EMBA AY 2016-2017 Assessment

Phase 1: Assessment Plan

Learning Outcome Assessed: EMBA Learning Outcome 3 – Communicate effectively in writing.

Assessment Method: Written Assignment.

Assignment Description (from course syllabus):
Global Business Practicum Paper. Each student will write a paper that integrates corporate diplomacy and the role of business in the global marketplace with a chosen topic of study. Each student and the professor will mutually agree on the chosen topic. The four learning outcomes specifically addressed by this assignment are: (a) apply principles and knowledge gained from both their EMBA program studies and work experience to better understand the complex, global ecosystem in which businesses operate; (b) gather and synthesize information on economic, political, organizational, cultural and legal factors associated with operating locally and in a global economy; (c) appreciate the opportunities, challenges and tradeoffs necessary to work with diverse (and likely competing) stakeholder groups; and (d) grapple with the social, moral, and environmental impact of organizations in the pursuit of creating return with stakeholders.

Targeted Performance (based on rubric): 80% of students meet or exceed expectations.

Evaluation Process: Students were evaluated by the course instructor using a rubric developed and approved by the EMBA Curriculum Committee.

Rubric: The rubric (see attached) consists of five categories – (1) Context & Purpose, (2) Central Message, (3) Content & Evidence, (4) Organization, and (5) Delivery & Mechanics – that are evaluated separately on a scale from ‘0’ (Does Not Meet Expectations) to ‘3’ (Exceeds Expectations).

Course: EMBA 6997—Global Business Practicum. This is a second-year EMBA course. Students were provided the rubric before completing the assignment.

Evaluator: Dr. Richard Stackman, Associate Professor & Interim Director of Executive Education. Dr. Stackman has previous experience as an editor at a daily newspaper, and he is currently the co-editor-in-chief of the Journal of Management Inquiry.

Phase 2: Results Assessment and Planned Action

Results: In aggregate, the results are quite positive as the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations across the five categories exceeded 80%. However, given the student population, four (of the 18) students failed to average a ‘2’ across the five categories. Of concern, the writing of two (of the four) students was deemed “Below Expectations.”

Overall, the assignment and rubric was a fair assessment of students’ writing effectiveness. The majority of students were deemed quite competent in their ability to express themselves in writing. Students are expected to enter the program with strong, well-developed writing skills. That two students were evaluated at the “Below Expectations” level reflects poorly on the
admissions process not the program curriculum. At this time, there is no need to change the rubric or the timing (i.e., in their second year) at which students are evaluated. Any substantive writing assignment from a second-year course can be used for the assessment in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Does Not Meet Expectations ‘0’</th>
<th>Below Expectations ‘1’</th>
<th>Meets Expectations ‘2’</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations ‘3’</th>
<th>% Students Meeting or Exceeding Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context &amp; Purpose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Message</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content &amp; Evidence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery &amp; Mechanics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Action(s):**
1. Review the admission standards (including TOEFL scores for students where English is not their native language) and the admission process (including how final acceptance decisions are made) with respect to the evaluation of an applicant’s writing ability.

2. Establish a process to identify students with writing deficiencies by the end of their first semester in the program, *not* in the second year. Refer these students to the University’s Writing Center or to other writing development resources.

**Phase 3: Closing the Loop**

[To be completed after addressing Suggested Actions.]