

**University of San Francisco
School of Management
Assurance of Learning Committee**

Meeting Summary

Date:	10/23/17	Start Time:	3:05pm	End Time:	4:05pm	Location:	MH 230
-------	----------	-------------	--------	-----------	--------	-----------	--------

Who was there (*Indicate attendees and who chaired the meeting.*)

Barry Doyle, Muhammad Al-Abdullah, Monika Hudson, Kim Connor, John Gonzales, Nick Tay, Tatiana Fedyk, Eric Freeman, Laura Camara, Katherine Green

Absent: Neil Walshe, Sonja Poole

Topic of Meeting (*Attach a copy of the agenda if possible.*)

AOL COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, October 23, 2017, 3p-4p, MH 230

AGENDA ITEMS:

- 1) AoL Committee: Scope (attachment) [5 min]
 - a. What we've done and where we are
 - b. What constitutes an LO?
- 2) MSEI LOs (attachment) [15 min]
 - a. Discuss what is and isn't an LO
 - b. Review these as practice for reviewing all outcomes for all programs
 - c. Opportunity for the group as a whole to think about LO language
- 3) BSBA Los 3 and 5 Discussion (We have issues with assessment points) [10 min]

Program Goal 1 – Develop Effective and Ethical Leaders

Learning Outcome: 03) Students will identify and describe stakeholders across multiple sectors; connect ethical theory to stakeholder values; recognize and interpret societal context that influences stakeholders.

Program Goal 2 – Innovative & Creative Decision-making

Learning Outcome: 05) Students will create, analyze and integrate relevant quantitative and qualitative information to develop and evaluate management decisions.

- 4) BSM Lo4 Report Review (attachment) [10 min]
 - a. What should we do with the info we have collected? Recommendations?
 - b. "meeting expectations" – What does that mean? **Defining Rubrics**
- 5) BSM GPI test results (attachment) [5 min]
 - a. To be discussed further by UG subgroup.

6) UG & Grad subgroups

[10 min]

- a. Programs Committee (UPC/GPC) liaisons
- b. Evaluating info, making changes, Ensuring loop closing (**both**)
- c. Agenda items for future
 - i. MGEM LOs (**Grad**)
 - ii. BSBA curriculum map (**UG**)
 - iii. Discussion of assessment points, and “what do we do with the assessment” (**both**)

MSEI Learning Outcomes:

AoL committee recommends building rubrics for the LOs then working backward. It will become apparent that some LOs need to be simplified because they’ll be difficult to build a rubric for.

Committee suggests simplification – Keep Program Goals 1 and 2, then have two LOs per goal. Keep it simple at first, then after assessing, add additional LOs if necessary. Program Goal 4 depends on a program having been around for some time, so perhaps add that at a later date.

Program doesn’t have to have an LO for everything the students learn.

LO1: It’s three LOs in one: Apply –Analyze–Create. What is an innovation toolset?

LO2: Specify which “technology competencies” – then those specifics can be measured.

LO3: “Demonstrate” – but then what? Tells what they want to do but not how it’s going to be completed.

LO6: More of a program goal. Not a measurable learning outcome.

MSIS Program Objectives:

Splitting out into Program Goals and Learning Outcomes (like most other programs in SOM) would be useful.

AoL Committee recommendation: Simplify. Many LOs are too broad and will be difficult to assess. Ask, “Where can I assess this?”

There are multiple objectives within some of the Program Objectives. An example is PO3: “foster financial systems” versus “human capital management” – two different things to measure that are not very similar.

Wording on LO 5 could be refined. It appears to read, “Create better people.”

BSBA LOs 3 & 5:

AoL Committee recommends keeping both of these Learning Outcomes.

LO3 – It is important. It should be covered in BUS 301 – revise curriculum? Can’t have an LO that’s not in the curriculum.

LO5 – Encompasses qualitative components that the domain concepts do not. LO5 can be tested in the capstone.

BSM LO4 Report

Should target be set at 80%? IN BSBA, students can pass RHET with a C- grade. For assessment, perhaps target should be set at 75%? An issue with the artifact is that it is early in the program. The assessment of written communication should be in the capstone.

GPI Results

Insufficient amount of data to draw any conclusions. Students were concerned that they didn’t know their results.

Program Committee Liasons (will keep AoL committee apprised if any assessment topics arise)

UPC Liason: Monika Hudson

GPC Liason: John Gonzales

AoL Committee subgroups (UG/Grad) will meet at least once this AY. The entire committee will reconvene toward the end of the AY.