faculty members.

In AY 2006-2007, CIMBAC began a comprehensive review of the MBA program. Initially, the committee reviewed the required foundation courses. One of the concerns was that there were too many credits required. Competitor programs were examined and based on CIMBAC's review and faculty input, the foundation course requirements were changed. LAW 503 Legal Principles and POM 503 Production/Operations Management were dropped as requirements and DS 501 Statistics was added. The core courses and electives were reviewed next. Competitor programs were again examined and specific attention was paid to the COB mission statement. The mission statement specifically cites "global" and "innovative". CIMBAC substantively changed the curriculum. Core courses were reduced by three credits and adding a fourth elective. Two of the six electives were restricted, one to be selected from a new category entitled "innovation" and a second from a new category entitled "analytic reasoning". In addition, IB 610 Globalization and Business Environment was added to the core. Faculty members were

invited to submit courses for consideration in the two restricted elective categories. As part of the application process for these courses, faculty members had to submit an assessment plan, agree to assess the course the first time offered as a restricted elective and to continue the assessment in the course every two years. CIMBAC has approved seven courses for innovation and six course for analytic. The MBA assessment plan in Appendix VIII shows the full schedule of assessment in the core and restricted elective courses. The faculty as a whole was solicited for input and then voted to approve the new curriculum in AY 2007-2008. The new learning goals and assessment plan were also approved by CIMBAC in that year.

The committee has established six learning goals with some multiple parts. Oral and written communication skills is one learning goal with two separate parts to assess. The same is the case for critical thinking and analytic skills (each separately assessed) and strategic and innovative thinking skills (each assessed separately). The committee has assessed all six of the goals and the multiple parts to date. The results of the assessment are provided in Appendix VIII.

In academic year 2008-2009, CIMBAC addressed feedback from the ETS test and general concerns of the faculty regarding the performance of our MBA students. They reviewed GMAT total scores including quantitative and verbal sub-scores, TOEFL scores and GPA's. They discovered a link between relatively low performance by American students associated with lower quantitative GMAT sub-scores and relatively low performance by international students associated with lower verbal GMAT sub-scores. There was also an association between relatively lower performance and those students who were conditionally admitted using an index. The index was computed as follows: 200 x GPA plus GMAT. A conditional admit was granted if the score was 950 points. As a result of this review and faculty input CIMBAC approved changing the MBA admission requirements, effective fall 2009, to:

1. Unconditional Admission. 2.75 minimum undergraduate GPA (total or last half of undergraduate study, up from 2.5) and a GMAT score of 450 or higher (minimum 20 verbal and 24 quantitative, previously there were no sub-score minimums).
2. Conditional Admission. Applicants whose undergraduate GPA or GMAT score is lower than what the business school normally considers acceptable, but who show promise of success in the program by other means may be conditionally admitted. In practice, the index score that is computed requires a score of 1,000 points with a minimum GPA of 2.5 and 400 GMAT (minimum 20 verbal and 24 quantitative). The computation is: GPA x 200 plus GMAT score. Thus, a student with a 2.5 GPA and a GMAT score of 500 would be admitted. (200 x 2.5 plus 500 = 1,000). In addition, the GPA for 12 credit hours of 500/600 level courses at EMU cannot be used as a substitute for the undergraduate GPA.
3. International student TOEFL requirement. In addition to requirements for unconditional or conditional admission, international students must have a TOEFL score of 550 (paper), 213 (computer) or 80 (iBT internet) with a minimum sub-score of 20 for reading, writing, listening and speaking. Previously, there was no minimum for the sub-scores of the TOEFL.

CIMBAC closed the loop and as a result, the admission standards for the MBA have been increased.

MSA Assessment Status

The accounting discipline assessment committee is responsible for the assessment of the MSA program. The committee consists of three members elected by the accounting faculty. This is a long-standing committee. Members are elected for two year terms. The learning goals were drafted by the committee and approved by the accounting faculty.

The accounting discipline has established four learning goals with some multiple parts, and will have assessed each of them by the end of 2009. The learning goals are assessed using direct methods in cases embedded in three courses. The full assessment plan is provided in Appendix VIII.

MSHROD Assessment Status

The MSHROD program has been conducting assessment for over 20 years. The learning goals of the MSHROD program were developed and approved by faculty with input from the department advisory board and alumni. They have been revised over the years. The faculty member that teaches the practicum class is responsible for collecting assessment data and compiling an assessment report that is shared with MSHROD faculty and the department head. The assessment data comes from the portfolio interviews with each graduating student. Each graduating student meets with the faculty member teaching the practicum class plus one additional faculty member chosen in consultation with the student and the teacher. The student is also required to put together a portfolio that includes samples of course work done in the MSHROD program that illustrates that the student has met each of the learning goals of the program. The student selects the specific assignment(s) and writes a narrative explaining how the assignment(s) illustrate that the student has met each learning goal. In the student's portfolio interview the student has to explain their portfolio selections, answer any questions from the faculty, and they receive feedback on their portfolio. The faculty in the interview use a rubric developed and approved by the MSHROD faculty to evaluate the students success in meeting the learning goals.

The department has established four program learning goals. All of these goals are assessed each fall and winter through the student portfolio interview process. After the winter assessment each year, a report is compiled of the fall and winter assessment and the outcomes are shared with the MSHROD faculty. Follow-up actions are discussed and agreed to by the faculty. The results of the winter 2009 assessment are provided in Appendix VIII.

As an example, the Change Management Knowledge and skills learning goal was assessed in the capstone course MGMT 688 Practicum in Human Resource Management and Organizational Development in winter 2009. Two faculty members reviewed portfolio essays and evaluated student presentations in their portfolio meeting. 100% of the students met or exceeded the goal. The results suggest that the faculty members who teach MGMT 602 Theories and Techniques of Organizational Development have been effective teaching students how to use diagnostic techniques to identify organizational issues and plan appropriate interventions to address those issues, and to do so with students working in teams. In the future, faculty members will continue

to focus on change models in MGMT 602 and other core courses such as MGMT 615 Organizational Design and Strategy.

MSIS Assessment Status

The computer information systems curriculum committee is responsible for the assessment of the MSIS program. The committee consists of three members elected by the department faculty. This is a long-standing committee. Members are elected for two year terms. The learning goals were drafted by the committee and approved by the department faculty.

The department has established four learning goals and has completed an initial assessment of all of them in the capstone course IS 696 Enterprise Information Systems Integration in spring 2009. The learning goals are assessed using direct methods embedded in the final capstone course. Students are required to do a project as part of the requirements for the course. The results of the winter 2009 assessment are provided in Appendix VIII.

MSIMC Assessment Status

The interdisciplinary integrated marketing communication steering committee is responsible for the assessment of the MSIMC program. The committee consists of five members teaching in the program. This committee was formed at the time the IMC program was developed in 2006. The learning goals were drafted by the committee and approved by all faculty members teaching in the program.

The faculty members have established four learning goals with some multiple parts and assessed two to date. The learning goals are assessed using direct methods embedded in multiple courses. The results of the initial assessment are provided in Appendix VIII.