Goal 1: Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge and integrative application of core business concepts to managerial decision making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Research Methods</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Assessment</td>
<td>Students must score a minimum of 60% in the tests of knowledge of core business courses in the MBA program.</td>
<td>Fall 04 overall mean score: 53% (vs. 58% in Spr/Su 04). Scores were lowest for finance, human resources, and management of innovation &amp; technology; highest for accounting, international business, and marketing.</td>
<td>Decline in average scores is puzzling and may be due to changes in test items from 2004. Faculty will analyze data in the Fall 2005 semester. Low scores are also due to lack of incentives for students to prepare and perform well in the test, and the time between taking the course and the test.</td>
<td>Test items from core areas are being reviewed and tests may be revised further. Embedded measures and improved rubrics may be considered for 2005-06 cycle. Waiving of some foundation courses may be revisited (this may explain low scores in finance). Consistency in domain of material covered by various instructors across sections of the same course (e.g., innovation and technology) must be monitored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custom-designed tests, covering core subjects, were administered in the capstone business strategy course in Spring 2003, Sp/Su 2004, and Fall 2004.</td>
<td>2006: Overall mean scores declined from 2004 to Fall '05 (44%; n=26). Spring 06 results are being analyzed.</td>
<td>2006: Decline in scores attributed to small sample size, timing of test, and lack of incentives to do well. Faculty will explore merits of other assessment tools.</td>
<td>2006: Actions are being delayed until fall 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006: Tests were improved and administered in Fall 05 and Spring 06 semesters.</td>
<td>2006-07: Mean scores for Fall 06 below the norm of 60% were in these subjects: management of technology and innovation; human resources and labor relations; finance, and business strategy; scores above the norm were for international business, marketing, and accounting. No significant changes in scores from 2006.</td>
<td>2006-07: Scores declined slightly between spring 06 and fall 06. But scores remain low in core subject tests. Test results may be due to lack of incentive for students to perform well.</td>
<td>2006-07: Scoring rubrics suggest that learning is achieved even though objective test data do not support these conclusions. Stronger incentives to do better on the core subject tests include. No specific actions taken to modify course content or curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006-07: Tests were administered in Spring 06 and Fall 06.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Indirect Assessment:
Students’ ratings of satisfaction with courses, curriculum, and services will be at the mean of ratings among peer schools.

Exit surveys of MBA graduates were collected in Dec 2003 and May 2004, pooled (n=80) and analyzed by EBI.

**2006:** Focus groups will be conducted with off-campus MBA students in summer term. Exit surveys will be conducted in 2006-07.

**2006-07:**
- Focus groups conducted with Accelerated MBA (weekend) students and Executive MBA class in summer 2006/Fall 2006.
- Exit surveys were administered to AMBA and HCA-MBA students.

CSU ranked higher than average for: course availability; overall satisfaction with the program; fellow students; and facilities and computing resources. Advising quality was at average. Rankings below average were for use of technology; ethical and social issues; breadth of curriculum; and satisfaction with electives.

**2006-07: AMBA focus group feedback showed satisfaction with course content but dissatisfaction with weekend students feeling disconnected from regular life of the college. EMBA students concerned about curriculum & program details and performance expectations in selected courses.**

**AMBA Exit survey (N=30):**
- High levels of satisfaction with program's value, quality, instructors, and willingness to recommend program to others. Weaknesses: Career services and academic advising.
- HCA (N=6): Satisfaction highest with skills related to making decisions, problem solving, ethical analysis, and making effective presentations. Moderate ratings for program's value.

Actions were recommended for selected areas; other items are being studied for curriculum review (e.g., ethics coverage is stronger at CSU than at other schools, but the course is introduced very early in the program; exit surveys happen at the very end). Electives are limited, but curriculum review will be undertaken.

2006-07: Focus Groups:
Students in weekend programs should feel connected to the school. EMBA students have high expectations about customer service and course expectations; faculty need to be aware of these expectations. Communication needs to be improved.

Exit Surveys: AMBA students are employed and do not seek Career Services advice. Academic advising is minimal because program is lock-step with little choice in course selection. Students get advice as needed from program staff, not the regular business advising office.

New information systems course may be offered in a revised MBA curriculum (already implemented in the new Executive MBA program). Regular MBA curriculum will be revised beginning in the fall 2005 semester.

**2006-07: Regular feedback sessions are scheduled with AMBA and EMBA classes, conducted by the dean or associate dean and other staff members.**

Students are informed by email about college events and business events in the community (but attendance from these groups continues to be very low).

Career Services office in the Business School has informed weekend program students about special programs, mock interview sessions, resume preparation, and etiquette dinners.
### Goal 2: Students will be able to communicate effectively in writing and in oral presentations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Research Methods</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Students must score at a “proficient” level for written reports and assignments in the business strategy capstone course. | Scoring rubric used to rate quality of written work ranging from “exemplary” and “proficient” to “marginal” and “unacceptable.” | Spring 2004: 80% rated “proficient;” 20% rated “exemplary.”  
Fall 2005: 18% rated “exemplary;” 59% “proficient;” 18% “unacceptable.”  
Spring 2006: Data being analyzed with same rubrics.  
**2006-07:** Informal review of scoring rubrics showed no significant changes in writing skills from 2005. Instructors have not changed during this period. | MBA students display a satisfactory level of proficiency in writing business reports. Some variance is noted among non-native speakers of English in ability to express thoughts clearly in writing.  
2006: Decline in scores attributed to tougher grading standards among new faculty in the capstone courses, and small increases in enrollment of international students (14% were non-native speakers of English).  
**2006-07:** Instructor expectations have been communicated more clearly to students; goal is to reduce “unacceptable” writing in the MBA program to less than 10%. | No significant actions taken; students scoring low on the verbal portion of the GMAT test are required to take remedial writing/speaking courses. |
| Students must score at a “proficient” level for oral presentations made in the business strategy capstone course | Scoring rubric used to rate quality of oral presentations ranging from “exemplary” and “proficient” to “marginal” and “unacceptable” | Spring 2004: 38% rated “exemplary;” 54% rated “proficient.”  
Fall 2005: 14% rated “exemplary;” 64% “proficient;” and 5% unacceptable.  
**2006-07:** No significant changes noted. | Strong levels of proficiency due probably to good preparation in the GAD 515 course and/or significant professional experience with oral presentations.  
**2006-07:** Student familiarity with Powerpoint and other tools has increased. | Continue to emphasize high standards in expectations described in course syllabi.  
**2006-07:** No new actions recommended. |
## Goal 3: Students will be able to demonstrate critical thinking skills in business decision making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Research Methods</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Assessment: Students must score at a “good” or “acceptable” level in analyzing business problems and cases in the business capstone course.</td>
<td>Scoring rubric used to rate critical thinking and reasoning skills, ranging from “good” and “acceptable” to “poor.”</td>
<td>Spr 2003 and Fall 2004: More than 90% of students were “good;” or “acceptable.” Ten percent were rated “poor.”  Fall 2005: 82% rated “good” or “acceptable;” 18% rated “unacceptable.”  2006: Being analyzed.</td>
<td>Graduating BBA students demonstrate acceptable levels of critical thinking and reasoning skills for business. Scoring rubric’s application to business is a minor concern.  2006: Decline in student quality and new instructors in capstone courses with tougher grading standards are possible explanations.  2006-07: Instructors have not changed since 2005; expectations are clearly communicated.</td>
<td>Continue to encourage students to think critically about business problems and solutions. An improved rubric is being developed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2006-07: Ratings have not changed significantly.**

| Indirect Assessment: Students’ self ratings of MBA program in preparing them for critical thinking will be at the average of ratings among peer schools.  **2006: EBI service discontinued. Students self ratings for critical thinking will be positive.** | Exit surveys assessed satisfaction. Data collected in December 2003 and May 2004 were combined and analyzed by EBI (n=85).  2006: Focus groups to be conducted in Summer 2006; exit surveys to be administered in 2006-07.  **2006-07: Focus groups were conducted for AMBA & EMBA; exit surveys were conducted.** | CSU MBA was above average in “ability to define problems;” at average for “ability to think critically;” and slightly below average for “ability to analyze and interpret data” and “to solve problems.”  **2006-07: Focus groups showed that professors challenge students to think and analyze. 75% of students in exit survey felt that the program enhanced their ability to analyze/solve problems; 71%--to think critically.** | The statistical differences among peer schools and our MBA were not deemed significant to take actions. | None. |

**2006-07: Self reports may be less reliable than objective assessment, but student awareness of critical thinking and analysis is enhanced when professors focus on this.**

**2006-07: Faculty are aware that critical thinking skills are present, but there are concerns that the level of thinking for MBA students must continue to be raised. Discussions continue about testing methods, use of applied field projects. New EMBA curriculum incorporates a field consulting project.**