

Eckelkamp College of Global Business and Professional Studies  
2010-2011 Annual Assessment of Student Learning

October 3, 2011

**Table of Contents**

List of Tables ..... 5

Mission & Vision..... 6

    Eckelkamp College of Global Business and Professional Studies Mission Statement ..... 6

    Our Statement of Vision ..... 6

Preface..... 6

    Personnel Change..... 6

    Organization..... 6

    Defining Goals, Objectives and Outcomes ..... 6

        Goal ..... 6

        Objective ..... 6

        Outcome ..... 7

Degrees offered through the ECGBPS ..... 7

Goals and Learning Objectives for Degrees in the ECGBPS ..... 7

    Goal 1 ..... 7

    Goal 2..... 8

    Goal 3..... 8

Selected Assessment Related Changes in 2010-2011 ..... 8

    Removal of the Performance Management Assessment..... 8

    Faculty annual survey ..... 8

    OPTIONS student experience with the OPTIONS administrative offices ..... 8

Review of Assessment Data from 2010-2011 ..... 9

    Selected highlights: ..... 9

    Areas for Improvement: ..... 9

Selected Recommendations for 2011-2012 ..... 9

    Conduct program review for select degree programs ..... 9

    Collect assessment data from the MM and MSSCM degrees..... 10

    Set achievement goals on the Major Field Test ..... 10

Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA) and Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) ..... 11

    Objectives ..... 11

    Methods..... 11

        Major Field Test (MFT)..... 11

        CompXM ..... 11

Results..... 13

    Major Field Test (MFT)..... 13

    CompXM. .... 15

Analysis..... 18

    Major Field Test (MFT)..... 18

CompXM. ....	18
Recommendations.....	19
Bachelor of Science in Sports Management (BSSM) and Bachelor of Science in Sports & Entertainment Management (BSSEM) .....	21
Objectives .....	21
Methods.....	21
Internships/Practicum evaluation.....	21
Sports marketing plan .....	21
Results.....	22
Internship/Practicum evaluation .....	22
Sports marketing plan .....	23
Analysis.....	23
Recommendations.....	23
Bachelor of Arts in Organizational Studies (BOS).....	25
Objectives .....	25
Methods.....	25
Recommendations.....	25
Bachelor of Arts in Contemporary Studies (BCS).....	26
Objective.....	26
Methods.....	26
Recommendations.....	26
Bachelor of Arts in Corporate Communication (BCC) .....	27
Objectives .....	27
Methods.....	27
Recommendations.....	27
Master of Business Administration (MBA).....	29
Objectives .....	29
Methods.....	29
Major Field Test (MFT).....	29
CompXM. ....	29
Results.....	30
Major Field Test (MFT).....	30
CompXM. ....	32
Analysis.....	35
Major Field Test (MFT).....	35
CompXM. ....	35
Recommendations.....	36
Master of Science in Accounting (MSA).....	38
Objective.....	38
Methods.....	38

Recommendations.....	38
Master of Science in Taxation (MST) .....	39
Objective.....	39
Methods.....	39
Recommendations.....	39
Master of Management (MM) .....	40
Objectives .....	40
Methods.....	40
Recommendations.....	40
Master of Science in Supply Chain Management (MSSCM).....	42
Objectives .....	42
Methods.....	42
Recommendations.....	42
Master of Science in Nonprofit Management (MSNPM).....	44
Objectives .....	44
Methods.....	44
Recommendations.....	44

**List of Tables**

Table 1	BBA and BSBA Assessment Indicators.....	12
Table 2	Average Total Scores and National Percentile Rank on the MFT for BSBA and BBA Students by Academic Year and Unit .....	13
Table 3	Average Percentage of Correct Responses and National Percentile Rank on the MFT for BSBA and BBA students by Subject Areas, Academic Year and Unit.....	14
Table 4	Average Balanced Scorecard, Board Query scores and International Comparison Percentiles for BSBA and BBA Students by Academic Year and Unit.....	15
Table 5	Average Balanced Scorecard Sub-scale Scores for BSBA and BBA Students by Academic Year and Unit .....	16
Table 6	Average Board Query Sub-scale Scores for BSBA and BBA Students by Academic Year and Unit .....	17
Table 7	BSBA and BBA Recommendations from 2009-2010.....	19
Table 8	BSBA and BBA Recommendations for 2011-2012.....	20
Table 9	BSSM Internship/Practicum Evaluations of Student Performance.....	22
Table 10	BSSM Sports Marketing Plan Evaluation of Student Performance .....	23
Table 11	BSSM and BSSEM Recommendations from 2009-2010 .....	24
Table 12	BSSM and BSSEM Recommendations for 2011-2012.....	24
Table 13	BOS Recommendations from 2009-2010 .....	25
Table 14	BOS Recommendations for 2011-2012 .....	25
Table 15	BCC Recommendations from 2009-2010.....	28
Table 16	BCC Recommendations for 2011-2012 .....	28
Table 17	MBA Assessment Instruments .....	30
Table 18	Average Total Scores and National Percentile Rank on the MFT for MBA Students by Academic Year and Unit .....	30
Table 19	Average Percentage of Correct Responses and National Percentile Rank on the MFT for MBA Students by Subject Areas, Academic Year and Unit .....	31
Table 20	Average Balanced Scorecard, Board Query scores and International Comparison Percentiles for MBA Students by Academic Year and Unit .....	32
Table 21	Average Balanced Scorecard Sub-scale Scores for MBA Students by Academic Year and Unit .....	33
Table 22	Average Board Query Sub-scale Scores for MBA Students by Academic Year and Unit .....	34
Table 23	MBA Recommendations for 2011-2012 .....	36
Table 24	MBA Recommendations from 2009-2010.....	37
Table 25	MSA Recommendations from 2009-2010 .....	38
Table 26	MSA Recommendations for 2011-2012 .....	38
Table 27	MST Recommendations from 2009-2010.....	39
Table 28	MST Recommendations for 2011-2012.....	39
Table 29	MM Recommendations from 2009-2010.....	41
Table 30	MM Recommendations for 2011-2012 .....	41
Table 31	MSSCM Recommendations from 2009-2010.....	43
Table 32	MSSCM Recommendations for 2011-2012 .....	43

## **Eckelkamp College of Global Business and Professional Studies 2010-2011 Annual Assessment of Student Learning**

### **Mission & Vision**

#### **Eckelkamp College of Global Business and Professional Studies Mission Statement**

The mission of the Eckelkamp College of Global Business & Professional Studies (ECGBPS) at Fontbonne University is to provide academically sound traditional and non-traditional programs that are responsive to current and future business needs. The programs strive to create a supportive environment that provides individualized attention to a diverse student population. Consistent with the liberal arts orientation of the University, programs are designed to enhance students' ethical and global perspective, enrich their overall quality of life professionally and personally, and prepare them for successful careers.

#### **Our Statement of Vision**

To be recognized for educating articulate, analytical thinkers charged with seeking ethical and socially responsible solutions to serve a dynamic business world in need.

### **Preface**

#### **Personnel Change**

Midway through the 2010-2011 academic year, the previous Assessment Coordinator for the College of Business resigned and a new Assessment Coordinator was hired. This change caused a disruption in the completion of most of the recommendations and agenda items for the 2010-2011 academic year.

#### **Organization**

This report is organized by degree and major for each of the College's 13 degrees. Each section will include the objectives, methods, data, analysis, conclusions, and recommendations for that particular degree.

#### **Defining Goals, Objectives and Outcomes**

**Goal.** A goal is an overarching, general statement describing the intended purposes of a degree program. Goals encapsulate and are supported by any number of objectives. Goal statements act as a foundation for a degree program and link it to the College's and University's larger mission and vision. Goals remain relatively stable over time. Goals statements are generally not used at the course level. Goals are fulfilled through the achievement of the objectives.

**Objective.** An objective is a specific, measurable statement describing what students should be able to know or do after completing a degree program or course. Objectives encapsulate and are supported by the program's curriculum, including any number of outcomes at both the program and course level. Objectives represent the "identity" of a program and should be reviewed more frequently than goals to ensure they are meeting the needs of the College's stakeholders.

**Outcome.** An outcome is a specific, measurable statement that describes how students will achieve each Objective. The outcome is an end-product in the form of an assignment or performance that can be measured using explicit criteria at either the course or program level. As such, outcomes are also a description of the assessment instrument used to collect data, which is used to evaluate the degree to which the objective has been met.

### **Degrees offered through the ECGBPS**

#### Undergraduate Degrees:

- Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA)
- Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA)
- Bachelor of Science in Sports Management (BSSM)
- Bachelor of Science in Sports & Entertainment Management (BSSEM)
- Bachelor of Arts in Organizational Studies (BOS)
- Bachelor of Arts in Contemporary Studies (BCS)
- Bachelor of Arts in Corporate Communication (BCC)

#### Graduate Degrees:

- Master of Business Administration (MBA)
- Master of Science in Accounting (MSA)
- Master of Science in Taxation (MST)
- Master of Management (MM)
- Master of Science in Supply Chain Management (MSSCM)
- Master of Science in Nonprofit Management (MSNPM)

### **Goals and Learning Objectives for Degrees in the ECGBPS**

The College has three overarching goals and their supporting learning objectives which apply to each of the College's degrees. These goals and objectives are in addition to the degree-specific goals and objectives. The degree-specific goals and objectives are listed under each degree's section. The College will need to determine what interaction these overarching goals will have on the individual degrees, especially as more degrees undergo the program review process.

**Goal 1:** To confirm the mission, values, and purposes of Fontbonne University by continuing to provide distinctive programs recognized for their academic excellence and enhancing students' personal and professional quality of life by preparing them for successful business careers. Upon completion of a major in the ECGBPS, students will be able to:

- A. Use business knowledge and understanding to think critically and analytically, communicate effectively, demonstrate technological competence, act ethically, and make ethical decisions.
- B. Recognize the responsibility of the individual and business organization to the social environment within a global perspective.
- C. Assume responsibility as citizens and business leaders.

**Goal 2:** To actively support the ongoing initiatives of Fontbonne University by enhancing students' ethical and global perspective. Upon completion of a major in the ECGBPS, students will be able to:

- A. Identify their responsibilities in the continuous pursuit of individual and corporate ethical behavior and global citizenship.
- B. Understand the impact global perspectives have on the development of solutions and implementation of resolutions to issues.
- C. Achieve personal and professional goals by participating in organizations that embrace ethical standards, diversity, and pursue excellence.

**Goal 3:** To provide quality business, educational, experiential, and active learning methods reflective of a liberal and professional body of knowledge. Upon completion of a major in the ECGBPS, students will be able to:

- A. Demonstrate their understanding of forces that shape business practices: ethical, global, social/cultural, legal, and technological issues in real world business settings.
- B. Use the business knowledge skills obtained to solve complex business problems.
- C. Use interpersonal and organizational dynamics in order to succeed in business.

### **Selected Assessment Related Changes in 2010-2011**

**Removal of the Performance Management Assessment.** The Performance Management Assessment (PMA) is no longer being used as an assessment instrument. After reviewing the usefulness and appropriateness of the instrument, it was determined that the PMA was not cost effective, lacked reliability and lacked connectivity to the learning outcomes and objectives of the BBA, BSBA and MBA degrees. Additionally, data from the PMA had greater limitations than value.

**Faculty annual survey.** In summer 2011, the College conducted its first Faculty Annual Evaluation survey to all OPTIONS faculty. The purpose of this assessment is to gauge areas where OPTIONS faculty believe students need training (i.e. Blackboard, APA style, etc.), how the faculty use Blackboard, areas where they want additional training and areas they need additional support to make their courses and their overall experience with Fontbonne more positive.

**OPTIONS student experience with the OPTIONS administrative offices.** Four new surveys were created to assess the OPTIONS student experience with the OPTIONS administrative offices. The Up-Front Admissions and Advising Experience survey is given to students during the new student orientation and focuses on the student experience with admissions, advising and orientation. The 4<sup>th</sup> Term survey is given to students at the end of their fourth term. The 4<sup>th</sup> Term survey focuses primarily on the student experience with the OPTIONS Business office and Financial Aid office. These two surveys were administered for the first time in the second spring term of 2011. However, only the Up-Front Admissions and Advising Experience Survey were administered to students in the summer 2011 term. The data received from them is used to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the various OPTIONS administrative offices. The fourth survey created, the End of Program survey, focuses on the

student experience throughout their program with the OPTIONS Business office, Financial Aid office, and Curriculum office. This survey has not yet been administered to students.

### **Review of Assessment Data from 2010-2011**

The College has two major assessment instruments currently in use: the Major Field Test (MFT) and the CompXM. The MFT and CompXM collect data from students in the College's BSBA, BBA, and MBA programs.

#### **Selected highlights:**

- Undergraduate MFT scores and percentile rankings in the subject areas of finance, information systems and quantitative business analysis have improved.
- Average total scores on the CompXM for MBA, BBA, and BSBA students have all risen steadily over the last three academic years.
- Overall, undergraduate students improved their scores on the Board Query portion of the CompXM.

#### **Areas for Improvement:**

- Undergraduate students' average total scores on the MFT continue to rank in the 5<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> percentile nationally.
- Undergraduate students continue to score poorly on several subject areas, including economics, management, marketing, international issues, and legal and social environment.
- Graduate students average total and subject area scores on the MFT continue to be very poor, ranking in the 1<sup>st</sup> percentile.
- Undergraduate BSBA students continue to perform lower on the CompXM as compared to the BBA students.
- Overall, undergraduate students performed lower on the Balanced Scorecard portion of the CompXM as compared to previous years.
- International graduate students continue to perform substantially lower on the CompXM and the MFT as compared to their resident graduate student counterparts.

### **Selected Recommendations for 2011-2012**

**Conduct program review for select degree programs.** The Bachelor of Arts in Organizational Studies (BOS), the Bachelor of Arts in Corporate Communication (BCC), the Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA), the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA) and the Master of Business Administration (MBA) are scheduled for program reviews in the 2011-2012 academic year. The program review process will ensure that each degree program has well written learning objectives and that those objectives are aligned with the curriculum. The review process will also include a specific examination of the capstone course to ensure the course is designed to demonstrate mastery of the program objectives and may include a new assessment instrument or changes to the current assessment instruments. The goal completion date is May 2012.

**Collect assessment data from the MM and MSSCM degrees.** Since the completed review of the Master of Management (MM) and Master of Science in Supply Chain Management (MSSCM) degrees in 2010-2011, the College has been unable to assess these programs due to lack of course offering, lack of enrollment and various other complications. However, aside from enrollment issues, the other complications have been dealt with and the College is now able to begin collecting data and assessing these degrees for the first time. The initial data from these programs will be examined closely to make an evaluation about the consistency and accuracy of the instrument itself, as well as make preliminary evaluations about the effectiveness of each degree's curriculum. The goal completion date is May 2012.

**Set achievement goals on the Major Field Test.** The College has been using the Major Field Test (MFT) since 2007, and students have scored consistently in the same percentile range during that timeframe. The value of this information has not been fully realized as the College has not yet set goals related to student achievement. In the 2010-2011 academic year the College identified a preliminary group of peer institutions that also take the MFT. During the 2011-2012 academic year, the College will finalize the list of peer institutions and begin to move forward on setting achievement goals for the Major Field Test.

## **Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA) and Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA)**

### **Objectives:**

1. Obtain the foundation for more in-depth study of specific business topics.
2. Acquire competencies needed for positions in business or advancement in their current jobs.
3. Examine business practices pertaining to effectively managing organizational needs.

### **Methods**

The College uses two primary methods to assess student achievement in the BSBA and the BBA programs: the Major Field Test and the CompXM. Table 1 highlights some of the differences between these two assessment instruments.

**Major Field Test (MFT).** This standardized test is designed to assess mastery of concepts, principles, and knowledge expected of students at the conclusion of an academic major in specific subject areas. In addition to factual knowledge, the tests evaluate students' abilities to analyze and solve problems, understand relationships, and interpret material. The MFT is a product of Educational Testing Services.

The Major Field Test for the Bachelor's Degree in Business contains 120 multiple-choice questions designed to measure students' subject knowledge and the ability to apply facts, concepts, theories and analytical methods. Some questions are grouped in sets and based on diagrams, charts and data tables. The questions represent a wide range of difficulty and cover depth and breadth in assessing students' achievement levels.

**CompXM.** The CompXM is an individual exam where students participate in a computer-generated simulation as a decision-making manager of a fictitious global company. The CompXM is a wrap-up to the team-based Capstone simulation, in which students participate throughout the duration of their capstone course.

During the CompXM, each student is involved in developing strategy, executing tactics, and analyzing competitors while learning many business concepts. Students are scored by their company's performance along several performance measures called the "Balanced Scorecard" as well as by correctly answering questions from the "Board Query" related to their simulated industry. The Balanced Scorecard is a measure of business acumen, and the Board Query is a measure of business knowledge. The CompXM is a product of Capsim Management Simulations, Inc.

Table 1

*BBA and BSBA Assessment Instruments*

Method of Assessment (implemented )	When Assessment Done	Objectives Addressed	Rationale for Method to Assess the Goals/Outcome
Major Field Test (Fall 07 Traditional) (Spring 08 OPTIONS)	End of program; Fall, Spring, & Summer	Overall Goals 1A, 2B, 3A, 3B  Objectives 1, 2, 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides an objective and efficient method to assess students’ broad base of business knowledge</li> <li>• Allows for easy comparison of scores between programs and against other universities with national normative data</li> <li>• Provides benchmarking and trend data</li> </ul>
CompXM (Fall 2007)	Capstone Course / End of program: Fall & Spring	Overall Goals 1A, 1C, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C  Objectives 1,2,3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measures knowledge of business in an active, applied methodology</li> <li>• Objective automated evaluation</li> <li>• Realistic preview into the business world</li> <li>• Offers formative assessment data to students</li> <li>• Provides trend data</li> </ul>

**Results**

**Major Field Test (MFT).** Tables 2 and 3 highlight the results of the Major Field Test for the BBA and BSBA students for the last three academic years.

Table 2

*Average Total Scores and National Percentile Rank on the MFT for BSBA and BBA Students by Academic Year and Unit*

Unit	AY08-09	Percentile	AY09-10	Percentile	AY10-11	Percentile
<b>OPTIONS</b>						
(BBA Students)	139.53	5th	143.44	10th	141.81	5th
# students	66		108		90	
<b>Traditional</b>						
(BSBA Students)	141.64	5th	145.07	15th	141.79	5th
# students	39		55		39	
<b>TOTAL</b>	140.31	5th	143.99	10th	141.81	5th
# students	105		163		129	
Note: Score range is 120-200						

Table 3

*Average Percentage of Correct Responses and National Percentile Rank on the MFT for BSBA and BBA students by Subject Areas, Academic Year and Unit*

OPTIONS (BBA Students)	AY08-09	Percentile	AY09-10	Percentile	AY10-11 <sup>a</sup>	Percentile
Accounting	41.0%	5th	44.1%	15th	36.8%	10th
Economics	34.5%	1st	39.5%	5th	38.4%	10th
Management	41.7%	1st	45.4%	10th	44.9%	1st
Quantitative Business						
Analysis	31.5%	1st	37.5%	5th	36.3%	10th
Finance	37.9%	1st	44.8%	10th	39.9%	20th
Marketing	38.4%	1st	45.2%	10th	43.7%	5th
Legal & Social Environment	39.5%	10th	42.0%	20th	43.6%	1st
Information Systems	56.5%	30th	56.2%	30th	51.8%	50th
International Issues	35.9%	1st	44.3%	10th	42.2%	5th
<i># Students</i>	66		108		90	
Traditional (BSBA Students)	AY08-09	Percentile	AY09-10	Percentile	AY10-11 <sup>a</sup>	Percentile
Accounting	41.8%	5th	44.5%	15th	38.7%	15th
Economics	39.1%	5th	39.5%	5th	36.6%	5th
Management	46.5%	10th	46.0%	10th	49.3%	5th
Quantitative Business						
Analysis	39.2%	5th	37.8%	5th	39.1%	25th
Finance	44.4%	10th	44.8%	10th	38.1%	15th
Marketing	43.2%	5th	45.3%	10th	46.9%	5th
Legal & Social Environment	39.3%	10th	41.8%	15th	46.4%	1st
Information Systems	54.0%	15th	56.0%	30th	49.4%	40th
International Issues	44.8%	10th	44.8%	10th	44.9%	5th
<i># Students</i>	39		55		39	
TOTAL	AY08-09	Percentile	AY09-10	Percentile	AY10-11 <sup>a</sup>	Percentile
Accounting	41.3%	5th	44.3%	15th	37.4%	10th
Economics	36.2%	5th	39.5%	5th	37.8%	5th
Management	43.5%	5th	45.6%	10th	46.2%	5th
Quantitative Business						
Analysis	34.4%	1st	37.6%	5th	37.1%	15th
Finance	40.3%	5th	44.8%	10th	39.4%	20th
Marketing	40.2%	5th	45.2%	10th	44.7%	5th
Legal & Social Environment	39.4%	10th	41.9%	15th	44.4%	1st
Information Systems	55.6%	25th	56.1%	30th	51.1%	50th
International Issues	39.2%	1st	44.5%	10th	43.0%	5th
<i># Students</i>	105		163		129	
Note: <sup>a</sup> ETS re-designed the test in September 2010						

**CompXM.** Tables 4 through 6 highlight the results of the CompXM for the BBA and BSBA students for the last three academic years

Table 4

*Average Balanced Scorecard, Board Query scores and International Comparison Percentiles for BSBA and BBA Students by Academic Year and Unit*

OPTIONS						
(BBA Students)	AY08-09	Percentile	AY09-10	Percentile	AY10-11	Percentile
Balanced Scorecard	260.48	31.54	281.98	29.8	261.44	31.36
Board Query	252.86	25.22	255.07	25.6	273.39	33.73
Total	513.34	*	537.05	*	534.83	*
<i># Students</i>	144		107		115	
Traditional						
(BSBA Students)	AY08-09	Percentile	AY09-10	Percentile	AY10-11	Percentile
Balanced Scorecard	199.80	12.25	212.27	10.5	195.18	12
Board Query	225.83	25.75	210.51	13	191.11	10.5
Total	425.63	*	422.79	*	386.29	*
<i># Students</i>	41		61		40	
TOTAL						
	AY08-09	Percentile	AY09-10	Percentile	AY10-11	Percentile
Balanced Scorecard	246.20	27	262.06	24.29	251.24	28.38
Board Query	246.50	25.38	242.34	22	260.73	30.15
Total	492.70	*	504.40	*	511.98	*
<i># Students</i>	185		168		155	
Notes: The score range for the Balanced Scorecard is 0-500 and 0-500 for the Board Query; total score is 0-1000.						
*Percentile rankings are not available for combined scores						

Table 5

*Average Balanced Scorecard Sub-scale Scores for BSBA and BBA Students by Academic Year and Unit*

<b>OPTIONS (BBA Students)</b>	<b>Score Range</b>	<b>AY08-09</b>	<b>AY09-10</b>	<b>AY10-11</b>
Financial	0-125	61.79	65.34	61.31
Internal Business	0-125	59.41	64.09	62.10
Customer Market	0-125	76.84	83.10	78.35
Learning & Growth	0-125	62.44	69.45	65.21
Total	0-500	260.48	281.98	261.44
<i># Students</i>		144	107	115
<b>Traditional (BSBA Students)</b>	<b>Score Range</b>	<b>AY08-09</b>	<b>AY09-10</b>	<b>AY10-11</b>
Financial	0-125	40.61	47.35	46.79
Internal Business	0-125	45.82	47.15	43.91
Customer Market	0-125	64.84	68.43	67.42
Learning & Growth	0-125	48.54	49.34	37.06
Total	0-500	199.80	212.27	195.18
<i># Students</i>		41	61	40
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Score Range</b>	<b>AY08-09</b>	<b>AY09-10</b>	<b>AY10-11</b>
Financial	0-125	56.81	60.20	59.08
Internal Business	0-125	56.21	59.25	59.30
Customer Market	0-125	74.02	78.91	76.67
Learning & Growth	0-125	59.17	63.70	60.88
Total	0-500	246.20	262.06	251.24
<i># Students</i>		185	168	155

Table 6

*Average Board Query Sub-scale Scores for BSBA and BBA Students by Academic Year and Unit*

OPTIONS (BBA Students)	Score Range	AY08-09	AY09-10	AY10-11
Human Resources	0-52	25.28	31.46	34.86
Marketing	0-75	39.32	38.68	38.90
Finance	0-119	61.39	64.51	68.04
Operations	0-22	8.57	8.68	9.99
Production	0-57	19.18	20.85	23.75
Accounting	0-93	51.88	48.56	49.75
Strategy	0-77	47.91	42.33	42.57
Total	0-500	252.86	255.07	273.39
<i># Students</i>		144	107	115
Traditional (BSBA Students)	Score Range	AY08-09	AY09-10	AY10-11
Human Resources	0-52	30.39	26.86	23.08
Marketing	0-75	37.04	27.75	23.60
Finance	0-119	53.93	56.15	49.31
Operations	0-22	12.03	13.57	6.81
Production	0-57	14.75	13.65	15.61
Accounting	0-93	40.24	36.53	42.36
Strategy	0-77	37.45	36.00	30.34
Total	0-500	225.83	210.51	191.11
<i># Students</i>		41	61	40
TOTAL	Score Range	AY08-09	AY09-10	AY10-11
Human Resources	0-52	26.48	30.14	33.04
Marketing	0-75	38.79	35.56	36.54
Finance	0-119	59.63	62.12	65.16
Operations	0-22	9.43	10.08	9.51
Production	0-57	18.14	18.79	22.49
Accounting	0-93	49.14	45.12	48.62
Strategy	0-77	45.45	40.52	40.69
Total	0-500	246.50	242.34	260.73
<i># Students</i>		185	168	155

## Analysis

**Major Field Test (MFT).** Overall goals 1A, 2B, 3A, and 3B and program objectives 1, 2, and 3.

The College's BSBA and BBA students continue to score consistently in the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile overall on the MFT. However, there was a small decrease in the average total scores in AY 2010-2011 compared to prior years, which could be the result of the test being redesigned in September 2010 by ETS.

The MFT is comprised of several subject areas, and the College's students are performing better in information systems, and finance than other subject areas. Additionally, traditional BSBA students are performing better in Accounting. It is not known why students are performing better in those areas and not others. A formal comparison of the curriculum to the content of the exam itself would illuminate how well the curriculum prepares students for each subject as well as the links between those subjects and the learning objectives.

The overall percentiles seem low, but it is not clear how well the College's students *should* be scoring on the exam. The percentile rankings are based on scores from every university that administers the MFT nationwide (618 institutions for the undergraduate version). This population includes institutions that enroll students that are more academically prepared than Fontbonne's students.

The data from the MFT provides evidence that the College's students have demonstrated *some level* of achievement regarding the goals and objectives for the BSBA and BBA degrees. What is not known is what level of performance constitutes having fully satisfied those goals and objectives. Additionally, the lack of performance goals is compounded by generic learning objectives. These factors make the process of identifying curricular or pedagogical areas in need of intervention that much more difficult, and should be addressed in the upcoming academic year.

**CompXM.** Overall goals 1A, 1C, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, and 3C and program objectives 1, 2, and 3.

Overall, the average scores for BSBA and BBA students on the CompXM increased from AY 2009-2010; additionally, students overall score higher on the Board Query (business knowledge) than the Balanced Scorecard (business acumen). However, both categories of students showed overall decreases in AY 2010-2011 from prior years. BBA students continue to perform lower on the Balanced Scorecard than on the Board Query. However, BSBA students are scoring higher on Balanced Scorecard than the Board Query. Ideally, students should be performing relatively the same on both portions of the exam. However, performance goals and/or expectations for student performance on the CompXM have not been established. Whereas the MFT provides an external benchmarking perspective, the real benefit of the CompXM is its ability to provide a "strengths and weaknesses" perspective. However, the CompXM does not have the ability to produce peer group comparisons like the MFT.

As with the MFT, the CompXM provides evidence that the College's students have demonstrated *some level* of achievement regarding the goals and objectives for the BSBA and BBA degrees. What is not known is what level of performance constitutes having fully satisfied those goals and objectives. Additionally, the lack of performance goals is compounded by generic learning objectives. These factors make the process of identifying curricular or pedagogical areas in need of intervention that much more difficult, and should be addressed in the upcoming academic year.

### Recommendations

The College's 2009-2010 assessment report outlined several recommendations (table 7). All the recommendations not completed in the 2010-2011 academic year, will continue to be on the agenda of assessment items for the 2011-2012 academic year as described in tables 7 and 8.

Table 7

#### *BSBA and BBA Recommendations from 2009-2010*

Recommendation	Priority	Required Resources/ Time	Timeline for Completion	Status
Explore the possibilities of using locally-authored questions on a portion of the MFT	Low	Medium		Completed
Make a determination about whether or not to continue using the PMA	High	Low		Completed
Create a panel of faculty to determine a grading scale for the CompXM in the context of the curriculum	Medium	High		Completed
Increase full-time faculty participation in shaping the College's assessment process and in driving the curricular recommendations that follow	High	High	Ongoing	In progress
Consider using the MFT to gather additional background information from students for analysis	Low	Medium	December	In progress
Identify a peer group from institutions administering the MFT in order to make more meaningful comparisons	High	Low	December	In Progress
Identify faculty and staff who will directly contribute to assessment efforts in each degree program	Medium	High	May	In progress
Create a panel of faculty to determine a grading scale for the MFT in the context of the curriculum	Medium	High	May	In progress
Re-instate the End of Program surveys for the BBA program	Medium	Medium	October	In Progress
Utilize faculty and staff to consider curricular changes based on student performance on the MFT	High	High	March	In progress
Use the peer group percentile rankings to set performance goals on the MFT	High	Medium	June	No Progress

Table 8

*BSBA and BBA Recommendations for 2011-2012*

Recommendations	Priority	Required Resources/ Time	Timeline
Conduct exit interviews with graduating students	Medium	High	Spring 2012
Create and distribute Alumni surveys	Medium	Medium	Spring 2012
Review and refine the learning outcomes of the programs	High	High	Spring 2012

## **Bachelor of Science in Sports Management (BSSM) and Bachelor of Science in Sports & Entertainment Management (BSSEM)**

### **Objectives:**

1. Demonstrate knowledge of the fundamental principles of the sport management field. In particular, students should possess an understanding of the key functions of management, sport marketing, sport finance, sport communication, sport sociology and psychology, sport law, international sport, and sport governance, and the interaction of these concepts in a practical environment.
2. Understand global linkages and apply models of cultural analysis to global sport management issues.
3. Demonstrate a working familiarity with concepts and procedures related to ethical “good practice” and conduct.
4. Appreciate individual differences and recognize all dimensions of diversity including ethnicity, gender, age, physical differences, sexual orientation, race, and religion.
5. Develop critical thinking models that include qualitative and quantitative techniques and be able to analyze and solve problems using these models in an ethical context.
6. Effectively apply a variety of oral and written business and professional communications styles.
7. Effectively apply technology to analyze and interpret data and understand its potential power in a dynamic business and professional world.
8. Demonstrate leadership, growth, and the ability to synthesize knowledge both in the classroom and in a practical sport setting.

### **Methods**

The BSSM degree currently utilizes two primary methods to assess student learning: Internships/Practicum Evaluations and the Sports Marketing Plan. The BSSEM does not yet have any assessment methods in place, but a senior capstone project is currently being designed.

**Internships/Practicum evaluation.** Supervisors evaluate and provide feedback on various aspects of the student’s internship/practicum experience. This instrument will be administered by the Director of Sports Management upon completion of the internship/practicum for each student. Forms are sent to the employers who provided the internship/practicum to the student. Information collected includes assignments completed and interpretation of work concepts. Overall student intern performance will be noted specifically dealing with analytical thinking, problem solving, written and oral communication, and technology use.

**Sports marketing plan.** Students will demonstrate sports marketing knowledge and skills by creating and implementing a sports marketing plan for a sporting event. The students will be responsible for presenting their plan to the professor and classmates. Marketing plan papers and videotape of students presenting the plan will be collected. Upon collection of these materials, the professor will use a rubric designed to evaluate the marketing plan

## Results

**Internship/Practicum evaluation.** Table 9 highlights the results of the Internship/Practicum evaluations for the 2010-2011 academic year.

Table 9

*BSSM Internship/Practicum Evaluations of Student Performance.*

Criteria	Performance Indicators				
	Excellent	Good	Adequate	Fair	Poor
The student arrived at work and was ready to begin at the designated time	10	0	0	0	0
The student performed their assigned tasks in an efficient and timely manner	10	0	0	0	0
The student followed the company guidelines or codes for dress and behavior	10	0	0	0	0
The student performed as a working member of the team	10	0	0	0	0
The student made contributions to the work with ideas or suggestions	10	0	0	0	0
The student pursued additional work when initial duties were complete	10	0	0	0	0
The student demonstrated a positive attitude towards work assignments	10	0	0	0	0
The student needed little supervision to perform assigned tasks	10	0	0	0	0
The student demonstrated a general "academic" knowledge of the assigned work	10	0	0	0	0
The student demonstrated characteristics you seek in a fulltime employee	10	0	0	0	0
The student's overall performance	10	0	0	0	0
Note: $n = 10$					

**Sports marketing plan.** Table 10 highlights the results the BSSM sports marketing plan evaluation for the 2010-2011 academic year.

Table 10

*BSSM Sports Marketing Plan Evaluation of Student Performance.*

Criteria	Performance Indicators				
	Excellent	Good	Adequate	Fair	Poor
Quality of Work, including completeness of information, quality of ideas in the analysis of the organization, etc.	15	5	0	0	0
Spelling, grammar and punctuation	5	10	5	0	0
Presentation	15	5	0	0	0
Paper and presentation format	20	0	0	0	0
Peer Evaluation	20	0	0	0	0
Note: <i>n</i> = 20					

**Analysis**

Based on the two current assessment tools, BSSM students are demonstrating their learning throughout the program. All the students that did an internship were rated very highly by their employers. Additionally, students did very well on their sports marketing plans with only a few students performing “adequately” in the area of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

**Recommendations**

The College’s 2009-2010 assessment report outlined several recommendations (table 11). All the recommendations not completed in the 2010-2011 academic year, will continue to be on the agenda of assessment items for the 2011-2012 academic year as described in tables 11 and 12.

Table 11

*BSSM and BSSEM Recommendations from 2009-2010*

Recommendation	Priority	Required Resources/ Time	Timeline for Completion	Status
Review and refine the learning outcomes of the programs	High	High		Completed
Refine the BSSM and BSSEM goals and objectives	High	Medium		Completed
Establish performance goals for the assessment instrument(s)	Low	Medium	May	No Progress
Re-instate the End of Program survey in the BSSEM	Medium	Medium	December	No Progress

Table 12

*BSSM and BSSEM Recommendations for 2011-2012*

Recommendation	Priority	Required Resources/ Time	Timeline
Conduct exit interviews with graduating students	Medium	Medium	Spring 2012
Create the capstone course case study project for the BSSM and BSSEM	High	Medium	Spring 2012
Create a pre/post test to be administered to sophomores and seniors in the BSSM	Medium	High	Fall 2013

**Bachelor of Arts in Organizational Studies (BOS)**

**Objectives:**

1. Obtain the foundation for more in-depth study of specific organizational studies topics.
2. Develop leadership and administrative qualities to assume managerial positions.
3. Examine management, motivational, and communication techniques used in leadership roles.
4. Acquire competencies needed for positions in business or advancement in their current jobs.

**Methods**

The BOS degree does not currently have assessment instruments in place to systematically collect data about student learning.

**Recommendations**

The College’s 2009-2010 assessment report outlined several recommendations (table 13). All the recommendations not completed in the 2010-2011 academic year, will continue to be on the agenda of assessment items for the 2011-2012 academic year as described in tables 13 and 14.

Table 13

*BOS Recommendations from 2009-2010*

Recommendation	Priority	Required Resources/ Time	Timeline for Completion	Status
Conduct complete program review to align the curriculum with newly created learning outcomes	High	High	May	No progress
Re-instate the End of Program survey	Medium	Medium	October	No progress

Table 14

*BOS Recommendations for 2011-2012*

Recommendations	Priority	Required Resources/ Time	Timeline
Conduct complete program review	High	High	Summer 2012

The BOS degree is scheduled to undergo a program review in the 2011-2012 academic year. The program review process involves re-writing the learning objectives so they are supported by and more accurately reflect the curriculum. This process will also include the development of a capstone project which is aligned with the new learning objectives to capture data about those learning objectives.

### **Bachelor of Arts in Contemporary Studies (BCS)**

#### **Objective:**

1. Examine ethics, leadership, and public responsibility issues in relation to individual, management, and corporate liability.

#### **Methods**

The BCS degree does not currently have assessment instruments in place to systematically collect data about student learning.

#### **Recommendations**

The BCS degree does not have any recommendations at this time. The program has extremely low levels of enrollment and is being considered for removal and/or permanent housing in the Interdisciplinary Studies department.

## **Bachelor of Arts in Corporate Communication (BCC)**

### **Objectives:**

1. Demonstrate the cogent writing and speaking skills needed for employment in business or advancement in the current organization.
2. Achieve proficiency in technology and software applications that support future trends in corporate communications.
3. Communicate, with demonstrated awareness, sensitivity to corporate and global communities' diversity.
4. Compare and contrast the basic functions of business and the required leadership skills needed for organizational success.
5. Analyze the relationship between positioning, brand awareness, and attitude in the marketing arena.
6. Demonstrate the ability to present a positive corporate image via public relations and media communications especially during crises.
7. Analyze the responsibilities and liabilities of the organization to ensure legal and ethical positions are not violated.

### **Methods**

The assessment instrument is a Career E-Portfolio in the capstone course (BCC490). The portfolio is scored with the OPTIONS standard writing rubric. Data from this assessment will be collected and analyzed for the first time in the first term of the fall semester of the 2011-2012 academic year.

### **Recommendations**

The College's 2009-2010 assessment report outlined several recommendations (table 15). All the recommendations not completed in the 2010-2011 academic year, will continue to be on the agenda of assessment items for the 2011-2012 academic year as described in tables 15 and 16.

Table 15

*BCC Recommendations from 2009-2010*

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Required Resources/ Time</b>	<b>Timeline for Completion</b>	<b>Status</b>
Articulate a mission statement, goals, and overarching topics for the program	Medium	Medium		Completed
Review and refine the learning outcomes of all programs so they are more specific and are reflective of the curriculum	High	High	May	In Progress
Review the results of the first scored portfolios and make any necessary changes to the rubric and/or portfolio	High	Med	November	No Progress
Establish desired cut-off scores on the portfolio	Low	Med	October	No Progress
Re-instate the End of Program survey	Med	Med	December	No Progress

Table 16

*BCC Recommendations for 2011-2012*

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Required Resources/ Time</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
Conduct exit interviews with graduating students	Medium	Medium	Spring 2012

The BCC degree is scheduled to undergo a program review in the 2011-2012 academic year. The program review process involves re-designing courses so they more accurately reflect the learning objectives of the program. This process will involve a redesigning of the capstone course to create a project that demonstrates students' mastery of the program learning objectives. This project will be used to assess students' learning and mastery in the program.

## Master of Business Administration (MBA)

### Objectives:

1. Acquire the competencies needed for obtaining or advancement in managerial careers through a professional business education, assessment, self-reflection, and skill development.
2. Recognize the interrelationships between the functional areas of business, and leverage this knowledge to analyze and solve complex business problems.
3. Understand how the rapidly changing political, economic, global, legal, technological, and social environments interact with organizations to guide ethical short- and long-term decision-making.
4. Understand the strategic manager's role in leading others, developing potential, and building social capital within organizations.

### Methods

The College uses two primary methods to assess student achievement in the MBA program: the Major Field Test and the CompXM. Table 17 highlights some of the differences between these two assessment instruments.

**Major Field Test (MFT).** This standardized test is designed to assess mastery of concepts, principles, and knowledge expected of students at the conclusion of an academic major in specific subject areas. In addition to factual knowledge, the tests evaluate students' abilities to analyze and solve problems, understand relationships, and interpret material. The MFT is a product of Educational Testing Services.

The Major Field Test for the Master's of Business Administration contains 124 multiple-choice questions designed to measure students' subject knowledge and the ability to apply facts, concepts, theories and analytical methods. Some questions are grouped in sets and based on diagrams, charts and data tables. The questions represent a wide range of difficulty and cover depth and breadth in assessing students' achievement levels.

**CompXM.** The CompXM is an individual exam where students participate in a computer-generated simulation as a decision-making manager of a fictitious global company. The CompXM is a wrap-up to the team-based Capstone simulation, in which students participate during their capstone course.

During the CompXM, each student is involved in developing strategy, executing tactics, and analyzing competitors while learning many business concepts. Students are scored by their company's performance along several performance measures called the "Balanced Scorecard" as well as by correctly answering questions from the "Board Query" related to their simulated industry. The Balanced Scorecard is a measure of business acumen, and the Board Query is a measure of business knowledge. The CompXM is a product of Capsim Management Simulations, Inc.

Table 17

*MBA Assessment Instruments*

Method of Assessment (implemented )	When Assessment Done	Objectives Addressed	Rationale for Method to Assess the Goals/Outcome
Major Field Test (Fall 07)	End of program; Fall, Spring, & Summer	Overall Goals 1A, 2B, 3A, 3B  MBA Objectives 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides an objective and efficient method to assess students' broad base of business knowledge</li> <li>• Allows for easy comparison of scores within the University's programs and against other universities with national normative data</li> <li>• Provides benchmarking and trend data</li> </ul>
CompXM (Fall 2007)	Capstone Course / End of program: Fall & Spring	Overall Goals 1A,1C, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C  MBA Objectives 1, 2, 3,4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measures knowledge of business in an active, applied methodology</li> <li>• Objective automated evaluation</li> <li>• Realistic preview into the business world</li> <li>• Offers formative assessment data to students</li> <li>• Provides trend data and an inexpensive and streamlined administration.</li> </ul>

**Results**

**Major Field Test (MFT).** Tables 18 and 19 highlight the results of the Major Field Test for the MBA students for the last three academic years.

Table 18

*Average Total Scores and National Percentile Rank on the MFT for MBA Students by Academic Year and Unit*

Unit	AY08-09	Percentile	AY09-10	Percentile	AY10-11	Percentile
OPTIONS	238.97	5th	236.21	5th	232.58	1st
# students	72		90		50	
International	225.63	1st	226.38	1st	223.25	1st
# students	35		39		16	
All Students	234.61	1st	233.24	1st	230.32	1st
# students	107		129		66	
Note: Score range is 220-300						

Table 19

*Average Percentage of Correct Responses and National Percentile Rank on the MFT for MBA Students by Subject Areas, Academic Year and Unit*

OPTIONS	AY08-09	Percentile	AY09-10	Percentile	AY10-11	Percentile
Marketing	47.58	10th	44.83	5th	39.06	1st
Management	47.28	5th	44.89	5th	43.86	1st
Finance	36.54	10th	35.96	5th	30.32	1st
Managerial Accounting	40.00	10th	37.77	5th	34.42	1st
Strategic Integration	43.82	10th	41.12	5th	36.76	1st
<i># Students</i>	72		90		50	
International	AY08-09	Percentile	AY09-10	Percentile	AY10-11	Percentile
Marketing	27.00	1st	31.00	1st	34.00	1st
Management	35.00	1st	35.00	1st	39.00	1st
Finance	31.00	1st	30.00	1st	28.00	1st
Managerial Accounting	32.00	1st	31.00	1st	32.00	1st
Strategic Integration	30.00	1st	28.00	1st	32.00	1st
<i># Students</i>	35		39		16	
TOTAL	AY08-09	Percentile	AY09-10	Percentile	AY10-11*	Percentile
Marketing	40.85	1st	40.65	1st	37.83	1st
Management	43.26	1st	41.90	1st	42.68	1st
Finance	34.73	5th	34.15	5th	29.76	1st
Managerial Accounting	37.36	5th	35.72	1st	33.83	1st
Strategic Integration	39.30	1st	37.15	1st	35.61	1st
<i># Students</i>	107		129		66	

**CompXM.** Tables 20 through 22 highlight the results of the CompXM for the MBA students for the last three academic years

Table 20

*Average Balanced Scorecard, Board Query scores and International Comparison Percentiles for MBA Students by Academic Year and Unit*

OPTIONS	AY08-09	Percentile	AY09-10	Percentile	AY10-11	Percentile
Balanced Scorecard	258.44	32.00	284.19	38.00	330.33	53.50
Board Query	207.20	28.20	305.80	42.43	327.21	55.88
Total	465.64	*	589.99	*	657.54	*
<i># Students</i>	105		91		82	
International	AY08-09	Percentile	AY09-10	Percentile	AY10-11	Percentile
Balanced Scorecard	246.70	16.50	279.13	36.00	231.77	19.00
Board Query	196.83	7.00	279.03	39.50	202.75	18.00
Total	443.53	*	558.16	*	434.52	*
<i># Students</i>	38		39		20	
TOTAL	AY08-09	Percentile	AY09-10	Percentile	AY10-11	Percentile
Balanced Scorecard	255.83	26.83	283.06	37.56	319.38	49.67
Board Query	204.89	22.14	299.85	41.78	313.38	51.67
Total	460.73	*	582.92	*	632.76	*
<i># Students</i>	143		130		102	
Notes: The score range for the Balanced Scorecard is 0-500 and 0-500 for the Board Query; total score is 0-1000.						
*Percentile rankings are not available for combined scores						

Table 21

*Average Balanced Scorecard Sub-scale Scores for MBA Students by Academic Year and Unit*

OPTIONS	Score Range	AY08-09	AY09-10	AY10-11
Financial	0-125	55.38	67.90	79.81
Internal Business	0-125	55.61	66.34	74.14
Customer Market	0-125	86.46	83.24	93.00
Learning & Growth	0-125	60.99	66.71	83.38
Total	0-500	258.44	284.19	330.33
<i># Students</i>		105	91	82
International	Score Range	AY08-09	AY09-10	AY10-11
Financial	0-125	59.40	61.98	48.79
Internal Business	0-125	54.67	65.17	56.82
Customer Market	0-125	80.23	83.68	78.66
Learning & Growth	0-125	52.41	68.30	47.51
Total	0-500	246.70	279.13	231.77
<i># Students</i>		38	39	20
TOTAL	Score Range	AY08-09	AY09-10	AY10-11
Financial	0-125	56.27	66.58	76.37
Internal Business	0-125	55.40	66.08	72.21
Customer Market	0-125	85.08	83.34	91.41
Learning & Growth	0-125	59.08	67.07	79.39
Total	0-500	255.83	283.06	319.38
<i># Students</i>		143	130	102

Table 22

*Average Board Query Sub-scale Scores for MBA Students by Academic Year and Unit*

OPTIONS	Score Range	AY08-09	AY09-10	AY10-11
Human Resources	0-52	32.16	35.22	37.20
Marketing	0-75	36.36	50.40	52.54
Finance	0-119	54.89	76.52	82.81
Operations	0-22	9.83	13.12	11.24
Production	0-57	14.69	27.15	26.99
Accounting	0-93	33.34	53.36	64.32
Strategy	0-77	32.23	50.04	52.10
Total	0-500	207.20	305.80	327.21
<i># Students</i>		105	91	82
International	Score Range	AY08-09	AY09-10	AY10-11
Human Resources	0-52	18.83	27.11	17.40
Marketing	0-75	26.63	31.75	29.00
Finance	0-119	50.42	78.54	55.00
Operations	0-22	8.00	10.74	11.30
Production	0-57	19.14	32.68	18.65
Accounting	0-93	40.15	57.52	34.95
Strategy	0-77	34.71	40.69	36.45
Total	0-500	196.83	279.03	202.75
<i># Students</i>		38	39	20
TOTAL	Score Range	AY08-09	AY09-10	AY10-11
Human Resources	0-52	29.20	33.42	35.00
Marketing	0-75	34.20	46.25	49.93
Finance	0-119	53.90	76.97	79.72
Operations	0-22	9.22	12.59	11.25
Production	0-57	15.80	28.38	26.06
Accounting	0-93	34.86	54.28	61.05
Strategy	0-77	32.79	47.96	50.36
Total	0-500	204.89	299.85	313.38
<i># Students</i>		143	130	102

## Analysis

**Major Field Test (MFT).** Overall goals 1A, 2B, 3A, and 3B and program objectives 1 and 2.

The College's MBA students continue to score consistently in the 1<sup>st</sup> percentile overall on the MFT. Additionally, there was a small decrease in the overall scores as compared to previous years.

The MFT is comprised of several subject areas, and the College's students are performing better in management than other subject areas. Overall, all subject areas, except management, saw decreases from the 2010-2011 academic year. Additionally, the percentile rankings for the 2010-2011 academic year were lower than previous years. International students' scores had no change in their percentile rankings. However, resident students' scores have consistently declined in their percentile rankings over the last three academic years. Part of this change could be due to the test being redesigned by ETS in September 2009.

The overall percentiles seem low, but it is not clear how well the College's students *should* be scoring on the exam. The percentile rankings are based on scores from every university that administers the MFT nationwide (230 institutions for the graduate version). This population includes institutions that enroll students that are more academically prepared than Fontbonne's students.

The data from the MFT provides evidence that the College's students have demonstrated *some level* of achievement regarding the goals and objectives for the MBA degree. What is not known is what level of performance constitutes having fully satisfied those goals and objectives. Additionally, the lack of performance goals is compounded by generic learning objectives. These factors make the process of identifying curricular or pedagogical areas in need of intervention that much more difficult, and should be addressed in the upcoming academic year.

**CompXM.** Overall goals 1A, 1C, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, and 3C and program objectives 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Overall, scores on the CompXM have steadily increased over the last three academic years. This is particularly true for our resident graduate students. However, the international students saw a decrease in their scores from the 2009-2010 academic year to the 2010-2011 academic year. One explanation for this decrease could be due to the level of English language comprehension by this particular group of international students. However, the resident student increase in scores could be attributed to the improved facilitation abilities of the faculty teaching the CompXM course. The CompXM is a complex simulation and faculty face as large of a learning curve as the students. As faculty become more experienced in administering the simulation, they are able to spend more time teaching and coaching students.

One difference this year compared to previous years is that students are scoring higher on the Board Query (business knowledge) section as compared to the Balanced Scorecard (business acumen) section. Additionally, the difference between the two sets of scores is minimal. At this time, performance goals and/or expectations for student performance on the CompXM have not been established. Where the MFT provides an external benchmarking perspective, the real benefit of the CompXM is its ability to provide a "strengths and weaknesses" perspective. However, the CompXM does not have the ability to produce peer group comparisons like the MFT.

As with the MFT, the CompXM provides evidence that the College's students have demonstrated *some level* of achievement regarding the goals and objectives for the MBA degree.

What is not known is what level of performance constitutes having fully satisfied those goals and objectives. Additionally, the lack of performance goals is compounded by generic learning objectives. These factors make the process of identifying curricular or pedagogical areas in need of intervention that much more difficult.

**Recommendations**

The College’s 2009-2010 assessment report outlined several recommendations (table 24). All the recommendations not completed in the 2010-2011 academic year, will continue to be on the agenda of assessment items for the 2011-2012 academic year as described in tables 23 and 24.

Table 23

*MBA Recommendations for 2011-2012*

Recommendations	Priority	Required Resources/ Time	Timeline
Conduct exit interviews with graduating students	Medium	High	Spring 2012
Create and distribute Alumni surveys	Medium	Medium	Spring 2012
Review and refine the learning outcomes of the program	High	High	Spring 2012

Table 24

*MBA Recommendations from 2009-2010*

Recommendations	Priority	Required Resources/ Time	Timeline for Completion	Status
Explore the possibilities of using locally-authored questions on a portion of the MFT	Low	Medium		Completed
Make a determination about whether or not to continue using the PMA	High	Low		Completed
Create a panel of faculty to determine a grading scale for the CompXM in the context of the curriculum.	High	High		Completed
Increase full-time faculty participation in shaping the College's assessment process and in driving the curricular recommendations that follow	High	High	Ongoing	In progress
Consider using the MFT to gather additional background information from students for analysis	Low	Medium	October	In progress
Identify a peer group from institutions that administering the MFT in order to make more meaningful comparisons	High	Low	December	In progress
Identify faculty and staff who will directly contribute to assessment efforts	Medium	High	May	In progress
Create a panel of faculty to determine a grading scale for the MFT in the context of the curriculum.	High	High	May	In progress
Re-instate the End of Program survey	Medium	Medium	December	In progress
Utilize faculty and staff to consider curricular changes based on student performance on the MFT.	High	High	March	In progress
Use the peer group percentile rankings to set performance goals on the MFT	Med	Low	May	No Progress

**Master of Science in Accounting (MSA)**

**Objective:**

1. Acquire the competencies needed for obtaining or advancement in accounting careers through a professional business education, assessment, self-reflection, and skill development.

**Methods**

The MSA degree does not currently have assessment instruments in place to systematically collect data about student learning.

**Recommendations**

The College’s 2009-2010 assessment report outlined several recommendations (table 25). All the recommendations not completed in the 2010-2011 academic year, will continue to be on the agenda of assessment items for the 2011-2012 academic year as described in tables 25 and 26.

Table 25

*MSA Recommendations from 2009-2010*

Recommendations	Priority	Required Resources/ Time	Timeline for Completion	Status
Review and refine the learning outcomes and objectives of the program so they are more specific and are reflective of the curriculum	High	High	May	No progress

Table 26

*MSA Recommendations for 2011-2012*

Recommendations	Priority	Required Resources/ Time	Timeline
Conduct exit interviews with graduating students	High	High	Spring 2012
Create and distribute Alumni surveys	Medium	Medium	Spring 2012

The MSA degree is scheduled to undergo a program review in the 2012-2013 academic year. The program review process involves re-writing the MSA learning objectives so they are supported by and more accurately reflect the curriculum. This process will also include the development of a capstone project which is aligned with the new learning objectives to capture data about those learning objectives.

**Master of Science in Taxation (MST)**

**Objective:**

1. Acquire the competencies needed for obtaining or advancement in taxation careers through a professional business education, assessment, self-reflection, and skill development.

**Methods**

The MST degree does not currently have assessment instruments in place to systematically collect data about student learning.

**Recommendations**

The College’s 2009-2010 assessment report outlined several recommendations (table 27). All the recommendations not completed in the 2010-2011 academic year, will continue to be on the agenda of assessment items for the 2011-2012 academic year as described in tables 27 and 28.

Table 27

*MST Recommendations from 2009-2010*

Recommendations	Priority	Required Resources/ Time	Timeline for Completion	Status
Review and refine the learning outcomes and objectives of the program so they are more specific and are reflective of the curriculum	High	High	May	No progress

Table 28

*MST Recommendations for 2011-2012*

Recommendations	Priority	Required Resources/ Time	Timeline
Conduct exit interviews with graduating seniors	Medium	High	Spring 2012
Create and distribute Alumni surveys	Medium	Medium	Spring 2012

The MST degree will not be considered for program review until the 2012-2013 academic year. The program review process involves re-writing the MST learning objectives so that they are supported by and more accurately reflect the curriculum. This process will also include the development of a capstone project which is aligned with the new learning objectives to capture data about those learning objectives.

### **Master of Management (MM)**

#### **Objectives:**

1. Apply the functions and responsibilities of management.
2. Analyze financial data in order to determine the financial performance of a company, and integrate those factors into managerial decision making.
3. Formulate a marketing strategy based on realistic opportunities and tempered by organizational constraints.
4. Develop and implement effective human resource plans which support the organization's strategic goals.
5. Identify and adapt leadership and communication styles when working with diverse internal and external constituents.
6. Examine the ethical environment of business, consider the impact business has on various stakeholders, and use this information to make socially responsible decisions.
7. Evaluate the impact of globalization, technology, diversity, and competition on management.
8. Utilize effective decision-making, including: determine challenges facing an organization, conduct research, collect data, formulate and analyze alternative solutions, implement a strategy, and apply quality control measures to insure continuous improvement.

#### **Methods**

The assessment instrument is a research paper in the capstone course (MGT519). The paper is scored with a rubric that is aligned with the learning objectives. Data from this assessment will be collected and analyzed for the first time in the first term of the fall semester of the 2011-2012 academic year.

#### **Recommendations**

The College's 2009-2010 assessment report outlined several recommendations (table 29). All the recommendations not completed in the 2010-2011 academic year, will continue to be on the agenda of assessment items for the 2011-2012 academic year as described in tables 29 and 30.

Table 29

*MM Recommendations from 2009-2010*

Recommendations	Priority	Required Resources /Time	Timeline for Completion	Status
Review and refine the learning outcomes and objectives of the program so they are more specific and are reflective of the curriculum	High	High		Completed
Review the results from the first scored research papers and make any necessary changes to the rubric and/or assignment prompt	High	Medium	October	In progress
Establish desired cut-off scores on the research paper	Low	Medium	May	No progress
Re-instate the End of Program survey	Medium	Medium	December	No progress

Table 30

*MM Recommendations for 2011-2012*

Recommendations	Priority	Required Resources/ Time	Timeline for Completion
Conduct exit interviews with graduating students	Medium	High	Spring 2012
Create and distribute Alumni surveys	Medium	Medium	Spring 2012

## **Master of Science in Supply Chain Management (MSSCM)**

### **Objectives:**

1. Develop analytical models to evaluate logistics and sourcing options and overall supply chain design.
2. Establish relative supply chain metrics and supplier score cards that can be applied consistently within an organization and across the supply chain.
3. Create guidelines for improving supply chain processes and implement changes in a manner that are sustainable.
4. Apply skill to systematically design and improve supply chain using tools and approaches such as lean, six sigma, and supply chain best practices, including the Supply Chain Operations Reference model (SCOR).
5. Develop supply chain strategies to create value through effective negotiation strategies.
6. Manage supply chain processes to ensure balance of inventory optimization strategies and financial attributes such as cost and cash flow while maintaining quality and delivery expectations.
7. Transform end-to-end supply chain through key elements of integrated processes, tools and systems, and demand planning and forecasting.
8. Evaluate supply chain processes to ensure alignment with strategic goals, and to minimize supply chain cost as well as life cycle costs and/or total cost of ownership.
9. Apply foundational concepts and approaches from disciplines such as Operations Management, accounting, economics and statistics to evaluate and improve end-to-end supply chain processes and alignment with organizational needs.

### **Methods**

The assessment instrument is a research paper in the capstone course (SCM590). The paper is scored with a rubric that is aligned with the learning objectives. Data from this assessment will be collected and analyzed for the first time in the first term of the fall semester of the 2011-2012 academic year.

### **Recommendations**

The College's 2009-2010 assessment report outlined several recommendations (table 31). All the recommendations not completed in the 2010-2011 academic year, will continue to be on the agenda of assessment items for the 2011-2012 academic year as described in tables 31 and 32.

Table 31

*MSSCM Recommendations from 2009-2010*

Recommendations	Priority	Required Resources/ Time	Timeline for Completion	Status
Review the results from the first scored research papers and make any necessary changes to the rubric and/or assignment prompt	High	Medium	May	No progress
Establish desired cut-off scores on the MSSCM research paper	Low	Medium	May	No progress
Re-instate the End of Program survey	Medium	Medium	December	No progress

Table 32

*MSSCM Recommendations for 2011-2012*

<b>2011-2012 Recommendations</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Required Resources/Time</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
Conduct exit interviews with graduating students	Medium	High	Spring 2012
Create and distribute Alumni survey	Medium	Medium	Spring 2012

## **Master of Science in Nonprofit Management (MSNPM)**

### **Objectives:**

1. Analyze various models and methods of board governance and leadership and the management of duties and responsibilities for moving the organization from mission statement to mission success.
2. Create a continuous model to strategically plan, develop, implement and evaluate services and programs to enhance organizational effectiveness.
3. Develop essential skills to identify, manage and maximize recurring and sustainable sources of revenue.
4. Apply fundraising principles, processes and skills to advance the organization.
5. Examine the impact of fiscal and legal requirements under which nonprofits operate and analyze the effects of federal and state laws on the various types of nonprofit organizations.
6. Apply the financial and human resource principles necessary to sustain a nonprofit organization including how to balance and support a volunteer staff.
7. Effectively communicate and advocate for a mission-based organization.
8. Assess the day-to-day operations of a nonprofit organization and propose a plan for high-impact management.
9. Examine the importance of ethical issues and the influence these issues have on management decision-making.
10. Synthesize acquired skills and knowledge in an experiential environment that results in a capstone project based on a student's area of interest.

### **Methods**

An assessment instrument is currently being designed as part of the capstone course (NPM 580). The capstone course is set to be offered in for the first time in the first term of the fall semester of the 2012-2013 academic year.

### **Recommendations**

Due to the newness of the program, the College is working to create an assessment instrument and currently does not have any other projects associated with this program for the 2011-2012 academic year.