

Linking Mission, Strategy and Student Outcomes Assessment: a Cost-Effective Model

Stephen J. Holoviak
Shippensburg University

Thomas P. Verney
Shippensburg University

Jerry A. Weigle
Shippensburg University

Justin S. Holoviak
Shippensburg University

Abstract

The purpose of this paper was to provide a demonstration of the assessment methods and processes that are used by the John L. Grove College of Business to assess student outcomes and how these assessments relate to mission and strategy.

Keywords: Assessment, Student-Outcomes, Cost-Effective, Mission, Strategy

Overview

As is succinctly stated in the mission statement, the John L Grove College of Business of Shippensburg University is committed to being an outstanding business school in the Mid-Atlantic region by providing a quality teaching and learning environment for undergraduate and graduate students. In fulfilling this mission the College committed itself to the continuous improvement process and to the assessment of learning outcomes as significant criteria in that process. The faculty are responsible for assessment and revision of their respective discipline content; as well as continuous improvement in the BSBA core curriculum which requires input responsibility shared by all faculty and deans. Through the strategic planning process, coupled with faculty meetings (Town meetings), processes are in place to improve the assessment of learning, to enhance curriculum integration, and to place greater emphasis on technology.

Strategic Planning, Learning Assessment, and Town meetings

Prior to 2000, strategic planning in the John L. Grove College of Business was undertaken at two levels –in each of the four academic departments and in the Dean’s Council. Each department submitted its plans via the annual staffing analysis. Planning for the College took place during monthly meetings and scheduled retreats of the Dean’s Council whose membership included the dean, the associate dean, and the four department chairs.

The College of Business is a leader in the strategic planning process at Shippensburg University. Recently, the university and our system office (14 colleges and universities in the PA system) began strategic planning. Prior to this the state system model was basically a three year rolling financial plan – not uncommon event in state public education. Our planning model links to both the university and the state system plan.

As a regional comprehensive university and an outstanding College of Business in the region we face a continual stream of demands by the regional stakeholders for help and support. The strategic process provides an efficient vehicle to respond. We respond by developing ongoing mechanisms for help by SBDC (Small Business Development Center) or our Frehn Consulting and land use center and other ways to move resources to meet ongoing needs.

The strategic process also provides a mechanism to tactically align ourselves for the needed resources to support the credit bearing academic needs of our traditional students and the regional nontraditional student emphasis.

Our process is rich with open dialogue. This begins with our monthly faculty/staff town meetings where the policy of transparency in budgeting and planning is finely displayed in consensus building discussions about the strategic agenda. Subsequently, we have a series of meetings with advisory boards, specific discipline boards, and student advisory boards which contribute to the pool of ideas. This “think tank” of idea generating dialogue is amassed at an annual retreat.

However, the process easily lends to use with assessment vehicles. Our academic program goals are linked in the process. This allows us to collect the assessment data, process it on our special software and then use the Town meetings venue to decide pathways to correct or adjust programming. Furthermore, it allows “loop closing” on past corrections we attempted and decided if the correction from a prior year or assessment time frame is actually working as envisioned. This process was revised for two reasons. First, the planning process was not thorough enough, nor was it an ongoing process. Second, there was not enough stakeholder involvement.

The college implemented processes to ensure continuous improvement, mission- and faculty-driven processes, and broader stakeholder involvement. The processes include the following:

1. Establishment of a committee for strategic planning
The strategic planning committee is chaired by a department chair and consists of all members of the COB Council. It replaced the former Mission Statement Committee. The latter group was active prior to the 1996 review and continued to work through 1997. Little progress was made after that, however, since the chair of the committee took an interim position in administration during the spring 1998 and returned to the College as interim dean for the 1998-1999 academic year. No replacement chair was designated, with no subsequent activity.
2. Development of mechanisms for closing the loop for outcomes assessment
Formal outcomes assessment procedures have been established at the college level and in each of the four academic departments. Each department had been and still is responsible for tracking and reporting results to the administration; little had been done with the dissemination of results at the college level. This effort is now under the direction of the Associate Dean and one of the department chairs, in conjunction with the department chairs. The Council meets regularly for the purpose of identifying critical areas for improvement and shares the information with faculty and students. Among the assessment procedures implemented are the AACSB/EBI Student Satisfaction, Alumni, Undergraduate Administrative Benchmarking surveys, internship surveys, senior exit interviews, and sophomore focus group discussions.
3. Establishment of town meetings for faculty and staff
The town meetings were initially used for reevaluation and restructuring of the core curriculum, a process that involved faculty across all disciplines. Prior to this, each department had its own monthly meetings, and no college-wide forum existed for discussion of common concerns. In addition to the core curriculum revision, the meetings have been used to discuss the strategic plan, the mission statement, distance education, the new MBA program, and numerous other topics. (Minutes of town meetings are disseminated to all faculty and staff members and are maintained in the Dean's office.) The major benefit clearly is broader faculty participation in planning, assessment, and new program development.

Strategic Planning Outcomes

The initial continuous improvement initiated by the use of town meetings for consensus decision-making among faculty was the revision of the BSBA core curriculum. While the intended effect was to reduce the number of required business core courses in order to enhance student's ability to elect multiple concentrations and areas of focus, and still maintain breadth of functional knowledge, it also enabled the faculty to identify and discuss BSBA learning goals that fulfill the mission of both the college and university.

The faculty was able to discuss and implement a business minor program in response to demands from the College of Arts and Science. Within the first year of its existence there were well over thirty business minors.

Based on input from regional business leaders as well as the College of Business Advisory Board, the faculty developed and implemented additional concentrations in Supply Chain, Entrepreneurship, and Personal Financial Planning. Significant changes were also discussed, adopted and implemented in the General Management concentration. In response to market demands and with the support and encouragement of regional business leaders, the faculty agreed to resurrect the MBA program. However, based on numerous discussions with

various stakeholders, the revised MBA would target working professional who had been working at least five years. The program would be a hybrid distance learning (through live classroom/videoconferencing) and online.

In response to faculty concerns regarding curriculum integration and administrative concerns about second-year retention, a one-credit Freshman Business Integration Experience was developed to both enhance business students' acculturation into the college of business and to initiate the functional integration process.

Finally, from an administrative perspective, being driven by a strategic planning process enabled the College of Business to integrate both the staffing and budgeting processes. It also enables the college to continuously refine the strategic planning process so that it is broad-based and continuous.

Learning Goals

Given the mission of the College of Business as it supports the mission of Shippensburg University; the College of Business faculty through the town-meeting process achieved consensus on the following learning goals and the identification of areas of integrative importance:

1. Possess a base knowledge in the following business disciplines: Accounting, Finance, Information Systems, Management, Marketing, and Supply Chain/Operations.

This learning goal is primarily met through the design and structure of the BSBA core curriculum. The BSBA core curriculum has been restructured to insure that each student possesses a base knowledge in each discipline before entering the major courses in that discipline. It is assessed with course-embedded measures, the ETS Major Field Test in Business, Student Internship Evaluations, and both student and alumni perceptions as measured in the Educational Benchmarking Institute (EBI) Surveys.

2. Possess the ability to use the basic tools (statistics, computers, and technology) of business.

The primary responsibility for this learning goal in the BSBA core curriculum is handled by the Business Computer Systems and Statistical Applications courses. However, most 300 and 400-level courses both required in the BSBA core or in a major, require students to either perform statistical analysis and/or employ technology. It is assessed with course-embedded measures, the ETS Major Field Test in Business, Student Internship Evaluations, and both student and alumni perceptions as measured in the Educational Benchmarking Institute (EBI) Surveys.

3. Possess a basic understanding of the economic, legal, and ethical context of business.

The relevant knowledge necessary to accomplish this learning goal is addressed in the following BSBA core curriculum courses: Principles of Economics, Financial & Managerial Accounting, Managerial Economics, American Legal Environment, and Business & Society. It is assessed with course-embedded measures, the ETS Major Field Test in Business (Economics and Legal and Regulatory Environment), and both student and alumni perceptions as measured in the Educational Benchmarking Institute (EBI) Surveys.

4. Possess the ability to communicate effectively both in writing and orally.

This learning goal permeates virtually every educational endeavor within the college of business. With the exception of economics and law, all BSBA core curriculum course have either a graded written component, a graded oral component or, as in the case of Strategic Management, both. It is assessed with course-embedded measures, Student Internship Evaluations, the Senior Exit Interviews, and both student and alumni perceptions as measured in the Educational Benchmarking Institute (EBI) Surveys.

5. Possess the knowledge and skills necessary to work in teams.

This learning goal is primarily addressed by the Organizational Behavior, Principles of Marketing, and Strategic Management courses in the BSBA core curriculum. However, the goal is reinforced by required and graded teamwork in other junior and senior-level core courses. It assessed with course-embedded measures, Student Internship Evaluations, Senior Exit Interviews, and both student and alumni perceptions as measured in the Educational Benchmarking Institute (EBI) Surveys.

Areas of Integrative Focus

Through the processes of strategic planning and collaborative consensus-building, the faculty agreed to further develop and increase three (3) specific areas of integration:

- Cross-functional;
- Global Business; and
- Cultural and Cross-cultural Diversity.

The following table is a summary of linkage between learning goals, BSBA core courses, and assessment methodologies:

		Type of Assurance		
		Course-embedded Measurement	Performance Exam (ETS)	Surveys (EBI)
1. Possess a knowledge base in the various disciplines in business.	Fundamentals of Financial Accounting Managerial Accounting Managerial Economics Financial Management Principles of Marketing Operations Management Organizational Behavior	X	X	X
2. Possess the ability to use the basic tools of business (statistics, computer, and technology).	Business Computer Systems Statistical Applications in business Operations Management	X	X	X
3. Possess an understanding for the context of business (economics, legal, and ethics).	Principles of Economics American Legal Environment Business & Society	X	X	X
4. Possess the ability to communicate effectively (in writing and orally).	All BSBA core courses	X		X
5. Possess the ability to work in teams.	Organizational Behavior	X		X
Additional Areas of Concern				

<input type="checkbox"/> Cross-functional Integration	Foundations of Business Administration Strategic Management	X	X	
<input type="checkbox"/> Global Business Environment	All BSBA core courses	X	X	X
<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Context and Diversity	Business and Society	X		X

Assessment Methods

Through the town meeting process, faculty agreed that multiple assessments, given concerns regarding reliability and validity, would be the preferred route. Given that the College of Business had been assessing students’ outcome, particularly with internship, the strategy employed was to re-organize and streamline the assessment process to focus on the specified learning goals and “areas of concern.” The following are the assessment procedures that were initially employed:

1. Course Embedded Measures.
 Every BSBA core curriculum course relies on course-embedded assessment methods to assure student learning and to provide faculty with feedback on attaining learning objectives. Depending on the course content and learning processes, the types of embedded assessment measures include: examinations, data analysis and reports, projects, presentations, papers, and portfolios that are used as input to standardized rubrics.
2. ETS Major Field Test in Business.
 Each spring semester a random sample of 50 graduating seniors completes the standardized exam near the end of their coursework. Results are normed against a national sample that traditionally includes approximately 400 business schools and 30,000 business students. The exam provides feedback to determine how well the program is equipping students with the standard functional business knowledge and skills as well as a “source of validation” for the embedded assessments.
3. EBI (AACSB) Undergraduate Business Student Satisfaction/Exit Survey.
 Every four (4) years, according to our strategic assessment plan, graduating seniors are administered this survey near the completion of the BSBA program to assess their perceptions of program quality and value. This national survey permits us to benchmark against ourselves, our comparison schools (select six), the Carnegie class, and all business programs that participates in the survey.
4. EBI (AACSB) Alumni Survey.
 According to our strategic assessment plan, every four (4) years a sample of alumni who have graduated between three (3) and six (6) years is surveyed to assess their perceptions of program quality and how well they were prepared for career and/or graduate school success. This is a national survey that permits us to benchmark our program to ourselves, our comparison schools (select six), the Carnegie class, and all business programs that participated in the survey.
5. Senior Exit Interview.
 The Dean and Associate Dean of the College of Business, near the end of each semester, conduct this combination of group interview and survey. Seniors who expect to graduate at the end of that semester are invited to participate. Interview questions and survey items generally pertain to the quality of instruction, advising, curriculum, facilities, and learning resources. Results are reviewed across time and discussed at college council and department meetings.
6. Internship Evaluations.

All student interns have their performance evaluated by their internship employer. Department chairs receive the individual evaluation forms and a summary of the results at the end of the semester in which the internship was completed. The evaluation form was redesigned in 2003 because of “restriction of range” problems and to more accurately reflect the research evidence on performance appraisal.

Assessment Procedures

1. Embedded Assessment.

Every BSBA core curriculum course relies on course-embedded assessment methods to assure student learning and to provide faculty with feedback on obtaining learning objectives. Depending on the course content and learning processes, the types of embedded assessment measures include: examinations, data analysis & reports, projects, presentations, papers, and portfolios. Discipline faculty assume the responsibility of assessing student learning as it occurs in their discipline and preparing an analysis for discussion at a Town meeting. Faculty are encouraged to discuss and develop schema for cross-functional integration.

2. ETS Major Field Test.

Because of the significant per student cost of administering this standardized exam, our strategic assessment plan dictates sampling fifty (50) graduating seniors in the spring semester of each year. The results of the test are provided to each department chair for discussion at department meetings and for follow-up discussion and action planning at a college of business town meeting.

3. EBI (AACSB) Undergraduate Business Student Satisfaction/Exit Survey.

The strategic assessment plan directs the administration of this survey to graduating seniors every four (4) years, beginning with the 1999 graduating class. This data, particularly the comparisons, is presented to the entire faculty at a college of business “Town meeting.”

4. EBI (AACSB) Alumni Survey.

As is indicated in the strategic assessment plan, this survey is administered to a sample of alumni every four (4) years. The initial survey was conducted in 2000 with the repeat in 2004. The comparison data and survey results are presented directly to all the faculty at the college of business town meeting.

5. Exit Interviews and Survey.

The Dean and Associate Dean conduct a group interview with graduating seniors and administer the exit survey near the end of every semester. The Associate Dean takes copious notes on the student discussion. The Associate Dean assumes the responsibility of providing a summary of those notes and the results of the survey to department chairs. The results are discussed at department meetings and summarized by the Associate Dean at both the town meeting and the college council.

6. Internship Evaluation.

The Associate Dean as Internship Director assumes the responsibility of insuring that student internship performance is formally evaluated by the employer. The individual and collective data is distributed to department chairs and faculty. Collective results are reviewed at a Town meeting.

Assessment Results

1. ETS Major Field Test in Business.

The College of Business first administered this test to 50 of our “best” students in 2001. All subsequent administrations were to a more random sample of 50 students (two sections of the strategy course). Appendix I contains a summary of the results compared to the norm data mean.

2. EBI (AACSB) Undergraduate Student Satisfaction/Exit Survey.

The initial implementation of this survey was conducted in May of 1999. Since the Strategic Assessment Plan calls for this survey to be conducted every four years, the second assessment was conducted in 2003. The results of both assessments, comparisons to peer and others institutions and the longitudinal analysis were presented at the Town meeting and are included in Appendix II.

3. EBI (AACSB) Alumni Survey Data.

The initial implementation of this survey was conducted in the summer of 2000. Since the Strategic Assessment Plan calls for this survey to be conducted every four years, the second assessment was conducted in 2004. The results of both assessments, comparisons to peer and others institutions and the longitudinal analysis were presented at the Town meeting and are included in Appendix III.

4. Senior Exit Interviews (Content Analysis).

The Dean and Associate Dean of the College of Business have the responsibility of conducting these group interviews with graduating seniors at the end of each fall and spring semesters. The Associate Deans compile a summary of the student comments. This summary is distributed to department chairs for discussion at department meetings. The summary is also discussed at a Town meeting. Examples of issues discussed include:

Things done well:

- 1 Technology
- 2 Group Work
- 3 Career Expositions
- 4 Library Services & webpage
- 5 Career Development Center
- 6 Internship Program
- 7 Etiquette Dinners

Things needing improvement:

- 1 Facilities in Grove for teamwork assignment
- 2 Increase “out-of-area” interviewers
- 3 Increase contact with alumni
- 4 Improve scheduling system
- 5 Business Writing/Communication
- 6 Increase global coverage

5. Internship Data.

All students in the College of Business who elect an internship for academic credit have their performance as an intern evaluated by the employer. The evaluation form (Appendix V) is returned to the Internship Director (Associate Dean).

Achieving Learning Goals

1. Embedded Assessment

Because of the variety of assessment methods utilized, the revision to the BSBA core curriculum, the sequential and integrative nature of the BSBA core curriculum, the consensus of the discipline faculty and the faculty “as a whole,” is that the satisfactory completion of a discipline course (or sequence of courses) is necessary evidence of achieving the learning goal. This evidence can be further validated by discipline ETS scores, internship evaluations, EBI data (both Alumni and Student), and Senior Exit Interview data.

Action Taken: Continuous review of the assessment data at the college of business town meetings with one annual meeting completely devoted to an analysis of the data and recommendations from the faculty.

2. ETS Major Field Test Scores

With the exception of the 2001 test scores (which was a biased sample), the discipline mean scores have remained relatively stable. However, there are two significant continuous improvement efforts – the BSBA core revision and the Freshman Integration Experience – which should manifest themselves in the May 2006 graduating seniors.

The goal of the Core Revision was to recognize and resolve several issues. First, to acknowledge the degree of stakeholders who hire our students that they want a broader student who may have dual majors or a major and a minor. Our core and major requirements at the time only allowed for 3 credit hours of electives. Secondly, we are a continuous improvement organization and our core had not been revised for 25 years. Not that individualized courses had been neglected, just the core concept and structure. The resultant changes, all handled by continuous improvement methods resulted in 16 hours of free electives to the students, increased flexibility, necessitated a revitalization of BSBA core courses and their integration, and it caused a ripple effect in the review of our major area requirements. The ETS data appears to validate the array of embedded assessment measure used to assure the accomplishment of learning goals.

Action Taken: Revision of BSBA Core Curriculum

3. EBI (AACSB) Undergraduate Student Satisfaction/Exit Data

Although there is a plethora of data that has been useful to the College of Business in making program and curriculum changes, such as the Freshman Integration course and Advisor Development programs, the most important are student perception of “learning outcomes,” and the 1999-2003 longitudinal analysis.

With the exception of “Effective Communication and Teamwork,” our students’ perception of accomplishing learning outcomes consistently exceeds both our Select Six comparison schools and the Carnegie Class.

Action Taken: Based on limited resource availability, the consensus of the college of business faculty was to collaborate with the English department in the development of a technical writing sequence of two (2) courses. Because of the BSBA core revision, additional free electives were created to enable business student to elect this sequence.

The 1999-2003 longitudinal analysis also confirms or validates program and curriculum changes that are in progress to continuously improve. In all factors both the faculty of the College of Business and its Deans have control over, student perception showed a positive increase.

The next administration of this survey, scheduled for 2007, should confirm and validate the core revision, the usefulness of the Freshmen Integration Experience, and our continuous improvement efforts to further enhance the integration of the business curriculum.

4. Internship Evaluation Data

Although all of the feedback data we receive from employers or potential employers is important, for validating our assessment of learning goals we take particular notice of the feedback on:

- Oral & Written Communication Knowledge with Major
- General Business Knowledge
- Problem Solving/Critical Thinking
- Collaboration/Working with Others

As is evident in the data table presented earlier, the feedback received with internship employers is overwhelmingly positive. Furthermore, even though the ratings are negatively skewed, the year-over-year trends show a positive increase.

Actions Taken: The revision to the BSBA core curriculum has enable students to elect both the technical writing sequence (strengthening the writing competencies) and the database course (ISM 300) (strengthening their technical skills).

5. EBI (AACSB) Alumni Survey Data

The data provide to the College of Business through this survey has been particularly useful in the following Actions Taken:

- Revising the BSBA Core Curriculum
- Developing a Supply Chain Concentration
- Developing the Freshman Integration Experience
- Revising the General Management Major
- Developing the Entrepreneurship Concentration

6. Senior Exit Interviews/Survey

Although the information provided is the least quantitative, it has been extremely useful in making programmatic improvements. Over the last four years the following Actions have been taken:

- Enhancing technology available for students, especially making Grove Hall “wireless.”
- Library staff in developing a “business module” specifically for the business students.
- Establishing “Etiquette Diners” for enhancing the business etiquette of business students.
- Collaboration with the English department in the development of the technical writing course to improve writing skills.

Actions in Progress:

- 1 Dedicating an underutilized classroom for technology-driven teamwork assignment and assigning a full-time graduate assistant as staff.
- 2 Surveying college of business alumni and encouraging those that are interested in increasing their contact with students and/or faculty to participate through CollegeCentral.com.
- 3 The current scheduling system is not able to construct “waiting lists” for students unable to enroll in “closed” courses. This forces department chairs to construct their own list which is confusing for students and departments alike. As the entire state system migrates to SAP, discussions are taking place to remedy this problem.

Recently as part of the senior exit interview process, students were administered a “learning goal specific” survey. These seniors were asked to rate the extent that the BSBA program achieves the specified learning goals. The average ratings were: (1-lowest; 5-highest)

- | | |
|---------------|------|
| 1. Accounting | 3.05 |
| 2. Finance | 3.08 |
| 3. Management | 3.88 |
| 4. Marketing | 3.48 |

5. Operations	3.23
6. Statistics	3.25
7. Technology	3.89
8. Economics	3.37
9. Legal	3.17
10. Ethics	3.48

As with the data from other assessment sources, student perceptions also confirm and validate the achievement of learning goals.

Conclusions - Looking Back

The data from multiple sources (embedded, ETS, EBI, internship, and exit surveys) support the conclusion that those students who graduate from Shippensburg University with a BSBA possess:

- A knowledge base in the various disciplines in business
- The ability to use the basic tools of business
- An understanding of the context of business
- The ability to communicate effectively, and
- The ability to work in teams

Our mean ETS Major Field test scores have remained stable over the past four years, while the program has undergone significant revisions. Given the revisions to the BSBA core, the Freshman Business Integration Experience, and the faculty consensus on linking learning objectives to assessment in their syllabi, it is expected that the mean ETS test scores will begin to increase beginning in 2005 with the full impact being demonstrated in 2006.

The data from both Students and Alumni (EBI) supports an increasing level of satisfaction with the program. Although some may argue that this is not “evidence of learning,” it is the position of the College of Business that these “reaction” criteria are critical to learning assessment. Specifically, in the absence of a positive “reaction” to the learning environment, learning is less likely to occur. Given that the reaction to the learning environment has continued to show a positive increase, focusing on discipline knowledge and cross-functional integration will have a much more positive impact on learning than if the reaction to the learning environment had been increasingly negative.

The use of multiple methods of assessment to validate learning in the College of Business is excellent examples of both the integrative nature of our mission and the strategic planning initiatives. The use of town meetings to involve all faculty in the discussions and decision-making regarding curriculum and learning assessment results provides the optimum consensus “vehicle” for “closing the loop” in strategic learning assessment and is a clear indicator of its successful working nature.

The assessment methods are well-known and used by other AACSB accredited schools. The College of Business faculty have papers presented at professional conferences and workshops on the Freshman Integration Experience, the internship evaluations, and senior exit interviews in order to make those instruments publicly available. Given that our primary mission is teaching, learning assessment is both critical and a logical extension of the strategic initiatives for teaching excellence.

Looking Forward

Certainly there are areas in which continuous improvement must be addressed. First, the faculty are generally concerned, if not dissatisfied, with the ability of our students to write effectively. This has been a topic of discussion at several “Town meetings.” The

university's approach to "writing across the curriculum" in general education does not seem to have had much of a positive impact. The technical writing concentration in English will assist some of the business majors but the College of Business needs to develop and implement a course of action to resolve this problem.

Second, there is an apparent need for the development of an assessment similar to that of the ETS Major Fields test that will enable the assessment of all BSBA graduating seniors. Because of budgeting issues, a random sample of May graduates is assessed using the ETS Major Fields test. A "final comprehensive" exam that assesses knowledge across all learning goals, particularly if it positively correlated with ETS scores, would provide additional validation of learning goal achievement.

Third, additional efforts need to focus on cross-functional integration. One of the goals of the Freshman Integration Experience was to begin the integration process and clearly one of the goals of the capstone strategy course is to assess student cross-functional abilities. Methods need to be developed to insure this integration occurs throughout the core curriculum. The current "pilot" project of cross-posting common cases on BlackBoard needs to be evaluated and discussed as a method of enhancing integration.

Fourth, staffing the Freshman Business Integration Experience will become an issue. Faculty must sacrifice "time away" from their discipline to engage students in this experience. There is little in the way of organizational rewards or recognition to entice faculty to take on this assignment.

Finally, strategies need to be developed to encourage greater participation by all faculty in the town meeting process. Clearly the consensus decision-making model has been successful for the college and efforts to achieve 100% participation must be examined. There is little doubt that the College of Business is the leader in university in learning assessment and the continuous improvement philosophy drives this leadership.

APPENDIX I**Summary Of ETS Major Fields Test
Business II**

Field	2001 Mean %	2002 Mean %	2003 Mean %	2004 Mean %
Accounting	56	45	44	43
Economics	50	47	45	44
Management	57	60	57	56
QBA	58	64	56	58
Finance	48	39	38	32
Marketing	53	45	46	47
Legal & Social	47	51	54	55
International	47	43	44	39

The mean test score of our 2001 sample was 162.

The mean test score of our 2002 sample was 155.

The mean test score of our 2003 sample was 158.

The mean test score of our 2004 sample was 152.

APPENDIX II**EBI (AACSB) Undergraduate Student Satisfaction/Exit Survey**

	Shippensbu rg University	Select 6 Weighted Mean	Carnegie (N-71) Weighted Mean	All (N-182) Weighted Mean
Factor 1: Required Courses: Quality of Faculty and Instruction	4.35	4.26	4.49	4.41
Factor 2: Required Courses: Faculty Responsiveness, Grades, and Student Effort	5.03	5.08	5.23	5.18
Factor 3: Major Courses: Quality of Faculty and Instruction	5.18	4.74	4.91	4.91
Factor 4: Major Courses: Faculty Responsiveness, Grades, and Student Effort	5.75	5.46	5.55	5.56
Factor 5: Breadth of Curriculum	5.04	4.97	5.08	5.01

Factor 6: Size of Enrollments for Required and Major Courses	5.87	5.72	5.55	5.35
Factor 7: Student Organizations and Extracurricular Activities	5.01	4.87	4.75	4.76
Factor 8: Facilities and Computing Resources	5.11	5.27	5.13	5.09
Factor 9: Characteristics of Fellow Classmates	5.22	5.29	5.20	5.20
Factor 10: Placement and Career Services	4.22	3.71	4.03	4.15
Factor 11: Advisor	4.72	4.93	4.73	4.75
Factor 12: Learning Outcomes: Effective Communication and Team Work	5.36	5.41	5.33	5.3
Factor 13: Learning Outcomes: Use and Manage Technology	5.39	5.25	5.21	5.17
Factor 14: Learning Outcomes: Effective Management and Leadership Skills	5.45	5.36	5.37	5.37
Factor 15: Learning Outcomes: Critical Thinking and Problem Solving	5.68	5.46	5.53	5.53
Factor 16: Overall Satisfaction with Program	5.27	4.76	4.84	4.87

1999-2003 Self-Comparison

Longitudinal Analysis	2003 MEAN	1999 MEAN
Factor 1: Required Courses: Quality of Faculty and Instruction	4.35	3.87
Factor 2: Required Courses: Faculty Responsiveness, Grades, and Student Effort	5.03	4.71
Factor 3: Major Courses: Quality of Faculty and Instruction	5.18	4.66
Factor 4: Major Courses: Faculty Responsiveness, Grades, and Student Effort	5.75	5.47
Factor 5: Breadth of Curriculum	5.04	4.58
Factor 6: Size of Enrollments for Required and Major Courses	5.87	5.92
Factor 7: Student Organizations and Extracurricular Activities	5.01	5.07
Factor 8: Facilities and Computing Resources	5.11	4.36
Factor 9: Characteristics of Fellow Classmates	5.22	5.39
Factor 10: Placement and Career Services	4.22	4.19
Factor 11: Advisor	4.72	NA
Factor 12: Learning Outcomes: Effective Communication and Team Work	5.36	NA
Factor 13: Learning Outcomes: Use and Manage Technology	5.39	NA
Factor 14: Learning Outcomes: Effective Management and Leadership Skills	5.45	NA
Factor 15: Learning Outcomes: Critical Thinking and Problem Solving	5.68	NA
Factor 16: Overall Satisfaction with Program	5.27	5.12

APPENDIX III

EBI (AACSB) Alumni Survey Data

		2004 Data	Select 6 Data	Carnegie's Class's Data	All Institutions Data	2000 Data
		Mean	Weighted Mean	Weighted Mean	Weighted Mean	Mean
Factor 1	Degree Furthered Career	5.05	5.07	4.93	4.89	5.00
Factor 2	Degree Provided Access	4.14	4.10	3.88	3.93	3.78
Factor 3	Knowledge and Skills to Succeed	5.61	5.58	5.41	5.34	5.49
Factor 4	Contribution of Accounting, Economics, Finance, Law	4.07	4.54	4.53	4.45	4.36
Factor 5	Contribution of Behavioral Science, Communications, Mgt, HRM, Mkt	4.66	4.88	4.77	4.64	4.58
Factor 6	Contribution of Intl Bus, OpRes, Policy, Strategy, Prod., OpMgt, Statistics	3.84	4.07	3.97	3.86	3.84
Factor 7	Importance of Skills Training	6.27	6.42	6.38	6.37	6.37
Factor 8	Effectiveness of Skills Training	5.44	5.55	5.43	5.31	5.14
Factor 9	Importance of Developing Abilities	5.85	6.03	5.99	5.97	5.86
Factor 10	Effectiveness of Developing Abilities	5.32	5.52	5.38	5.30	5.17
Factor 11	Contribution of School Activities to Success	4.34	4.41	4.36	4.37	4.34
Factor 12	Degree of Change in Program	4.55	4.72	4.81	4.70	4.72
Factor 13	Overall Satisfaction with Program	5.16	5.07	4.93	4.90	5.11

APPENDIX IV

Employer Evaluation Of Student Interns

	2000	2001	2002	2003
Quantity of Work	3.62	3.59	3.72	3.6
Quality of Work	3.65	3.69	3.68	3.76
Attendance/Punctuality	3.77	3.72	3.68	3.39
Attitude Toward Work	3.74	3.8	3.82	3.69
Initiative	3.63	3.68	3.78	3.59
Responsibility/Dependability	3.74	3.81	3.7	3.74
Ability to Learn	3.84	3.89	3.81	3.83
Willingness to Learn	3.83	3.92	3.88	3.79
General Business Knowledge	3.36	3.39	3.89	3.59
Knowledge Within Major	3.49	3.39	3.37	3.67
Computer/Technical	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.7
Collaboration/Working with Others	3.74	3.81	3.65	3.77
Problem Solving/Critical Thinking	3.6	3.5	3.8	3.7
Oral Communication	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.7
Written Communication	3.47	3.49	3.47	3.6

APPENDIX V

Supervisor/Employer Evaluation

**Shippensburg University
John L. Grove College of Business
Business Internship Program**

Intern's Name: _____

Major: _____

Dates of Internship: _____, 20__ to _____, 20__

Employer: _____

Please rate the intern in each category based on the following scale. Rate the intern objectively, compared with previous interns you have employed, with other personnel assigned the same or similar responsibilities, or with individual standards.

5 – Consistently exceeds what is expected

- 1 Job performance easily exceeds job requirements; performance approaches best possible attainment

4 – Frequently exceeds what is expected

2 Accomplishments are above expected level or essential requirements

3 – Consistently achieves what is expected

3 Meets established objectives in a satisfactory and adequate manner

2 – Occasionally fails to achieve what is expected

4 Meets some of the established objectives and expectations but definite areas exist where achievements are substandard

1 – Consistently fails to achieve what is expected

5 Performance is at a level below established objectives with the result that overall contribution is marginal and substandard

0 – Not applicable

1. Skills

Supervis or Rating		
	Written Communication	Clear expression of ideas in writing and in appropriate grammatical form
	Oral Communication	Effective expression of ideas or viewpoints to others in individual or group situations
	Problem Solving/Critical Thinking	Shows ability to identify fundamental concepts, ideas, themes, or issues that help to integrate, interpret underlying patterns in a set of data or information
	Collaboration/ Working with Others	The extent to which the intern works cooperatively with others, recognizes the needs and desires of other people, treats others with respect and courtesy, and inspires their respect and confidence
	Computer/ Technical	The extent to which the intern demonstrates technical knowledge required to perform the job

2. Knowledge

Supervis or Rating		
	Knowledge within Major	The extent to which the intern demonstrates and is able to apply their educational learning within the business and work environment
	General Business Knowledge	The extent to which the intern understands established business practices, governance, culture, processes and procedures
	Willingness to Learn	The interest and desire the intern shows in learning new concepts, ideas, programs or facets of the company
	Ability to Learn	The ease in which the intern grasps new

		concepts, ideas, or tasks that are not a part of those normally expected.
--	--	---

3. Character Traits

Supervis or Rating		
	Responsibility/ Dependability	Can be counted on to turn in assignments when due; volunteer to assist others in projects; and complete work independently
	Initiative	The extent to which the intern shows initiative in making work improvements, identifies and corrects errors, develops new work tasks, or solves problems
	Attitude Toward Work	The extent to which the intern demonstrates a willingness to cooperate and accept direction and instruction in a positive manner
	Attendance/ Punctuality	Can be counted on to attend meetings, arrive to meetings and work on time and as scheduled

4. Performance Objectives

Supervis or Rating		
	Quality of Work	The extent to which completed work is accurate, neat, well organized, thorough and applicable
	Quantity of Work	The extent to which the amount of work completed compares to quantity standards for the job or produced by other employees
	Overall Performance	Based on the overall skills demonstrated by the intern, knowledge shown by the intern, and character traits exuded by the intern