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*The McCoy College of Business assesses all six undergraduate competency goals every three years. This report discloses the assessment results of Competency Goal 5 for the 2023-2024 academic year.*

***BBA Program Level Competency Goal 5:***

**Competency Goal 5 states:**

***Comprehend the skills needed for effective teamwork in diverse settings*. Graduates should be able to work productively in groups to accomplish assigned or self-developed tasks and goals. They should appreciate diverse perspectives and different cultures.**

One course assessed this goal for the 2023-2024 academic year:

 Strategic Management and Business Policy (MGT 4335)

The results from each course, along with an analysis of the results by the instructors and plans for the coming year, appear below. Following that will be the recommendations of the joint meeting of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Course Coordinators from each course.

**MKT 4335: Strategic Management and Business Policy**

**Current Period Assessment Method**

For this course, various assessment instruments are used to assess teamwork competency. In this current period, the following instruments were used to assess teamwork. This list is not exhaustive:

* A team case analysis and presentation where students worked in teams, in and out of class, to use the analytical frameworks from the course. The case analysis concluded with peer evaluations.
* A variety of in-class team activities applying the course material across a variety of scenarios.
* A semester-long team strategic analysis of a publicly traded company that included a mini-business plan. The analysis concluded with peer evaluations.
* Team performance in a semester-long business simulation. Performance was calculated using numerous financial metrics from the simulation.
* An end-of-semester team project and weekly in-class team-based assignment.
* A final team project consisting of a written business plan for a new franchise in San Marcos.
* Two team-based projects during the semester. The projects were written analyses using the course frameworks. The projects concluded with peer evaluations.
* Two team-based projects – one early in the semester and one at the conclusion of the semester. Peer evaluations were taken for each project, and students received feedback after the first team project on the improvements they needed to make before the project at the end of the semester. The projects were application-based and included written and verbal components.
* For added context, team size was similar across all sections of the course. Most teams consisted of between four and five students. As is noted above, the class activities were diverse and ranged from in-class activities to semester-long projects. In most instances, peer evaluations were taken and had an impact on student grades.

The instructors have wide latitude in the rubric they use to assess teamwork. The only expectation is that they use the following cutoffs to determine whether performance on the competency exceeds, meets, or does not meet expectations.

* Exceeded expectations= students who earned 90 percent or better
* Met expectations = students who earned between 70 and 89.9 percent
* Below expectations = students who earned below 70 percent

Ideally, at least 80% of students should meet or exceed expectations.

**Results from Current Assessment Period**

San Marcos Campus

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance 2023-2024** | **Assessment Method Face-2-Face/Hybrid** | **Assessment Method 100% On-Line** |
|  | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** |
| Exceeded (90%+) | 453 | 57.9% | 160 | 87% |
| Met (80%+) | 318 | 40.6% | 16 | 8.7% |
| Below (<80%) | 12 | 1.5% | 8 | 4.3% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Performance 2022-2023** | **Assessment Method Face-2-Face/Hybrid** | **Assessment Method 100% On-Line** |
|  | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** |
| Exceeded (90%+) |  506 |  63.8% | 113  | 75.3%  |
| Met (80%+) | 239  |  30.1% |  30 |  20% |
| Below (<80%) |  48 | 6.1% |  7 | 4.7% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Performance\* 2021-2022** | **Assessment Method Face-2-Face/Hybrid** | **Assessment Method 100% On-Line** |
|  | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** |
| Exceeded (90%+) |   |   |   |   |
| Met (80%+) |   |   |   |   |
| Below (<80%) |   |  |  |  |

\*I was not the course coordinator for the year and do not have any previous data.

**Instructor Observations**

Current Assessment Period

For the two most recent assessment periods, performance on the teamwork competency exceeded the goal of 80% of students either meeting or exceeding expectations. In the 2023-2024 assessment period, 98.5% of students taking hybrid or face-to-face courses and 95.7% of students taking fully online courses met or exceeded expectations. In the 2022-2023 assessment period, 93.9% of students taking hybrid or face-to-face courses and 95.3% of students taking fully online courses met or exceeded expectations. Overall, in the 2023-2024 assessment period, 97.9% of all students met or exceeded expectations for teamwork competency. Overall, in the 2022-2023 assessment period, 94.2% of all students met or exceeded expectations for teamwork competency.

From a qualitative perspective, instructors stated that most students met or exceeded their teamwork expectations. Students were willing to participate and showed little signs of significant dysfunction. Some students took the lead and showed initiative as team leaders, while most were content with being good team members without taking a leadership role. Very few students performed poorly in the team activities. The main reasons for the students not performing up to expectations were lack of participation and communication with team members.

There are at least two reasons why students in the capstone course did exceedingly well on the competency goal. First, given that all students enrolled in the capstone course are graduating seniors, students were largely motivated to participate in class-related activities. Second, students in the capstone course are very familiar with teamwork since they have experienced team-based projects in most of their classes prior to their arrival in the capstone course. To conclude, most students either met or exceeded the goal.

Compared to Previous Assessment Period

Comparing the two years of data, several observations can be made. First, from the 2022-2023 year to the 2023-2024 year, hybrid and face-to-face sections saw a decline in the percentage of students that exceeded expectations, an increase in the percentage of students that met expectations, and a decline in the percentage of students that were below expectations. Second, from the 2022-2023 year to the 2023-2024 year, online sections saw an increase in the percentage of students who exceeded expectations, a decrease in the percentage of students who met expectations, and a slightly lower percentage of students who were below expectations. Third, comparing modalities, online sections tended to have a higher percentage of students that exceeded expectations and a lower percentage that met expectations.

These comparisons should be interpreted in the context of several limitations. First, it is difficult to make significant conclusions based on only two data points. It is even more difficult to come to a conclusion when those data points are generated by different instructors over two time periods. In the 2022-2023 time period, nine different instructors taught the various sections of capstone. In 2023-2024, 12 different instructors taught the various capstone sections, four of whom had not previously taught the class. Second, it is difficult to make a valid comparison between modalities due to the disparity in the number of students enrolled between the modalities. The number of students enrolled in hybrid and face-to-face sections is nearly four to five times the number of students enrolled in fully online sections. As a result, caution is warranted when making comparisons between modalities.

**Instructor Recommendations for Next Academic Year**

Instructors offered numerous recommendations for the next academic year. For example:

* Let students work more on team-based activities in class as opposed to out of class. This may create more of a rapport between team members.
* Require attendance for class periods that will include team-based work.
* Weighting team-based work more heavily in the students’ course grade.
* Share intra-team peer evaluation feedback regularly throughout the semester. By doing this, students will have a better understanding of where they stand on their team participation.
* Have more check-in periods throughout the semester to ensure teams are working effectively and using their time well.
* Do more work earlier in the semester to set-up communication channels so that they are established in advance of the team project. This could be done via various tools such as Discord, Microsoft Teams, or Slack.

To conclude, there are numerous ways to incorporate teamwork into a strategic management course. Instructors of this course have wide latitude in choosing what they are comfortable with, what they think is best from a pedagogy perspective, and what suits their teaching strengths. Moving forward, one of my goals as the course coordinator is to put some additional structure in place via a common assessment rubric. This will require significant discussion amongst the capstone instructors. Ideally, we will choose five or six hallmarks of good teamwork and develop a rubric that each student can use to assess. While this is an important endeavor, I do not anticipate this being completed until at least the 2025-2026 school year.

**Faculty Responsible for Reporting on Progress: Dr. Corey Fox**

**Joint Assurance of Learning and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Review**

On August 30th, the Assurance of Learning Committee and the Undergraduate Curriculum committee held a joint meeting to review the assurance of learning results for the Core Competency on TEAMWORK.

The assessment results were reported to the joint committee members along with recommended curriculum changes from associated core course coordinators to improve student success. Additionally, the joint committee discussed the recent impact of changes on the structure of the assessment process, the courses participating in the assessment of the competency, and potential programmatic changes. It was determined that because of the recent changes it would be best to allow for a period of consistent assessment to better reflect the impact of the changes on the assessment process.

Finally, it was determined that it would be beneficial if an in-depth review of the assessment processes and rubrics for all competencies to be completed in the 2024-2025 academic year.