



<b>Program:</b> <u>Master of Business Administration</u>	<b>Completed By:</b> <u>Benoy Joseph</u>
<b>Department:</b> <u>College of Business Administration</u>	<b>Date:</b> <u>5/31/2006</u>

**Goal 1: Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge and integrative application of core business concepts to managerial decision making.**

Outcomes	Research Methods	Findings	Review	Actions
<i>Direct Assessment:</i> Students must score a minimum of 60% in the tests of knowledge of core business courses in the MBA program.	<p>Custom-designed tests, covering core subjects, were administered in the capstone business strategy course in Spring 2003, Sp/Su 2004, and Fall 2004.</p> <hr/> <p><b>2006: Tests were improved and administered in Fall 05 and Spring 06 semesters.</b></p>	<p>Fall 04 overall mean score: 53% (vs. 58% in Spr/Su 04). Scores were lowest for finance, human resources, and management of innovation &amp; technology; highest for accounting, international business, and marketing.</p> <hr/> <p><b>2006: Overall mean scores declined from 2004 to Fall '05 (44%; n=26). Spring 06 results are being analyzed.</b></p>	<p>Decline in average scores is puzzling and may be due to changes in test items from 2004. Faculty will analyze data in the Fall 2005 semester. Low scores are also due to lack of incentives for students to prepare and perform well in the test, and the time between taking the course and the test.</p> <hr/> <p><b>2006: Decline in scores attributed to small sample size, timing of test, and lack of incentives to do well. Faculty will explore merits of other assessment tools.</b></p>	<p>Test items from core areas are being reviewed and tests may be revised further. Embedded measures and improved rubrics may be considered for 2005-06 cycle. Waiving of some foundation courses may be revisited (this may explain low scores in finance). Consistency in domain of material covered by various instructors across sections of the same course (e.g., innovation and technology) must be monitored.</p> <hr/> <p><b>2006: Actions are being delayed until fall 2006.</b></p>



<p><i>Indirect Assessment:</i> Students' ratings of satisfaction with courses, curriculum, and services will be at the mean of ratings among peer schools.</p>	<p>Exit surveys of MBA graduates were collected in Dec 2003 and May 2004, pooled (n=80) and analyzed by EBI.</p> <hr/> <p><b>2006: Focus groups will be conducted with off-campus MBA students in summer term. Exit surveys will be conducted in 2006-07.</b></p>	<p>CSU ranked higher than average for: course availability; overall satisfaction with the program; fellow students; and facilities and computing resources. Advising quality was at average. Rankings below average were for use of technology; ethical and social issues; breadth of curriculum; and satisfaction with electives.</p>	<p>Actions were recommended for selected areas; other items are being studied for curriculum review (e.g., ethics coverage is stronger at CSU than at other schools, but the course is introduced very early in the program; exit surveys happen at the very end). Electives are limited, but curriculum review will be undertaken.</p>	<p>New information systems course may be offered in a revised MBA curriculum (already implemented in the new Executive MBA program). Regular MBA curriculum will be revised beginning in the fall 2005 semester.</p>
--	---	--	---	--



**Goal 2: Students will be able to communicate effectively in writing and in oral presentations.**

Outcomes	Research Methods	Findings	Review	Actions
<p>Students must score at a "proficient" level for written reports and assignments in the business strategy capstone course.</p>	<p>Scoring rubric used to rate quality of written work ranging from "exemplary" and "proficient" to "marginal" and "unacceptable."</p>	<p>Spring 2004: 80% rated "proficient;" 20% rated "exemplary."</p> <hr/> <p><b>Fall 2005: 18% rated "exemplary;" 59% "proficient," 18% "unacceptable."</b></p> <p>Spring 2006: Data being analyzed.</p>	<p>MBA students display a satisfactory level of proficiency in writing business reports. Some variance is noted among non-native speakers of English in ability to express thoughts clearly in writing.</p> <hr/> <p><b>2006: Decline in scores attributed to tougher grading standards among new faculty in the capstone courses, and small increases in enrollment of international students (14% were non-native speakers of English).</b></p>	<p>No significant actions taken; students scoring low on the verbal portion of the GMAT test are required to take remedial writing/speaking courses.</p> <hr/> <p><b>2006: Curriculum committee has recommended raising minimum admission standards (e.g., TOEFL scores for international students and GMAT scores for all graduate business programs).</b></p>
<p>Students must score at a "proficient" level for oral presentations made in the business strategy capstone course</p>	<p>Scoring rubric used to rate quality of oral presentations ranging from "exemplary" and "proficient" to "marginal" and "unacceptable"</p>	<p>Spring 2004: 38% rated "exemplary;" 54% rated "proficient."</p> <hr/> <p><b>Fall 2005: 14% rated "exemplary;" 64% "proficient;" and 5% unacceptable."</b></p>	<p>Strong levels of proficiency due probably to good preparation in the GAD 515 course and/or significant professional experience with oral presentations.</p> <hr/> <p><b>See explanation for written communications above.</b></p>	<p>Continue to emphasize high standards in expectations described in course syllabi.</p>



Goal 3: Students will be able to demonstrate critical thinking skills in business decision making.				
Outcomes	Research Methods	Findings	Review	Actions
Direct Assessment: Students must score at a "good" or "acceptable" level in analyzing business problems and cases in the business capstone course.	Scoring rubric used to rate critical thinking and reasoning skills, ranging from "good" and "acceptable" to "poor."	<p>Spr 2003 and Fall 2004: More than 90% of students were "good;" or "acceptable." Ten percent were rated "poor."</p> <hr/> <p><b>Fall 2005: 82% rated "good" or "acceptable;" 18% rated "unacceptable."</b></p> <p><b>2006: Being analyzed.</b></p>	<p>Graduating BBA students demonstrate acceptable levels of critical thinking and reasoning skills for business. Scoring rubric's application to business is a minor concern.</p> <hr/> <p><b>2006: Decline in student quality and new instructors in capstone courses with tougher grading standards are possible explanations.</b></p>	Continue to encourage students to think critically about business problems and solutions. An improved rubric is being developed.
Indirect Assessment: Students' ratings of MBA program in preparing them for critical thinking will be at the average of ratings among peer schools.	<p>Exit surveys assessed satisfaction. Data collected in December 2003 and May 2004 were combined and analyzed by EBI (n=85).</p> <p><b>2006: Focus groups to be conducted in Summer 2006; exit surveys to be administered in 2006-07.</b></p>	CSU MBA was above average in "ability to define problems;" at average for "ability to think critically;" and slightly below average for "ability to analyze and interpret data" and "to solve problems."	The statistical differences among peer schools and our MBA were not deemed significant to take actions.	None.

31 May 2006

**2005-06 MBA/HCA Administrative Capstone Series Assessment for the Seventeen Students Graduating during the Academic Year 2005 -2006**

The table below presents the extent to which the graduating MBA/HCA students have mastered the didactic and the professional skills needed to obtain an entry level position in health care management as measured by the parameters identified below and defined on the next page..

<b>Parameter</b>	<b>Parameter Description</b>	<b># of students scoring at a grade level of 'A' (90-100)</b>	<b># of students scoring at a grade level of 'B' (80-89)</b>	<b># of students scoring with an unsatisfactory score (&lt;80)</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
1	Completion of Internship Requirements	12	5	0	None – we are satisfied
2	Professional Development Assignments	11	2	4	Students identified as unsatisfactory will have to repeat the presentation.
3	Content and Quality of Major Project	15	1	1	No action
4	Quality of Portfolio	8	6	3	Students with unsatisfactory portfolio will have to correct deficits prior to graduation
5	Demonstration of Health Care Administration	10	2	5	Faculty will further evaluate and tailor to fit new curriculum
6	Preceptor's Evaluation	16	0	1	Individual counseling
7	Achieving Internship Goals	15	2	0	No action taken

## **The Parameters Defined**

### **Parameter 1: Completion of Internship Requirements (up to 10 points)**

This evaluates whether or not the basic internship components have been completed, i.e., time requirement, scope of experience, exposure to governance and management, overall experience, and reports.

### **Parameter 2: Professional Development Assignments (up to 15 points)**

This examines the accomplishment of the various professional development requirements along with the student's assessment of lessons learned from completing them. Elements include tutorials on dress and deportment, career planning, and statistics; a professional presentation; identification of career plans; creation of a professional resume; and ten professional site visits to local health care organizations, including one or two shadowing experiences with health care managers.

### **Parameter 3: Content and Quality of Major Project (up to 24 points)**

This evaluates the completion and quality of one or more major projects undertaken as part of the student internship. Evaluation considers the relevance of the project to the goals of both the internship organization and the internship program, time commitment, and key project components, including approach, data analysis, findings, and conclusions and/or recommendations.

### **Parameter 4: Quality of Portfolio (up to 20 points)**

This examines the quality and professionalism of internship documentation with respect to both portfolio organization and written contents.

### **Parameter 5: Demonstration of Health Care Administration Core Competencies (up to 16 points)**

This evaluates whether or not the student has demonstrated through internship documentation and class summaries the eight core competencies of the Health Care Administration Program, such as personal and interpersonal skills, leadership, information management, and industry knowledge.

### **Parameter 6: Preceptor's Evaluation (up to 10 points)**

This considers the preceptor's assessment of the student's internship performance, identifying areas of strength and opportunities for improvement.

### **Parameter 7: Achieving Internship Goals (up to 5 points)**

This examines to what extent the student's individual internship goals and the program's goals have been mastered