Student Learning Assessment Program

## Response to Summary Form

**Graduate Programs 2017**

Department: School of Business

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Level[[1]](#footnote-1)\*** | Comments |
| Learning Objectives | Level 3, M.B.A. | Objectives are clear, measurable, and programmatic. Each of the CGS goals has been addressed.  |
| **How, Where, and When Assessed** | Level 3, M.B.A. | The HLC specifically notes comparisons of different delivery methods and their assessment in the accreditation criteria, so Eastern will need to continue to be mindful of assessing on-line programs and student learning in those programs compared to students in comparable face-to-face programs. Do you see differences or similarities in your Charleston, Parkland, and on-line programs? You indicate specific courses and assignments used for assessment of goals and objectives, which is good. This report includes indirect as well as direct data for many of the objectives given, which is a good step. The report also includes multiple assessment sites for each goal and objective, so it is a well-rounded plan. |
| **Expectations** | Level 3, M.B.A. | Expectations are in place for each of the measures used. It is difficult to know what the rubric scores mean without the rubrics themselves, so it would be helpful to include those in the next iteration of this report. Your students are clearly meeting the majority of the expectations you have set, so perhaps it is time to raise the bar in certain cases. Since this is a graduate program, it is expected that the majority of students will meet basic expectations and a good number will exceed them. Where you note that expectations are not met—finance, for example—what steps are in place to increase student learning?  |
| **Results** | Level 2-3, M.B.A. | Results are being reported and discussed by the faculty. It is not always clear for which cohort you are reporting results. Do you report and collect results for all assessment instruments for each of the cohorts or do you combine them? More analysis of what the data tell you about student learning—whether collectively or by cohort—would be useful. Your ETS results are higher than the national averages, so that is impressive. As the AACSB team notes, assessing changes to the curriculum is needed. Pre- and post-change results can show the impact on those curricular changes. I think you have the data to do that, but I don’t see the actual analysis here. |
| **How Results Will be Used** | Level 3, M.B.A. | Although the coordinator indicates that faculty turnover has necessitated additional instruction on assessment and anchoring of rubrics, it is clear that assessment of student learning is an integral part of the work of this program. Planned assessment meetings, anchoring sessions, and discussions of the data should continue on a regular basis. You mention curriculum changes as a result of discussions from your advisory committee. Data/information from the advisory board/employers sound vital to your curriculum changes, so you may want to include that information and how you collect it in column two as an indirect measure. Given your program, you may also want to consider collecting information from employers of recent graduates. |

**Next report due: June 15, 2019**

1. \* Levels should not be interpreted as grades or scores; they are stages of implementation based on patterns of characteristics described by North Central Association. These levels are approximations based on the information provided in the summaries. Please refer to the checklist for the Primary Traits listed for each level on the assessment web site at [www.eiu.edu/~assess](http://www.eiu.edu/~assess). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)