

ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR THE CITADEL'S SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, 2004-2005

Assessment Philosophy

The overall objective of the School of Business Administration's assessment program is **continuous improvement** in our programs. We have identified three primary stakeholders -- our graduating students, our alumni, and recruiters from firms who hire our graduates -- from whom we collect information about perceptions of our programs' quality. Survey results from these groups should tell us how well-prepared graduating students believe they are, how well-prepared our alumni found themselves once they were in jobs applying the concepts they learned in our programs, and how firms that hire our graduates rate our students' potential and actual job performance compared to the performance of other schools' graduates.

Survey instruments have been designed for each of our three stakeholder groups. We have been conducting our Senior Exit Survey (for undergraduates) annually and our Alumni and Recruiter Surveys once every four years. The Citadel's Office of Planning and Assessment now administers a college-wide *Citadel Experience* Survey to all graduating seniors in every major. Rather than sending our majors a separate survey, we now add our questions on at the end of the college-wide survey. We are then able to analyze just the responses of business majors to both the college-wide survey questions and our own School of Business Administration questions.

All of these surveys give us some good information about what our students and graduates think or feel about our program; but for some time now, we have also been concerned about how we might measure what our graduates *know* when they leave our program. To that end, we began using Educational Testing Service's (ETS) Major Field Assessment Tests (MFAT) for both our undergraduate graduate programs in 2003.

Mission Statement

Our present Mission Statement was developed over the school year 2001-2002 with input from faculty, students, administrators, alumni, the School of Business Administration Advisory Board, and representatives from companies who hire our graduates. School Year 2002-2003 was the first year our Mission Statement and Covenant were in place.

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION MISSION

The mission of the School of Business Administration is to educate and develop leaders of principle to serve a global community.

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION COVENANT

Our teaching, professional, and personal activities are based on our commitment to these values:

1. Integrity, fairness, and concern for others in all of our relationships;
2. Continuous pursuit and dissemination of knowledge to promote enlightened changes in society;
3. Continuous improvement in all that we do.

Expected Assessment Results

Alumni Survey

The objective portion of our departmental Alumni Survey includes questions in four broad categories of knowledge and abilities: knowledge of functional areas, communications skills, analytical skills, and general characteristics. In each question, respondents are asked to rate how well The Citadel's Business Administration program prepared them for their career on a scale from 1 (meaning "very poorly") to 5 (meaning "very well"). The faculty decided that we would feel good about our graduates' satisfaction in areas which receive a mean score of 3.50 or better. We thought that mean responses in the 3.00-3.50 range would indicate room for improvement, and means less than 3.00 would identify our most serious weaknesses.

Recruiter Survey

Our Recruiter Survey asks corporate recruiters to compare Citadel graduates their company has hired with employees who graduated from other schools. The recruiters are asked to supply ratings of Citadel graduates' effectiveness in seventeen different areas using a five-point scale on which 1 meant "worst" and 5 meant "best." A sixth choice for each question was "Not Observed." The faculty decided that we would be pleased with mean scores of 3.50 or better for our students' comparative effectiveness. We thought that mean responses in the 3.00-3.50 range would indicate room for improvement, and means less than 3.00 would identify areas which need our immediate attention.

Senior Exit (Student) Surveys

A. College-Wide (*Citadel Experience*) Survey

We identified a total of nine questions from the college-wide survey which we thought would give us the best information about how business majors perceived the quality of the education they received in our Department. The first four questions asked students to rate their satisfaction in several areas using these answer choices: "Very Satisfied," "Satisfied," "Dissatisfied," "Very Dissatisfied," or "No Opinion." We decided that we would be pleased if 80% of our majors were "Very Satisfied" or "Satisfied" in each of these areas. The last four survey items asked our majors to "Strongly Agree," "Agree," "Disagree," or "Strongly Disagree" with four statements about our curriculum and our professors. We decided that we would be pleased if 80% of our majors "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" with these statements.

B. School of Business Survey

In addition to the institution's annual college-wide senior exit survey, between 1996 and 1999 we had conducted our own (then Department, now School of Business) senior exit survey. This instrument asked more questions specifically designed for our majors. After a three-year period of not using this separate survey, we once again asked our majors these more specific questions by adding the questions to the *Citadel Experience* college-wide survey. The School of Business portion of the survey was divided into three sections. Section One asked students to rate their satisfaction with the exposure they received in our department to various societal issues using a scale from 1 (meaning "poor") to 5 (meaning "excellent"). Section Two asks students to rate the effectiveness of various teaching methods used in our department using the same scale, with a sixth possible answer being "not experienced." The third section is identical to the entire objective portion of our Alumni Survey, so it was subdivided into four categories plus one overall rating question. The faculty decided that we would feel comfortable about our students' satisfaction in areas which received a mean score of 3.50 or better. We thought that mean responses in the 3.00-3.50 range would indicate room for improvement, and means less than 3.00 would identify our most serious weaknesses.

MFAT Results

Because we had never used the Major Field Assessment Tests before, we really didn't know what kind of results to expect. Several colleagues from other schools who have used this test had advised us that unless we gave students some time of formal review to prepare for the test and unless we made some connection with students' performance on the test and their grade in some course, then the results of the test were not likely to give us a good idea about how our students compare to those in other programs. We decided to administer the test through our capstone course, Strategic Management (BADM 422 in the undergraduate program and BADM 635 in the MBA program). Having no particular frame of reference, we hoped that our students would score in at least the 50th percentile of the national average scores for all parts of this test.

Actual Assessment Results

Alumni Survey

The Alumni Survey is administered once every four years. This year was not a year for the administration of this survey.

Recruiter Survey

The Recruiter Survey is administered once every four years. This year was not a year for the administration of this survey.

Senior Exit Surveys

A. College-Wide (*Citadel Experience*) Survey:

The Table below shows the percentages of our Majors who were "Very Satisfied" or "Satisfied" (Questions 1-4) or who "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" (Questions 5-8) with each survey item:

<u>Survey Item</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>Change from 2003-2005</u>	<u>Change from 1995-2005</u>
% Very Satisfied or Satisfied					
1. Your Major program of study	80.4	89.5	88.9	-0.6	+ 8.5
2. Instruction in your Major	63.6	82.5	86.9	+4.4	+23.3
3. Academic Advising in course sel/req	40.1	57.0	49.5	-7.5	+ 9.4
4. Academic Advising for policies	39.3	55.8	54.5	-1.3	+15.2
% Who Strongly Agree or Agree					
5. BA currcilm preprd me to use mthdlgs	83.1	82.6	87.9	+5.3	+ 4.8
6. Major profs interested in my progress	54.2	67.4	71.7	+4.3	+17.5
7. Major profs were accessible	63.6	83.7	83.8	+0.1	+20.2
8. Major profs had enthusiasm for subj	67.3	81.4	84.9	+3.5	+17.6

Our goal had been for at least 80% of our students to be “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied” with or to “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” with the survey items we had identified as being most important. We exceeded this goal in five out of eight categories. However, on the questions relating to satisfaction with academic advising (#3 and #4) we fell far short of our goal. The quality of our faculty advising has been a concern of ours for some time, and from 1995 through 2004 we made remarkable and steady improvement in terms of mean scores on this survey. In the 2005 survey, though, our ratings fell back down slightly. Our hope was that the Luncheon/Information Sessions we conducted for each of our three upper classes of majors last October might help our advising ratings continue on their upward trend, but that did not seem to be the case. We will be discussing this issue in particular when we go over all of the assessment results at our first School of Business faculty meeting of the new school year.

Short-term Changes

The overall results from this year’s college-wide senior exit survey are encouraging. Compared to the ratings we received in 2003, this year’s mean scores were higher in five of the eight categories. The sobering results from 2003 caught the attention of faculty and administrators alike, and our conscious efforts to improve our “customer service” since then have largely paid off. While we did experience declines in three categories, two of those declines were quite small and probably insignificant.

Longer-term changes

In addition to the fact that this year’s mean ratings were higher than the 2003 ratings for five of the eight questions we particularly look at, the 2005 mean ratings were also quite a bit higher than our 1995 ratings in all eight cases. It is also encouraging that several of the 1995-to-2005 increases in mean ratings were quite large.

B. School of Business Survey

The attached Excel spreadsheet shows the historical results from our own School of Business Administration survey questions. For various reasons, our “internal” senior exit survey had not been given since 1999. In 2003, we began to administer these “internal” questions to graduating senior business majors as a special additional section on their college-wide (*Citadel Experience*) survey. In hindsight, it seems obvious that we are probably asking too many questions in our portion of the *Survey*, particularly in light of the great length of the college-wide instrument itself!

Item #	Variable	Average 1996-99	2004	2005	Chg from 2004	Chg from 96-99 avg.
1	Satisfaction with academic advice	3.50	3.80	3.47	(0.33)	(0.03)
2	Satisfaction with career advice	3.44	3.73	3.43	(0.30)	(0.01)
3	Satisfaction with personal advice	3.30	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
4	Satisfaction with overall advice	3.67	3.80	3.57	(0.23)	(0.10)
5	Exposure to cultural differences	3.58	3.91	3.63	(0.28)	0.05
6	Exposure to ethical issues	3.82	4.28	4.23	(0.05)	0.41
7	Exposure to gender issues	3.76	3.57	3.51	(0.06)	(0.25)
8	Exposure to racial issues	3.62	3.57	3.39	(0.18)	(0.23)
9	Exposure to international business	3.65	3.47	3.55	0.08	(0.10)

10	Overall exposure to societal issues	3.84	4.04	3.82	(0.22)	(0.02)
11	Effectiveness of casework	3.92	3.98	3.80	(0.18)	(0.12)
12	Effectiveness of lecture	3.75	3.61	3.55	(0.06)	(0.20)
13	Effectiveness of in-class discussions	3.96	4.00	4.00	0.00	0.04
14	Effectiveness of group projects	3.93	3.73	3.76	0.03	(0.17)
15	Effectiveness of in-class experiential exercises	3.86	3.52	3.60	0.08	(0.26)
16	Effectiveness of computer assignments	3.96	3.70	3.56	(0.14)	(0.40)
17	Effectiveness of independent research projects	3.84	3.90	3.73	(0.17)	(0.11)
18	Effectiveness of internship	3.97	3.83	3.83	0.00	(0.14)
19	Knowledge of accounting	3.66	3.37	3.18	(0.19)	(0.48)
20	Knowledge of economics	3.93	3.64	3.44	(0.20)	(0.49)
21	Knowledge of marketing	4.07	3.95	3.77	(0.18)	(0.30)
22	Knowledge of management	4.18	4.46	4.20	(0.26)	0.02
23	Knowledge of finance	3.64	3.44	3.41	(0.03)	(0.23)
24	Knowledge of production	3.90	3.58	3.54	(0.04)	(0.36)
25	Knowledge of MIS	4.08	3.77	3.72	(0.05)	(0.36)
26	Knowledge of inter-relationship of functional areas	4.01	3.80	3.73	(0.07)	(0.28)
27	Developing writing skills	3.94	4.04	3.94	(0.10)	0.00
28	Developing listening skills	4.17	4.19	4.18	(0.01)	0.01
29	Developing speaking skills	4.22	4.47	4.26	(0.21)	0.04
30	Developing formal oral presentation skills	4.21	4.42	4.24	(0.18)	0.03
31	Problem formulation ability	4.07	3.85	3.87	0.02	(0.20)
32	Knowledge of sources of business data	4.17	3.83	3.83	0.00	(0.34)
33	Statistical analysis skills	4.04	3.83	3.75	(0.08)	(0.29)
34	Statistical interpretation skills	4.09	3.83	3.74	(0.09)	(0.35)
35	Developing computer literacy	4.30	4.22	4.08	(0.14)	(0.22)
36	Understanding business ethics	4.32	4.52	4.46	(0.06)	0.14
37	Developing inter-personal skills	4.29	4.24	4.16	(0.08)	(0.13)
38	Learn stress management skills	4.25	4.22	4.03	(0.19)	(0.22)
39	Understanding cultural diversity in U.S.	4.02	3.91	3.73	(0.18)	(0.29)
40	Understanding the legal environment	4.26	3.98	3.91	(0.07)	(0.35)
41	Understanding international business environment	4.05	3.57	3.56	(0.01)	(0.49)
42	Coping with uncertainty in decision-making	4.24	3.91	3.79	(0.12)	(0.45)
43	Preparation in major	4.30	4.02	3.93	(0.09)	(0.37)
44	Help in career placement	4.26	3.32	3.29	(0.03)	(0.97)
45	Overall satisfaction with instruction in major	4.40	3.76	3.77	0.01	(0.63)

Rating of areas

Advising (Items 1-4)	3.48	3.78	3.49	(0.29)	0.01
Diversity issues (Items 5-10)	3.71	3.81	3.69	(0.12)	(0.02)
Effectiveness of teaching methods (Items 11-18)	3.90	3.78	3.73	(0.05)	(0.17)
Teaching of functional areas (Items 19-26)	3.93	3.75	3.62	(0.13)	(0.31)
Workplace skills (Items 27-31)	4.12	4.19	4.10	(0.09)	(0.02)
Quantitative skills (Items 32-35)	4.15	3.93	3.85	(0.08)	(0.30)
Environment and coping skills (Items 36-42)	4.21	4.05	3.95	(0.10)	(0.26)
General preparation and placement (Items 43-45)	4.32	3.70	3.67	(0.03)	(0.65)

Identifying salient themes in the table of responses above is difficult, because the results are quite mixed. We had hoped for average scores of 3.5 or better on each item in the survey. The good news is that we achieved this goal on 37 out of 44 items. In addition, single lowest score on any item (#19, knowledge of accounting) was still 3.18. When we look at the average ratings of areas addressed by grouped questions, all of the group averages are well above 3.5, with the exception of the "Advising" area with an average score of 3.49. A fact that catches our attention is that this year's mean responses are, for the most part, lower than last year's means. One difference between this year's survey and last year's (2004) is that there were approximately three times more respondents this year. While many of the decreases are slight, some are not. It is also true that, for the first time in several years, many of the mean responses in the 2005 survey are lower than the mean responses from the 1996-99 period. All of these results will be discussed with the entire School of Business faculty at our first faculty meeting of the new school year.

MFAT Results

[The historical data in the tables below are CORRECTED from reports submitted earlier.]

Here are the **group percentile scores** from our first two years of experience with the MFAT:

Undergraduates

Subject Area	Fall 2002	Spring 2003	Fall 2003	Spring 2004	Spring 2005
Accounting	36.1	35.7	40.4	36.5	34.8
Economics	34.1	32.3	38.4	38.9	37.4
Management	52.1	52.4	52.9	54.7	50.5
Quantitative Business Analysis	49.6	47.9	52.4	46.8	49.1
Finance	29.7	29.1	33.3	31.9	30.4
Marketing	40.8	38.9	41.7	44.5	40.7
Legal and Social Environment	47.2	44.6	42.7	43.5	49.7
International Issues	39.4	35.3	37.6	39.4	37.5

MBA Students

Subject Area	Spring 2003	Spring 2004
Marketing	58	63
Management	31	95
Finance	40	89
Managerial Accounting	33	35
Strategic Integration	56	74
OVERALL SCORE	48	70

Undergraduate MFAT Results

At the risk of sounding defensive, it appears that the advice we received from colleagues at other institutions was correct. From Fall, 2002 through Spring, 2004, we did not give our students any type of review preparation for the test, nor did we tie their performance on the test to any kind of grade. For those reasons, there was evidently a problem getting all students to take the test seriously enough to try to do their best. One explanation for the poor undergraduate MFAT results is that students had no motivation to take the test seriously.

Nevertheless, our faculty was concerned about the low scores. As a result, we did two things: First, we held a faculty retreat last fall on the general topic of what AACSB calls “Assurance of Learning.” This involves ways in which we can document the fact that students in our program are mastering subject matter content in our courses. As a part of this retreat, we spent two hours having faculty look at questions on the MFAT to see what kinds of things our students missed. [NOTE: We made numbered photocopies of the test, used them in that meeting room only, and then re-collected all copies of the test and destroyed them. There are no copies of the undergraduate MFAT test “out in the public” with our faculty or anyone else at The Citadel.] The time we spent analyzing the test was most informative. Our faculty came away from this experience with two distinct impressions: (1) many of the questions are, in our minds, poorly worded or ambiguous, and (2) in many cases the ideas tested were relatively minor points rather than the major ideas from our courses. Again, this sounds defensive; but it also makes our score results easier to understand. The second thing we did in response to previous undergraduate MFAT scores was to ask faculty from early of the five primary subject areas (accounting, economics, finance, management, and marketing) to present a one-class-period review of the most important ideas from their respective disciplines to each section of the undergraduate Strategic Management class.

We also think that there may be better ways to assess our students’ progress than using the MFAT. Beginning this fall we’re going to use another assessment tool in our undergraduate capstone course. All students will be using the Capstone® Business Simulation throughout the semester, and then toward the end of the semester they will take a related test of student competency called Comp-XM®. According to its developers, Comp-XM® gives a student “a simulated company to manage, examining the student’s performance over five simulated years, and testing the student’s understanding of the problems and issues faced by managers. It both evaluates student understanding and serves as a quality control instrument.”

MBA MFAT Results

We also administered Educational Testing Service’s Major Field Assessment Test (MFAT) for MBAs to students in our capstone Strategic Management course (BADM 635) in 2003 and 2004. We now realize that the first time we gave the MFAT (in 2003), we made two significant errors: first, we administered the test at the very end of the semester; second, we said very little to students about the purpose or the importance of the test. The results (not too surprisingly, in retrospect!) were rather mediocre. The second year we gave the MFAT (2004), we administered the test about half-way through the semester, and we also spent a few minutes talking with students beforehand about why we were giving the test and how the results could help us improve the quality of our program. We believe these changes in test administration largely explain the significant improvement in scores we experienced in just one year. We’d also like to believe that the 2004 scores give a more accurate measure of how our students compare with students in other MBA programs around the country, because we believe our students took the MFAT more seriously during the 2004 test administration than they did in 2003.

Even though our students’ 2004 performance on the MFAT compares fairly well with the performance of their peers at other schools, we have concerns about the usefulness of this test as a measure of what our students have learned – particularly in light of how sensitive some of the MFAT performance measures seem to

be. For that reason, beginning this fall we will be using another assessment tool in our MBA capstone course. All students will be using the Capstone® Business Simulation throughout the semester, and then toward the end of the semester they will take a related test of student competency called Comp-XM®. According to its developers, Comp-XM® gives a student “a simulated company to manage, examining the student’s performance over five simulated years, and testing the student’s understanding of the problems and issues faced by managers. It both evaluates student understanding and serves as a quality control instrument.”

Despite the fact that we are looking for other ways to measure student learning in addition to the MFAT, we are not ignoring the fact that our MFAT percentile scores in Accounting, and to a lesser extent Marketing, are not where we want them to be. Faculty members in these two areas will be conducting a curriculum review this fall to see if course coverage modifications are warranted in light of the MFAT data. We will also be particularly interested in seeing what the Comp-XM® data tell us about our students understanding of Accounting and Marketing issues.

Use of Survey Results

Once the surveys have been analyzed and discussed, the results are used in two ways:

(1) The entire faculty discusses the results at a School faculty meeting devoted to assessment issues, and (2) the School of Business’s Undergraduate Program and Assessment Committee (UPAC) and Graduate Program and Assessment Committee (GPAC) carefully study the results to see if curriculum revisions are suggested by the assessment results. They also propose modifications to our survey instruments as they deem necessary.

Resources Required

In order to continue using the *Major Field Assessment Test* (MFAT) in both our undergraduate and graduate programs, and based upon the number of undergraduate majors plus MBA students we graduate each year, **we will need increased departmental funding of approximately \$6,525 per year.** (The tests cost approximately \$25 each for the undergraduate version and \$30 each for the MBA version, so the funding requirement is approximately **\$6,525** ($165 \times \$25 = \$4,125$ for undergraduates plus $80 \times \$30 = \$2,400$ for MBAs plus shipping charges.) For the next school year (2005-06), we are charging students enrolled in our capstone courses (BADM 422 for undergraduates, BADM 635 for MBA students) a lab fee to cover the cost of the Capstone® Business Simulation. We may need to ask the Office of Planning and Assessment for the funds to cover the administration of the Comp-XM® test once it become available, but at this time we have no information about its cost.

Goals & Objectives for 2005-2006

1. Hire new faculty and insure they are successfully integrated into the Business School.
2. Get our AACSB Maintenance of Accreditation and Assurance of Learning Processes fully functioning.
3. Hold two School-wide retreats, one on rethinking the MBA Program in the fall and another on a topic to be selected in the spring. Insure we discuss an MBA course in leadership to meet our mission.
4. Reinvigorate The Citadel Business Network, our on-line newsletter.
5. Install a system for tracking all undergraduate Pre-Business majors to insure they satisfy course and career

visioning requirements for entry into the Business School.

6. Continue efforts to insure our students have opportunities to study abroad.
7. Complete the coordination and get approved the dual degree MBA and JD program with the Charleston College of Law.
8. Get a database set up for guest speakers, hereafter known as the Business School Speaker's Bureau.