



**Undergraduate Curriculum Management and
Assurance of Learning Committee
Meeting Minutes
Monday, March 22, 2021, 10:00 a.m.**

Meeting Facilitator(s): Fang Lin and Mary Jo Goedeke, Co-chairs

Secretary: Mary Jo Goedeke

In Attendance: Bienvenido Cortes, Economics, Associate Dean for Graduate School of Business
Linden Dalecki, Marketing
Mary Jo Goedeke, Accounting
Fang Lin, Finance
Shipra Paul, Management
Jae Choi, CIS

Not in Attendance:
June Freund, Economics
David Hogard, Academic Advising

Committee Meeting

The co-chairs of the UCM&AOL Committee, Fang Lin and Mary Jo Goedeke, called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. by Zoom meeting.

I. Curriculum Management.

There were no curriculum items for consideration.

II. AOL

a. MFT Update

Stephen Horner updated the committee on preliminary MFT results. He stated that he would be able to provide final numbers when he completed the Cohort in a few weeks.

b. Fall Assessment Research Results

i. Teamwork Peer Review Results

Mary Goedeke presented the committee with the results of the peer-review assessments. The results of the peer-review were overwhelmingly positive. Students responded that their fellow teammates exceeded their expectations in every dimension at a rate between 75% to 81%. Those responding that their teammates performed below expectations were 4.5% or fewer in every dimension assessed.

ii. Teamwork Professional Deliverables Results

Mary Goedeke then presented the committee with the results of the Professional Deliverables part of the teamwork assessment. The assessment was conducted in MGT 690-02 and MGT 690-03. A total of 47 students were assessed in those two sections. Each student was evaluated by the course instructor Mary Judene Nance and Stephen Horner, who also teaches MGT 690. Results were compiled based upon overall score and were also compiled per instructor. Upon reviewing the results, the committee agreed that the results yielded useful results regarding areas in which student performance could be improved. Specifically, Eye Contact, Posture, Visual Presentation, and Substance were areas identified for improvement.

Stephen Horner noted that these assessments were based upon pre-recorded videos, and that some results, such as eye contact, may have been different as a result of the online environment. Mary Goedeke noted that video meetings and presentations are increasingly part of a cultural business norm, and that perhaps the curriculum should include instruction about video and online presentation practices.

Stephen Horner shared with the committee his additional analyses of the data resulting from the assessment, including an analysis of the differences between the scores of assessors. Fang Lin noted that although the assessors utilized different grading standards, there were clearly visible trends as the instructor's evaluations tracked each other in which areas needed improvement. Stephen Horner also noted that in the 10th performance dimension, which is Substance, that the Accounting majors seemed to do well in relaying financial information, whereas the other majors seemed to struggle more, as a general rule. This observation is reflected in the data provided, but the scores are not divided by major.

Lastly Fang Lin shared with the group the curriculum map, regarding when communication and teamwork are presented to the students in the Kelce curriculum. The committee identified Business Professionalism as a possible course to modify to improve student's skills. This course does require a presentation, which could address some of these skills. The decision was made to contact instructors of that course and discuss with them possibilities for curriculum improvement.

c. Spring Assessments

i. Communication (MGT 330)

The committee then turned toward the matter of assessments currently scheduled for Spring. Fang Lin reported that for sections of MGT 330 offered this semester, there are two instructors, Matthew Lunde and Kristen Maceli. These instructors have already provided information to the students and a rubric for assessment. These rubrics are not aligned with each other. He advised that we have the option of continuing the assessments this semester, applying two different rubrics, or we could delay the assessments so that a unified rubric could be developed. After discussion, it was determined that the assessment's usefulness in improving student outcomes would be better if we waited to develop a common rubric. Importantly, the same rubrics would need to be used to "close the loop" and utilizing multiple rubrics would make it difficult to discern meaningful results. We considered the ability to "close the loop" prior to the year of record and based upon the fact that the year of record would be

