



2008-2009 Assessment Plan Report

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT **AY 2008-2009** *for the Marketing Major*

Report Date: *June 30, 2009*

School/College: *School of Business and Management*

Department/Program: *Department of Marketing, Globalization, and Strategy (MGS)*

Person completing the Report: *Shenzhao Fu, Department Chair*

1. **Overview Statement:** Briefly summarize the assessment activities that were undertaken this academic year, indicating:

a. which program learning outcomes were assessed this year.

In this academic year, we drafted the Marketing Major Assessment Plan with six Learning Outcomes (LOs). But we have not formally collected data in any Marketing classes. However, some relevant data on these LOs have been collected in the capstone class (BUS 401, Strategic Management) with ETS-MFT instrument.

b. who in your department/program was involved in the assessment of the above learning outcomes

All marketing faculty participated in the drafting process of the Assessment Plan. Professor Roger Chen, a member of MGS who taught BUS 401 in spring 2009, participated in the ETS-MFT data collection.

2. **Please Answers the Following Questions for Each of the Student Outcomes Assessed:**

a. **What did you do?**

Describe clearly and concisely how you assessed the learning outcomes that were evaluated this year (e.g., measures, research methods, etc.). [please use bullet points to answer this question]

The MFT measurements are not specifically designed for the six LOs we have adopted, and the administration does not distinguish Marketing Majors versus non-Marketing Majors. Therefore, it is hard to draw definitive conclusion on Marketing Majors' LO achievements with this year's MFT data.

However, among all 76 business seniors who participated in the MFT, of which



2008-2009 Assessment Plan Report

??? are Marketing Majors, the overall average Marketing competency score was 57% correct, at 70th percentile among nearly 600 business schools/universities participated in the test. This performance gives us an indirect measure on how well our business students (including Marketing Majors) have learned about relevant marketing subjects, regardless specific LOs.

We interpret this indirect measure as follows:

1. *The 70th percentile figure indicates that our marketing curriculum, including the introductory marketing course offered to all business majors, is on par, or slightly above par, with 600 other business schools/universities;*
2. *The 57% correct score is not a passing score. We have more work to do to help our students learn the marketing subjects effectively;*
3. *The MFT results are not accurate measures of the six Learning Outcomes set forth in our Assessment Plan for the Marketing Major.*

b. What did the faculty in the department or program learn?

Summarize your findings and conclusions as a result of the assessment indicating strengths and weaknesses in student learning demonstrated by this assessment.

We need to develop our own measurements, reflecting our pre-determined LOs, and administer among the Marketing Majors.

c. What will be done differently as a result of what was learned?

Discuss how courses and/or curricula will be changed to improve student learning as a result of the assessment. Include a discussion of how the faculty will help students overcome their weaknesses and improve their strengths.

To be discussed after a new instrument is adopted and administered.

3. Attach a copy of the components of the department/program assessment plan that have been modified since its initial submission:

- a. Program Mission
- b. Program Learning Goals
- c. Program Learning Outcomes
- d. Program Learning Rubrics aligned with outcomes
- e. Curriculum map that shows the courses that pertain to the outcome



2008-2009 Assessment Plan Report

Please return to Sonja Martin Poole (smpoole@usfca.edu) by **May 15, 2009**