

Graduate Program – Continuous Improvement Actions

Learning Goal	Learning Objective	T2 Data Collection	T3 Data Collection
<p>Goal 3: Decision Making Skill: Our graduates will demonstrate Analytical Skills.</p>	<p><u>Decision Making:</u> Students will be able to gather, analyze, and integrate relevant information to make appropriate business decisions.</p>	<p>When Assessed: Fall 2015</p>	<p>When Assessed: Fall 2016</p>
		<p>Where Assessed: MGT 585</p>	<p>Where Assessed: MGT 585</p>
		<p>How Assessed: Rubric</p>	<p>How Assessed: Rubric</p>
		<p>Actions Taken:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A business case was introduced in Fall 2014 that emphasized identifying, discussing, and resolving a business issue to align with the student learning objective. 	<p>Actions Taken:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Revisions were made to the common goals & rubrics to align with the COB’s mission. These realignment efforts were consistent with the recommendations made by AACSB consultant, Dr. Karen Tarnoff. 2) Minimum standard raised to 90%. 3) A pilot assignment was utilized in MGT 585 to insure that the artifact is aligned with the students learning objectives. The new assignment included a brief case/scenario and students were asked to identify the problems/issues in the case, analyze the issues, provide alternatives/recommendations for what could have

			<p>been done differently, and provide an action plan for carrying out the alternative decision(s).</p>
		<p>Results: Standard of 80% not met (identification, analysis, alternative & recommendations, action plan development).</p>	<p>Results: There was significant improvement in how well the students addressed the 3 major components of decision making identified in the assessment rubric: Identification, Analysis, Solution/Recommendation. Even the lowest scoring papers addressed each of the four decision making criteria. Prior to the introduction of this new assignment, many students did not even mention/address one or more of the 3 decision making elements.</p>
		<p>Continuous Improvement Actions: The faculty panel deemed the rubric for the assignment adequate despite expressing disappointment with the results. The following recommendations were provided relating to the assignment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Using the same instrument to assess decision-making and leadership is not appropriate given that leaders make multiple decisions on a daily basis and also engage in many other tasks as well. Therefore, there should be separate assignments to assess these two functions. 2. Using case analysis as the assessment instrument for this SLO3 is too subjective and open for interpretation for both students and 	<p>Continuous Improvement Actions: In the spring of 2017, students were asked to read an article from Management Decision (1996) entitled "A Process Perspective on Strategic Decision Making" by E. Frank Harrison. As an extra credit opportunity, students were asked to then write a 1-2 page summary of the article. This article was selected because it provides a complete overview of the decision making process and should help students in their understanding and learning of the process, as well as their subsequent performance on the decision making case assignment.</p>

		<p>assessors using a rigid rubric. The panel suggests using a more objective, clear, and concise instrument.</p> <p>3. This assessment instrument should be administered towards the end of the semester and not early in the term. This particular assessment was conducted in early October, just a month into the semester. It was the very first case analysis that students were required to do and, therefore, they were not fully aware of the expectations, approach, and methodology employed in case analysis.</p>	
--	--	--	--