CBE CIC Meeting Notes

Nov 6, 2020

Date and Participants:

Nov 6, 2020
Committee members: Eric Fricke, TT Rajan Selvarajan, Vish Hegde, Kai Ding, Ya You
Guests: Nancy Mangold, Chongqi Wu

Agenda:

1. MSBA program curriculum map 2020
   • BAN 693: Replaced M(A) with D
   • Vote: everyone voted YES, form approved

2. Closing-the-Loop-Form_MSBA_LO1:
   • Eric’s recommendation: (3)/(4) need to rework e.g., further explain why performance has not been improved: compare previous vs. current rounds; (5e): discuss “benchmark”
   • Next: Chongqi will update the form.

3. Closing-the-Loop-Form_MSBA_LO2:
   • Part 4: added “Primary benchmark of 70% of students meeting or exceeding expectations was met. Secondary benchmark of less than 10% of students not meeting expectations for each trait was not met. Traits 1 and 2 had 32% and 40% of students, respectively, not meeting expectations. Improvement actions will be needed for Traits 1 and 2.”
   • Part 3: added “Assessment scores have improved since Spring 2016. It appears the BAN 602 the quantitative prerequisite course helped to improve student learning.”
Comment: Were GRE/GMAT minimums raised per last improvement action ideas?
   • Part 5: added “Move assessment from the introductory quantitative skills course to the capstone to give students more time to develop their skills.”
Comment: Please confirm with faculty that they all want to implement improvement actions 2 (Revise rubric?) and 3 (Remove linear algebra?) in above box.
   • Next: Chongqi will review the above changes.

4. Closing-the-Loop-Form_MSBA_LO3:
   • Part 3: added “Assessment score met all benchmarks again this round and slightly improved.”
Comment: Faculty did mention trying to increase the sample size of the assessment, but that was not done as the sample size went from 16 to 15 in the latest round. No other improvements were previously recommended.”
   • Part 4: added “Assessments met the overall benchmark of 70% and the secondary benchmark of less than 10% not meeting expectations in each rubric.”
Comment: Improvement in the sample size (larger) should be considered to ensure unbiased results.
• Part 5: Comment:
Improvement in the sample size (larger) should be considered to ensure unbiased results. Confirm how improvement 2 in above box will be implemented and how we can follow-up on these changes in the future. Is this improvement action needed given assessment scores?

• Next: Chongqi will review the above changes.

5. Closing-the-Loop-Form_MSBA_LO4
• Part 3: added
“Overall assessment scores were about the same as last assessment but in assessment scores for traits 3 and 4 are lower this round. Past improvement action of increasing the sample size was not implemented as sample size dropped from 16 to 15.”

• Part 4: added
“The overall assessment score of 90% met the 70% benchmark, but traits 3 and 4 did not meet the benchmark of less than 10% of students not meeting expectations. For trait 3, 13% of students did not meet expectations and for trait 4 27% of students did not meet expectations. Improvements will be needed for traits 3 and 4 and for the sample size.”

• Part 5: Comment:
What is the detailed improvement action and how will it address traits 3 and 4? Could students submit their assessed papers first to the csueb tutoring center for comments? To Chongqi: In your email you said this “PLO4 will be introduced in university writing skill requirement, which MSBA requires the student to meet by the end of their first semester.” Could this be an improvement action? Consider specifying which courses will implement a new writing assignment?

• Next: Chongqi will review the above changes.