SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

Program Assessment: *Annual Report*

Program: **One Year MBA Program**

Department:

College/School: Chaifetz School of Business

Date: Sept/Oct 2021

Primary Assessment Contact: One Year MBA Program faculty director, Dave Sanders

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

> Four of Five learning outcomes are assessed in this report. The data collection for this report represents the work of a single cohort of 37 students through our 11-month program (Summer '20, Fall '20, Spring '21).
>
> Ideally, we would have collected data for LO3 Global Trends/Local Practices, however, the COVID pandemic prevented us from taking the study abroad trip during which this assessment usually occurs. Our students did participate in a virtual immersion experience, but within this adaptation we did not find a suitable replacement for the traditional assignment.

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

> Learning outcome 1 (Knowledge of Key Business Functions) was assessed by using the ETS field exam.
>
> Learning outcome 2 (Problem Analysis and Decision Making) was assessed using a two-part question from the final exam in Econ 5010. This question requires students to utilize MS Excel in the decision-making process. In part 1, students are given a random price point and overall price elasticity of demand for their product. Using this information, students must then create a business proposal evaluating the current pricing decision, and a pricing strategy going forward to maximize revenue. Students must generate a both a total revenue schedule and graph as well as a demand schedule and graph for this product in Excel. Part 2 focuses on utilizing MS Excel to evaluate salary contracts using regression analysis to assess the added value of multiple variables. Students must test for multicollinearity, evaluate their regression model overall, evaluate each selected variable, and then determine if the model should be adjusted based on those results. Finally, once the students have a "final" model, they would then test that model against a set of three contracts to determine if the contract was acceptable, over-valued, or under-valued. A short, written evaluation was required.
>
> Learning outcome 3 (Global Trends/Local Practices) was not assessed during this cycle. COVID travel restrictions prevented a global immersion trip.
>
> Learning outcome 4 (Oral and Written Communication Skills) are assessed via the MBA 6015 Spring Practicum Project. This course is a six-credit hour internship course. Various organizations have partnered with the program to work with real data related problems that these organizations are currently facing. At the end of the practicum the team is required to author a report detailing their work and make a presentation summarizing that report. This report is

presented to faculty as well as key personal from the partner organizations typically containing members of organization boards or executives. This year's assessment focused on oral communication.

Learning outcome 5 (Ethical Decision Making and Approaches) is assessed via a written case study and strategic plan in MBA6007 (Decision Tools and Traps).

Madrid students are not part of this program.

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?
   NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.

For learning outcome 1, the ETS Field Exam questions were graded and scored. Note, that exam was delivered and proctored remotely during the 2020 pandemic.

For learning outcome 2, MBA 6008 course instructor grades the projects as part of the course, and uses a rubric to separately assess the quality of decision-making based on 3 criteria.

For learning outcome 4, MBA 6015 course instructors grade presentations as part of the course, and use a rubric to separately assess the quality of oral and written communication based on 11 criteria.

For learning outcome 5, the MBA6007 assessment in Fall 2020 involved groups of students preparing a strategic plan for Tyson Foods (case from 16th edition of David & David Strategic Management Concepts and Cases). After preparing their case, the students were then asked to collect more recent information regarding the company's response to the pandemic and employee health-related concerns, and then modify their plans accordingly. The exercise culminated in a discussion with a Tyson Foods representative.

In addition to the formal assessment of learning outcomes, student feedback was assessed through various meetings with individual students throughout the program. Each cohort has a minimum of two cohort representatives. The cohort reps met with the program director between 4-6 times each of the three semesters and the Dean's office at a minimum of twice annually. In addition, the program director met personally with each student in the cohort at a minimum of twice annually.

4. What did you learn from the data? <u>Summarize</u> the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.
   NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.

Learning outcome 1: ETS test results for this cohort reveal a complex picture regarding the health of the program. Prior to AY20-21, ETS scores had consistently increased over the previous 4 iterations, to the point where our institutional average of 258 (i.e., mean test score) placed us in the 92nd percentile nationwide for AY19-20. For AY20-21, our mean score dropped to 249, placing us at the 50th percentile based on 2021 comparative data from 223 institutions (mean score of 247; June 2021, ETS MFT Comparative Guide). Subscores for foundational areas of knowledge (Marketing, Management, Finance, Accounting, and Strategic Integration) ranged from a low of 14th (Accounting) to 70th (Marketing) percentile, compared to the previous year where we had 3 of the five areas above the 90th percentile. A single individual scored above the 90th percentile, with 3 others above the 80th percentile (previous year, 4 test takers scored above the 95th percentile).

Learning outcome 2: Students generally scored well in all three rubric criteria with 33 of 37 (89%) students either meeting or exceeding expectations in the first criteria (Understanding the problem in the context of data analysis), 30 of 37 (81%) either meeting or exceeding expectations in the second criteria (Apply analytical techniques to solve the problem), and 26 of 37 (70%)

either meeting or exceeding expectations in the third criteria (Develop specific solutions to solve the problem).

Learning outcome 4: Student presentations were graded using a modified method this year due to the virtual nature (Zoom) in which most took place. For this assessment, the instructor and a representative from the partner corporation provided scores for the quality of the oral presentation, as well as the content of the presentation. In general, scores were very strong for this area of assessment. Average scores, which included both dimensions from both graders, were strong: 35 of 37 students scored 3.5 or higher out of 5, which equates to > 70%.

At a more granular level, company representatives tended to grade more leniently than did the course instructor, but the difference was not substantial (4.78 vs. 4.51 on presentation; 4.41 vs. 4.30 on content). Based on our instructor scores, content results (30 of 37 scored either 4 or 5; 81%) were slightly lower than presentation scores (32 of 37 scored either 4 or 5; 87%).

Learning outcome 5: Students were assessed on their ability to identify the moral implications of a business case, apply ethical frameworks to their analysis of the case, and choose an appropriate course of action that demonstrates corporate social responsibility. Overall, 29 of 37 students (78%) of students met or exceeded expectations on this assignment.

5. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

1. Prior to AY20-21, we were pleased with the progression our students were showing on the ETS exam. This year presented some troubling data; however, we recognize this is only a snapshot and does not necessarily indicate a trend. We will continue to monitor this aspect of our assessment to see if a trend emerges.

In terms of speculation, there are three potential confounding factors. First, the pandemic forced changes in learning modalities, and the majority of classroom time for these students occurred virtually (i.e., Zoom). We are well aware that this could impact learning and knowledge retention, but do not know to what extent. With that said, we do not think the entirety of the drop in score can be accounted for by this adjustment, because we would assume that such an impact would have been experienced broadly by almost all institutions, and therefore the drop would have been part of an overall effect that would not have impacted percentile ranking to the extent that we dropped.

Second, as part of the pandemic adjustment, several classes were changed not only in terms of modality, but in terms of course content. Our program is built as an integrated, cross-discipline team-taught program but that pedagogy did not transfer well to online learning, so we shifted to more traditional courses. The rise in scores had been linked to our integrated program, and thus this simplified model may have had an impact.

Finally, a third consideration is that we increased our cohort size from 17 the previous year to 37. In doing so, we admitted additional students to the program who may not have made the cut in previous years. When we look at the scores of our top 15 test takers, we were in the 95th percentile; however, the scores of our lowest 15 were in the 13th percentile. This issue has now become an agenda point for our graduate recruitment strategy sessions.

2. We are pleased with our students' current level of proficiency in decision-making and analytics, and we will attempt to continuously update the data-analytics programs and languages that we are exposing students to in order to stay current with contemporary business demands and trends. In terms of specific areas for attention, by expanding our admission funnel, we may have

admitted students whose quantitative backgrounds were not as strong as previous cohorts of students. Also, our OYMBA has become a program populated almost exclusively by students directly from undergraduate programs. The area with the lowest score on problem-solving was their ability to offer specific solutions. This deficiency could be attributed to a lack of practical experience in business (which we hope is offset by the time they graduate due to the time-intensive practicum they perform for local businesses).

3. We are pleased with our students' current level of proficiency in the written and oral communications outcome. We have consistently received positive feedback from our partner organizations that indicate the written and oral communication of our students is in line with professional business communication expected within their organization. This is reflected in the faculty assessment rubrics as well. We continue to search for reliable partners who can provide relevant problems and data for students to solve.

4. The pandemic presented a novel situation for this year's ethics-based assessment. While the assignment began with a standard strategic planning case based on Tyson Foods, we were able to incorporate a "real-time" ethical dilemma to address. Tyson Foods (and other meat processing operations) was covered heavily in the news cycle due to their response to COVID, and government pressure to keep our food supply chain moving even at the height of the pandemic. Groups were required to adjust their strategies based on these external forces that were out of their control, but to do so in an ethical way. Dr. Jim Fisher also has a contact in Tyson who was able to assist in de-briefing the students and their approaches to the problem. In the end, the student groups all seemed to gravitate toward utilitarian frameworks for decision-making, but were able to identify potential problems with that approach.

6. In addition to the above outcome-based recommendations, we have additional recommendations based on student feedback. As part of the 2018 redesign, the program adopted an integrated teaching approach. This would include as many as 5 teachers in a single course teaching related, but diverse, topics. This has not been well received by students and has been one of the most frequently cited issues with the program. In 2019 we attempted some adjustments in the integrated assignments and material as well as adding vertical integration among courses we felt would improve the integration. This was not the case. If anything, students were more strongly opposed to integration.

Prior to the 2020 start we had already began conversations on the continuation of integration. The pandemic has caused us to eliminate integration for the summer as it would be too difficult to coordinate remotely. So far students have had a very favorable view of course offerings. This reinforces the need to re-assess the use of integration.

Students would like to see even more analytics in the program in all three semesters. We have enhanced the analytics in the summer term for the current cohort, and have begun discussion on how to get additional analytics in the fall semester in coming years.

6. Did you follow up ("close the loop") on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? *(For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?)*

We are constantly changing the program to match both industry demand as well as consumer choices. We are looking into stepping away from courses where the integration was not as successful in learning outcomes as we had hoped and trying to consolidate those courses into a more refined and specialized product, while still incorporating some elements of team teaching. We are adding in additional analytic material (such as design thinking and digital marketing analytics) We are also researching the need for future courses based on what are

industry partners are looking for in graduates.

Students have requested electives in the program. The current program is a lockstep program so substitutions are not possible at this time; however, a revised program proposal that is currently making its way through our curriculum revision process will allow for at least one elective in place of required entrepreneurship content. Upon examination, none of our peer institutions have required entrepreneurship content as part of their MBA programs.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.

Major Field Tests

DEPARTMENTAL SUMMARY OF TOTAL TEST AND SUBSCORES

Test: MBA
Form Code: 4NMF
Institution: Saint Louis University
Cohort: 2021_One_Year_MBA
Closed on: June 21, 2021

TOTAL TEST		
Scaled Score Range	Number in Range	Percent Below
300	0	100
295-299	0	100
290-294	0	100
285-289	0	100
280-284	0	100
275-279	0	100
270-274	1	97
265-269	2	92
260-264	4	81
255-259	6	65
250-254	6	49
245-249	3	41
240-244	6	24
235-239	3	16
230-234	4	5
225-229	1	3
220-224	1	0

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Total Test Scaled Score	249	12

Students responding to less than 50% of the questions: 0
Students in frequency distribution: 37
Students tested: 37

Major Field Tests

DEPARTMENTAL SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT INDICATORS

Test: MBA
Form Code: 4NMF
Institution: Saint Louis University
Cohort: 2021_One_Year_MBA
Closed on: June 21, 2021

Assessment Indicator Number	Assessment Indicator Title	Mean Percent Correct
1	Marketing	63
2	Management	59
3	Finance	36
4	Accounting	35
5	Strategic Integration	50

Students responding to less than 50% of the questions: 0
Students in frequency distribution: 37
Students tested: 37

2021 Comparative Data Guide - MFT for MBA
Individual Students Total Score Distribution
Data includes students from domestic institutions who tested between September 2017 through June 2021

Number of Examinees	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation
28,042	246.9	247.0	15.9

Individual Students Total Score Distribution

Total Score Range (220 - 300)	Percent Below
283 - 300	99
282	98
281	98
280	98
279	98
278	97
277	97
276	96
275	95
274	95
273	94
272	93
271	93
270	91
269	90
268	87
267	87
266	85
265	84
264	84
263	82
262	80
261	78
260	75
259	73
258	73
257	70
256	68
255	65
254	65
253	62
252	60
251	57
250	57
249	54
248	51
247	49
246	46
245	46

Total Score Range (220 - 300)	Percent Below
244	43
243	40
242	38
241	35
240	33
239	30
238	30
237	28
236	26
235	26
234	24
233	21
232	19
231	18
230	16
229	14
228	13
227	13
226	11
225	10
224	7
223	7
222	5
221	4
220	1

Total Scores are reported as *scaled scores*.
Percent Below based on percent below the lower limit of the score interval.

2021 Comparative Data Guide - MFT for MBA
Institutional Means Total Score Distribution
Data includes students from domestic institutions who tested between September 2017 through June 2021

Number of Institutions	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation
223	247.1	248.0	8.1

Institutional Means Total Score Distribution

Mean Total Score Range (220 - 300)	Percent Below
264 - 300	99
263	98
262	98
261	97
260	95
259	94
258	93
257	91
256	86
255	82
254	79
253	75
252	69
251	63
250	55
249	50
248	44
247	38
246	34
245	30
244	29
243	26
242	24
241	18
240	17
239	15
238	13
237	11
236	9
235	8
234	8
233	7
232	4
231	3
230	2

Institutional Assessment Indicator Mean Score Distributions

Data includes students from domestic institutions who tested between September 2017 through June 2021

Assessment Indicator	Number of Institutions	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation
1: Marketing	223	58.1	60.0	7.5
2: Management	223	54.8	56.0	7.0
3: Finance	223	35.2	35.0	4.3
4: Accounting	223	40.1	41.0	5.8
5: Strategic Integration	223	48.4	50.0	6.4

Institutional Assessment Indicator Mean Score Distributions

Mean Percent Correct (0 - 100%)	A1[2] Percent Below	A2[2] Percent Below	A3[2] Percent Below	A4[2] Percent Below	A5[2] Percent Below
71 - 100	99	99	99	99	99
70	98	99	99	99	99
69	97	99	99	99	99
68	95	98	99	99	99
67	91	98	99	99	99
66	87	96	99	99	99
65	80	93	99	99	99
64	75	91	99	99	99
63	70	90	99	99	99
62	62	88	99	99	99
61	54	82	99	99	99
60	48	76	99	99	98
59	43	69	99	99	97
58	37	60	99	99	95
57	33	52	99	99	93
56	30	45	99	99	89
55	25	40	99	99	85
54	21	33	99	98	82
53	17	28	99	98	75
52	15	26	99	97	65
51	13	23	99	96	59
50	12	18	99	94	49
49	11	17	99	92	41
48	9	16	99	90	35
47	9	12	99	86	32
46	8	10	98	82	28
45	6	8	98	77	22
44	6	7	97	72	19
43	5	6	95	68	17
42	2	4	94	60	13
41	2	4	89	48	12
40	2	3	85	41	9
39	1	2	78	35	8

Mean Percent Correct (0 - 100%)	A1[2] Percent Below	A2[2] Percent Below	A3[2] Percent Below	A4[2] Percent Below	A5[2] Percent Below
38	1	2	69	31	7
37	1	1	61	27	5
36	1	1	52	20	3
35	1	1	43	14	3
34	1	1	36	13	2
33	1	1	25	11	2
32	1	1	18	8	1
31	1	1	14	6	1
30	1	1	9	4	1
29	1	1	5	2	1
28	1	1	4	1	1
27	1	1	2	1	1
0 - 26	1	1	1	1	1

[1] Assessment Indicators for this test cannot be compared to testing years prior to 2017 due to changes in the MBA Test that were introduced in 2017.

[2] Assessment Indicator 1: Marketing
Assessment Indicator 2: Management
Assessment Indicator 3: Finance
Assessment Indicator 4: Accounting
Assessment Indicator 5: Strategic Integration

Assessment Indicators are reported as *percent correct.*
Percent Below based on percent below the lower limit of the score interval.

	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement
Understand the problem in the context of data analysis	Clearly identifies and summarizes the problem/opportunity. Analyzes and assesses the situation with a clear awareness of what needs to be accomplished.	Problem/opportunity is identified but is somewhat clear and summarization is basic. Analyzes and assesses the situation with awareness of the goals of the analysis.	Problem/opportunity is identified but is not clear and summarization lacks focus. Analyzes and assesses the situation with limited awareness of the goals of the analysis.
Identify and apply specific analytical techniques to solve the problem	Identifies one or more solutions that indicates a thorough comprehension of the problem and is sensitive to contextual factors.	Identifies one or more solutions that indicates comprehension of the problem and is sensitive to contextual factors.	Identifies one solution that indicates surface-level understanding of the problem.
Develop specific solutions to solve the problem	Correctly analyzes the majority of the problem; provides a good technology solution, and/or utilizes all appropriate resources.	Correctly analyzes the majority of the problem; provides an adequate technology solution, and/or utilizes appropriate resources.	Fails to provide a correct analysis of some of the problem, omits vital resources, and/or fails to develop an adequate technology solution.

	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement
Understand the problem in the context of data analysis	17	16	4
Identify and apply specific analytical techniques to solve the problem	15	15	7
Develop specific solutions to solve the problem	15	11	11

Last Name	First Name	Practicum Project	Customer			SLU Mentor			Total	Grade	Comments
			Presentation	Content	Average	Presentation	Content	Average			
		NP - Digital Shelf	4	4	4	5	4	4.5	4.35	A	High involvement in the overall object. Displayed responsibility and sincerity
		NP - Digital Shelf	4	5	4.5	4	3	3.5	3.8	A-	Not much involvement in the overall object. Displayed responsibility and sincerity
		NP - Digital Shelf	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	A	Very high involvement in the overall object. Displayed high responsibility and sincerity
		NP - Digital Shelf	4	4	4	5	5	5	4.7	A	Very high involvement in the overall object. Displayed high responsibility and sincerity
		BMT	5	4	4.5	5	4	4.5	4.5	A	High involvement in the overall object. Displayed responsibility and sincerity
		NP - New Items	3	3	3	4	4	4	3.7	A-	Not much involvement in the overall object. Displayed responsibility and sincerity
		Together CU	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	A	was another student who was given a flawed problem statement. The goal and objective of this particular problem statement shifted a couple of times throughout the semester due to not having access to the data needed to solve it. was extremely adaptable to these changes and worked closely with the Together team to provide meaningful data analysis.
		NP - Online/Offline	5	4	4.5	5	5	5	4.85	A	Very high involvement in the overall object. Displayed high responsibility and sincerity
		Together CU	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	A	did a great job utilizing Sprout Social to give a detailed account for the Together CU Facebook page.
		Together CU	4	5	4.5	5	5	5	4.85	A	did a great job with his problem statement and provided some valuable insight for Together CU in regards to their customer feedback.
		NP - New Items	5	3	4	5	5	5	4.7	A	High involvement in the overall object. Displayed responsibility and sincerity
		NP - Online/Offline	5	4	4.5	5	4	4.5	4.5	A	High involvement in the overall object. Displayed responsibility and sincerity
		STL Auarium	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	A	Very high involvement in the overall object. Displayed high responsibility and sincerity
		STL Auarium	5	5	5	4	3	3.5	3.95	A-	Not much involvement in the overall object. Displayed responsibility and sincerity
		NP - New Items	4	3	3.5	5	4	4.5	4.2	A	Very high involvement in the overall object. Displayed high responsibility and sincerity
		NP - Online/Offline	3	4	3.5	4	5	4.5	4.2	A	High involvement in the overall object. Displayed responsibility and sincerity
		NP - New Items	5	3	4	5	5	5	4.7	A	Very high involvement in the overall object. Displayed high responsibility and sincerity
		STL Auarium	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	A	High involvement in the overall object. Displayed responsibility and sincerity
		NP - Digital Shelf	4	4	4	5	5	5	4.7	A	High involvement in the overall object. Displayed responsibility and sincerity
		NP - Online/Offline	5	4	4.5	4	3	3.5	3.8	A-	Not much involvement in the overall object. Displayed responsibility and sincerity
		BMT	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	A	High involvement in the overall object. Displayed responsibility and sincerity
		Together CU	4	5	4.5	5	5	5	4.85	A	Similar to , I believe also did a great job highlighting the strenghts and weaknesses of the Together CU Twitter account. also made some great and realistic suggestions of how to increase their Twitter engagement.
		Together CU	5	5	5	5	3	4	4.3	A	presented well and provided some valuable insights to the Together CU page, however I do think that he could have done more with his problem statement. A lot of what he presented was opinion-based, and not backed up by any actual data analysis. I wish he would have taken a deeper dive into the Google Analytics metrics to really provide some backup to some of the suggestions he had made.
		Together CU	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	A	completed both Google Analytics Academy for Beginners and Advanced, and put a lot of time into completing a customized guide for Together CU. He was also able to provide great suggestions to his team members. He was a great asset to our team.
		BMT	5	4	4.5	5	4	4.5	4.5	A	High involvement in the overall object. Displayed responsibility and sincerity
		NP - New Items	3	3	3	5	4	4.5	4.05	A	High involvement in the overall object. Displayed responsibility and sincerity
		STL Auarium	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	A	Very high involvement in the overall object. Displayed high responsibility and sincerity
		STL Auarium	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	A	High involvement in the overall object. Displayed responsibility and sincerety
		Together CU	3	3	3	4	3	3.5	3.35	A-	I think and problem statement was flawed from the beginning, at no fault of their own. Since it was contingent on the work of their team mates, and were not able to do any work for the first several weeks of the project. Once they finally received data, they worked as diligently as they could and were very engaged with the Together team as well as myself and Abhi. They also ran into problems with testing, as they were trying to rush this aspect to get results and throw it into a presentation the week of our final. Again, at no fault of their own, as they were completely reliant upon the Together CU marketing team to run these ads and provide the necessary metrics and results for analysis.
		Together CU	3	3	3	4	3	3.5	3.35	A-	I think and problem statement was flawed from the beginning, at no fault of their own. Since it was contingent on the work of their team mates, and were not able to do any work for the first several weeks of the project. Once they finally received data, they worked as diligently as they could and were very engaged with the Together team as well as myself and Abhi. They also ran into problems with testing, as they were trying to rush this aspect to get results and throw it into a presentation the week of our final. Again, at no fault of their own, as they were completely reliant upon the Together CU marketing team to run these ads and provide the necessary metrics and results for analysis.
		BMT	4	4	4	4	3	3.5	3.65	A-	High involvement in the overall object. Displayed responsibility and sincerety but overall presentation and research quality not as thorough as others.

		Together CU	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	A	and had a tough problem statement that involved working with the CU Nexus data. I think they did a great job breaking down the different steps and highlighting the pain points for customers through the application process. They left Together CU with several areas to look into further.
		NP - Online/Offline	5	4	4.5	5	5	5	4.85	A	Very high involvement in the overall object. Displayed high responsibility and sincerety
		BMT	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	A	High involvement in the overall object. Displayed responsibility and sincerety
		NP - Online/Offline	5	4	4.5	5	4	4.5	4.5	A	High involvement in the overall object. Displayed responsibility and sincerety
		STL Auarium	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	A	High involvement in the overall object. Displayed responsibility and sincerety
		Together CU	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	A	and had a tough problem statement that involved working with the CU Nexus data. I think they did a great job breaking down the different steps and highlighting the pain points for customers through the application process. They left Together CU with several areas to look into further.