Appendix C

MBA Assurance of Learning 2007-2008: Closing the Loop

Global Module (April 24, 2008)

Present: Yamin Ahmad, Jeff Heinrich (convening and reporting), Hamid Moini, Praveen Parboteeah, Sameer Prasad, Lois Smith.

The group first discussed the currency of the objectives. No one suggested any changes since last year. It was noted that the objectives are very broad and non-specific as necessitated by the fact that courses in the global module cover very different content areas.

The stated purpose of the meeting this year is simply for group members to describe how they do assessment.

- Hamid bases assessment on 3 projects, each one mapped to one of the three objectives. The three projects are 1) to manage a multinational firm, 2) a global asset portfolio management project, and 3) 2 cases related to exchange rate risk management. Categories of very good/good enough/not good enough based on points earned on respective assignment. Exact scale not described.
- Sameer utilizes one assignment, a final exam where students analyze a book. He provided a detailed rubric basing categorization of outcome on the completeness of responses across expected dimensions.
- Yamin assessed based on responses to questions on a midterm and a final exam. One question on each exam is assessed for each objective. Final proportions derived from average for each objective. Outcome categorization is based on a point scale. I (Jeff) use essentially an identical approach but with some differences in the scale.
- Praveen uses one case analysis for each objective, with outcome categorization based on a grade scale. Marilyn Lavin and Carol Scovotti in previous correspondence indicated a similar approach.

A few instructors use multiple questions for each objective (Sameer, myself, Yamin, and Hamid) while the others use just one assignment for the purpose. No instructor reported any change in their assessment practice to date, with the exception of accommodating the change in objectives done last year. I shared with the group that the objectives for the global module should appear on the course syllabus.

We briefly discussed impressions of the outcome distribution (VG/GE/NGE). Each instructor agreed that the distribution broadly, roughly mirrored their "sense" of how students actually performed in their courses. We concluded with a brief discussion on the extent to which we feel a "global consciousness" is being instilled in students or assessed. The group did not feel confident at this time translating existing assessment results into a verdict on that question.

Managing Technology Module (May 5, 2008)

Six faculty participated in the discussion including: Ambrose, Basu, and Chenoweth (convening and reporting) from ITBE/MCS; Bramorski, Dougan, Drago from Management; and Lavin from Marketing.

Lavin described some difficulties she was having fitting in individual assessments for one of the competencies, particularly as her course is part of two modules. She is currently using a group assignment. Drago and Chenoweth indicated that the competencies must be assessed at the student level, although there is nothing wrong with doing that in the context of a group assignment.

Drago stressed that it was important that we complete the AOL process (uploading to Digital Measures) in a timely fashion.

Several faculty indicated that while some students performed poorly on these particular assessments, the majority of students did well and, perhaps more importantly, they improved throughout the course. Improvement was attributed to the feedback students received on earlier assignments.

Bramorski and others indicated how important it was to make sure students were a part of the process and understood the competencies that were being assessed. Everyone agreed.

Faculty agreed that they had not had to change their courses to add the AOL assessment processes, but the processes were time consuming. They also felt that these AOL closing the loop sessions were valuable and that perhaps next time we should look at the various assessments that are being used for the competencies across courses.

Strategy Module (April 23)

Six faculty participated in the discussion including; Bronson, Drago (convening and reporting), Godiwalla, Tourigny and Werner from Management and Zhu from Finance.

Only one individual in attendance had not performed an assessment for this module before (Tourigny) so the traits were discussed and the unique conditions of assessing this module's learning objective were covered briefly. Because Mgmt 788 is a required course in this module assessment of the 1st and 3rd traits are carried out in this course. All other courses in this module assess the 2nd trait.

Werner, Bronson and Zhu shared their findings from the Fall semester assessment. Results of the assessments varied across faculty but it was generally noted that most ended up with the majority of students falling in the 'Very good' range' and the fewest students falling in the 'not good enough' range. Participants were encouraged to fill in all areas of assessment in Digital Measures including any actions to be taken due to the assessment. No problems or concerns were uncovered in this discussion (except that in using Digital Measures it was important to put parts of the assessment in the appropriate places to get credit for doing them and to save what you have put in).

It was noted that AACSB would be visiting campus during Fall semester 2008 and it was vitally important that all assessments for Spring semester be turned in on a timely basis. The question arose as to whether summer classes would need to be assessed and I have put that to the Graduate Studies committee for a decision.

There was some discussion of standardizing the assessment method for all Mgmt 788 courses which would make comparisons across courses easier and also make it easier for individuals teaching Mgmt 788 for the first time.

Ethics Module (February 26, 2008)

Present: Dougan, Parboteeah, Swanson, Smith (Godiwalla submitted comments prior to the meeting.)

The faculty teaching in the ethics module of the MBA program met to discuss their understanding and measurements for the three competencies under the ethics module, and shared ideas for favorite cases as well as results.

All faculty used case examples and student essays to measure each of the competencies.

Competency A: Identify the key dimensions of ethical reasoning

Faculty agreed that the basic definition of this competency was to ask students to identify in a sentence or two the major ethical dilemma involved in the case. The students should identify the dilemma from one actor's point of view (assigned by the faculty member). They should also show the forces affecting or leading to the dilemma situation whether economic, legal, political, or other environmental factors.

Competency B: Apply appropriate theories and models to assess divergent perspectives of a particular ethical dilemma

The group indicated that students should be able to understand and apply various ethical theories to assigned cases. We used stakeholder analysis, relativism, utilitarianism, universalism, rights, justice or other models to assess this competency. The ethical models used depended in part on the case involved. We agreed students should be able to demonstrate a basic understanding of these ethical theories.

Competency C: Develop and justify recommended solutions to an ethical dilemma.

In this competency, faculty asked students to apply ethical theories and generate a number of actions based on those theories. Then they were to choose and defend the action they felt was best among those they suggested as possibilities.

"Favorite" Cases

Several faculty used the same case analyses. Among the favorites mentioned were:

Shell in Nigeria, Dow Corning (silicone breast implants), Colt (hand guns), Exxon Valdez, A.H. Fuller, Gap (sweat shops), Dalkon Shield, Sicom and CD Piracy in China, Odwalla Juice.