SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms): Technology and Leadership   Department: NA

Degree or Certificate Level: Bachelor of Science   College/School: School for Professional Studies

Date (Month/Year): September 2023   Assessment Contact: Katie Devany/John Buerck

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2022-2023

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2022

Is this program accredited by an external program/disciplinary/specialized accrediting organization or subject to state/licensure requirements? No

If yes, please share how this affects the program's assessment process (e.g., number of learning outcomes assessed, mandated exams or other assessment methods, schedule or timing of assessment, etc.):

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle? (Please provide the complete list of the program's learning outcome statements and **bold** the SLOs assessed in this cycle.)

Student LO #1: Apply fundamental competencies from business functions.
Student LO #2: Analyze a problem and identify the computing requirements appropriate to its solution.
Student LO #3: Analyze the local and global impact of computing on individuals, organizations, and society.
Student LO #4: Describe the role of ethics in decision-making in multicultural, professional organizations.
Student LO #5: Apply leadership principles in multiple contexts.

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please describe the artifacts in detail, identify the course(s) in which they were collected, and if they are from program majors/graduates and/or other students. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

Student LO #1 Artifacts

- ORLD 2000 – Executive Summary Presentation
  - The Executive Summary Presentation is the final component of a three-paper series in which students describe their selection process for the company they studied. The presentation also includes the following components: a SWOT analysis, highlights of the company research, a recommendation for investment in the company, a reflection of what the student learned through the research process, lessons learned along the way, as well as future plans related to the company (both personal and professional).
- ORLD 2500 - Financial Analysis Case Study
  - This project will require students to utilize knowledge and skills in financial and managerial accounting to manage the financial data of a fictional organization. Students will be given beginning balances and background information on the organization. Based on this information, students will be required to: prepare an operating budget, including assumptions used; manage transactions and make proper journal entries; prepare an income statement and balance sheet; and prepare a variance report with explanations. The operating budget, income statement, and variance report will be included in the portfolio.

- ORLD 2700 - Human Resources Organizational Assessment
  - This project will allow students to conduct in-depth research in the area of human resource management (HRM) and apply HRM theory and research to a Fortune 500 organization. Students will select one HR functional area and will then write a paper based on the selected functional area and Fortune 500 organization that includes: 1. What are the trends, activity, and focus of that organization in the functional area selected by the student? 2. What competition, barriers, distractions, strategic disadvantages, etc. does this organization have in regard to its main competitors in this functional area? 3. What recommendations would the student give to the organization to create strategic and competitive advantages in this functional area?

Student LO #2 Artifacts: Final Projects

Student LO #5 Artifacts

- ORLD 1000 – Leadership Development Plan
  - Students are expected to reflect upon course content and concepts in preparing a Leadership Development Plan, which calls for the identification of two distinct leadership goals: (1) A Personal Goal (self-leadership) and (2) A Professional Goal. Then students are to apply a SMART Goal approach to each one, reflecting upon their strengths and weaknesses individually and in the context of work.
- ORLD 3800 – Final Presentation on Organizational Design Analysis
  - The main project for the course will be to conduct a design analysis of the organization for which you work. If you are not currently working or volunteering for an organization, then you may choose another organization. Note that you must have access to information on the organization including contacts with whom you can speak. This is not a standard research paper on a company of your choice. The analysis is broken down into four assignments that allow you to directly apply what you are learning to your organization. It culminates with a recorded presentation that includes your recommendations for the organization based on your analysis of its strategy, structure and culture.
- ORLD 4000 - Global leadership analysis presentation
  - The final project of the course is a presentation of the country you have selected specifically highlighting (a) historical and cultural context, (b) organizational norms related to leadership practices, and (c) individual insight (gleaned from cultural assessments) for delivering effective cross-cultural interaction. In other words, the presentation should resemble a white paper which summarizes primary influences on leadership within your country and ways in which leaders can increase global mindfulness further enhancing global competences.

3. **Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process**
   What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and **include them in/with this report document** (please do not just refer to the assessment plan).

A rubric was used to assess each student artifact. Additionally, the instructor assessed the student's mastery of the related learning outcomes using the outcome tool in Canvas. The related student outcomes were embedded in the artifact's rubric to allow for assessment of the outcomes at the same time as the artifact. In this way, the assessment of the student learning outcomes is relevant and timely as the instructor has just completed the evaluation of the artifact and can accurately assess mastery of the outcome(s).

4. **Data/Results**
   What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

The Canvas outcomes reported that many of the artifacts had properly assessed student learning outcomes for their specific courses, but some minor adjustments might be needed; which will be explained further in section 5 of this

report. Most instructors used final projects as their assessment tool and felt it was appropriate for the type of students in these classes.

- **SLO #1:** The majority of students (85%) successfully demonstrated the objective, 3% partially demonstrated the objective, and 12% did not demonstrate the objective as assessed through completion of the related artifacts.
- **SLO #2**: 139 total artifacts assessed
    - Meets Standard – 70 students met this level (50%)
    - Approaches Standard – 22 students met this level (16%)
    - Does Not Meet Standard – 6 students met this level (4%)
    - Did not report = 41 (30%)
- **SLO #5:** The majority of students (82%) successfully demonstrated the objective, 8% partially demonstrated the objective, and 10% did not demonstrate the objective as assessed through completion of the related artifacts.

All courses were taught online, so there is no difference in teaching modality to note**

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you? Address both a) learning gaps and possible curricular or pedagogical remedies, and b) strengths of curriculum and pedagogy.

As discussed in section 4, the data has largely supported that the learning outcomes have been supported by the artifacts chosen. With this said, faculty are not all reporting assessment data in Canvas. This has prompted the administration to reflect with all faculty directors in SPS to come up with a school wide plan moving forward.

Solution summary = Dr. Matt Grawitch is in the process of developing a school wide assessment tool that will be implemented in fall of 2023. This new assessment tool will more strictly monitored by program directors.

6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of <u>Current</u> Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss the results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

An ad-hoc discussion around course delivery and evaluation was had with selected CIS and LOB adjunct faculty. As an outcome, all agreed that the program is delivering an applied and up-to-date program of study to the students. It was, however, stressed that all faculty will need to report tangible data this coming year to support our discussion.

B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies	- Course content - Teaching techniques - Improvements in technology - Prerequisites	- Course sequence - New courses - Deletion of courses - Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings
Changes to the Assessment Plan	- Student learning outcomes - Artifacts of student learning - Evaluation process	- Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics) - Data collection methods - Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

Currently there are no immediate changes to the program.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

The Technology and Leadership BS program is scheduled to go through a program review starting in the fall of 2023.

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                                 │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

7. Closing the Loop: Review of <u>Previous</u> Assessment Findings and Changes

A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years **as a result of previous assessment data**?

Over the past two years, Dr. Joe Lyons has stepped in as the Interim Director of the CIS program (which comprises half of the program). Dr. John Buerck (the former program director) was moved to Interim Dean in the school. Because of this interim role, no real changes were implemented.

B. How has the change/have these changes identified in 7A been assessed?

Please see the response to 7A.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

NA

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

New Assessment / Data Collection Method: Dr. Matt Grawitch is in the process of developing a school wide assessment tool that will be implemented in fall of 2023. This new assessment tool will more strictly monitored by program directors.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., artifact prompts, rubrics) with this report as separate attachments or copied and pasted/appended into this Word document. Please do not just refer to the assessment plan; the report should serve as a stand-alone document. Thank you.