

Undergraduate Day Business Program Program Learning Outcomes Progress Report (as of May 15th, 2014)

I. List of Program Level Learning Outcomes

1. Students will acquire and demonstrate **analytical** and problem solving skills within various disciplines of business—accounting, economics, finance, management and marketing.
2. Students will learn to describe, discuss and analyze **relevancy** of current events in American business with attention to the global, social and ethical dimensions of events.
3. Students will acquire the communication, **research** and technological skills needed to analyze a business situation (problem and/or opportunity), and prepare and present a management report.
4. Students will engage in at least one **internship** or service learning experience to demonstrate relevancy of foundational and theoretical knowledge of their academic major and to gain career related experiences.
5. Students will develop critical thinking abilities and a foundation of **ethical** principles that allows them to work effectively, respectfully, ethically and professionally with people of diverse ethnic, cultural, gender and other backgrounds.

II. The table below indicates the timeline for assessment: learning outcome to be assessed, the identified course, and the year that the assessment will occur.

Learning Outcomes — Year	Acquire and demonstrate analytical and problem solving skills within various disciplines of business—accounting, economics, finance, management and marketing.	Learn to describe, discuss and analyze current events in American business with attention to the global, social and ethical dimensions of events.	Acquire the communication, research and technological skills needed to analyze a business situation (problem and/or opportunity), and prepare and present a management report	Engage in at least one internship or service learning experience to demonstrate relevancy of foundational and theoretical knowledge of their academic major and to gain career related experiences	Develop critical thinking abilities and a foundation of ethical principles that allows them to work effectively, respectfully, ethically and professionally with people of diverse ethnic, cultural, gender and other backgrounds
2013-14	BUS 2980	BUS1000	BUS2980	BUS2990	BUS1008
2014-15	BUS 2980	BUS1000	BUS 2980	BUS2990	BUS1008
2015-16	BUS 2980	BUS1000	BUS 2980	BUS2990	BUS1008
2016-17	BUS 2980	BUS1000	BUS 2980	BUS 2990	BUS1008

2017-18	BUS 2980	BUS1000	BUS 2980	BUS2990	BUS1008
---------	----------	---------	----------	---------	---------

III. Summary of Results:

PLO#1: Students will acquire and demonstrate analytical and problem solving skills within various disciplines of business—accounting, economics, management and marketing.

Learning Outcome #1 was assessed in Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 using three separate assessment methods. Two of the measures, ETS-Major Field Test and Business Simulation Assignment, were assessed by the instructor, Don Campodonico in the two sections of the course BUS 2980 Business Policy and Strategy. The third measure, Graduation Surveys, consisted of self-assessment by the graduating seniors.

Methods of Assessment:

1. *External benchmarking of student learning of PLO #1 was achieved through administering ETS –MFT in Business to students enrolled in the Business Policy and Strategy course in Fall 2013. (External Assessment; Quantitative Assessment)*

In 2013, The Major Field Test in Business provided a comparison of 6 NDNU students to 32,982 students enrolled in a similar program in 438 schools. The students were tested on their problem solving skills in various disciplines of Business. We have earlier data from 2009 so we were able to compare four years of data.

2. *Instructor evaluation of the student's analytical and problem solving skills based on GLO-BUS business simulation assignment in BUS 2980 Business Policy and Strategy. (Internal Assessment; Quantitative Assessment)*

The first assessment tool, an instructor evaluation of student performance of PLO #1 was based on a group student project. The students were given a business situation and they had to analyze the case study on specific measures. These measures included the following:

- a. Financial Analysis: assessment of the individual's skills in analyzing financial ratios and financial statements.
- b. Financial Management: assessment of the group's ability to apply financial management principles.
- c. Operations Management: assessment of the group's ability to manage production operations and control production costs.
- d. Marketing Management: assessment of the group's ability to effectively market the company's product and control marketing costs.

- e. Human Resource Management: assessment of the group's proficiency in workforce management and controlling labor costs.
 - f. Strategic Analysis & Planning: assessment of the group's strategic planning and strategic thinking skills.
3. *A self-evaluation of the mastery over the PLO # 1 by the graduating students through a written survey. (Internal Assessment; Quantitative and Qualitative Assessment)*

For Spring 2014, the program director, Sujata Verma, administered a graduation survey to all graduating seniors in which they self-assessed their mastery over all the program learning outcomes including PLO#1 on a scale of 1 to 5.

Results of Assessment:

1. ETS-MFT Assessment Results: Comparison of four year data 2009-2013:

Summary Comments for Fall 2013:

- The NDNU mean score steadily improved from 142 in 2009 to 153 in 2012 and even more impressively the 2012 cohort placed in the 59%-tile of the total institutions (438) tested through June 2011 and 86% tile in Spring 2013. This is a significant improvement from the 5%-tile figure for 2009 and 2010. See Table 1 below
- The results from this, albeit small cohort, are extraordinary. Clearly their score is the highest ever attained by any one class of traditional age undergraduate day students. Moreover, four of the six students exceeded the ETS individual mean score.
- In terms of discipline specific scores, the scores are again among the best ever achieved. It is particularly noteworthy that in the quantitative disciplines (Accounting, Finance and Quantitative Business Systems – QBS, we have historically not performed well. However, the numbers from these cohorts are exceptional. For example, in QBS, we scored in the 97%-tile meaning that 97% of the 662 institutions scored less than our score.

Summary Comments for Spring 2014

- This was the second highest cohort score achieved by all UG day cohorts to date. Moreover, six of the fifteen students met or exceeded the ETS individual mean score 152. The high score of 168 was in the 85%-tile.
-
- In terms of discipline specific scores, this cohort exceeded the ETS mean in two disciplines, Legal and Social Environment and Information Systems. The biggest negative disparities were in International and Economics. The disciplines of Finance, Management and Marketing came the closest to meeting or exceeding the ETS mean.

Table 1. ETS MFT Results

	NDNU Spring 2009	ETS Collectiv e Data 2010	ND NU Spring 201 0	ETS Collectiv e Data 2010	ND NU Spring 201 1	ETS Collectiv e Data 2011	ND NU Spring 201 2	ETS Collectiv e Data 2012	ND NU Spring 13	ETS Collectiv e Data 2013	ND NU Fall 201 3	ETS Collectiv e Data 2013	ND NU Spring 201 4	ETS Collectiv e Data Sp 2014
# of Participants	2 5	83,323 students /564 Schools	23	132,647 students /618 Schools	18	15,939 students /259 Schools	25	32,982 students /438 Schools	22	80,708 students /585 Schools	6	128,135 students /662 Schools	15	128,135 students /662 Schools
Individual Student Mean score	142	151.6	141	151.6	147	153.5	153	150.3	146	150.3	158	150.1	148	150.1
Standard Deviation	13	7	8	7.2	11	13.7	17	7.4	13	7.4	20	7.2	12	7.2
Percent at or Below	5%	45%	5%	45%	15%	50%	59%	43%	23%	42%	86%	43%	34%	43%

Table 2: Discipline Specific ETS MFT Results

Disciplines	NDNU % ranking 2009	NDNU % ranking 2010	NDNU % ranking 2011	NDNU % ranking 2012	NDNU % ranking Spring 2013	NDNU % ranking Fall 2013	NDNU % ranking Spring 2014
Accounting	15%-tile	20%-tile	10%-tile	78%-tile	28%-tile	88%-tile	20%-tile
Economics Management	10% 5%	5% 5%	50% 10%	74% 36%	36% 15%	16% 22%	2% 22%

Quantitative Bus. Analysis	5%	5%	20%	18%	23%	97%	1%
Finance	5%	10%	15%	74%	22%	87%	38%
Marketing	5%	5%	5%	55%	21%	81%	38%
Legal & Social Environment	5%	10%	5%	65%	43%	99%	92%
Information Systems	1%	1%	15%	24%	20%	77%	67%
Intl. Issues	15%	5%	15%	78%	29%	17%	2%

2. **Methods of Assessment:** *Internal evaluation based upon the Learning Assessment Report generated via the GLO-BUS simulation*

Summary Comments: This most recent cohort, (Spring 2014) did reasonably well in the simulation. The areas of Financial Analysis and Financial Management scored well above our total cohort mean. In addition, the Strategic Analysis & Planning component was the second highest measured of all the previous cohorts. The latter item is worthy of note. Students (and their associated teammates) are required to set 3-Year Performance goals in the areas of ROE, EPS, Stock Price, Image Rating and Credit Rating. The teams are evaluated for how well they performed against their goal and are given “extra points” if they achieve a stretched goal.

The areas of weakness as demonstrated by this cohort were Operations Management and HR Management. The scores in Operations are historically low due to product costs, and in addition, due to loss sales for not having sufficient inventory to meet demand.

**GLO_BUS Business Simulation Assessment Results: Comparison of five year data 2008-2013:
Key Lessons Learned from the GLO-BUS Simulation (thru Spring 2013)**

Students in their end of simulation company presentations, in addition to providing insight into their performance, vision and functional strategies, the following are a summary of the most often mentioned lessons learned and instructor observations

Finance

- Understand your capital structure targets...while debt financing has its own issues, e.g. servicing debt, affect on net income; equity financing has its own set of appeal and concerns. Students continue to attempt to manipulate key metrics e.g. ROE by

borrowing money to buy back stock. A risky proposition in spite of continued emphasis on investing borrowed funds into assets that return a higher rate. Independent of the above, six of the nine cohorts evaluated to date have exceeded the cohort mean score. The most recent cohort demonstrated good financial analysis and management overall.

Marketing

- Need to stay abreast of competition. This goes beyond their apparent direction, but more specifically how each firm stacks up against the features and functionality of each competitor's product offerings. It is critical to measure based upon the elements that drive the buying decision.
- Don't be afraid to raise prices...if you have something e.g. feature or quality issues, leverage that feature if a higher price will be acceptable to buyers. Neglecting this possibility, merely throws away the incremental affect on the bottom line.
- Providing promotional and product features is fine, but caution with regard to warranty terms...extended warranties can result in very large expenses to accommodate contingent liabilities
- Overall the mean score for Marketing management is the lowest of the six areas evaluated. While market image historically is good, marketing costs per unit appears to be a challenge for students.

Operations

- It is essential to stay abreast of market demand and match capacity with demand. Moreover, running production facilities at full capacity is essential to minimize overall product cost.
- Students tend to not tie production planning with promotions creating in marketing. As a result there are either insufficient inventory to accommodate sales or excessive inventory. The former is the more likely scenario.
- The most recent cohort (Spring 2014) had difficulties controlling production costs. Most attempted to differentiate their product (which is fine) although there appears to be less concern with a target cost and associated gross margin per unit.

Strategy

- Students do not stay focused on their strategy....they **continue** to be more concerned with "winning the simulation" versus doing the best they can. In the strategy they choose to compete. They are not following the advice of Michael Porter who said: "You don't have to be the biggest to be the best...you just have to be the best at what you do."

- Students tend to opt to be the “low cost leader” but their product design and operational strategy is often inconsistent with that strategy. More specifically, feature richness not commensurate with low cost. They are not tying “strategy with structure and value added business processes.”
- In spite of the items listed above, from a strategic thinking standpoint cohorts in general do well in this area as evidenced by their performance against their 3-Year strategic plan they are required to develop.
-

Table 3:

Discipline											
	2008	2009	2010-(01)	2010-(02)	2011	2012-(01)	2012-(02)	2013S	2013F	2014S	Mean
Financial Analysis	3.1	3.1	3.1	2.6	3.1	3.5	2.7	2.0	2.5	3.3	2.89
Financial Management	2.5	2.4	3.4	3.3	1.4	4.4	0.8	2.0	2.7	3.2	2.59
Operations Management	3.2	3.3	4.2	3.2	1.95	0.5	2.6	3.3	2.3	1.1	2.55
Marketing Management	1.5	1.9	2.8	2.8	2.6	3.0	1.8	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.38
Human Resource Management	1.0	2.5	3.4	3.4	2.2	3.7	2.2	1.8	3.1	1.6	2.47
Strategic Analysis & Planning	3.2	3.1	2.8	2.7	1.9	4.0	1.9	2.0	2.7	3.7	2.78

PLO#2: Students will learn to describe, discuss and analyze current events in American business with attention to the global, social and ethical dimensions of events

Methods of Assessment: *Internal Instructor's evaluation of student's performance via online discussion of a current topic in BUS1000Business Foundations Course.*

Instructor: Dr. Roger Goodson

Summary Results: The overall 'Reuter's Score' for this particular class, Fall Semester, 2013 was 3.8. in the Above Adequate Contributor range. The instructional activity goal is 4 out of possible 5 for most postings. Comparison to the 2012 average was 3.5, in the Adequate Contributor range.

Table 4: Number of students assessed: 17

6 Outstanding Contributors
5 Good Contributors
4 Adequate Contributors
2 Unsatisfactory Contributors
2013 Average Score. 3.76 . Above Adequate
The 2012 Ave. was 3.50 Adequate
<p>5.0=Outstanding Contribution to Discussion 4. G = Good Contribution to Discussion 3.A = Adequate Contribution to Discussion 1.Unsatisfactory Contribution to Discussion 0. N = Non-Contributor</p>

PLO#3: Students will acquire the communication, research and technological skills needed to analyze a business situation (problem and/or opportunity), and prepare and present a management report.

Methods of Assessment: *Internal Instructor's evaluation of student's group presentation based on the Crowley Inn Case Study Assignment*

Instructor: Don Campodonico

Summary results to date:

Outcome#1: Most students have approached this issue by applying good managerial accounting concepts and understand that low variable cost businesses yield high contribution margin and thus have leveraged P&Ls. Most student recognize immediately that the high contribution margin the inn earns, is reason alone to determine that occupancy is the key areas of focus if profit is to be optimized. Their approach to calculating break even utilizes good managerial techniques. Some students get "bogged" down in detail and miss the intent of why this is important and should drive the actions recommended in Issue 2 and Issue 4.

Outcome #2: Students recognize the need for structure and process in order to deliver value. Typical focus is on performance management, reward systems and benchmarking. Often motivational techniques are discussed but normally surrounding hygiene factors as opposed to culture shift to address issues such as accountability. Perhaps overestimating the effect of salary on motivation level and performance. Overall students recognize the operational issues that are negatively affecting the inn's operations and develop plausible management actions.

Outcome #3: Students are recognizing the need to evaluate both the qualitative and quantitative issues associated with any decision. Some students fail to compare alternative financial options and focus too much on subjective issues while others accurately recognize the financial circumstances that are embedded in the case study. Nonetheless, they do come to a conclusion that is thought through...for the most part.

Outcome #4: Students typically zero in on promotional options, particularly in light of available technology today e.g. web sites, social media, and external informational sites. It is interesting to note that most students focus on promotion as opposed to product and price. The conclusion on issue 1 should drive them to address the 4Ps more aggressively, and although for the most part students acknowledge this relationship; they are not aggressive in their marketing program.

Outcome#5: This is the weakest outcome of the case study. Students need to determine, via quantitative methods, the value of the inn as well as assess the potential buyers offer. Students continue to not use the appropriate time value of money technique. Students fail

to utilize the appropriate time value of money technique nor recognize the need to develop future cash flows based upon plausible assumptions. The case calls for using discounted cash flow to properly value the inn, although other techniques would be acceptable. Some students struggled with the financing scheme associated with this case, and fail to determine the PV of the financing cash flows. Some students do utilize alternative methods to determine the inn's value such as cap rate, replacement costs which are relevant and appropriate.

Table 5

Year	Outcome #1:	Outcome: #2	Outcome #3	Outcome #4	Outcome #5
	1. Determine the level of financial leverage and conclude whether cost control or occupancy drives profit	2. Define Operational issues and determine additional necessary actions	3. Assess the franchising option and provide a recommendation to management	4. Evaluate the current Marketing plan and develop recommendations to improve	5. Determine the asset's valuation and recommend to management whether to accept the acquisition offer
2008	4	4.2	4.2	4.3	3.7
2009	3.6	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.3
2010-01	4.5	4.7	4.2	4.8	3.7
2010-02	4.0	4.8	4.6	4.5	3.5
2011	3.6	3.3	4.9	3.9	3.3
2012-01	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.5	3.5
2012-02	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.0	3.5
S' 2013	3.8	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.9
F'2013	4.7	3.9	4.2	4.3	3.8
S'2014	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.2	3.5
Current Mean	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.2	3.6

Learning Outcome #4: Engage in at least one internship or service learning experience to demonstrate relevancy of foundational and theoretical knowledge of their academic major and to gain career related experiences

Methods of Assessment: *External supervisor’s evaluation of student’s performance on site as an intern demonstrating student readiness for the job market*

Internal Assessment: Instructor evaluation of the reflection paper and resume reflecting the written communication skill of the intern in career development related assignments.

Summary Comments:

- In Fall 2013, the overall rating of 24 students by their Internship supervisors was a 4.61 out of a possible 5, representing a high level of satisfaction. The students scored high in Timeliness (5) and Collaboration (5) followed by Overall Professionalism (4.83), while the two lowest scores were obtained for Initiative and Enthusiasm (4.33) and Assertiveness (4.35). Written and oral communication skills received a high score of 4.67.
- The mean score of 9.18 out of 10 on the internship reflection paper and 9.02 out of 10 on student resumes for Fall 2013 represents a high level of written communication skill in interns career development related assignments.
- The narrative evaluations asked the supervisors to identify the strengths and weakness areas of the interns. The feedback reinforced the satisfaction with student intern’s performance on the basis of enthusiasm, good work ethic, attention to detail, good communication skills, overall professionalism, quick learner etc. The lack of work experience and industry knowledge were listed the student interns biggest limiting factors. Many supervisors suggested specific further training in particular areas that could benefit the interns.

“I am extremely grateful to the program. Student was a pleasure to work with and teach. If all students are this helpful and professional, I would think you as teachers would be happy and I commend you for this program”

“I would have appreciated more information about NDNu’s Internship Program and defined expectations from the institution for the student and the employee”

Table 6

	Mean scores from 1 (lowest)-5(highest)				
	S 2010	S 2011	S 2012	F 2012	F13
Attendance	4.37	N/A	4.13	4.74	4.61

Promptness	4.40	N/A	4.25	4.68	4.57
Dependability	4.43	N/A	4.50	4.79	4.61
Initiative	4.33	N/A	4.38	4.58	4.65
Quality of Work	4.37	N/A	4.50	4.74	4.52
Ability to work independently	4.47	N/A	4.43	4.58	4.48
Communication skills	4.50	N/A	4.63	4.63	4.52
Assertiveness	4.00	N/A	4.63	4.58	4.35
Ability to relate well to others	4.43	N/A	4.63	4.74	4.65
Problem solving ability	4.20	N/A	4.38	4.63	4.48
Decision making ability	4.30	N/A	4.38	4.68	4.52
Overall professionalism	4.67	N/A	4.63	4.74	4.83
Professional manner	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.48	4.67
Collaboration with colleagues	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.52	5.00
Initiative and Enthusiasm	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.70	4.33
Oral and written communication	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.52	4.67
Requirements are completed in a timely manner	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.35	5.00
Overall rating	4.37	4.54	4.45	4.61	4.61
Reflection paper (out of 20)	N/A	18.45	20.00	9.9/10	9.18/10
Resume (out of 5)	N/A	4.59	4.47	9.1/10	9.02/10
# of students	15	14	8	23	24

PLO#5: Students will develop critical thinking abilities and a foundation of ethical principles that allows them to work effectively, respectfully, ethically and professionally with people of diverse ethnic, cultural, gender and other backgrounds.

Methods of Assessment: *Internal Assessment: Instructor evaluation of a writing assignment in which each student was to find an article that discussed a law that affected business and opine on the law.*

Instructor: James Kelley

Summary Comments: The course assessed was Building Business Values, BUS 1008-01. The course was taken by primarily freshman. The scale on the rubric was 1-4, with 4 being the highest. The performance, except for three students, was poor.

Table 7

	Mean score (1=Poor,4=Excellent); n=20
Issues	1.95
Evidence	1.65
Influence	1.7
Position	1.85
Conclusions	1.85
Overall mean	1.8

III. Survey of Graduating Seniors (Student Self-Assessment of all PLO's)

This survey has been conducted for the last three cohorts in Spring 2011 –Spring 2013 and following is a summary of the results. Also included are the comparisons on the basis of first two sections of the surveys. The questions on the survey included the relevance of the core courses, request for suggestions for improvement and career plans after graduation.

Summary Comments:

-Students expressed satisfaction with the availability of teachers, classroom environment in 2014 survey and were least satisfied with recommending NDNU to family and friends. In terms of overall mean, the score was the highest of all three years.

-In terms of self-assessment of the five program learning outcomes (PLO's), outcomes 4 (internship) and 5 (critical thinking) scored the highest while outcomes 1 (analytical and problem solving skills) and 3 (research and technical skills) scored lower. In terms of overall mean, the result was as high as last year.

TABLE 8: GRADUATION SURVEY RESULTS:

SECTION 1: EFFECTIVENESS OF THE DAY BUSINESS PROGRAM	Spring 2011 MEAN (17 respondents)	Spring 2012 MEAN (24 respondents)	Spring 2013 MEAN (23 respondents)	Spring 2014 MEAN (20 respondents)
I feel that the overall program was challenging.	3.47	3.66	3.98	3.76
I found the work with my peers in classes to be very helpful in the learning process."	4.29	4.04	3.98	4.03
I found most of my teachers to be generally available for help when I needed it	4.47	4.38	4.52	4.60
I generally found most classroom environments congenial and non-threatening	4.59	4.29	4.38	4.60
I feel that NDNU prepared me well for my professional development goals	3.44	3.83	3.89	3.76
I recommend NDNU to my friends and family	3.94	3.79	3.83	3.64
TOTAL	4.035	3.99	4.10	4.07

Table 9: GRADUATION SURVEY RESULTS

SECTION 2:SELF ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES	Spring 2011 MEAN (17 respondents)	Spring 2012 MEAN (24 respondents)	Spring 2013 MEAN (23 respondents)	Spring 2014 MEAN (20 respondents)
PLO#1.I acquired and can demonstrate analytical and problem solving skills within the various disciplines of business—accounting, economics, finance, management and marketing	4.06	4.38	4.09	4.08
PLO#2.I learned to describe, discuss and analyze current events in American business with attention to the global, social and ethical dimensions of events	3.94	4.25	4.17	4.28
PLO#3.I acquired the communication, research and technological skills needed to analyze a business situation and I can prepare and present a management report	4	4.13	4.09	4.24
PLO#4.I was engaged in at least one internship or service learning experience	4.53	4.75	4.72	4.84
PLO#5.Develop critical thinking abilities and a foundation of ethical principles that allows them to work effectively, respectfully, ethically and professionally with people of diverse ethnic, cultural, gender and other backgrounds	4.235	4.525	4.47	4.54
TOTAL	4.16	4.42	4.34	4.42

Thank you!