



IACBE

International Assembly for Collegiate Business Education

Annual Report – Accredited Member

Institution: University of Maryland University College
Academic Business Unit: MBA Program
Academic Year: 2010-11

International Assembly for Collegiate Business Education
P.O. Box 3960
Olathe, Kansas 66063
USA

IACBE ANNUAL REPORT
For Academic Year: 2010-11

This annual report should be completed for your academic business unit and submitted to the IACBE by November 1 of each year.

General Information

Institution's Name: University of Maryland University College
3501 University Boulevard East
 City and State or Country Adelphi, MD Zip or Postal Code 20783
 Name of Submitter: Nancy Gentry Glenn, DM
 Title: Assistant Chair, Business & Executive Programs
 Your Email Address: ngentry@umuc.edu
 Telephone (with country code if outside of the United States): 240-684-2475
 Date Submitted: October 28, 2011

Accreditation Information

1. If applicable, when is your next institutional accreditation site visit? 2016 Year
2. When is your next reaffirmation of IACBE accreditation site visit? 2014 Year
3. Provide the website address for the location of your public notification of accreditation by the IACBE: <http://www.umuc.edu/gen/accred.shtml>
4. Provide the website address for the location of your public disclosure of student learning results: <http://www.umuc.edu/gen/accred.shtml>
5. If your accreditation letter from the IACBE Board of Commissioners contains "notes" that identified areas needing corrective action, please list the number of the IACBE's Accreditation Principle for each note in the table below. Indicate whether corrective action has already been taken or that you have made plans to do so. (Insert additional rows as necessary.)

<i>Commissioners' Notes</i>	<i>Action Already Taken</i>	<i>Action Planned</i>
Request was made, in 2004, for an Outcomes Assessment Plan to be developed and written, per IACBE	A revised Outcomes Assessment Plan was written and submitted on December 21, 2010.	

<i>Commissioners' Notes</i>	<i>Action Already Taken</i>	<i>Action Planned</i>
requirement, and submitted.		
Request was made, in 2004, for a copy of the regional reaffirmation letter for 2006.	A copy of the regional reaffirmation letter was submitted to IACBE in October, 2007.	

Administrative Information

1. Provide the following information pertaining to the current president/chief executive officer of your institution:

Name: Susan C. Aldridge

Title: President

Highest Earned Degree: PhD Email: President-office@umuc.edu

Telephone (with country code if outside of the United States): 301-985-7077 Fax (with country code if outside of the United States): _____

_____ Check here if this represents a change from the previous year.

2. Provide the following information pertaining to the current chief academic officer of your institution:

Name: Greg Von Lehmen

Title: Provost

Highest Earned Degree: PhD Email: Provost-office@umuc.edu

Telephone (with country code if outside of the United States): 301-985-7174 Fax (with country code if outside of the United States): _____

_____ Check here if this represents a change from the previous year.

3. Provide the following information pertaining to the current head of your academic business unit:

Name: Anna Andriasova

Title: Acting Chair, Business & Executive Programs

Highest Earned Degree: PhD Email: aandriasova@umuc.edu

Telephone (with country code if outside of the United States): 240-684-2483 Fax (with country code if outside of the United States): 240-684-2404

code if outside of the United States): _____ code if outside of the United States): _____

Check here if this represents a change from the previous year.

4. Provide the following information pertaining to your current primary representative to the IACBE (if not the same as the head of the academic business unit):

Name: Nancy Gentry Glenn
Title: Assistant Chair, Business & Executive Program
Highest Earned Degree: Doctor of Management Email: ngentry@umuc.edu
Telephone (with country code if outside of the United States): 240-684-2475 Fax (with country code if outside of the United States): 240-684-2404

_____ Check here if this represents a change from the previous year.

5. Provide the following information pertaining to your current alternate representative to the IACBE:

Name: Anna Andriasova
Title: Acting Chair, Business & Executive Programs
Highest Earned Degree: PhD Email: aandriasova@umuc.edu
Telephone (with country code if outside of the United States): 240-684-2483 Fax (with country code if outside of the United States): 240-684-2404

_____ Check here if this represents a change from the previous year.

Programmatic Information

1. Did you terminate any business programs during the reporting year?

No

_____ Yes. If yes, please identify the terminated programs on a separate page at the end of this report.

2. Were changes made in any of your business programs?

No

____ Yes. If yes, please identify the changes on a separate page at the end of this report.

3. Were any new business programs (including new majors, concentrations, and/or emphases) established during the academic year?

No (skip to the *Outcomes Assessment* section below)

____ Yes. If yes, please identify the new programs on a separate page at the end of this report, and answer item 4 below.

4. If applicable, was approval of your institutional accrediting body required for any of the programs identified in item 3 above?

No

____ Yes. If yes, please attach a copy of the material that you sent to your institutional accrediting body.

Outcomes Assessment

1. Has your outcomes assessment plan been submitted to the IACBE?

Yes

____ No. If no, when will the plan be submitted to IACBE? _____

2. Is the original or revised outcomes assessment plan that you submitted to the IACBE still current or have you made changes?

The outcomes assessment plan that we have previously submitted is still current.

____ Changes have been made and the revised plan is attached.

____ We have made changes and the revised plan will be sent to the IACBE by: _____

3. Complete the Outcomes Assessment Results form below and include it with this annual report to the IACBE. **Note: Section II of the form (Operational Assessment) needs to be completed only if you received first-time accreditation or reaffirmation of accreditation after January 1, 2011.**

An example of a completed form can be found in a separate document that is available for download on the IACBE's website at: www.iacbe.org/accreditation-documents.asp.

Section I (Student Learning Assessment) of the Outcomes Assessment Results form must be completed for each business program that is accredited by the IACBE (i.e., a separate table must be provided for each program).

Performance targets/criteria are the criteria used by the academic business unit in evaluating assessment results to determine whether intended outcomes have been achieved. For example, if the academic business unit is using the ETS Major Field Test as one of its direct measures of student learning, then a performance target might be that the Institutional Mean Total Score on the exam will place students in the upper quartile nationally; or if the academic business unit is using a

comprehensive project in a capstone course as a direct measure of student learning, then a performance target might be that 80% of the students will score at the highest level (e.g., proficient, exemplary, etc.) on each project evaluation criterion.

Remember that your outcomes assessment plan needs to include two or more direct and two or more indirect measures of student learning. These measures should be used at the program level.

At the bottom of each section of the form, space is provided to identify changes and improvements that you plan to make as a result of your assessment activity.

Italicized entries in the form represent areas where the academic business unit should insert its own assessment information. Add tables and insert rows in the tables as needed.

Other Issues

Briefly comment on other issues pertaining to your academic business unit that you would like to share with the IACBE.

MBA program enrollments, overall, have increased from fall, 2010 to fall, 2011 after experiencing a slight decline in fiscal year 2010. We continue to see increased enrollment in the Dual MBA format of our MBA program and have added a new, concentrated 1-year MBA program to offer a second option to prospective MBA students. The new 1-year MBA focuses on the same set of competencies and basic content of the current 2-year MBA program but the structure is unique in that students complete a series of eight 5-week courses as well as 3 practicum courses that allow students to apply what they are learning in their content courses to their own organizations. The practicum courses are eleven weeks long and run concurrently with the five-week courses. It is estimated that students will devote 30-40 hours per week to this intensive program. In addition, our Executive MBA format has been discontinued because it was deemed that institutional resources might best be allocated to other programs more strategically aligned with UMUC's mission.

Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2010-11

Section I: Student Learning Assessment

Student Learning Assessment for <i>(Program 1)</i>	
Intended Student Learning Outcomes for <i>(Program 1)</i> :	
1. <i>(Intended Learning Outcome 1): Written Communication: Produce writing that meets expectations for format, organization, content, purposes, and audience.</i>	
2. <i>(Intended Learning Outcome 2): Critical Thinking: Demonstrate the use of analytical skills and reflective processing of information.</i>	
3. <i>(Intended Learning Outcome 3): Information Literacy: Demonstrate the ability to use libraries and other information resources to effectively locate, select, and evaluate needed information.</i>	
4. <i>(Intended Learning Outcome 4): Program Content Knowledge: Demonstrate the ability to apply the disciplinary knowledge and skills appropriate for the chosen fields of student/program.</i> <i>(Intended Learning Outcome 5): Technology Fluency: Demonstrate an understanding of technology broadly enough to apply technology productively to academic studies, work, and everyday life.</i>	
Assessment Tools for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Targets/Criteria for Direct Measures:
1. <i>(Direct Measure 1): Written Communication: Students were asked to critically analyze the Apple case and update the case information with new research to include Apple’s other product lines and identify lessons learned to benefit information systems managers. The analysis will be submitted as a succinct report to include an executive summary.</i>	<i>(Target/Criterion for Direct Measure 1): UMUC’s Graduate School Assessment process measured this competency across a sample of AMBA 640 students. We applied the Graduate School’s standardized writing rubric. The target was that 75% of students will score equal to or above 85% on the assignment.</i>
2. <i>(Direct Measure 2): Critical Thinking: For the first time, the MBA program adopted and administered an online critical thinking assessment instrument, developed by an outside organization well-known for research and assessment in the area of critical thinking.</i>	<i>(Target/Criterion for Direct Measure 2): the program hopes to see improvement in the mean aggregate score of students in AMBA 670 between the pre-test and post-test assessments. The initial pre-test was administered in October, 2011, with the mean aggregate score of 17.31,</i>

<p>The program has administered the assessment at the beginning of this cohort program, in AMBA 610, as a pre-test, and will administer it again, as a post-test in the capstone course, AMBA 670. Pre-test scores were analyzed to identify areas of needed focus. Post-test scores will be analyzed against pre-test scores to determine whether program/course improves implemented as a result of pre-test findings and student academic improvement realized have resulted in aggregate improvement in critical thinking and to identify additional program/course improvements needed.</p> <p>Another measure for Critical Thinking was the Graduate School's assessment conducted in AMBA 640 and using the Apple case study analysis as a written assignment.</p>	<p>falling just below average and normed against other comprehensive public universities. Because the assessment was administered to incoming MBA student for the first time, a target score was not identified. Our target for improvement for the post-test is a mean aggregate score of 21, just above the mean aggregate for mid-level MBA programs against which UMUC is normed.</p> <p>The target for the Graduate School's Critical Thinking assessment in AMBA 640, was that 75% of students would score equal to or above 85% on the Apple case study analysis assignment.</p>			
<p>Assessment Tools for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:</p>	<p>Performance Targets/Criteria for Indirect Measures:</p>			
<p>1. (Indirect Measure 1): All MBA program competencies: Focus Groups of Dual MBA alumni were conducted, by an external consultant, to gain a deeper understanding of the affect the Dual MBA program had on graduates' professional and personal lives, and to explore in-depth attitudes, perceptions, and opinions on student satisfaction with the program. (See attached Dual MBA Program Qualitative Study.)</p>	<p>(Target/Criterion for Indirect Measure 1): The target criterion for this measure was to gain objective feedback about student experience in the Dual MBA program and to learn how alumni participation in the program has been of value post-graduation. We sought to identify the program's strengths and needs for improvement and compare/contrast two different graduating classes. The outcome of this research was to inform program curriculum and design and, ultimately, to improve student learning.</p>			
<p>2. (Indirect Measure 2): Written Communication: A survey of Writing Coaches who participated in the MBA program's new Writing Coach Program, initiated in Summer, 2011.</p>	<p>(Target/Criterion for Indirect Measure 2): The purpose of the survey was to identify the Writing Coach program's strengths and areas of needed improvement. The outcome of this research was to inform program design and delivery and, ultimately, improve student writing skills.</p>			
<p>Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:</p>	<p>Performance Target Was...</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1593 1224 1944 1273"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1593 1224 1770 1273">Met</td> <td data-bbox="1770 1224 1944 1273">Not Met</td> </tr> </table>		Met	Not Met
Met	Not Met			
<p>1. (Results for Direct Measure 1): Students scored below target on two dimensions of the rubric: organization and sources. Organization refers to logical sequencing of and transitions and summary conclusion to develop main idea and content. Sources refers to identification and use of appropriate research to support assertions. On organization, 50% of students learned at a competent level; on sources, 62.5% of students learned at a competent or exemplary</p>		<p>X</p>		

level.		
2. <i>(Results for Direct Measure 2): The program studied results closely and noted that the lowest mean score was for the evaluation and explanation scale of the instrument. This scale is defined in part by the assessment developers as referring to “the ability to assess the credibility and logical strengths of statements or other representations which are accounts or descriptions of a person’s perception, experience, situation, judgment, belief or opinion,”...as well as “the assessment of claims and arguments.” Of particular interest are the results of the Graduate School’s assessment on the competency of Critical Thinking applied in AMBA 640, which also indicated a weakness in the area of analysis and evaluation where 63.6% of students learned at the competent level with a target of 75% of student scoring 85% or higher on this Apple case study assignment.</i>	X (for pre-test)	X for Graduate School Assessment in AMBA 640
Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Target Was...	
	Met	Not Met
1. <i>(Results for Indirect Measure 1): The Dual MBA program was able to identify, as a result of the focus groups conducted, area of needed improvement. Overall, alumni were quite satisfied with the quality of instruction, content, and the goal of the Dual MBA program to balance learning in the first master’s program with the business perspective focus of the Dual MBA program – there was little duplication across the two master’s programs. There was consensus that the program gave participants both an immediate and long-term career edge over competitors with only one master’s degree. Alumni expressed value for the cohort structure, the integrated nature of program themes, the focus on building competencies, and the technology enhancements of the course delivery system. As might be expected, some students preferred more emphasis on global management, others not so much; this depended largely upon the nature of business/industry of various students. While some alumni expressed frustration with teamwork, others indicated their appreciation for it especially as they experienced application of effective team skills in the workplace.</i>	X	
2. <i>(Results for Indirect Measure 2): The survey helped to identify areas of needed improvement in this recently implemented program. Major findings from the Writing Coach survey administered in August, 2011, were that fewer students availed themselves of the Writing Coach resource than actually could have used help with writing skills, faculty encouragement of students to use the Writing Coach resource increases actual participation, students have difficulty producing a draft for review by the Writing Coach prior to the submission deadline.</i>	X	
Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Areas for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:		
1. <i>(Course of Action 1): The MBA program will continue to encourage students to avail themselves of Writing Coaches assigned to each section of the first course in the MBA program, AMBA 610. Coaches will be encouraged to communicate to all students in their assigned sections about the benefits the Writing Coaches have to offer and how to best utilize this resource. Writing Coaches will encourage students to submit assignments</i>		

for review after they have been graded so that students have time to receive valuable writing feedback to apply the next assignment submitted. Faculty will be more active in encouraging and directing students to take advantage of Writing Coach resources.
2. (Course of Action 2): Critical Thinking: The MBA program will ensure that all faculty, in each course of the program, are provided with a copy of the critical thinking textbook provided to students and faculty in the first course in the MBA program, AMBA 610, so that they can reinforce critical thinking skills throughout assignments in all courses in the program. At least one assignment in every course will focus on critical thinking and the process identified explicitly in the textbook. We will define critical thinking in the rubric of every written assignment through program courses to ensure student understanding and compliance with assignment requirements for critical thinking.
3. (Course of Action 3):
4. (Course of Action 4)

Section II: Operational Assessment (Note: Complete this section only if you received first-time accreditation or reaffirmation of accreditation after January 1, 2011.)

Operational Assessment for (Name of Academic Business Unit)	
Mission of the (Name of Academic Business Unit):	
(Mission Statement):	
Intended Operational Outcomes:	
1. (Intended Operational Outcome 1)	
2. (Intended Operational Outcome 2)	
3. (Intended Operational Outcome 3)	
4. (Intended Operational Outcome 4)	
Assessment Measures for Intended Operational Outcomes:	Performance Targets/Criteria for Operational Assessment Measures:
1. (Measure for Intended Operational Outcome 1)	(Target/Criterion for Measure 1)

2. <i>(Measure for Intended Operational Outcome 2)</i>	<i>(Target/Criterion for Measure 2)</i>	
3. <i>(Measure for Intended Operational Outcome 3)</i>	<i>(Target/Criterion for Measure 3)</i>	
4. <i>(Measure for Intended Operational Outcome 4)</i>	<i>(Target/Criterion for Measure 4)</i>	
Summary of Results from Implementing Operational Assessment Measures:	Performance Target Was...	
	Met	Not Met
1. <i>(Results for Measure 1)</i>		
2. <i>(Results for Measure 2)</i>		
1. <i>(Results for Measure 3)</i>		
2. <i>(Results for Measure 4)</i>		
Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Areas for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:		
1. <i>(Course of Action 1)</i>		
2. <i>(Course of Action 2)</i>		
3. <i>(Course of Action 3)</i>		
4. <i>(Course of Action 4)</i>		