



Spears School of Business
Master of Business Administration
Assessment Report Form 2015-2016

Date of Report: 9/15/2016

Name of Person Submitting Report: Sarah Chabinak

A. Program Information:

Assessment Coordinator's Name: Sarah Chabinak

Assessment Coordinator's Email Address: sarah.chabinak@okstate.edu

Number of students enrolled in the program 2015-2016: Fall 2015 = 457 Spring 2016 = 393

Number of students graduated in 2015-2016: 207

B. Program Mission Statement

In the box below, provide the mission statement for the program.

The mission statement, educational objectives, and goals for program should guide the assessment process. The mission statement should align with department, college, and institutional mission statements.

"The Oklahoma State University Master of Business Administration Program will prepare individuals for leadership roles in dynamic, local, national, and global business environments. To accomplish this mission the program will:

- Strive to develop a strong sense of community among all of our MBA students and alumni.
- Focus on developing the whole student, academic as well as professional and interpersonal.
- Provide an exceptional educational experience by integrating theory, application, and practitioner networks.

C. University Assessment Funds

Were university assessment funds used by the department/program for assessment activities? Yes No

If university assessment funds were used by the department or program, describe how university assessment funds were used and the contribution the funds had on the assessment process. Funding requests for the next academic year have a separate process and should not be included here.

University Assessment funds were used to purchase the Major Field Test.

D. Student Learning Outcomes

On the pages that follow, list the Student Learning Outcomes associated with the program identified in this assessment form.

Student Learning Outcome 1: Ethical Decision Making

Student Learning Outcome 2: Teamwork & Leadership

Student Learning Outcome 3: Decision Analysis

Student Learning Outcome 4: Critical Thinking Skills

Student Learning Outcome 5: Written Communication Skills

Student Learning Outcome 4: Oral Communication Skills

While all objectives are listed, the objectives assessed during the 2015-2016 Academic Year include Student Learning Outcome 2: Teamwork & Leadership and Goal 3: Decision Analysis

D2) Student Learning Outcome #2: Teamwork and Leadership

Identify opportunities for students to learn this outcome during the 2014-2015 academic year:

For example, include a curriculum map that lists the courses or other learning experiences in which the student learning outcome is taught. Another example is a written narrative that describes how the learning outcome is integrated into the program.

This objective anticipates that graduates will be skilled in working with teams and providing direction to those teams. Students should:

- Demonstrate responsibility in their team interactions through active attendance at and preparation for team meetings;
- Be adept at recognizing problems, identifying causes, and recommending solutions;
- Demonstrate an attitude of enthusiasm, cooperation, and commitment;
- Carry a fair share of their load of team activities.

CURRICULUM MAP

- X = Courses where learning goal is addressed
- A = Courses where learning goal is assessed

Course Number	Course Name	Teamwork & Leadership
ACCT-5283	MBA Managerial Accounting	x
FIN-5013	Business Finance	x
MBA-5100	Professional Development	x
MGMT-5303	Corporate and Business Strategy	A
MGMT-5113	Management & Org Theory	x

How many students were included in the assessment of this outcome? 106 (Stillwater = 15, online = 91)

How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?

Students enrolled in MGMT 5303 in Stillwater and Online are asked to complete the exercise as part of the course. Tulsa's MGMT 5303 in Spring 2016 was a short, seven week class that met on Saturdays and due to the shortened schedule they did not use the Business Strategy Game rubric in the class. After the curriculum and course rotation change the only time MGMT 5303 is offered in Tulsa is in the spring semester. Tulsa should be able to use the rubric in Spring 2017 regardless of format.

Assessment Methods

Identify the method(s) used to assess this learning outcome. Check all that apply.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfaction Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Internship |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics) | <input type="checkbox"/> Benchmarking | <input type="checkbox"/> Interviews |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Analysis of written artifacts | <input type="checkbox"/> Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards | <input type="checkbox"/> Performance or jury |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component | <input type="checkbox"/> Visual collection (photos, videos, etc.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oral presentation | <input type="checkbox"/> Capstone project | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of student research |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Course project | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): |

[Click here to specify.](#)

Describe the how the assessment method was implemented, administered, and/or conducted.

Additional Comments:

Peer evaluation is part of The Business Strategy Game at www.bsg-online.com.

Did your department/program faculty have a goal set for this learning outcome? Yes No

For example, "80% of students included in the assessment will receive a 4 on the rubric" or "80% of students included in the assessment will achieve a passing score on the certification exam." If yes, please describe the goal below.

Goals:

The scores that accompany each rating level are presented on the rubric.

1. The first objective is measured by summing the scores for Questions 1-3 on the rubric. A minimal level of acceptable performance would be someone who missed no more than 10-20% of meetings (4 points), was late to no more than 10-20% of meetings (4 points), and exhibited adequate preparation (4.5 points). These minimal points would be $4+4+4.5=12.5$. Consequently, **the goal on this objective is that at least 90% of students should have an average total score on Questions 1-3 of at least 12.5**. The committee notes that while missing 20% of meetings may seem high, it is a more acceptable outcome when the students are non-traditional students (e.g., Tulsa and Distance) and have a variety of other commitments such as work-related travel. It is not unusual, for example, for military members to get deployed for one to three weeks.
2. The second objective is measured by summing the scores for Questions 4-7. A minimum acceptable performance in this area would be to have an adequate understanding of company operations (9 points), adequate skill in diagnosing problems (9 points), adequate skill in proposing strategic approaches (9 points), and adequate skill in contributing to decisions and performance (9 points). Consequently, the goal on this objective is that **at least 90% of students should have an average total score on Questions 4-7 of at least 36**.
3. The third objective is measured by summing the scores for Questions 8-10. A minimum acceptable performance in this area would be to demonstrate an adequate level of enthusiasm and commitment (4.5 points), an adequate level of teamwork and cooperativeness (4.5 points), and an adequate ability to present views and make a case for proposed actions (4.5 points). Consequently, the goal on this objective is that **at least 90% of students should have an average total score on Questions 8-10 of at least 13.5**.
4. The fourth objective is measured with Question 11. A minimum desired performance in this area would be that a student carry roughly a fair share of the load (4.5 points). Consequently, the goal on this objective is that **at least 90% of students should have an average score on Question 11 of at least 4.5**.

Provide a summary of the results from the assessment of Learning Outcome 2.

Report student's scores for this assessment, as well as students' strengths and weaknesses relative to this learning outcome.

Results for this evaluation process in Fall 2015 are provided below on an objective-by-objective basis. There were 106 students evaluated in two classes. Since each student was evaluated by several peers, there were 414 total evaluations completed. A student's score on each question was calculated as the average of the scores assigned to him/her by all of his/her peers. The student's score for each objective was the sum of his/her scores on the questions related to that objective (as outlined in the preceding "Goals" section).

- **Objective 1:** Students should demonstrate responsibility in their team interactions through active attendance at and preparation for team meetings;

Statistic	Distance 2013 (n=46)	Stillwater 2013 (n=28)	Combined 2013 (n=89)	Distance 2015 (n=91)	Stillwater 2015 (n=15)	Combined 2015 (n=106)
Average Score (Out of 18 Possible)	16.1	16.6	16.5	16.6	15.3	16.5
Median Score	16.7	16.8	17.0	17	17.25	17.5
High	17.7	17.7	18.0	17.9	18	18
Low	11.0	12.5	11.0	5	6	5
Standard Deviation	1.7	1.1	1.5	1.8	3.8	2.0
% \geq Target Score of 12.5	93.5%	100.0%	96.6%	95.6%	80%	96.2%

- **Objective 2:** Students should be adept at recognizing problems, identifying causes, and recommending solutions.

Statistic	Distance 2013 (n=46)	Stillwater 2013 (n=28)	Combined 2013 (n=89)	Distance 2015 (n=91)	Stillwater 2015 (n=15)	Combined 2015 (n=106)
Average Score (Out of 48 Possible)	42.1	43.6	43.0	42.9	39.2	42.3
Median Score	43.7	44.0	44.0	44.0	42.0	44.0
High	45.3	45.3	47.3	47.8	44.7	47.8
Low	30.3	36.0	30.3	22.0	22.0	22.0
Standard Deviation	3.4	2.2	2.9	3.5	6.7	4.5
% \geq Target Score of 36	93.5%	100.0%	96.6%	94.5%	80.0%	91.5%

- **Objective 3:** Students should demonstrate an attitude of enthusiasm, cooperation, and commitment.

Statistic	Distance 2013 (n=46)	Stillwater 2013 (n=28)	Combined 2013 (n=89)	Distance 2015 (n=91)	Stillwater 2015 (n=15)	Combined 2015 (n=106)
Average Score (Out of 18 Possible)	16.0	16.3	16.2	16.1	15.2	16.0
Median Score	16.4	16.5	16.5	16.5	15.8	16.5
High	17.0	17.0	17.5	17.8	16.8	18.0
Low	12.2	13.5	12.2	8.0	10.0	8.0
Standard Deviation	1.0	0.8	0.9	1.5	2.1	1.5
% ≥ Target Score of 13.5	95.7%	100.0%	97.8%	95.6%	80.0%	95.2%

- **Objective 4:** Students should carry a fair share of their load of team activities.

Statistic	Distance 2013 (n=46)	Stillwater 2013 (n=28)	Combined 2013 (n=89)	Distance 2015 (n=91)	Stillwater 2015 (n=15)	Combined 2015 (n=106)
Average Score (Out of 6 Possible)	5.1	5.4	5.2	5.2	5.3	5.2
Median Score	5.2	5.5	5.5	5.3	5.5	5.4
High	5.7	5.7	6.0	5.8	5.8	5.8
Low	3.8	4.5	3.8	3.0	4.5	3.0
Standard Deviation	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4
% ≥ Target Score of 4.5	89.1%	100.0%	94.4%	95.6%	100%	98.1%

What do the results suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?

Summary Notes: Overall, results were similar to the results from 2013. Students in Stillwater were more generous with their ratings on Objective 1 than the Online students, but for Objectives 2 and 3 they were less generous with their ratings. Both groups were quite similar on Objective 4. Interestingly, Stillwater students missed the 90% goal on Objectives 1 (80%), 2 (80%) and 3 (80%), but 100% percent of this group rated their peers as carrying a fair share of the load (Objective 4). There were a few Stillwater students who rated low across their team (including their self-evaluation) and there was one student who was rated low by the rest of their team, so in a class of 15 it doesn't take much to drop below 90%.

Some more disaggregated detail with respect to each of the questions is provided below. In these descriptions, the ratings assigned to students are considered; however, we also consider the lowest rating that a student received from any of his/her peers, which may be a more realistic indicator of performance.

- Attendance:
 - 93% of ratings indicated that the peer was always present or very dependable.
 - 81% of students received "always present" or "very dependable" as their lowest rating.
 - 9% of students received a lowest rating that indicated they missed 20% or more of the meetings.

- Promptness:
 - 97% of ratings indicated that the peer was late to at most 1-2 meetings.
 - 91% of students received a lowest rating of “never kept co-managers waiting” or “late to 1 to 2 meetings.”
 - 6% of students received a lowest rating that indicated they were late to 20% or more of the meetings.
- Preparation for Meetings:
 - 91% of ratings indicated that the peer’s preparation for meetings was good, excellent, or exceptional.
 - 80% of students received a lowest rating on preparation of good, excellent, or exceptional.
 - 8% of students received a lowest rating that indicated they were only marginally prepared or worse.
- Understanding Company Operations, Skill in Interpreting and Analyzing Numbers
 - 94% of ratings indicated that the peer’s performance in this area was good, excellent, or exceptional.
 - 85% of students received a lowest rating in this area of good, excellent, or exceptional.
 - 5% of students received a lowest rating that indicated their performance in this area was marginal or worse.
- Skill in Diagnosing Company Problems, Competitiveness, and Standing
 - 94% of ratings indicated that the peer’s performance in this area was good, excellent, or exceptional.
 - 86% of students received a lowest rating in this area of good, excellent, or exceptional.
 - 6% of students received a lowest rating that indicated their performance in this area was marginal or worse.
- Skill in Proposing What to Do and Strategic Approaches to Take
 - 94% of ratings indicated that the peer’s performance in this area was good, excellent, or exceptional.
 - 84% of students received a lowest rating in this area of good, excellent, or exceptional.
 - 8% of students received a lowest rating that indicated their performance in this area was marginal or worse.
- Contributions to Decisions and to the Company’s Overall Performance
 - 91% of ratings indicated that the peer’s performance in this area was good, excellent, or exceptional.
 - 81% of students received a lowest rating in this area of good, excellent, or exceptional.
 - 7% of students received a lowest rating that indicated their performance in this area had little positive impact, no impact, or a negative impact.
- Enthusiasm and Commitment
 - 95% of ratings indicated that the peer’s performance in this area was good, excellent, or exceptional.
 - 87% of students received a lowest rating in this area of good, excellent, or exceptional.
 - 4% of students received a lowest rating indicating that they had no or inadequate enthusiasm and commitment.
- Teamwork and Cooperativeness
 - 97% of ratings indicated that the peer’s performance in this area was good, excellent, or exceptional.
 - 90% of students received a lowest rating in this area of good, excellent, or exceptional.
 - 2% of students received a lowest rating that indicated their performance in this area was marginal or worse.
- Exercise of Leadership Within the Groups
 - 93% of ratings indicated that the peer’s performance in this area was good, excellent, or exceptional.
 - 93% of students received a lowest rating in this area of good, excellent, or exceptional.
 - 8% of students received a lowest rating that they were ineffective or worse in this area.
- Carried a Fair Share of the Workload
 - 77% of ratings indicated that the peer carried more than a fair share of the workload.
 - 53% of students received a lowest rating indicating that they carried more than a fair share of the workload.
 - 12% of students received a lowest rating that they carried less than a fair share of the workload.
- Overall Workload
 - 96% of ratings indicated that they evaluated their peer as good to exceptional.
 - 90% of students received a lowest rating indicating that they were rated as good to exceptional.
 - 7% of students received a lowest rating indicating that they were below average or worse.

Timeline for the Assessment

Indicate the timeline for the assessment of this learning outcome. While outcomes assessment must be conducted every year, not all student learning outcomes for a given program must be assessed every year. If the assessment of a particular learning outcome occurs on cycle or rotation, please describe and provide the rationale for the cycle/rotation below.

Each Semester Yearly Every other year

Other (please specify): [Click here to type the number of students included in the assessment of Outcome 2.](#)

D3) Student Learning Outcome #3: Decision Analyses

Identify opportunities for students to learn this outcome during the 2014-2015 academic year:

For example, include a curriculum map that lists the courses or other learning experiences in which the student learning outcome is taught. Another example is a written narrative that describes how the learning outcome is integrated into the program.

This objective anticipates that students will be able to:

- Demonstrate an advanced knowledge of business vocabulary, processes, environment, and practices appropriate to MBA students;
- Integrate and synthesize knowledge of the business disciplines to analyze complex scenarios and make strategically-appropriate decisions.

• **CURRICULUM MAP**

- X = Courses where learning goal is addressed
- A = Courses where learning goal is assessed

Course Number	Course Name	Decision Analysis
ACCT-5183	MBA Financial Reporting	x
ACCT-5283	MBA Managerial Accounting	x
ECON-5113	Managerial Economics	x
FIN-5013	Business Finance	x
FIN-5053	Theory & Practice of Fin Mgmt	x
MBA-5100	Professional Development	x
MGMT-5303	Corporate and Business Strategy	A
MGMT-5113	Management & Org Theory	x
MKTG-5133	Marketing Management	x
MSIS-5303	Quantitative Methods in Business	x

How many students were included in the assessment of this outcome?

109

How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?

Students enrolled in MGMT 5303 at each of the three campuses (Stillwater, Tulsa, and Distance) are asked to complete the Major Field Test as part of the course.

Assessment Methods

Identify the method(s) used to assess this learning outcome. Check all that apply.

Survey

Analysis of written artifacts

Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)

Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oral presentation | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component | <input type="checkbox"/> Visual collection (photos, videos, etc.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Course project | <input type="checkbox"/> Capstone project | <input type="checkbox"/> Review of student research |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfaction Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Internship | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Benchmarking | <input type="checkbox"/> Interviews | Click here to specify. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards | <input type="checkbox"/> Performance or jury | |

Describe the how the assessment method was implemented, administered, and/or conducted.

- The preferred method for assessing these objectives is the ETS Major Field Test for MBA students. This test is nationally benchmarked and assesses student knowledge in marketing, management, finance, and accounting, as well as their ability to strategically integrate across disciplines. We were able to adapt the test to the distance program for spring 2014 which allowed for distance student results to be included. Previously distance students were not included because a significant proportion of distance students are military officers; and most military testing centers will not allow use of the lockdown browser necessary to administer the MFT (a consequence of the “Wikileaks” episode).
- For on-campus students in Stillwater and Tulsa, the exam will be administered during a regularly-scheduled class period of MGMT-5303 (strategic management); and the score made up a small component of the student’s grade. Distance students in MGMT-5303 scheduled a test time at a certified testing center or through Proctor U.

Did your department/program faculty have a goal set for this learning outcome? Yes No

For example, “80% of students included in the assessment will receive a 4 on the rubric” or “80% of students included in the assessment will achieve a passing score on the certification exam.” If yes, please describe the goal below.

Our goal is to score at least two points above the national median overall and across all disciplines.

Provide a summary of the results from the assessment of Learning Outcome 3.

Report student’s scores for this assessment, as well as students’ strengths and weaknesses relative to this learning outcome.

Results

Results of the 2015/2016 ETS MFT test are presented below for Stillwater, Distance, Tulsa, and overall. The ETS scores for Spring 2012 and 2014, along with the ETS national mean and median, are shown for comparison. The 2012 assessments did not include distance students since the lockdown browser issue had not been remedied yet.

Row Labels	n	Mean Score	Institutional Percentile	Median	High	Low	Standard Deviation	% >= 90th Percentile
Spring 2012	71	254	67	255	288	225	13.95	1%
Spring 2014								
Distance	50	264	95	267	286	220	13.39	30%
Stillwater	24	255	70	255	272	237	11.92	13%
Tulsa	36	259	86	261	284	228	14.51	22%
All	110	260	88	261	286	220	13.78	24%
2015/2016								
Distance	73	259	89	259	284	220	12.62	14%
Stillwater	15	250	53	249	271	220	10.33	7%
Tulsa	21	259	89	261	280	231	10.66	24%
All	109	258	86	257	284	220	12.62	15%

Topic Area	STW Spring 2014	TUL Spring 2014	DL Spring 2014	OSU Overall Spring 2014	STW Fall 2015	TUL Spring 2016	DL Fall 2015	OSU Overall 2015/16
N	24	36	50	110	15	21	73	109
Marketing	62	66	66	65	60	63	64	63
Marketing Percentile	67	89	89	85	58	77	81	77
Management	62	62	67	64	61	69	67	66
Management Percentile	60	60	88	71	58	98	91	88
Finance	51	53	58	55	40	51	50	49
Finance Percentile	83	89	98	94	23	86	84	81
Accounting	49	55	56	54	49	52	52	51
Accounting Percentile	60	90	94	89	63	84	84	79
Strategic Integration	56	58	60	59	54	56	58	57
Strategic Integration Percentile	70	80	89	85	63	74	86	80

*Assessment Indicators for this test (Topic Areas) cannot be compared to testing years prior to 2013 due to changes in the MBA test introduced in 2013, so 2012 results have been removed from the Topic Area table.

Overall: The MFT national median is the 50th percentile, so any measure above the 52nd percentile met our goal for OSU's MBA students. Overall, we met our goal for each discipline at each location, with the exception of Finance in Stillwater, where we were significantly below our goal. This is most likely due to the removal of a previously required second Finance course from the curriculum. While the drop was not as precipitous in the Tulsa and Online groups, some of them may have already taken the second Finance course since they tend to be part time students and spend a longer time in the program, making it more likely they took that course prior to the curriculum change. In the Management area, we increased significantly in Tulsa as well our standing overall. While the mean scores for each location were fairly consistent with the Spring 2014 results; it is interesting to note that both Online and Stillwater had drops in the number of students at or above the 90th percentile, but Tulsa actually had a small increase. This could be a combination of the removal of the second Finance course from the curriculum and the fact that most Tulsa students are part time students and full time working professionals with experience.

Overall, as an institution, we scored at the 67th percentile in Spring 2012, the 88th percentile in Spring 2014, and the 86th percentile in 2015/16. Of the three locations, Tulsa has been the most consistent (3 percentile increase), followed by Online (6 percentile decrease), then Stillwater (17 percentile decrease). Again, the Stillwater drop is likely due to the removal of the second Finance course from the curriculum, which is something the MBA Curriculum committee will want to consider as they look at the strength of the curriculum, especially in comparison to peer institutions.

What do the results suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?

The results suggest that OSU MBA students have been reasonably consistent in their performance over the past three administrations of the MFT. Overall, we met our goal for each discipline at each location, with the exception of Finance in Stillwater, where we were significantly below our goal. This is the first administration of the MFT since the curriculum change that took place in 2014/2015, so while the effects of that change are visible in the Stillwater results (see Finance discussion above) due to it being a shorter program, the Tulsa and Online students tend to be part time so the program takes longer, thus taking more time for curriculum changes to show up in their results.

Timeline for the Assessment

Indicate the timeline for the assessment of this learning outcome. While outcomes assessment must be conducted every year, not all student learning outcomes for a given program must be assessed every year. If the assessment of a particular learning outcome occurs on cycle or rotation, please describe and provide the rationale for the cycle/rotation below.

Each Semester

Yearly

Every other year

Other (please specify): If the assessment of Learning Outcome 3 occurs on a cycle or rotation, click here to describe and provide the rationale.

E. Summary of Assessment Results

Describe the overall results of the program assessment and program faculty members' interpretation of the assessment results.

What did the assessment reveal? What do faculty interpret the results to mean? What do the results suggest about the curriculum, teaching practices, and/or student achievement of the program learning outcomes?

Overall, students seem to be performing consistently year to year in most areas. One area that needs further discussion is the significant drop in results on the Major Field Test for our Stillwater students in Finance. After the 2014/2015 curriculum change that gave students the option to take a Marketing Analytics or Predictive Analytics Technologies or advanced Finance class instead of requiring an advanced Finance as the only option, many students have been choosing Marketing Analytics, especially in Stillwater. The MBA Committee felt giving students the option between three analytically strong courses would allow them the flexibility to explore current business trends without diminishing the quantitative and analytical strength of the program. While the students have enjoyed the option and it has allowed several students to present at Marketing

Analytics oriented conferences, it does appear to conflict with the national MBA expectation of a strong finance background.

F. Dissemination of Results

Describe the individual(s) or committee (e.g., a curriculum committee) responsible for reviewing and interpreting assessment data.

Sarah Chabinak, Ed.D., Manager, Graduate Programs tabulates results and puts together the MBA Assessment Report in collaboration with Dr. Ramesh Sharda, Vice Dean of the Watson Graduate School of Management and Ms. Jan Analla, Assistant Director of the MBA Program. The MBA Curriculum Committee, which consists of a faculty representative from each of the seven academic departments, assists with administration and scoring of assessment measures and curriculum revision when needed to “close the loop” based on assessment results.

Describe the process for sharing and discussing assessment results with program faculty.

The results are discussed during MBA Curriculum Committee meetings as needed and each committee member is then responsible for sharing results and updates with their department. Many of the members teach core MBA courses, so they can make changes to what they are doing in their classes easily if needed. This assessment report will also be forwarded to each MBA Curriculum Committee member as well.

G. Program Improvements Based on Assessment

Based on the findings of this assessment, what changes are being considered or planned for the program?

Describe the actions that will be taken as a result of the discussion of the assessment evidence.

The program underwent a major curriculum revision during Spring of 2015 that resulted in shortening the overall hours and removing/replacing/allowing guided options for some of the MBA core courses. After seeing the Finance score differential, especially in the Stillwater group, the MBA Committee will discuss the impact of not requiring a second Finance course and discuss possible alternatives.

Based on the findings of this assessment, what (if any) changes are planned for the assessment process?

For example, are there additional assessment data that may need to be collected? Are changes to the program assessment plan warranted?

We are still working to use the same measures across all three locations, which is a challenge due to location, student type, and faculty preferences.

Learning Goals	Method of Assessment	Administration of Assessment	Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Goal 1: Ethical Decision Making	Ethics Email Case (same as Goal 5)	MGMT 5303/D2L Community—All Campuses			X STW X DL	X TUL		
Goal 2: Teamwork & Leadership	Business Strategy Game	Stillwater & Distance: MGMT 5303	X			X TUL	X STW X DL	
	Team Project using Same rubric as Business Strategy Game	Tulsa: MGMT 5303		X				X
Goal 3: Decision Analysis	Major Field Test	MGMT 5303— All campuses	X STW X DL	X TUL			X STW X DL	X TUL
Goal 4: Critical Thinking Skills	Business Critical Thinking Skills Test (BCTST)	MGMT 5303— All campuses			X STW X DL	X TUL		
Goal 5: Written Communication Skills	Ethics Email Case (same as Goal 1)	MGMT 5303/D2L Community			X STW X DL	X TUL		
Goal 6: Oral Communication Skills (All use same rubric)	Case Competition	Stillwater: PD Class	X				X	
(propose 3 min video resume instead)	Case Video Response	Distance: MGMT 5303					X	
(propose 3 min video resume instead)	Class Presentation	Tulsa: MGMT 5303						X

*Indicates assessment not done as planned due to curriculum and core course changes.

Describe the process for implementing these changes/planned program improvements.

We will alter the schedule as needed to accommodate changes the MBA Committee feels are necessary.

H. Assessment Tools

Please provide a copy of any assessment tools (questionnaire, scale, interview questions, etc.) [here](#).

Student Learning Outcome 2: Teamwork & Leadership

TEAMWORK AND LEADERSHIP RUBRIC

Co-Manager Meetings

1. Attendance at co-managers' meetings – 6 points
 - Habitually absent – 1 point
 - Missed close to 50% of our meetings – 2 points
 - Missed about 20-30% of our meetings – 3 points
 - Missed about 10-20% of our meetings – 4 points
 - Very dependable; missed only one or two meetings – 5 points
 - Always present – 6 points

2. Promptness – 6 points
 - Habitually late – 1 point
 - Late to about 50% of our meetings – 2 points
 - Late to about 20-30% of our meetings – 3 points
 - Late to about 10-20% of our meetings – 4 points
 - Late to only one or two meetings – 5 points
 - Never kept co-managers waiting – 6 points

3. Caliber of preparation for meetings (was familiar with where things stood and latest results – 6 points)
 - Always behind rest of the team – 2 points
 - Marginal; usually had to catch up during meeting – 3.5 points
 - Adequate; about as well-prepared as others – 4.5 points
 - Good; somewhat better prepared than others – 5 points
 - Excellent; usually well prepared – 5.5 points
 - Exceptional; generally best-prepared of all co-managers – 6 points

Effectiveness in Helping Run the Company

4. Understanding of company operations; skills in interpreting and analyzing the numbers on the screens and in the company reports – 12 points
 - Quite weak – 5 points
 - Marginal; sub-par - 7 points
 - Adequate – 9 points
 - Good – 10 points
 - Excellent; very impressive – 11 points
 - Exceptional; strongest of all co-managers – 12 points

5. Skills in diagnosing our company's problems, competitiveness, and standing vis-à-vis rivals – 12 points
 - Quite weak – 5 points
 - Marginal; sub-par – 7 points
 - Adequate – 9 points
 - Good – 10 points
 - Excellent; very impressive – 11 points
 - Exceptional; strongest of all co-managers – 12 points

6. Skills in proposing “what to do” and strategic approaches to take – 12 points
 - Quite weak – 5 points
 - Marginal; sub-par – 7 points
 - Adequate – 9 points
 - Good – 10 points
 - Excellent; very impressive – 11 points
 - Exceptional; strongest of all co-managers – 12 points
7. Caliber of contribution to decisions and to the company’s overall performance – 12 points
 - Quite weak; had almost no impact (or took actions which hurt performance) – 4 points
 - Had little positive impact (or even a negative impact) in shaping company performance – 7 points
 - Adequate; played a supporting role in shaping company performance – 9 points
 - Good; played an important positive role in shaping company performance – 10 points
 - Excellent; played a major and positive role in shaping company performance – 11 points
 - Exceptional; highest positive impact of all co-managers – 12 points

Effectiveness as a Member of the Company’s Management Team

8. Enthusiasm and Commitment - 6 points
 - Almost none – 1 point
 - Inadequate – 3.5 points
 - Adequate; acceptable – 4.5 points
 - Good enthusiasm and commitment – 5 points
 - Very enthusiastic and committed – 5.5 points
 - Exceptional; strongest of all co-managers – 6 points
9. Teamwork and cooperativeness – worked well with co-managers - 6 points
 - Quite weak; gave team many problems – 2 points
 - Marginal; prone to make decisions without telling anyone – 3.5 points
 - Adequate – 4.5 points
 - Good – 5 points
 - Excellent; very impressive – 5.5 points
 - Exceptional; strongest of all co-managers – 6 points
10. Exercise of leadership within the groups - 6 points
 - Had little to say and little to offer – 1 point
 - Ineffective; had a hard time winning support for ideas – 3 points
 - Adequate ability to present views and make a case for proposed actions – 4.5 points
 - Good ability to present views and make a case for proposed actions – 5 points
 - Effective and persuasive in convincing others to go along with proposed actions – 5.5 points
 - Exceptional; strongest of all co-managers – 6 points
11. Carried a fair share of the overall workload - 6 points
 - Far less than a fair share – 3 points
 - Slightly below a fair share - 4 points
 - Roughly a fair share – 4.5 points
 - Slightly above a fair share – 5 points
 - Well above a fair share – 5.5 points
 - Far beyond what any other co-manager did – 6 points

12. Overall Evaluation - 10 points

- Below 50 – I would like to have fired this person as a co-manager – 4 points
- 50-59 – Very weak (I would definitely not want to be teamed with this person again) – 5 points
- Marginal; sub-par – 6 points
- Slightly below average – 6.5 points
- Average – 7 points
- Slightly above average – 7.5 points
- Good – 8 points
- Very good - 8.5 points
- Excellent; very impressive – 9 points
- Exceptional; strongest of all co-managers – 10 points