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1. **SB Assurance of Learning**  
   Governance for Assurance of Learning

This document summarizes the distribution of responsibilities within the SB for Assurance of Learning (AoL) activities. The general principle guiding this distribution is that the faculty should be the primary owners of AoL – not the administration. The faculty accordingly must develop a high level of knowledge and engagement in AoL.

**Faculty Authority and Responsibility**

The School’s AoL revision during 2014-2015 was carried out by a broad coalition of faculty – rather than centrally, by the administration. For each degree program, the focus of the redesign effort centered on the program committees. Other faculty members were enlisted in such activities as refining curriculum maps and identifying embedded assignments to use in near-term assessments. Getting actual assessments underway brought in additional members of the appropriate learning goal communities.

Going forward, decision-making authority regarding the timing, content, analysis, and interpretation of assessments is in the hands of the program committees and the associated learning goal owners. Actual measurement activity is also widely distributed among the faculty. In most cases the faculty members in whose courses student work samples are generated carry out the assessment scoring for those samples.

There is potential for concern with scoring bias under these conditions. Accordingly, all faculty members who are scoring work samples need to be mindful that:

1. program-level assessment plays no role in course evaluation or faculty evaluation;

2. the goal is not to make sure our students “pass” assessments at the designated threshold but to uncover areas for program-level improvements.

When we can detect shortfalls in our students’ learning, we are in the position to do something to improve future learning outcomes. When all students “pass” or exceed expectations on an assessment, that is a signal that we need to revise our goals or increase the program rigor.

Under some circumstances, other faculty might be enlisted to score student work samples and aggregate the results. Other scenarios can be entertained where the scoring of work samples might be outsourced to other parties (e.g., elsewhere at the university or business advisers).
**Administration Authority and Responsibility**

To help support AoL as a faculty-owned process, the School’s administration limits its direct involvement in AoL.

The Director of Accreditation plays a facilitative role (the Director is a member of the faculty, not a member of the administration). The Director advises program committees on the maintenance of learning goals, learning objectives, rubrics, and curriculum maps; assists, as needed, in the identification of work samples; monitors execution against assessment schedules; promotes AoL among the faculty; prepares reports as required by the deans’ office, the university, and AACSB; and maintains the infrastructure for archiving AoL data and documents.

The Dean and Associate Dean of Faculty and Research have authority over budgeting for resources required to support AoL (such as sending faculty for AACSB training in assessment) and over issues relating to faculty workloads, evaluation, and compensation that might arise in connection with AoL activities. The Associate Deans for the undergraduate and graduate programs coordinate with the program committees on such issues as course design, curriculum structure, and faculty training that might arise in relation to actions to close the loop on assessments.

**AoL Committee Structure**

The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, which led the effort to establish the current AoL program for the BA/BS degree, was divided in fall 2015 into an Undergraduate Programs Committee, an Undergraduate Business AoL Committee, and an Undergraduate Accounting AoL Committee. The AoL committees are in charge of the measurement, analysis, and interpretation of assessments. The Undergraduate Programs Committee shares with these AoL committees the responsibility for making decisions about closing the loop that affect courses and curriculum. Individuals with joint membership on the Undergraduate Programs Committee and the AoL committees for the undergraduate and accounting programs help to ensure coordination between the committees.

Each graduate program has a Programs Committee that includes the respective Academic Director and has the central responsibility for AoL and curriculum matters. Curriculum within each graduate program is coordinated through the Academic Director. The Academic Director from each graduate program conveys recommendations of curricular changes from the AoL process to the Graduate Programs Committee (GPC). The AoL responsibilities of the GPC committee include: sharing information about progress in assessment in each respective programs, sharing ideas about ways to close the loop in relation to different kinds of assessment outcomes, helping hold each program accountable to keep AoL moving forward, and planning events and other activities that will help to engage the faculty at large and other community members (e.g., students, business community) in AoL. The GPC provides a mechanism for integrating AoL efforts across graduate programs and for promoting a robust culture of assessment. The GPC is composed of all of the Academic Directors plus a full-time faculty member who are the voting members; the Director of Graduate Business Programs and the
Associate Dean of Graduate Programs who are non-voting members. The GPC votes on all graduate curricular revisions, as well as new program and certificate proposals.

The Graduate or Undergraduate Program Committee submits curriculum changes to faculty for approval. A majority of Faculty Council votes submitted is required for approval. If approved by The SB faculty, proposals that call for significant changes are submitted to the respective University Curriculum Committee.

The figures below shows the general AoL/Curriculum relationships for the graduate and undergraduate committees.

**Graduate Program Curriculum/AoL Governance:**

- **Graduate Program Learning Goal Owner**
  - Collect data
  - Analyze data and prepare assessment report

- **Graduate Program/AoL Committees** (MBA, HCMBA, MS GSCM, MRED, MSF, MTAX)
  - Review Assessment Report from LG Owner
  - Make Curricular change “closing the loop” recommendations
  - Share recommendations with GCC

- **Graduate Curriculum Committee**
  - Collaborate with Graduate Program committees on closing-the-loop initiatives and curriculum changes
  - Present curriculum change proposals to Faculty Council

- **Faculty Council**
  - Vote to approve curricular changes
Undergraduate Curriculum/AoL Process:

**Accounting Learning Goal Owner**
- Collect data
- Analyze data and prepare assessment report

**Accounting AoL Committee**
- Review Assessment Report from LG Owner
- Make Curricular change “closing the loop” recommendations
- Share recommendations with UGCC

**Undergraduate Learning Goal Owner**
- Collect data
- Analyze data and prepare assessment report

**Undergraduate AOL Committee**
- Review Assessment Report from LG Owner
- Make Curricular change “closing the loop” recommendations
- Share recommendations with UGCC

**Undergraduate Curriculum Committee**
- Collaborate with AoL committees on closing-the-loop initiatives and curriculum changes
- Present curriculum change proposals to Faculty Council

**Faculty Council**
- Vote to approve curricular changes

**Graduate Programs Committee**

*Purpose:*
The role of the Graduate Programs Committee is to oversee, and provide guidance to, the portfolio of graduate programs within the SB in relation to curricula, practice, and development.

*Membership:*
Committee includes 1 member from each of Graduate Program committee, Director of Accreditation (ex-officio) and Associate Dean for Graduate Programs (ex-officio). Additional faculty members welcome.

*Responsibilities:*
- To review and recommend curricular proposals for graduate business programs to include addition, removal or change to courses or programs
To establish, review and monitor academic procedures for all graduate programs to ensure that the process conforms to the policies of Portland State University

To coordinate activities and share practices across graduate business programs

**Graduate Program Committees (Curriculum and AOL responsibilities):**
The SB has an individual committee for each of its graduate programs. Currently, those programs are Global Supply Chain Management (GSCM), Health Care MBA (HC-MBA), Master of Business Administration (MBA), Master of Finance (MSF), Master of Real Estate Development (MRED), and the Master of Tax (MTAX). If new graduate programs are adopted by the SB, a specific committee will be created for that program. The purpose of each committee is to monitor, assess, generate and operationalize activities and decisions specific to that program as they relate to the respective curriculum and Assurance of Learning. Following are the curriculum and AoL responsibilities for each graduate program:

- Developing and assessing individual learning goals
- Aligning the mission with the learning goals
- Providing assessment-based feedback for curriculum development and improvements
- Generating a curriculum map, for its individual program
- Designing and implementing curriculum program revisions when appropriate

**Undergraduate Programs Committee**

**Purpose:**
The role of the Undergraduate Programs Committee is to oversee and provide guidance across the BA core program and the individual discipline areas of Accounting, Finance, Management, Marketing, and Supply Chain Management in relation to curriculum, practice, development, and Assurance of Learning.

**Membership:**
- 1-2 members from the UG Assurance of Learning / Curriculum – BA & UG Assurance of Learning / Curriculum – ACTG committees
- At least 1 full-time faculty member from each area: ACTG, FIN, MGMT, MKTG, SLM
- Overlap between any of the above members is permitted
- Ex-Officio: Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs, Director of Accreditation

**Responsibilities:**
- Reviewing and recommending curricular proposals for undergraduate business programs to add, remove, or make changes to courses or programs
• Establishing, reviewing and monitoring academic procedures for all undergraduate programs to ensure that the process conforms to the policies of the University
• Coordinating activities and sharing practices across undergraduate business programs
• Assessing the need for new curricular ideas and overseeing such revisions at the undergraduate level

The timing for these responsibilities follow:

**Fall:**
• Ensure that all curriculum proposals that were approved by UGP during the previous Spring are presented to Faculty Council in time to get approved and signed proposals to the Office of Academic Affairs by November 15th
• Begin collecting curriculum proposals for following Spring proposal season
• Initiate new curriculum ideas
• Coordinate with Undergraduate Assurance of Learning / Curriculum committees on assessments, findings and actions to close the loop on assessments

**Winter:**
• Collect all curriculum proposals that will be proposed during Spring proposal season by mid-February
• Work with proposers, area directors and any other potentially affected areas to provide preliminary review and feedback on proposals
• Set Spring proposal schedule by the end of the term
• Initiate new curriculum ideas
• Coordinate with Undergraduate Assurance of Learning / Curriculum committees on assessments, findings and actions to close the loop on assessments

**Spring:**
• Review all proposals submitted prior to mid-February
  □ Invite all area directors to provide feedback on each proposal at least one week prior to being presented to UGP
• Vote on each proposal by mid-May, communicate decision or conditions to proposer as soon as decision is made
• Begin submitted proposals to Faculty Council for vote
• Coordinate with Undergraduate Assurance of Learning / Curriculum committees on assessments, findings and actions to close the loop on assessments
UG Assurance of Learning Committee – BA / BS

**Purpose:**
- Oversee the Assurance of Learning process in the BA core
- Ensure that AACSB standards and best practices are being followed in the BA core
- Facilitate the SB in preparing pertinent documentation for accreditation purposes at the University and School level
- Communicate Assurance of Learning activities and programs to faculty & administration

**Membership:**
- 1 full-time faculty member to serve as Learning Goal Owner for each Learning Goal in the BA program, and in that capacity to coordinate assessments for that Learning Goal and to solicit from faculty teaching courses in support of the Learning Goal suggestions for “closing the loop” in response to assessments
- At least 2 members of the Undergraduate Programs Committee
- Overlap between Learning Goal Owners and UPG members is permitted
- Ex-Officio: Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs, Director of Accreditation

**Responsibilities:**
- Coordinate with the Undergraduate Programs Committee to ensure that course and curriculum changes are based on learning goal assessment outcomes
- Coordinate in-class assessments for Assurance of Learning
- Assist with actual assessments, as necessary
- Compile and analyze results of each assessment
- Propose recommendations for (1) improving the assessment process, and (2) improving the BA program based on assessment results
- Periodically review and revise Learning Goals, Learning Objectives, Assessment Rubrics, Curriculum Map, and Assessments Schedule, as necessary

UG Assurance of Learning Committee – Accounting

**Purpose:**
- Oversee the Assurance of Learning process in the Accounting program
- Ensure that AACSB standards and best practices are being following in Accounting
- Provide the Assurance of Learning component of the Accreditation Report for the Accounting Area
• Facilitate the SB in preparing pertinent documentation for accreditation purposes at the University and School level
• Communicate Assurance of Learning activities and programs to administration and accounting faculty

**Membership:**
• 1 full-time faculty member to serve as Learning Goal Owner for each Learning Goal in the Accounting program, and in that capacity to coordinate assessments for that Learning Goal and to solicit from faculty teaching courses in support of the Learning Goal suggestions for “closing the loop” in response to assessments
• At least 1 member of the Undergraduate Programs Committee
• Ex-Officio: Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs, Director of Accreditation

**Responsibilities:**
• Coordinate with the Undergraduate Programs Committee concerning actions to “close the loop” to make curriculum changes based on assessment outcomes
• Coordinate in-class assessments for Assurance of Learning
• Assist with actual assessments, as necessary
• Compile and analyze results of each assessment
• Propose recommendations for (1) improving the assessment process, and (2) improving the Accounting program based on assessment results
• Periodically review and revise Learning Goals, Learning Objectives, Assessment Rubrics, Curriculum Map, and Assessments Schedule, as necessary
2. SB Assurance of Learning
Overview of the SB’s AoL Program

The discussion that follows is coded to the accompanying figure, below.

Activities #1 through #5 in the figure identify tasks that each program (AoL) committee carried out in 2014-2015 to put in place the structure, content, and process for AoL. The program committees will continue to carry out these tasks indefinitely and on a maintenance basis in order to refine, and keep up to date, their assessment activities. Specifically, each program committee will:

[1] Refine existing learning goals, and specify new learning goals as the program evolves.

[2] Refine existing learning objectives and specifying new learning objectives as the program evolves.

[3] Continue to simplify and refine existing rubrics to enhance clarity and usability, and create new rubrics as new learning goals are identified.

[4] Maintain a curriculum map that identifies the courses that play a central role in promoting each learning goal, including making adjustments to the map as new relationships between courses and learning goals are identified.

[5] Maintain a realistic schedule of assessments, meeting the AACSB requirement that each learning goal be assessed at least twice during the five-year accreditation cycle. Wherever possible, student work should be drawn for a learning goal assessment from a course taken relatively late in the students’ program, in order to ensure that program level learning is being measured.

[6] Activity [6] in the figure establishes and maintains the organizational framework for faculty participation in learning goal assessments. Each learning goal is the primary responsibility of a learning goal owner. The instructors teaching courses that support a given learning goal (as identified by the pertinent curriculum map) are brought together into a learning goal community.
Activities #7 through #11 in the figure identify the steps undertaken for each assessment:

[7] In advance of an assessment, the program committee works with the learning goal owner and other appropriate faculty to identify a course-embedded assignment that can be used for the assessment.

[8] In the graduate programs, which are relatively small, the entire population of students enrolled in the course that serves as the assessment site is measured. (This excludes the few students who might be cross-enrolled in that course from other programs.) In the undergraduate business program, which graduates over 700 students per year, a sample size of 15% to 20% is assessed. Each assessment is directed by the appropriate learning goal owner. Faculty teaching sections where the work samples originate collect those samples. In most cases, those same faculty score the samples, using the appropriate rubric – although other arrangements might be made for scoring.

[9] The program committee, the learning goal owner, and members of the learning goal community generate ideas and reach decisions about closing the loop based on assessment outcomes. All learning goal community members, whether or not their classes are a site for assessment, are encouraged to discuss assessment outcomes and to contribute ideas about closing the loop. The learning goal owner facilitates these discussions.

[10] The program committee summarizes decisions about closing the loop in an assessment report for the deans’ office.

[11] The learning goal owner leads the implementation of material changes that implement the decisions for closing the loop.

Notes

(a) The SB has standardized on a 70% threshold, for the sum of students who meet or exceed expectations on an assessment, as the basis for determining what action is required for closing the loop. However, even when an assessment sample meets this threshold on the
learning goal as a whole, program committees scrutinize aggregate student performance on the learning goal’s constituent learning objectives in order to identify areas of weakness in courses and curriculum that might need attention. The objective is not to meet a certain threshold; the objective is continuously improve the goals, the objectives and the programs.

(b) The aim of actions to close the loop is not to intervene in the instruction of the current students whose work has been the subject of the assessment. Instead, the goal is to identify and implement changes that will improve outcomes for future students. That is, AoL concerns the performance of the program over the long run, not the improvement of current student performance.

(c) At no point in this process is individual faculty performance evaluated. In the aggregated assessment reports, all student information is anonymous in an effort to make the focus of assessment on how the program as a whole is meeting its goals and objectives. Further, there is no correlation between an assessment and any faculty promotion and tenure criteria. Assessment reports and results should not be used by promotion and/or tenure committees or by administration in any job evaluation procedures. Among other reasons, this is done to make the focus of assessment on how the program as a whole is performing, not on any individual faculty performance.
Overview of the SB’s Assurance of Learning Program
3. **SB Assurance of Learning**  
**Introduction to the D2L On-line Resource**

This page provides an overview of the D2L on-line resource that supports the School of Business Administration’s program in assurance of learning (AoL).

**Site Content**

The “course content” page in D2L represents the core of the site. This page contains separate sections for school-wide D2L documents and for each program in the SB, including:

- Undergraduate BA/BS program
- Accounting Program
- MBA program
- MSF program
- MS GSCM program
- MRED program
- Healthcare MBA program
- MTAX program

The collection of school-wide D2L documents includes:

- The AoL Handbook
- Description of the AoL process, with illuminating graphic
- Account of faculty and administration responsibilities for AoL at the school
- The School’s master schedule, updated annually, of the AoL assessments for the current accreditation period

The section for each program includes documents covering the current versions of that program’s:

- Learning goals, learning objectives, and rubrics
- Curriculum map
- Schedule of assessments
- Reports on assessments in-progress, or completed

The first three documents, which are available in editable form (Word or Excel), appear for each program within a sub-module entitled “Core Documents.” The assessment reports appear within a sub-module entitled “Assessment Reports.”
Access and Responsibilities

The overall aim of the D2L resource is to provide the broadest possible platform for faculty participation and knowledge acquisition in AoL-related matters. In keeping with that goal, any faculty member enrolled at the main AoL site can visit and study the AoL materials for any of the SB’s programs – whether or not that faculty member is actively involved in the program in question. Such openness will give people like program directors and AoL committee chairs, program committee members, and all other faculty involved in assessment the opportunity to survey what is being done across the school’s different programs.

D2L provides what are, at best, crude levels of access control. Faculty members given Instructor status in D2L can potentially add, change, or delete any material at the main site or any of the discussion forum sites in which they have been enrolled. Accordingly, the first responsibility of any person accessing the D2L AoL resource is not to mess things up.

That said, the intention is not that the school’s Director of Accreditation functions as a gate-keeper (and bottleneck) when it comes to posting new material, or updating existing material, at the D2L AoL site, or managing discussions at the forum sites. Instead, it is envisioned that the pertinent program directors and learning goal owners will be actively involved in such activities as updating assessment schedules, posting revised statements of learning goals and/or learning objectives, posting revised rubrics, posting updated curriculum maps, and posting and updating assessment reports and action reports. Learning goal owners will also be principally responsible for initiating and conducting relevant on-line discussions (using the forums) among learning goal community members.

Other faculty members (which is to say, not program directors, AoL committee chairs, and learning goal owners) will typically not have reason to add, change, or edit the core AoL documents for the SB programs.
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**Current Program Learning Goals & Objectives**

Undergraduate Business Program

Learning Goals & Objectives

**LG1: Problem Solving & Decision Making**

Graduates of the Business Administration Baccalaureate program will have the capacity to recognize and understand a wide range of common and novel business problems and to follow a systematic approach to solve them effectively.

Learning Objectives:

1. *Problem definition:* Students will construct clear and specific problem statements using contextually relevant evidence.
2. *Research techniques and data analysis:* Students will employ in-depth information and data from relevant sources throughout the problem solving process.
3. *Solution evaluation:* Students will thoroughly evaluate solutions from multiple dimensions using appropriate analytical tools.
4. *Decision-making:* Students will make decisions based on a synthesis of research, data analysis, and evaluation of solutions.

**LG2: Sustainability**

Graduates of the Business Administration Baccalaureate program will possess a holistic perspective on the impact that business practices have on social, economic, and environmental systems.

Learning Objectives:

1. *Stakeholder identification:* Students will identify relevant social, economic, and environmental stakeholders and their stakes.
2. *Stakeholder relationships:* Students will be aware of the interconnections between the firm and its social, economic, and environmental stakeholders.
3. *Solution development:* Students will develop solutions that demonstrate a consideration of social, economic, and environmental stakeholders and their stakes.
4. *Recognition of implications and consequences:* Students will analyze potential short- and long-term results of a specific business decision including the ability to explain consequences from multiple stakeholders' points of view.
LG3: Business Communication

Graduates of the Business Administration Baccalaureate program will effectively communicate complex information with a variety of stakeholders to increase knowledge and achieve objectives.

Learning Objectives:

1. *Context, purpose and audience:* Students will demonstrate a thorough consideration of context, purpose, and audience in the communication.
2. *Manner of presentation:* Students will present a central message in a clear, concise, and convincing manner.
3. *Delivery of complex information:* Students will skillfully articulate complex information in a manner that allows the message to be understood by multiple stakeholders.
4. *Use of sources:* Students will demonstrate a consistent use of credible, relevant sources that supports the message or credibility of the communicator.

LG4: Integrative Learning

Graduates of the Business Administration Baccalaureate program will synthesize and transfer learning to new, complex business situations within their program of study.

Learning Objectives:

1. *Connection of concepts:* Students will connect examples, facts, or theories from multiple fields of study or perspectives.
2. *Transfer of skills and theories:* Students will adapt and apply skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations to solve problems or explore issues.
3. *Integrated communication:* Students will fulfill assigned tasks by choosing a format, language, and graphic or other visual representation that explicitly connects content and form, demonstrating awareness of purpose and audience.
4. *Self-reflection:* Students will evaluate changes in their own learning over time, recognizing complex contextual factors (*e.g.*, works with ambiguity and risk, deals with frustration, considers ethical frameworks).
Accounting Program

Learning Goals & Objectives

LG 1: Technical Knowledge
Graduates will possess the technical accounting knowledge necessary for entry-level positions in the accounting profession.

*Learning Objective 1-1:* Students will demonstrate knowledge and application of foundational accounting concepts.

LG2: Critical Thinking
Graduates will apply critical thinking skills to identify and apply accounting judgment.

*Learning Objective 2-1:* Students will identify and analyze accounting issues for an unstructured or incomplete set of facts and provide reasoned solutions.

LG 3: Ethical Reasoning
Graduates will incorporate ethical principles of the accounting profession when analyzing and responding to accounting issues.

*Learning Objective 3-1:* Students will identify and analyze ethical issues, including identifying stakeholders, analyzing alternative courses of action, and proposing reasoned resolutions to promote the public interest.

LG 4: Communication
Graduates will be able to produce effective communications.

*Learning Objective 4-1:* Students will demonstrate a thorough consideration of context and purpose and audience, will present a central message in a clear, concise, and convincing manner and will demonstrate a consistent use of relevant authoritative sources to support their message.
MBA Program

Learning Goals & Objectives

LG1: Critical Thinking

MBA graduates will demonstrate comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Learning Objectives:

1. *Description or clarification of the problem:* Students will be able to describe and clarify the problems to be analyzed.
2. *Interpretation and evaluation of information:* Students will interpret and evaluate information to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis.
3. *Organization of evidence:* Students will organize evidence to reveal important patterns, differences, or similarities.
4. *Conclusions and recommendations:* Students will logically tie conclusions/recommendations to the analysis.

LG2: Systems Thinking

MBA graduates will understand the multiplex systems across critical external domains (social, economic, and political) and internal functional domains and scales (global and local) that influence decision-making.

Learning Objectives:

1. *Identify stakeholders and stakes:* Students will identify relevant and specific stakeholders and articulate their stakes.
2. *Acknowledge interdependencies:* Students will acknowledge the interdependencies between and among stakeholders from the perspective of the focal organization or unit.
3. *Analyze implications of decisions:* Students will analyze the many (intended and unintended) implications that decisions have from multiple stakeholders points of view.
LG3: Global Mindset

MBA graduates will engage in new and unfamiliar contexts in a manner that enables understanding, experiencing, and adjusting.

Learning Objectives:

1. **Openness**: Students will demonstrate the willingness to seek to understand ideas, values, norms, situations and behaviors different from their own.
2. **Inquisitiveness**: Students will demonstrate the willingness to seek new experiences that offer new insights and perspectives.
3. **Adjusting**: Students will demonstrate an ability to learn from mistakes and adjust behavior to ensure success.

LG4: Communication

MBA graduates will be able to effectively convey information through speech, visuals, writing, and behavior.

Learning Objectives:

1. **Context, purpose, and audience**: Students will demonstrate consideration of context, purpose and audience in the communication.
2. **Presentation of central message**: Students will present a central message in a clear, concise and convincing manner.
3. **Articulation of complex information**: Students will articulate complex information in a manner that allows the message to be understood by stakeholders.
Master of Finance

Learning Goals & Objectives

LG1 - Critical Thinking

Graduates of the MSF program will be effective business decision makers who critically analyze an economic or financial issue and develop a clearly supportable position/recommendation on the issue.

Learning Objectives

1. Students will identify relevant issues in relation to unstructured settings characterized by complex and incomplete information.
2. Students will develop and draw meaningful insights, conclusions and develop alternatives from appropriately applied analysis.
3. Students will develop and apply criteria to develop supportable positions and/or recommendations.

LG2 – Systems Thinking

Graduates of the MSF program will understand the multiplex systems across critical domains (social, economic, political, etc.) and scales (global and local) that influence ethical decision-making.

Learning Objectives

1. Students will identify their ethical decision making model and apply it
2. Students will recognize the firm’s interdependencies among its relevant economic, social and environmental stakeholders
3. Students will analyze the potential implications that decisions have from multiple stakeholders’ points of view.
LG3 – Finance Knowledge

Graduates of the MSF program will apply the techniques, tools and strategies useful for performing complex financial analysis

Learning Objectives

1. Students will incorporate relevant contextual information in a financial analysis
2. Students will choose, apply and interpret the appropriate financial analysis method/s
3. Students will identify relevant risks and can incorporate them into the analysis
4. Students will utilize information systems and data analysis methods in support of their analysis.

Learning Goal 4 – Business Communications

Graduates of the MSF program will effectively communicate complex information with a variety of stakeholders to increase knowledge and achieve objectives.

Learning Objectives

1. Students will present a central message in a clear, concise, and convincing manner.
2. Students will use credible and relevant sources to support the central message or credibility of the communicator
3. Students will articulate complex information in a manner that allows the message to be understood by all stakeholders
4. Students will summarize the central message with a quality conclusion and recommendation
Master of Science in Global Supply Chain Management

Learning Goals & Objectives

LG1: Problem Solving & Decision Making

MSGSCM graduates will develop a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Learning Objectives:

1.  *Explanation of issues*: Students will craft a clear and actionable problem statement that includes all contextual information.
2.  *Evidence*: Students will present primary and secondary data most relevant to the situation.
3.  *Analysis*: Students will apply appropriate methodology to produce an analysis that articulates insightful patterns.
4.  *Conclusion*: Students will propose solutions and make decisions based upon the analysis.

LG2: Systems Perspective

MSGSCM graduates will be able to recognize complex problems and understand them as multidimensional and interrelated and understand the impact on stakeholders.

Learning Objectives:

1.  *Identify stakeholders and stakes*: Students will identify relevant stakeholders in a supply chain issue and articulate their stakes.
2.  *Recognizes interdependencies*: Students will acknowledge the interdependencies between and among stakeholders from the perspective of the focal organization.
3.  *Analyzes implications of decisions*: Students will analyze the many implications that decisions have from multiple stakeholders’ points of view.
LG3: Emotional Intelligence

MSGSCM graduates will demonstrate effective leadership and teamwork skills, supported by high levels of emotional intelligence in the areas of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and social management.

Learning Objectives:

1. **Self-awareness**: Students will exhibit awareness of their own strengths and weaknesses in professional environments.
2. **Self-management**: Students will demonstrate the ability to manage their own behavior appropriately in professional settings.
3. **Social awareness**: Students will demonstrate an awareness of the perspectives of others in professional settings.
4. **Relationship management**: Students will demonstrate the ability to create positive, productive relationships in professional settings.

LG4: Supply Chain Strategy

MSGSCM graduates will develop and clearly communicate innovative and alternative supply chain strategies that are adaptive to international environments.

Learning Objectives:

1. **Think globally**: Students will evaluate the impact of culture on business strategies, and develop business strategies that adapt to international environments.
2. **Make strategic decisions**: Students will generate alternative strategic actions in business situations, and choose and defend strategies that sustain competitive advantage.
3. **Innovate**: Students will create strategies and identify structures and processes that exploit technology for innovative business opportunities and solutions.
4. **Communicate, negotiate, and persuade**: Students will develop messages that are appropriate in style, tone, and content for communication situations.
Master of Real Estate Development

Learning Goals & Objectives

LG1: Teamwork and Leadership

MRED graduates will demonstrate effective leadership and teamwork competencies, supported by high levels of emotional intelligence (e.g., self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and social management).

Learning Objectives:
1. Interpersonal communication skills: Students will demonstrate effective interpersonal communication skills.
3. Inquiring and advocacy competencies: Students will demonstrate both inquiring and advocacy competencies in team environments.
4. Communication: Students can effectively communicate real estate development issues, analysis, and concepts through verbal, written, and graphic modalities.

LG2: Critical Thinking

MRED graduates will critically evaluate real estate development problems and opportunities, analyze those problems with appropriate quantitative and qualitative data analytic techniques, and prescribe and defend subsequent solutions.

Learning Objectives:
1. Problem identification: Students can identify and evaluate a real estate development problem/opportunity from multiple perspectives.
2. Research techniques and data analysis: Students can select and employ appropriate qualitative and quantitative data analytic techniques and tools to conduct real estate-specific analyses with pertinent qualitative and quantitative data.
3. Solution evaluation and selection: Students can select and defend a chosen alternative/solution that is consistent with the evaluation.
LG3: Equity and Sustainability Thinking

MRED graduates will have an equity and sustainability perspective (e.g., environmental stewardship, intergenerational resources, equitable opportunities and access).

Learning Objectives:
1. Understanding of interdependencies: Students will demonstrate understanding of the interdependencies between environmental stewardship, social equity and real estate development.
2. Recognition of effects: Students will demonstrate recognition of crucial direct and indirect effects of real estate development decisions, including intangible effects.
3. Strategy selections: Students can effectively assess and select appropriate strategies for employing equitable and sustainable approaches and techniques in a real estate development context.

LG4: Communication

MRED graduates will effectively communicate complex information with a variety of stakeholders to increase knowledge and achieve objectives.

Learning Objectives:
1. Consideration of context, purpose, and audience: Students will demonstrate a thorough consideration of context, purpose and audience.
2. Delivery of message: Students will present a central message in a clear, concise, and convincing manner. The method of delivery supports the message.
3. Articulation of quantitative information: Students will skillfully articulate quantitative information in a way that allows it to be understood by all key stakeholders.
4. Data sources: Students will demonstrate a consistent use of credible, relevant sources that supports the message or credibility of the communicator.
Healthcare MBA

Learning Goals & Objectives

LG1: Systems

Healthcare MBA graduates will understand the complex healthcare system across critical domains (social, economic, political, regulatory, etc.) and scales (micro to macro) that influence healthcare policy and operations and apply this understanding to their own professional situation and organization.

Learning Objectives:

1. Relevant and specific stakeholders: Students will identify relevant and specific stakeholders in the healthcare system, articulate their stakes, and illustrate how those stakeholders operate in a mutually influencing system.
2. Providing stakeholder value: Students will analyze the potential short- and long-term implications (intended and unintended) that healthcare policy, finance, and operations decisions have on providing value from multiple stakeholders’ (especially patients’) points of view.
3. Translation to specific organizational, business, and quality issues: Students will be able to translate and apply their understanding of the complex healthcare system to address specific healthcare organizational, business, and quality issues faced by stakeholders in the healthcare system.

LG2: Analysis and Decision Making

Healthcare MBA graduates will analyze complex and ambiguous issues in healthcare and reason toward solutions that are innovative in healthcare contexts.

Learning Objectives:

1. Define problem: Students will craft meaningful and actionable problem statements with strong consideration towards diverse stakeholders.
2. Use and analysis of evidence: Students will systematically gather and methodically analyze primary and secondary evidence most relevant to the situation.
3. Potential solutions: Students will thoughtfully design and rigorously evaluate potential solutions.
4. Decision-making: Students will propose solutions that address the needs of diverse stakeholders and are sensitive to contextual factors.
LG3: Leadership

Healthcare MBA graduates will accurately name their own emotional state, understand their impact on others, and act to promote a strength-based, appreciative climate.

Learning Objectives:

1. *Emotional self-reflection:* Students will meaningfully reflect on their own emotions and articulate how they impact others.
2. *Capabilities and motivations:* Students will reflect on their own strengths, weaknesses, drives, values, and goals.
3. *Adaptation:* Students will skillfully redirect disruptive emotions and impulses, and effectively adapt to changing circumstances.
4. *Professional relationships:* Students will foster professional relationships with a strength-based, appreciative perspective.

LG4: Communication

Healthcare MBA graduates will communicate in a manner that appropriately and thoughtfully informs, influences, and inspires diverse stakeholders.

Learning Objectives:

1. *Context, purpose, and audience:* Students will demonstrate a thorough consideration of context, purpose and audience in the communication.
2. *Inquiry:* Students will demonstrate evidence of inquiry throughout the communication.
3. *Clear, concise, and convincing presentation of message:* Students will present a central message in a clear, concise and convincing manner.
4. *Articulation of complex information:* Students will skillfully articulate complex information in a manner that allows the message to be understood by diverse stakeholders.
MTax

Learning Goals & Objectives

LG1: Critical Thinking
Graduates of the Master of Taxation (“MT”) program will be effective business decision makers who are able to critically analyze an economic, financial and/or tax issue and develop a clearly supportable position/recommendation on the issue.

Learning Objectives:
1. Identification of relevant issues: Students will identify relevant issues in relation to unstructured settings characterized by complex and incomplete information.
2. Draw meaningful insights: Students will develop and draw meaningful insights, conclusions and develop alternatives from appropriately applied analysis.
3. Develop a supportable recommendation: Students will develop and apply criteria to develop supportable positions/recommendations.
4. Economic focus: Students will be able to effectively utilize tax guidance to focus on the economic significance of the tax issue at hand rather than just the legal form of the issue.
5. Strategic planning: Students will develop defensible strategic planning relating to alternate courses of action in specific tax situations.
6. Risk assessment: Students will identify relevant risks in federal, state, local and/or international tax situations and properly address them in their analysis and recommendations.

LG2: Research Skills
Graduates of the MT program will be able to conduct effective professional tax research.

Learning Objectives:
1. Utilization of primary resources: Students will be able to utilize primary tax resource databases to gather information in order to address federal, state, local and/or international tax issues.
2. Interpret and apply tax authority: Students will be able to research, review and interpret relevant tax authority standards and will be able to apply those standards to complex and unstructured economic, financial and/or tax situations.
3. Analytical skills: Students will be able to effectively analyze information gathered from the databases and other resources using appropriate analytical tools in order to enhance the development, sharing and reporting of their research.
LG3: Technical Tax Knowledge

Graduates of the MT program will apply the techniques, tools and strategies useful for performing complex tax planning, analysis and compliance.

Learning Objectives:
1. *Technical knowledge*: Students will demonstrate knowledge of fundamental tax principles as well as familiarity with federal, state, local and/or international tax rules and regulations, legal rulings and/or other governmental pronouncements.
2. *Policy and compliance*: Students will demonstrate an understanding of relevant tax policy and compliance issues related to federal, state, local and/or international tax situations.

LG4: Business Communication

Graduates of the MT program will effectively communicate complex information with a variety of stakeholders to increase knowledge and achieve objectives.

Learning Objectives:
1. *Central message*: Students will present a central message in a clear, concise, and convincing manner.
2. *Evidence*: Students will use credible and relevant sources to support the central message or credibility of the communicator.
3. *Complex information*: Students will articulate complex information in a manner that allows the message to be understood by all relevant stakeholders.
4. *Conclusion*: Students will summarize the central message with a quality conclusion and recommendation.
5. SB Assurance of Learning
Writing an Assessment Report

The assessment of a learning goal in any program begins with the identification of a course and assignment that will be the basis for the assessment. The AoL or program committee makes this determination. For graduate programs, the work of all of the students taking the course in the given year is typically collected and evaluated. (Where there are part-time and full-time cohorts, this entails measuring both groups.) For the undergraduate program, a sample consisting of from 15% to 20% of the total number of students taking the course in question during that academic year should be used. Roughly speaking, that is 200 students, or most/all of the students taking that (core) course during a specific quarter.

Once the assignments are collected and scored (using the learning goal rubric for written and analytical work samples), the learning goal owner produces a concise analysis of the results in spreadsheet form, and prepares a brief narrative giving an interpretation of the results. As soon as possible after the completion of this work, the AoL or program committee meets to discuss the assessment results and to decide on actions that will be taken to “close the loop” in order to improve student learning outcomes. The program director (for graduate programs) or the chair of the AoL committee (for the undergrad program) writes a brief summary of the committee’s analysis and conclusions.

The AoL or program committee chair, working with the pertinent learning goal owner, produces a final assessment report comprised of the following elements:

- a heading identifying the term, learning goal, course, and learning goal owner
- a list of other participating faculty (if any)
- the learning goal owner’s brief narrative, as described above
- the program director’s/AoL committee chair’s summary, as described above an image of the spreadsheet showing the assessment results (anonymized)
- a copy of the assignment

Examples of these elements from the Spring 2015 assessment of LG#2 in the MS in Global Supply Chain Management program follow. A link to the spreadsheet file used in aggregating the assessment results appears in D2L beneath the link you used to access the document you are currently reading. The assignment document in this case has been embellished with notes that show the mapping of the assignment questions to the learning objectives for this learning goal. These notes did not appear in the student version of this assignment.

The program director (or AoL Committee chair) uploads the final assessment report to the main SB AoL D2L site, and establishes a link to it from the appropriate section of the Course Content page. S/he also emails the final assessment report to the accreditation director.

Examples of sample assessment reports are included in the following section:
[1] Depending on the program and assessment, an assessment report might look different from the following examples. So the elements that appear below are offered as helpful, but not prescriptive, examples.

[2] The MSFA sample that follows helpfully reports on actual activity that had taken place to close the loop based on decisions made during the previous assessment of that learning goal. Such documentation should be provided whenever available, so that the School can confirm with AACSB peer review team members that promised actions were actually carried out, not just discussed.

[3] The assessment report is concise by design. Making your assessments reports succinct will encourage people to read them, and it will facilitate aggregation of information on assessment outcomes when it comes time to report on our AoL activities to the university and to AACSB.

[4] When distinct cohorts must be included in a learning goal assessment, student work samples will sometimes have to be collected across sections that take place during different terms. A single assessment report should aggregate the results across these sections.

[5] Sometimes a single assignment cannot be identified or devised that will support the assessment of all of the learning objectives for a given learning goal. (Note that each learning goal is operationalized as, typically, three or four learning objectives.) In such cases, different work samples must be collected from the same set of students across different courses (and possibly different terms) in order to separately assess subsets of the learning objectives. A single assessment report should aggregate the results across these learning objectives.

[6] Two sample assessment materials follow. All completed assessment reports have been posted under the appropriate sections of the Course Content page at the main SB D2L site for Assurance of Learning, and are available there for your inspection. Some program committees have taken to posting interim assessment documents in these sections, also. Be certain which kind of document you are examining.
## ASSESSMENT REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning objectives 1-4 were assessed with the same instrument. The learning objectives are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Context, purpose and audience:</strong> Students will demonstrate a thorough consideration of context, purpose, and audience in the communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Manner of presentation:</strong> Students will present a central message in a clear, concise, and convincing manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Delivery of complex information:</strong> Students will skillfully articulate complex information in a manner that allows the message to be understood by multiple stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Use of sources:</strong> Students will demonstrate a consistent use of credible, relevant sources that supports the message or credibility of the communicator.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The sample was taken from an assignment presented in BA 325, Information Literacy &amp; Technical Competence, during the Fall term of the 2018/2019 school year. A total of 189 students across two sections were assessed, including one hybrid, and one fully online section. The assignment included a short business case identifying a business problem followed with a set of questions focused on communicating key insights in the form of an executive summary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The course instructor used the Undergraduate Business Communication rubric to assess the learning objectives. Students were categorized into Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not meet Expectations for each objective. For a student to Exceed Expectations for the Learning Goal, they must Exceed Expectations for all four Learning Objectives. For a student to Meet Expectations for the Learning Goal, they must Meet or Exceed Expectations for all four Learning Objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings

Overall, 89.5% of the students were determined to Meet or Exceed Expectations for the learning Goal.

Specific findings for the Undergraduate Business students were:

- 33.9% of the students were categorized as Exceeds
- 55.6% of the students were categorized as Meets
- 10.5% of the students were categorized as Does Not meet

- Students had the most difficulty with Learning Objective 4, Use of Sources, with 10.5% failing to meet expectations. This objective refers to a proper use of sources throughout the presentation. The Use of Sources was the most problematic Objective in the spring 2016 assessment but the rate has improved by 24%. This shows that we are improving students’ understanding of proper sourcing, and the use of proper formatting, but that we still have room to improve.

- A small group of students also seemed to have trouble with Learning Objective 2, Manner of Presentation, reflected in 7.4% of the students receiving no points for this Objective. These students struggled to deliver a concise message that was clear and convincing.

Closing The Loop

Data collected from this fall 2018 assessment indicates:

1. Programmatic changes made following the spring 2016 assessment were effective in closing the loop for Learning Goal 4: Use of Sources. The actions taken to close that loop in 2016 were:
   - Created library guides for classes with secondary research assignments (e.g., based on assigned texts, articles, and cases). Listed on D2L online courses and available to all students here: [https://guides.library.pdx.edu/c.php?g=265596&p=1775706](https://guides.library.pdx.edu/c.php?g=265596&p=1775706)
   - Developed detailed writing and presentation guidelines in BA 301 and 311.
   - Created a peer tutoring program in the School of Business for core BA courses and includes support for students on writing and communication. This tutoring service is highly trafficked by students.
   - In BA325, students were provided with a rubric at the start of term which showed them how all their communication would be assessed.

Action Plan: Based on the results and ongoing discussions with the evaluating instructors, the course coordinator has the following recommendations moving forward:

- While the results of this assessment demonstrate that student learning is improving, we recommend developing an online student resource that addresses each of the four learning objectives that comprise the Business Communication Learning Goal. This resource will include a built-in assessment to ensure that students are aware of, and familiar with the content provided.
## Student Results:

### AOL Assessment

**BA-325: Information Literacy**

**Business Communication LG**

**Erica Wagner FALL/2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>LO 1- Context, Purpose &amp; Audience</th>
<th>LO 2- Manne r of Presentation</th>
<th>LO 3- Deliver y of Complex Information</th>
<th>LO 4- Use of Sources</th>
<th>Overall Assessment (&quot;meets&quot; or &quot;exceeds&quot;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LO Scoring:**

2 = Exceeds Expectations  
1 = Meets Expectations  
0 = Does Not Meet Expectations

**Decision Rules:**

1) Must at least "meet" on all objectives to meet on the learning goal overall.  
2) Must "exceed" on all objectives to exceed on the learning goal overall.

**Results:**

Meets expectations - 105 of 189 students = 55.6%  
Exceeds expectations - 64 of 189 students = 33.9%
| 172 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 173 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 174 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 175 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 176 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 177 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 178 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 179 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 180 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 181 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 182 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 183 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 184 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 185 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 186 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 187 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 188 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 189 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Exceeds: 64
- Meets: 105
- Does Not Meet: 20
- Total: 189
### Learning Objectives

Learning objectives 1-3 were assessed with the same instrument. The Learning Objectives are:

1. Students will identify their ethical decision making model and apply it
2. Students will recognize the firm’s interdependencies among its relevant economic, social and environmental stakeholders
3. Students will analyze the potential implications that decisions have from multiple stakeholders’ points of view.

### Sample

The sample was taken from an embedded assignment in ACTG 560: Professional Ethics, taught Winter 2016. A total of 32 students were assessed. The assignment was an individual paper that covered: core values, ethical decision making, corporate obligations and value systems.

### Methods

The course instructor utilized the MSFA Systems Thinking rubric to assess the Learning Objectives and categorize student performance into Exceeds (2 points), Meets (1 point) or Does Not Meet (0 points). For a student to Exceed expectations for the Learning Goal, they must Exceed expectations for all 3 Learning Objectives. Similarly, a student must Meet or Exceed expectations of each Learning Objective to Meet expectations for the overall Learning Goal.

### Findings

Overall, 84% of the students were determined to Meet or Exceed expectations for the Learning Goal.

Findings for the MSFA students were:

- 34% of the students were Exceeds
- 50% of the students were Meets
- 16% of the students were Does Not Meet

During 2015 Systems Thinking Assessment, 67.5% of student Met or Exceeded Expectations
Closing the Loop

During the 2015 assessment, the following closing the loop actions were taken:

• A fundamental element of the Learning Goals is the ability to identify stakeholders and then recognize the interdependencies and implications of decisions. MGMT 511 – Foundations in Strategy is taught in the Fall term and will be used to introduce the concepts related to stakeholder identification, interdependencies and implications of decisions. The stakeholder issues will be explicitly introduced in conjunction with the following frameworks: PEST (Political, Economic, Social and Technological), VRIO (Value, Rarity, Imitability, Organization), Porter Five Forces and SWOT. The committee also wants to ensure the students have the opportunity to consistently utilize the frameworks in other courses. In support of that, the strategy course instructor will also prepare a summary of the frameworks for distribution to the other instructors in the program. (Done: Garten)

• The sample used to assess the Learning Goal was an assignment in ACTG 560 – Professional Ethics. Section 3 of the assignment requires the student to discuss the role of corporations in society. The assignment will be updated to restructure or add questions which would allow students to more fully demonstrate their ability to identify the relevant stakeholders of the corporation, interdependencies and consequences of decisions. (Done: Layzell)

• A concept to re-sequence the ACTG 560 – Professional Ethics course was also discussed. The concept was to re-design ACTG 560 from a course taught in a single term to a course that would span the duration of the program with student touch points in multiple terms. This concept will be discussed more fully and evaluated as part of any future program revision (will be addressed in MSFA program revision to be implemented in Fall 2017).

Based on results of the 2016 assessment, additional actions should be taken to:

• Revise assignment in ACTG 560 to allow for further depth and use of examples for LO1: Ethical Decision Making Model
• Evaluate a re-sequence course to later in the program, with introduction of LG earlier in the program as part of the 2017-18 program revision
• Evaluate assessing the Systems Thinking learning goal in a course later in the program. This may allow to work through a complex problem requiring stakeholder management, financial implications and one’s ethical decision making model. The committee identified FIN 565 – Corporate Financial Strategies as a good candidate.
Student Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>LO#1 Identify their ethical decision making model and apply</th>
<th>LO#2 Recognise a firm's interdependencies with its economic and environmental stakeholders</th>
<th>LO#3 Analyze the potential implications that financial decisions have from multiple stakeholders' points of view</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DNM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DNM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DNM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DNM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DNM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#18</td>
<td>did not complete assignment</td>
<td>assignment</td>
<td>incomplete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>DNM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNM</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>