

Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2015-16

Section I: Student Learning Assessment

<i>B.S. in Organizational Management</i>	
Student Learning Assessment for Program	
General Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes (General Program ISLOs)	
The Organizational Management program will develop critical thinkers and servant leaders with the ability to:	
1. Empower themselves through self-awareness and self-management.	
2. Collaborate for enhanced creativity and productivity	
3. Plan, organize, lead, and control resources	
4. Seek, evaluate, and analyze information for ethical and effective decision-making	
5. Communicate for shared understanding.	
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:
1. Leading Within Organizations Paper and Presentation ISLOs assessed by this measure: 1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% of students in each group will score 24 or higher (30 point scale) on the Response Paper Rubric • 80% of students in each group will score 16 or higher (20 point scale) for the Presentation Rubric
2. Capstone Project: Reflections, Report, and Presentation ISLOs assessed by this measure: 1, 4, 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% of students in each group will score 4 or higher (6 point scale) on the Project Reflection Rubric • 80% of students will score 50.0 or higher on items 1 – 6 of the weighted Capstone Project Paper Rubric (out of 62.5) • 80% of students will score 14.0 or higher out of 17.5 on items 7, 8, 9 of the Writing section of the Capstone Project Paper Rubric • Students will average 80% on the rubric for Capstone Project Presentation Rubric
3. Project Management Group Project, Team Presentation ISLOs assessed by this measure: 2, 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% of groups will score 8 or higher out of 11 on the Team Presentation Rubric • 80% of students will score 23 of 29 points on the Final Project Rubric
4. Financial Intelligence Final Project ISLOs assessed by this measure: 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% of students will score 28 or higher out of 35 on the Final Project Rubric
5. Statistics ISLOs assessed by this measure: 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% of students will score of 24 or higher on a 32 point scale on the Problem Analysis Assignment Rubric

Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:		Performance Targets/Criteria (Objectives) for Indirect Measures:
1.	End of Program Evaluation ISLOs assessed by this measure: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mean score of 3.00 or higher on a 4.00 scale in the Program Outcomes category of the evaluation
2.	Alumni Survey ISLOs assessed by this measure: 2, 3, 4, 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Q1 a, b, d, e, f mean score of 4.0 or higher (5.0 scale)

Assessment Results	
Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:	
1.	Leading Within Organizations Paper and Presentation – Response Paper: Result: 100% of students achieved this level. Presentation: Result: Data was incomplete. 100% of students in reporting groups achieved this level.
2.	Capstone Project: Reflections, Report, and Presentation – Reflection Paper: Result: Only one group out of five achieved this level. Report: Result: 86% of total students achieved this level in items 1 -6 Result: 4 of 6 groups reported for an average of 84% on the writing items 7, 8, 9 in the project rubric. Presentation: Result: Only 1 group out of 5 did not reach the goal of 80% of students meeting this level.
3.	Project Management Group Project – Project: Result: Data was incomplete. 100% of reporting groups achieved this level. Presentation: Result: Data was incomplete. The groups averaged 83% achievement level.
4.	Financial Intelligence – Final Project: Result: Groups averaged 76% achievement level.
5.	Statistics – Statistics Analysis Assignment: Result: 79% of total students achieved this level.
Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:	
1.	End of Program Evaluation – Result: All items received a 3.00 or higher.
2.	Alumni Survey - Result – This survey is not distributed yearly.

Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes:

Intended Student Learning Outcomes	Learning Assessment Measures								
General Program ISLOs	<i>Direct Measure 1</i>	<i>Direct Measure 2</i>	<i>Direct Measure 3</i>	<i>Direct Measure 4</i>	<i>Direct Measure 5</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 1</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 2</i>		
	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...		
1. Empower themselves through self-awareness and self-management	Met	Not Met				Met	NA		
2. Collaborate for enhanced creativity and productivity	Met		Met			Met	NA		
3. Plan, organize, lead, and control resources			Met	Partially Met		Met	NA		
4. Seek, evaluate, and analyze information for ethical and effective decision-making		Met			Met	Met	NA		
5. Communicate for shared understanding		Met/ Partially Met				Met	NA		

<p>Results from previous action plans (review action plans from previous three years and assess progress based on subsequent results):</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work on writing skills is ongoing and often listed each year as an area for improvement. We find that our students have improved their skills during the program, but we are aware that, even with that improvement, some adult students still struggle to reach our expectation of clear, direct, and concise expression of ideas. Although this is an ongoing area for improvement, faculty members feel they are making strides in their methods of teaching these skills, and we have worked with the tutors at the Learning Center to be sure tutors are aware of assignment expectations when students schedule help with papers. We also provide additional help for faculty who are less confident about providing this feedback for their students.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our 2012-13 report indicated review of Financial Intelligence content was needed. This course is often more difficult than students are prepared to handle. The instructor recorded some short video clips of areas that need additional attention and posted these online for student review after the information was presented in class. In the following year, students reported their appreciation for this opportunity to review new skills in this way.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are using student feedback regarding effectiveness of faculty and of curriculum. We regularly discuss, as full-time and adjunct faculty, the needed updates to module content based on workplace needs. This too is being done continuously, but intentional reviews are done every three years. Our addition of Leading Within Organizations, Strategic Management and Project Management came about as a result of student suggestions. Students have found the new modules challenging, but useful in their day-to-day-work. We noted in 2013-14 that these new modules, although well received, would need careful observation for student and faculty input into content and delivery methods. We continue to monitor student and faculty feedback to inform our updates to these modules.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In our 2014-15 report, we noted that faculty recognized the need for training in the area of rubrics – use and reporting. We have attended to that issue, but further plans are underway to meet this need. See below.
<p>Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met (include review of results from previous three years to provide context for current year results):</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some incomplete data. This has occurred in the past, but we seem to continue having this issue. A letter with rubric attached will be sent to the faculty at the end of a module in which an object is measured directly. With a high percentage of adjuncts teaching in the OM program, there is an increasing need to train and support these new instructors.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In our 2014-15 report we identified training for our adjuncts as a need. Although this work is being done, it is requiring increased amounts of time to bring new adjuncts up to speed. We are seeing that this process will require continued focus for the director.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISLO #1 Direct Measure 2 – This reflection paper was not being correctly written by the students, so we clarified the rubric and showed students specifically what was needed. The paper is an opportunity for students to reflect on their experience, but it is not graded. Faculty thought this was an added stressor at the time students were completing the Capstone Research Project; however, it appears that students did not take it seriously because there was no grade attached. We will first attempt to explain the need for this short paper, but we may need to give it some grading weight in order to be taken seriously by students.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISLO #5 Direct Measure 2 – Only one group did not meet this goal and it seems the instructor’s directions for the presentation may have been confusing to students.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISLO #3 Direct Measure 4 – The Financial Intelligence module in semester one still challenges students. We are working on making changes to the content and to using faculty who can refocus the information to the level of the many students who have not had accounting or finance courses in the past. 76% of students met this goal in the final project for the module. This module is a work in progress as we make plans to adjust content, student support options, and faculty. There is only a 4% shortfall in results, but faculty observed that we can make appropriate adjustments to the module to improve student learning.

Section II: Operational Assessment

Operational Outcomes for B.S. in Organizational Management

Intended Operational Outcomes:	
1.	Organizational Management graduates will complete the program in three years
2.	Organizational Management graduates will be employed in their field of study
3.	Organizational Management program will be offered at convenient locations and times for working adults
4.	OM students will be supported in their learning by effective, caring faculty, staff and support services at the college
Assessment Measures/Methods for Intended Operational Outcomes:	Performance Targets/Criteria (Objectives) for Operational Assessment Measures/Methods:
1. Report from CAO office IOOs Assessed by this Measure: 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% of our students complete the program in three years.
2. Office of Career Services Annual Report IOOs Assessed by this Measure: 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% of our students will be employed in the their field of study
3. Group Schedules IOOs Assessed by this Measure: 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide both Eastside and Westside locations for face-to-face program in fall and spring. Provide online program both spring and fall
4. End of Program Evaluations and Module Evaluations - Report from CAO office IOOs Assessed by this Measure: 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> End of Program Evaluation – Academic Advising 1-4, Program Support 1-5 with scores of 3.0 (4.0 scale) Module Evaluation – items 6 – 12 with scores of 3.0 (4.0 scale)

Summary of Results from Implementing Operational Assessment Measures/Methods:								
1. <i>Summary of Results for CAO Report – Result:</i> 88% of students completed the modules for the major.								
2. <i>Summary of Results for Office of Career Services Annual Report – Result:</i> Of those graduates employed, 92% are employed in their field of study								
3. <i>Summary of Results for Group Schedules – Result:</i> We continue to provide 4 classroom starts (2 on campus, 2 at Jefferson Road site) and two online starts/year.								
4. <i>Summary of Results for End of Program Evaluation –Result:</i> Advising and Program Support all scored 3.0 and above.								
5. <i>Summary of Results for Module Evaluations –Result:</i> Five faculty members scored below 3.0 on at least one item of the student evaluation of instructors in the program. This constitutes 83% of modules taught with student scores of instructors at 3.0 or higher. Also, of those five instructors, all received higher scores from other groups which they taught in the OM program.								
Summary of Achievement of Intended Operational Outcomes:								
Intended Operational Outcomes	Operational Assessment Measures/Methods							
	<i>CAO Report</i>	<i>Office of Career Services Annual Report</i>	<i>Group Schedules</i>	<i>End of Program Evaluation</i>	<i>Module Evaluations</i>			
	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...			
1. <i>Program Completion</i>	Met							
2. <i>Employment</i>		Met						
3. <i>Convenience</i>			Met					
4. <i>Student Support</i>				Met				
5. <i>Student Evaluation of Instructor</i>					Partially Met			

<p>Results from previous action plans (review action plans from previous three years and assess progress based on subsequent results):</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The only issues that sometimes arise from administration are those regarding number of sites and number of offerings/year. OM has been able to justify meeting twice per year online, twice on the east side of Rochester and twice on the west side (main campus). We also offer groups options for any of four nights per week for the duration of their major modules (Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty whose scores fall below 3.0 on a 4.0 scale receive additional help with specific concerns as their module evaluations are completed and sent to the director.
<p>Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Operational Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met (include review of results from previous three years to provide context for current year results):</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One instructor with low scores is the instructor for Financial Intelligence. Part of the difficulty here was the need to pull this full time faculty member into an interim role as Department Chair. The resulting overload contributed to lower scores as did what we learned about the need to adjust some of the content in this module going forward.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two cohorts consistently scored instructors lower than the other cohorts. We know that one of those cohorts had a number of interpersonal problems within the group and the director worked with some of those students during the program. Faculty discussed the need for a clear expectation of student behavior toward other students and toward faculty. We will develop and use a statement of expected group behavior in the Student Handbook so that expectations are clear and stated in writing.