



ASSURANCE OF LEARNING REPORT

Organization, Leadership & Communication Department
October 1, 2012 [v.2]

Overview

The Organization, Leadership & Communication Department supports core and major/concentration curriculum at the undergraduate and graduate levels in the School of Management. See Tables 1a, 1b and 1c for a summary of the Department's course offerings and scheduled assessment of specific School of Management program goals.

Developed in May 2011, the Department's assessment plans for the M.S. in Organization Development [MSOD] and the B.S. in Organizational Behavior & Leadership [BSOBL]¹ provide the foundation to ensure effective and efficient assessment of student learning related to affective learning outcomes [assessed in 2011-2012], cognitive learning outcomes [to be assessed in 2012-2013], and performance learning outcomes [to be assessed in 2013-2014] at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Goals Assessed: 2012

The specific program goals assessed via students enrolled in OLC Department courses during the 2011-2012 academic year are underlined in the third column of Table 1a.

Process: Direct Measures. Three faculty teaching undergraduate students in BUS 304—Management & Organizational Dynamics and BUS 494—Honors: Management & Organization Dynamics submitted a total of 65 randomly selected written assignments from five separate sections. From those 65 submitted assignments, 20 were randomly chosen for evaluation using the rubric provided as Table 2.

Faculty teaching graduate students in MBA 6104—Learning to Lead, MBAE 6902—Leadership, and OD 662—Psychological Dimensions of Organizations submitted a total of 65 randomly selected assignments from 5 separate sections. From those 65 submitted assignments, 20 were randomly chosen for evaluation using the rubric provided as Table 2.

Dr. Eli Kass created the 'affective learning' rubric, and the rubric was reviewed and approved at an OLC Department meeting in May 2012. The OLC faculty determined that an undergraduate student, on average, should be deemed 'sufficient' and a graduate student should be deemed as 'competent' across the four factors defined by the rubric. It is important to note that faculty chose not to create a rubric that fit exactly to the assignments, nor revise assignments to fit exactly with the rubric. Instead, the faculty focused on a process that was to be a learning experience. The review of the assessment results could lead to changes to the program goal, the course curriculum for the courses assessed, the assignments assessed, and/or the rubric itself.

For assessment purposes, two faculty members (Drs. Kathy Kane and Keith Hunter who taught at the graduate level) evaluated the undergraduate student papers and two faculty members (Drs. Rebekah Dibble and Kevin Lo who taught at the undergraduate level) evaluated the graduate student assignments. Both sets of faculty were provided with two sample papers so they could discuss using the rubric to best calibrate their individual assessments.

The faculty pairs received the following instructions:

You will be receiving several messages from me regarding the Assurance of Learning assessment process. This message includes the rubric used to assess the 20 undergraduate- and graduate-level papers, two

¹ Please note that the BSOBL/BSOLM is being 'taught out' and will be replaced by the B.S. in Management [BSM] starting in spring 2012. The BSM will include an OBL concentration.

additional papers that you can use to calibrate your use of the rubric with one another, and your individual assessment spreadsheet to be submitted when you complete your review of the 20 papers. A second email will provide the Google docs link to your 20 papers.

The faculty returned their individual assessments to the department chair by June 30, 2012.

Results from Direct Measures. The ratings for the faculty pairs (one pair for undergraduate, one pair for graduate) were averaged to create a composite score for each paper assessed. Seventeen [out of 20] undergraduate students were deemed 'sufficient'. Fourteen [out of 20] graduate students achieved a 'competent' rating.

Summary: Affective Program Goal Rubric Results

Undergraduate	Sufficient*	Graduate	Competent
Student recognizes his/her perceptions and assumptions may not reflect reality.	Yes	Student recognizes his/her perceptions and assumptions do not necessarily reflect reality.	No
Student may demonstrate some development of self-awareness.	Yes	Student demonstrates development of self-awareness.	Yes
Student is able to identify, describe, and define at least one of the following: a. Common and attributional biases that can inhibit effective leadership. b. How the student may contribute to poor leadership. c. Core Ignatian values, the self-reflection process and benefits of diversity.	Yes	Student is able to identify, describe, and define at least two of the following: a. Common and attributional biases that can inhibit effective leadership. b. How the student may contribute to poor leadership. c. Core Ignatian values, the self-reflection process and benefits of diversity.	Yes
Student identifies areas for improvement in terms of broad classes of behaviors.	Yes	Student identifies actionable behaviors for improvement.	No

*YES: Average score was greater than 1.

**YES: Average score was greater than 2. NO: Average score greater than 1.7 but less than 2.0.

Because the graduate paper assignments from three distinct courses were not equivalent, the two faculty who assessed these papers found the entire process 'difficult'. This could explain, in part, the lower number of graduate students deemed 'competent'.

Overall, for both the undergraduate and graduate students according to the faculty evaluators, the curriculum is addressing the core Jesuit values. The four faculty evaluators also stated that the assessment process provided good personal insights. For example, one faculty member said this was "a good exercise for me to become more familiar with the MBA program content" and the process "will help me bring some continuity to the curriculum."

Process: Indirect Measures. All students who started the MSOD program in fall 2011 or thereafter receive surveys at the end of each course. The survey seeks student input regarding their learning experience and provides an indirect check on the program curriculum. The first part of the survey asks students for their input on how well a given course addresses the learning outcomes outlined in the syllabus. A Likert scale is used with [1] did not address to [5] fully addressed. Part two of the survey seeks student input on how well the course addressed the MSOD program goals. Students are to rank the five program goals from [1] lowest to [5] highest in relation to the course. Finally, students are given the opportunity to provide written feedback on the course and course content only related to the strengths of the course (i.e., what they wouldn't want to see changed) and what ways the course could be improved (i.e., what they would like to see changed).

Over a three-year cycle the department can evaluate two key issues. First, how well the five program goals are addressed across the entire curriculum. [See Table 3. This table is a work-in-progress. Not all courses have been offered yet since the revised curriculum was implemented.] Second, how well a given course covers the learning outcomes provided in the syllabus.

Please note the same student survey process will be put in place for the BSM-OBL program following its launch in spring 2013.

Recommendations and Next Steps

Specific programmatic curricular revisions (i.e., 'closing the loop') are difficult to pinpoint merely one year into a three-year assessment cycle. Again, the faculty members view the three-year assessment of student learning as a learning process. Faculty discussions during faculty meetings (and reflected in the department meeting minutes) will continue with respect to:

- Updates to individual course syllabus made by full-time faculty and how these changes are communicated to adjunct faculty assigned to teach sections of a specific course.
- Better calibrate the course learning goals, assignments and rubrics in relation to a program's stated goals. For example, the faculty are discussing whether the rubric should focus more on developing effective leadership, or put another way, should we be examining students with respect to a more positive approach to leadership? Also, should the third factor be revised, as the three elements [a, b and c] are not equally important.
- Better training on using the rubric to ensure greater inter-rater agreement *without* biasing independent evaluations.
- Create greater consistency of assignments for student evaluation and assessment of learning at the graduate level. This applies to core courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels.
- Update the Student Learning Assurance Plans for MSOD and BSM-OBL.

In summary, it is important to note the School of Management instituted major curricular changes, based on its strategic plan, during the 2011-2012 academic year, which are reflected in courses offered by the OLC Department.

- A new MBA core curriculum has combined two separate 2-unit courses (Learning to Lead and Understanding Organizations) into one course, now called: Leadership, Teams & Organizations.
- The OLC Department faculty decided to distinguish comparable courses in the MBA and MSOD programs—specifically, OD 660 (Leadership & Organizations) and MBA 6014 course (Leadership, Teams & Organizations)—via distinct learning outcomes and assigned texts/readings.
- The BSOBL/BSOLM program is being taught out and the BSM program is launching in spring 2013. The BSM is comprised of a 28-unit core, which integrates the four legacy degree completion degrees into one program, with distinct 16-unit concentrations. The OLC Department will offer an OBL concentration, similar to the OBL major offered to traditional undergraduate students in the BSBA program.