

Date Received _____

**Annual Assessment Report Form
DUE JUNE 1, 2005**

Directions: Please complete a form for each of the programs within your department. This form was designed to provide a format for assessment reporting and should not be used to limit the amount of information provided. Each box that is attached to each of the sections is designed to adjust to varying lengths. If you have any questions, please contact Denise Webster at x7714. Send the report form via e-mail to devin1lk@cmich.edu.

1. Program Information:

Program	MSA—Information Resource Management Concentration
Department	MSA
College	Graduate
Academic Year	2004-2005
Report Submitted by	Larry L. Smiley
Phone/e-mail	6525/ smile1ll@cmich.edu
Date Submitted	July 27, 2005

2. According to the Assessment Plan for this program, what were the planned assessment activities to be conducted during the 2004-2005 Academic Year? You may want to copy and paste from this program's assessment plan (Section 3: Evidence and Artifacts).

Outcomes assessed for this academic year	Way this assessment was carried out	Expected measures from these assessment instruments
MSA outcomes 1,3,4,7	Capstone project (MSA 685) scored by pilot rubric	Percent of possible points
MSA outcomes 1,2,3,4,5,6,7 Concentration outcomes 1,2,3	Current student survey	Detailed data analysis
MSA outcome 2	Problem-based project in Quantitative Analysis	Percent of possible points
MSA outcome 5	Problem-based project in Finance	Percent of possible points

3. Results, conclusions, and discoveries. What are the results of the planned activities listed above? What conclusions or discoveries were made from these results. Describe below or attach to the form.

Results, conclusions, and discoveries	
Capstone project (MSA 685) using scoring rubric (4-point scale):	
Ratings by Monitors only, N=137:	
1. Problem statement well conceptualized and fits purpose of research	3.45
2. Research strategy appropriate to problem	3.55
3. Literature review related to topics identified by problem statement	3.44
4. References appropriate and adequate	3.26
5. Research design appropriate	3.39
6. Data analysis appropriate	3.20
7. Conclusions integrate major findings of literature and study	3.21
8. Recommendations represent application of findings	3.33
9. APA format appropriately used, grammar and syntax appropriate	2.92
10. Executive summary includes important details within two pages	2.10
Overall score	3.19
Ratings by Reviewers only, N=153:	
1. Problem statement well conceptualized and fits purpose of research	2.75
2. Research strategy appropriate to problem	2.85
3. Literature review related to topics identified by problem statement	3.04
4. References appropriate and adequate	2.92
5. Research design appropriate	2.74
6. Data analysis appropriate	2.67
7. Conclusions integrate major findings of literature and study	2.63
8. Recommendations represent application of findings	2.58
9. APA format appropriately used, grammar and syntax appropriate	2.78
10. Executive summary includes important details within two pages	2.17
Overall score	2.71
Ratings by both Monitors and Reviewers, N=290	
1. Problem statement well conceptualized and fits purpose of research	3.08
2. Research strategy appropriate to problem	3.18
3. Literature review related to topics identified by problem statement	3.23
4. References appropriate and adequate	3.08
5. Research design appropriate	3.05
6. Data analysis appropriate	2.92
7. Conclusions integrate major findings of literature and study	2.90
8. Recommendations represent application of findings	2.93
9. APA format appropriately used, grammar and syntax appropriate	2.85

10. Executive summary includes important details within two pages	2.14
Overall score	2.94

Results show that monitors score higher than reviewers by approximately one-half point. This is understandable when considering that monitors have worked with students in developing the project from the beginning and have a somewhat vested interest in the project. Reviewers do not have any experience with the student or the project except to be the second reader.

Items 9 and 10 rated the lowest of all components included in the rubric.

Current student survey

Current student survey was not completed during 2004-2005 school year.

Problem-based project in Quantitative Analysis

Based on a sample of MSA 640 sections, two pieces of data were reported by instructors:

1. Percent of correct answers on problem solving exams was at 90%.
2. Students required to make-up problems that can be solved by using the quantitative techniques covered in the course. All students were able to do this satisfactorily.

Problem-based project in Finance

Two pieces of data were reported by a sample of instructors who taught MSA 635 during 2004-2005.

1. Assignments and exams focusing on FM's bench level technical demand. Students must effectively use math, relevant aspects of accounting data producing formulas, and accepted conversion to information techniques to achieve a successful outcome.

Distribution of grades are:

- A—22%
- B—50%
- C—21%
- E—7%

2. Students assigned in a group project to search information about stock market. Must apply financial theory learned in the course. They are required to analyze corporate financial and non-financial information, prepare financial ratios from income and balance sheet, track progress of stocks, and report findings to the class. Students' self-reporting was that they learned great deal about financial management by doing this project. Grade distributions were all at A and B level.

4. Use of Results. Did the results lead to program changes? If so, describe the changes made. If not, describe why changes were not needed.

The Student Guide to the MSA 685 Project was revised during spring and summer, 2005. Master Course Syllabi for MSA 600 and MSA 685 were revised. This was done to keep the two courses as separate and not overly dependent one to the other. Three regional meetings were held with instructors of these two courses to share findings of the MSA 685 study and to inform instructors about the changes to take place. MSA 685 courses are being scheduled differently than in the past in order to reduce the number of "Incomplete" grades assigned each term.

5. Dissemination of results, conclusions, and discoveries. How and with whom were the results shared?

MSA 685 instructors received a copy of the report from the MSA 685 study conducted during the months of October-December, 2004.

All MSA 685 approved instructors received copies of the revised Student Guide to the MSA 685 Project.

Findings and report of impending changes were shared with appropriate instructors, advisors, and program administrators in ProfEd.