

# STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT

---

**PROGRAM:** Human Resources Management (MA), 2017-2018 Assessment

**SUBMITTED BY:** Dr. Virginia Bianco-Mathis

**DATE:** September 30, 2018

**BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WHERE AND HOW ARE DATA AND DOCUMENTS USED TO GENERATE THIS REPORT BEING STORED:** Indirect measures from student generated course evaluations are stored electronically by institutional effectiveness office and Program Director. Samples of course materials reviewed are held electronically on course canvas and in paper by course faculty.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**Program description from the Course Catalog:** Please copy and paste the current year's catalog description of this program. This is generally a one-two paragraph description immediately following the name of the program. Please be sure to include the listing of program outcomes as printed.

**\*\*This description and outcomes are from the catalog for the years being evaluated AND for the present catalog (2018-2019). In cue are the strengthened outcomes that—because of a change in Associate Dean—were not changed in the current catalog. The modified outcomes, approved by Ann Boudinot in 2017, have been in use and measured and are reflected in this assessment (see next section). Though not yet in the catalog, all students have received them electronically with the explanation of soon being in the catalog.**

### Human Resource Management (M.A.)

This master's degree program prepares students to excel as specialists or generalist human resource professionals, managers, and consultants. Students acquire competencies in all the core human resource management functional areas within a systems perspective and relating strategically to overall organization performance.

Upon successful completion of the human resource management program, students will be able to

- use organizational analysis and research methodology to develop and implement HR and OD interventions that support high performance in individuals, teams, and organizations;
- identify and develop HR and knowledge management interventions that support business strategies and add value to the entire business enterprise;
- function as a role model of HR leadership, orchestrating strategy and working effectively in a team environment; and
- implement and continuously monitor HR initiatives in alignment with personnel law, health and safety regulations, ethical behavior, labor relations, diversity, and international issues.
- This program is certified by the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) and the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) to be in alignment with designated competencies as required by each association.

List all the program’s learning outcomes: (regardless of whether or not they are being assessed this year) **\*\*Strengthened and approved by Ann Boudinot, 2017**

Learning Outcome	Year of Last Assessment	Assessed This Year 2017-2018	Year of Next Planned Assessment
Select an appropriate OD/HRM analysis model, organize strategic trends within organizations, formulate and explain recommendations for new or improved HR/OD structures, and develop an implementation plan to support business goals.	2014-2015	no	2020-2021
Survey and organize performance, selection, and total pay systems within organizations and design new or improved structures that measure strategic results at the individual, team, and organizational level.	2013-2014	yes	2022-2023
Investigate and evaluate the OD/HR leadership and team behaviors within organizations that support a healthy culture and produce HR/OD leadership and team development projects that increase engagement and business results.	2014-2015	no	2020-2021
Appraise alignment of HR/OD initiatives concerning employment law, ethics, labor and international relations, and diversity and create a plan for improved initiatives in line with “best in practice” guidelines.	2013-2014	yes	2022-2023

Describe **briefly** how the program’s outcomes support Marymount’s mission, strategic plan, and relevant school plan (generally not more than two paragraphs, may use bullet points):

The program’s overall goals are to

- 1) prepare students to excel as specialists or generalist human resource professionals, managers and consultants;
- 2) enable students to acquire competencies in all the core human resource management functional areas within a systems perspective and relate strategically to overall organization performance.

The program’s outcomes support the University’s mission/vision (including mission/vision of 2018) in terms of

- a) “Emphasizing academic excellence”—High standards are established for each course with rubrics emphasizing outcomes for each assignment that supports one or more assessment outcomes.
- b) “Career preparation”—Each course in the program has a balance of theory and practical application with a major project requiring access to an organization within the Washington, D.C area.
- c) “Professional development”—Professional development is the cornerstone of this program: Human Resource Management. Students learn to develop themselves while developing others within organizations—that’s the essence of Human Resources.
- d) “The moral growth of the individual”—Ethics is a component of every course. Human Resources professionals are the “keepers” of organizational ethics and our students must demonstrate this in all outcome projects.
- e) “Global perspective”—The program has been recently modified to make Global Human Resources a required course instead of just an elective. This course also has the option for students to go abroad and study international HR approaches.

The program's outcomes support the School's mission/vision. As updated in 2017, the outcomes emphasize ethics, communications, critical thinking, leadership, and team building.

a) "Educating current and future professional managers"—The degree is entitled Human Resource Management with a culminating course in running a Human Resources Department as a Vice President, and the nature of leadership and being a role model at its core.

b) "Knowledge that has value for the business community and society"—Human Resources is a part of every business entity, whether it is a department of 1 or 200. Human Resources also plays the major role in linking organizations with the outside community and creating internal cultures within the organization itself. Teamwork—both leading teams and participating as an engaged member—is a method used in every course.

c) "...seeks to develop a new breed of principled business professionals"—The HRM curriculum is highly application focused. Students work on cases and go into organizations to solve problems and demonstrate the transfer of skills in the real world. The actual process of critical thinking is taught as applied to ethical, legal, and business scenarios

Each learning outcome is linked directly to both the University and the School mission and strategic plan in the following ways:

*1. Select an appropriate OD/HRM analysis model, organize strategic trends within organizations, formulate and explain recommendations for new or improved HR/OD structures, and develop an implementation plan to support business goals.* Supports “career preparation” and “professional development.” Students are prepared to manage through a systems approach and apply interventions to solve organizational problems and improve performance in all HR functional areas: compensation, benefits, organization development, recruitment, performance management, personnel law, training and development, team work, and global relations. They personally develop in applying analytical tools to business issues. Furthermore, supports “academic excellence” and “future professional managers.” Students learn to apply qualitative and quantitative rigor to their work. It also supports SBT’s goal to enhance and apply technological strategies. Students apply research and measurement methods to HR/OD programs to validate HR/OD efforts and demonstrate correlations between HR initiatives and organizational outputs.

*2. Survey and organize performance and total pay systems within organizations and design new or improved performance/total pay structures that measure strategic results at the individual, team, and organizational level.* Supports “value for the business community” and “future professional managers.” Students learn to work closely with an organization’s overall strategic direction, so the entire business enterprise is successful and all HR functional areas (listed in #1) are aligned with the overall strategies and goals of the business (i.e., if a business is trying to expand into the global marketplace, the student learns to tailor HR/OD strategies and knowledge to global cultures and environments).

*3. Investigate and evaluate the OD/HR leadership and team behaviors within organizations that support a healthy culture and produce HR/OD leadership and team development projects that increase engagement and business results.* Supports “future professional managers,” “value for society,” and “career preparation.” Students learn to manage and work in team environments which foster the organizational community and society. This supports the university’s desire to engage with the Washington, D.C. environment. Students learn to assess group situations (in real D.C. based businesses) and develop and facilitative positive team outputs.

*4. Appraise alignment of HR/OD initiatives concerning employment law, ethics, labor and international relations, and diversity and create a plan for improved initiatives in line with “best in practice” guidelines.* Supports “value for business community,” “moral growth,” and “academic excellence.” Students study and apply strict human resource laws in organizations, learn the value of working within diverse and international environments, and develop/apply HR tools that maximize ethical, diverse, and international initiative

Provide a **brief** description of the assessment process used including strengths, challenges and planned improvements to the process, and provide evidence of the existence of a culture of continuous improvement based on assessment (*generally not more than two paragraphs, may use bullet points*):

The assessment process we used this year:

- All courses in the HRM curriculum have a culminating project that measures student learning in one or more of the four learning objectives, as shown in the matrix below.
- Every two years we test two objectives.
- Every cycle we rotate the courses to continually monitor the effectiveness of the outcome project for all the courses, ensuring that each one measures what we have built into the learning outcomes for that course.
- This past cycle we worked with Ann Boudinot to make each outcome more aligned with Bloom's taxonomy. In line with more rigorous levels of learning, all course rubrics were strengthened (attached), more detailed measurement analysis was conducted (demonstrating number of students below, at, and above established standard), and additional measurement methods were used for increased validity and reliability (three direct methods and two indirect methods). In order to measure the outcome of being able to transfer knowledge to REAL COMPANIES (enter a real company as opposed to just working with in-class cases), we added a two-part final assignment and rubric in the Total Pay course to measure the difference of the learning outcome in two different settings: demonstrating competency with "given" real-life scenarios/cases AND demonstrating competency of entering a real organization, gathering pertinent data, and demonstrating the same competency. The intention was that such refinement in approach would yield more precise results for continuous improvement. Given that "transfer application to the real world" is a cornerstone of the program, such differentiation is relevant. Lastly, we strengthened the assessment by conducting an item analysis of each rubric criterion to ascertain achievement within the components of each learning outcome.

Our assessment process included three direct and two indirect methods that measure the number/percentage of students that were at, below, and above the designated level of learning required to meet the outcome assessment criteria established for that learning outcome. As stated above in blue, our process also included a two-part assignment differentiating transfer/application of skills from classroom written case studies/scenarios to real cases within the outside HRM environment. This was done through

- Teacher evaluation of a two-part major project demonstrating standard level of performance of the outcome learning (course objectives and assignment criteria are aligned to learning outcome).
- Teacher evaluation compared to the review of two outside readers (all against the stated learning outcome criteria). Outside readers were all experts in the field who have attended a conference session on how to evaluate the projects in a consistent and valid way (all using the same provided learning outcome criteria templates).
- Focus groups conducted by an outside expert with group of students being measured on the designated outcome learning.
- Graduating student assessment survey conducted by university outcomes assessment office

Courses and learning objectives matrix:

Learning Outcome	Learning Outcome Projects in the following courses measure this outcome:
Select an appropriate OD/HRM analysis model, organize strategic trends within organizations, formulate and explain recommendations for new or improved HR/OD structures, and develop an implementation plan to support business goals.	OD521, HRM533
Survey and organize performance, selection, and total pay systems within organizations and design new or improved structures that measure strategic results at the individual, team, and organizational level.	HRM509, HRM538, HRM539, HRM534
Investigate and evaluate the OD/HR leadership and team behaviors within organizations that support a healthy culture and produce HR/OD leadership and team development projects that increase engagement and business results.	MGT515, OD523, HRM533, OD521, HRM509
Appraise alignment of HR/OD initiatives concerning employment law, ethics, labor and international relations, and diversity and create a plan for improved initiatives in line with “best in practice” guidelines.	HRM585, LA535, HRM534, HRM538, HRM539

Describe how the program implemented its planned improvements from last year:

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
<p>Through the use of organizational analysis and research methodology, develop and implement HR and OD interventions that support high performance in individuals, teams, and organizations. <i>Revised: Select an appropriate OD/HRM analysis model, organize strategic trends within organizations, formulate and explain recommendations for new or improved HR/OD structures, and develop an implementation plan to support business goals.</i></p>	<p>--The results of the most significant measures do not indicate program changes.</p> <p>--The results of some of the indirect comments indicate that we should tailor the program to some industry trends; namely, more analytics, more applicable law material, and more detailed global policies—and tighten the corresponding criteria/assignments. This would also improve one of the lower alumni survey results in “research to support a position—60%.” We will seek to address these areas by adding an analytics course, re-focus some of the material in the Global HRM course and tighten the measures accordingly, and look to make the law content even more HRM specific.</p> <p>The improvements implemented last year in the teaching of ethics (“Voices to Values” program) and addition of more writing intensive techniques to the graduate curriculum--led to increased points in making ethical responses, using “application research,” solving real problems, and writing and giving presentations.</p> <p>Several trends emerged from the indirect measures that led us to seek counsel from our HR review body, SHRM.</p>	<p>--Added Analytics course. Low enrollment caused cancellation two semesters in a row. Replaced full analytics course with an analytics module within four courses: HRM533, HRM534, HRM538, HRM539. In replacing one of our professors, we were able to find and hire a professor who is an expert in HR analytics. He is teaching analytics in the three initial curriculum courses and another professor has added it to capstone course.</p> <p>--Continuing the “Voices to Values” program has made ethics a cornerstone for all the HRM courses. The use of the Voices to Values checklist accompanying HRM cases has strengthened this emphasis. Two students who took the SHRM certification test after completing the Marymount HRM program indicated that they did well on the ethics section of that exam.</p> <p>--A conference was held with the law professor to include sections more in line with the SHRM</p>

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
	<p>a) Students are not happy with the personnel law class provided out of the SBA legal staff. They are seeking something more aligned with HR application and policies on the job. To further this notion, I was given confidential information that one of our students had failed the legal section of the SHRM certification test. This failure could be due to many reasons, but it does make us look more closely to the comments from our focus groups/survey.</p> <p>b) Students would like more flexibility in “majoring” in a particular HR topic.</p> <p>c) Students would like some on line courses.</p> <p>d) More networking possibilities.</p> <p>e) More coverage of conflict resolution.</p> <p>All of the above “HR trends” information has thrown us into a mode of “revitalizing the program.” We have drafted a sharper degree plan and HR “Marymount activities” plan to address some trend issues. We will continue to work this draft. Key components include:</p> <p>--Not “majors” (since Marymount doesn’t support majors in terms of being listed on one’s diploma) but four distinct “concentration areas” which the registrar will put on each person’s transcript: analytics, coaching, performance management, or learning organizations. The exciting discovery is that we can offer these distinct areas of concentration WITHOUT changing the learning outcomes of the program. We already have the core courses—we just never “packaged them” in the way being requested. What a marvelous marketing opportunity sitting in front of our faces! <u>If you haven’t noticed, we are psyched about this.</u></p> <p>--The addition of networking activities: Spotlight Presentations by industry leaders; Marymount Consulting Roundtables; more focused Marymount Chapter SHRM Meetings, and more articles/presentations conducted by Marymount professors in regional forums.</p> <p>--Replacement of law class with an HRM Legal Issues and Workplace Policies</p> <p>--Addition of the already mentioned People Analytics Course</p>	<p>certification exam. He went through each criterion and modified the law class accordingly. Three students who took the revised course and then took the SHRM certification exam said that all topics tested had been covered in the Marymount course. That said, we did not replace the law course with a newly titled course (HRM Legal Issues and Workplace Policies) because such a change would hurt the certification of specifically titled law courses within SBT. So, we kept the “Employment Law” title.</p> <p>--New specialty areas are popular, and students have indicated they chose Marymount because of the specialty areas provided. They claim that the Marymount curriculum covers all the core HRM topics while also offering flexibility.</p> <p>--The Marymount chapter of SHRM has doubled in size and our student leadership team was recognized by the Northern VA Chapter. In addition, the evening programs we offer through the Marymount chapter now go through a vetting process where we can offer SHRM certification points. This has raised our profile and has also provided an avenue for us to emphasize our specialty areas (analytics, training, OD, etc.). Lastly, we have doubled our interaction with the business community and this has provided jobs and internships for our students (6 more job opportunities than the previous cycle).</p> <p>--We have not yet moved on any “on line” initiatives. The plan is to pilot two “synchronous” on line courses in the upcoming cycle. This is also in line with the entire university push to provide more on-line courses.</p>

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
<p>Function as a role model of HR/OD leadership, orchestrating strategy and working effectively as an individual contributor or within a team environment. <i>Revised: Investigate and evaluate the OD/HR leadership and team behaviors within organizations that support a healthy culture and produce HR/OD leadership and team development projects that increase engagement and business results.</i></p>	<p>-- Specific curricular changes are not indicated at this time. Presently, student praise these two courses for having the kind of job aids they can immediately use the next day at work. That said, as indicated on page 16, the Chair/Director is going to pilot a new outcomes assessment approach that focuses just on several intense assignments/measures coming out of the capstone course, HRM533.</p> <p>--Findings from the indirect focus groups/learning outcomes survey indicate that students feel very high about knowing and applying leadership, team interactions, and tools as taught in these two courses.</p> <p>--Other findings are outlined under the Interpretation of Results in the narrative for Outcome #1 (comments concerning content of law course and global course).</p>	<p>--After meeting with Ann Boudinot, it was decided that utilizing an assessment approach that only focused on assignments coming out of the capstone course was not feasible and would not get the results we sought. Thus, we moved to strengthening the existing outcomes statements (using Bloom’s taxonomy) and revised the outcome projects and rubrics across the curriculum accordingly. As will be seen below, this has allowed more detailed analysis.</p> <p>--Given the outcome narrative of the last report, we increased the use of analytics, improved the content and outcome assignments (and accompanying rubrics) for both the law course and global HRM course.</p>

**Provide a response to last year’s University Assessment Committee review of the program’s learning assessment report:**

We found the last program’s assessment report very useful. It was accepted, and the following advice was given. We were advised to

1. Comment: Strengthen the outcome statements using Bloom’s taxonomy.  
Response: We did this with the help of Ann Boudinot. Strengthened outcomes listed above.
2. Comment: Include a more rigorous approach to measuring/analyzing the data to provide more differentiation and distinction in the results (more areas for improvement).  
Response: We did this through upgrading the outcome assignment statements and rubrics, and by breaking down the findings not only by those students who met the standard, but also the percentage below and above. Further analysis was done by each course objective aligned with the learning outcome, and even further by each criterion on the rubric. This provided more robust findings for improvement. Also added two-part assignments to differentiate inside classroom learning vs. outside “real client” learning. Lastly, conducted a focus group AFTER the direct measures were tabulated to enable the opportunity to question participants about the direct measure findings.
3. Comment: We were asked to watch the tone of our language in the report.  
Response: We have written this report to be more straightforward with less emotion.



## Outcomes Assessment 2017-2018

**Learning Outcome 2:** Survey and organize performance, selection, and total pay systems within organizations and design new or improved performance/total pay structures that measure strategic results at the individual, team, and organizational level.

### Assessment Activity

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss how the data was collected and describe the student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
<p>--HRM534: Total Pay research/benchmarking final project [Part 1 and Part 2] requiring the survey of multiple pay systems within both an assigned case AND an actual “real” company: analysis of existing pay systems, identification of strengths and weaknesses across defined parameters and models, and design of improved or totally new system that supports the organization’s culture and strategy.</p> <p><b>Direct:</b> Evaluation of final outcome product by professor using rubric with defined criteria directly aligned to program assessment outcome #2 (see attached HRM534 assignment and rubric).</p> <p><b>Direct:</b> Evaluation of representative sample of final product by two outside experts using rubric with defined criteria directly aligned to program assessment outcomes.</p>	<p>--90% of enrolled students score 80 points across the defined components of the assignment rubric and no students score fewer than 78 points (aligned with program learning outcomes and course objectives) for both Part One and Part Two of each final assignment, as evaluated by the instructor.</p> <p>--Two outside professional readers score representative samples of final outcomes within six points of the instructor rating, but no lower than 80.</p> <p>--90% of students will score no lower than 80% of allowable points for each criterion.</p>	<p>--For 24 HRM students, instructor provided rubric used on culminating project, as described in first column and demonstrated in appendix. Instructor evaluated each outcome using the rubric.</p> <p>--Two outside professionals, coached by the instructor, used the same rubric to evaluate a representative sample of product outcomes.</p> <p>--Instructor conducted analysis of answers tied to each rubric criterion (total points, percentages, range of points) to surface more in-depth findings concerning learning outcomes</p>	<p>For Part One of assessment assignment, all 24 students met the performance standard of 80 points across the defined components. Specifically:                      --10 students were above standard by 10 points (90 and above)                      --12 students were moderately above standard by 4 – 9 points (84 – 89)                      --2 students were at or slightly above standard (80 – 83)                      --0 students below</p> <p>For Part Two of the assessment assignment,                      --8 students were above standard by 10 points (90 and above)                      --10 students were moderately above by 4 – 9 points (84 – 89)                      --4 students were at or slightly above standard (80 – 83)                      --2 students were below 80 but not less than 78</p> <p>Actual numbers are being used instead of percentages. Given the low number of the group (24), percentages would be deceiving (i.e., 10% of 24 people is only two people).</p> <p>For both Part One and Part Two of the assignment, the outside readers came within six points of that of the instructor scoring, validating the alignment among raters and alignment between the assignment, learning outcomes, and program outcomes.</p> <p>The assessment result indicates that the learning outcome as presented in the program meets the performance standard when applied to both Part One and Part Two of the outcome testing. With both in class “real scenarios” and “within organization” testing conditions, 90% of students scored 80 points across the defined components of the assignment.</p>

<b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	<b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	<b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss how the data was collected and describe the student population</i>	<b>Analysis</b> <i>1) Describe the analysis process.  2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
<b>Direct:</b> Item evaluation (point system) of each criterion within the outcome assessment rubric			<p>However, the test differentiation surfaced pertinent findings that need to be addressed for further improvement and the attainment of higher outcome learning.</p> <p>90% of students scored no lower than 80% of allowable points for each criterion (<u>see Criterion Analysis in appendix</u>).</p> <p>The direct assessment results indicate that the learning outcome as presented in the program meets the performance standard.</p> <p>However, a breakdown of the scoring surfaces pertinent findings that need to be addressed for further improvement and the attainment of higher outcome learning (comparison to other HRM courses in the curriculum). This is explained in the supporting comments below the chart.</p>
<b>Indirect:</b> Student focus group held with class participants (24) conducted by outside expert, tied to learning outcome #2. See explanation below this chart and appendix.	90% of participants rate each learning outcome, course objective (aligned to outcome), and rubric criteria (aligned to objectives), as being achieved at 3.5 or better on a 5.0 scale. General comments were coded using qualitative analysis.	An outside professional donated her time to conduct an end-of-course focus group for the 24 students taking HRM534. This followed qualitative research protocol. Survey answers were tabulated and focus group answers were coded and summarized.	90% of participants rated learning outcome (and supporting course objectives and rubric criteria) as being achieved at 3.5 or better: --15 students rated the learning outcome achievement at 4.5 or higher --5 students rated the learning outcome achievement at 3.8 or higher --4 students rated the learning outcome achievement at 3.5
<b>Indirect:</b> Graduate survey conducted by institutional effectiveness.	80% of participants rate items aligned to assessment outcomes at very good or high. Chosen aligned topics: <i>Ability to...</i> --find job/be successful on job --produce coherent written/spoken argument on a position --determine ethical responses --conduct research --transfer skills to community service --demonstrate leadership	Conducted by institutional effectiveness surveys. Have two years of data.	Results of two years in a row: 80% of participants rated relevant items at very good or high except for one area: appreciation of global issues/diversity (which is discussed below).

<b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	<b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	<b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss how the data was collected and describe the student population</i>	<b>Analysis</b> <i>1) Describe the analysis process.  2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
	--use technology in the field --solve problems in the field --work/lead a team --appreciate global/diverse issues --make decisions		

### Interpretation of Results

**Describe the extent to which this learning outcome has been achieved by students** (*Use both direct and indirect measure results*):

Outcome learning objective #2 is being met in line with the established standards.

The direct assessment results indicate that the learning outcome #2 is being achieved according to the measures on the culminating class assignment (as ascertained by the instructor and two outside readers). The culminating activities in HRM534 [both Part One and Part Two] require students to survey and organize total pay systems within organizations and design new or improved total pay structures (and relate the impact to associated performance and selection systems) that measure strategic results at the individual, team, and organizational level. The instructor’s measure was further validated through the measures of two outside evaluators who found the same result. Evaluators all scored within the established standard of 6 points of the instructor. This year’s evaluators had specific expertise in Total Pay: Professor Lynn Lorenz and Dr. Christine Greathouse.

Learning outcome level	Instructor Rating	Outside Professional Rating	Outside Professional Rating
High sample	98	100	95
Good sample	92	88	90
Acceptable or just below (78 – 80)	82	85	84

The direct method of criterion analysis (further breakdown of each rubric criterion) indicated that 90% of students scored no lower than 80% of allowable points for each criterion (see Criterion Analysis in appendix).

Indirect: Focus group data resulted in 90% of participants rating the learning outcome as being achieved at 3.5 or better. When asked to rate each objective for HRM534 (each aligned with learning objective #2) and the criteria on the rubric for the HRM534 culminating activity (Part One and Part Two), students rated each at 3.5 or higher. See actual results in the appendix, HRM 534 Focus Group Data. Thus, the focus group data further supports that learning objective #2 is being achieved by the curriculum. However, there are areas for improvement when all the data is analyzed further, which will be included in the section on “opportunities for improvement.”

Indirect: Results of two years in a row of the graduate survey indicate that 80% of participants rated relevant items at very good or high, except for one area (global/diverse issues). Interesting patterns emerge when comparing the two survey results on the key areas pertinent to learning outcomes #2:

Measurement Area: Ability to...	2016 [total of 14 respondents]	2017 [total of 7 respondents]
Find job/be successful at job	87.7	100
Produce coherent written/spoken position arguments	85.7	100
Determine ethical responses	92.9	100
Conduct Research	78.6	85.7
Transfer skills to community service	85.7	100
Demonstrate leadership	92.9	100
Use technology in the field	78.0	85.7
Solve problems in the field	92.9	100
Work in/lead a team	92.9	100
Appreciate global/diverse issues	71.4	78.6

Notable findings from indirect graduate surveys:

All findings for the graduate survey need to be kept in perspective since a rating pool of only 7 (2017 graduating student survey) is very low. However, some noted patterns include the following:

--Much higher scores in 2017. We believe this is due to gaining traction with the improved objectives, tighter and more detailed rubrics, and closer alignment between the objectives and caliber of the learning assignment (that measures the learning). The revised curriculum and testing better defined and emphasized the skills measured in the graduate survey.

--Big improvement with technology and research. Most likely a result of the inclusion of analytics in HRM534, 538, 539, and 533.

--Seems to be a weakness indicated with global/diversity. Will be discussed in areas for improvement.

**Briefly describe program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome and discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome**

We were able to analyze the data and dig deeper into the findings this cycle because of the following actions:

- strengthening the rubrics, criteria, and learning outcomes
- implementing a two-part outcomes assessment to further test transfer of learning
- breaking down assessment of the learning outcome by specific criteria to pinpoint more specific “learning” areas
- conducting a professional focus group AFTER the results of the final learning outcome project was submitted and scored, thus allowing us to question and gain a deeper understanding of the scores.

**Strengths as demonstrated through all direct and indirect measures:**

- Transfer of learning to real environments. Our students can get jobs and do the work on the job immediately.
- Use of real scenarios and case studies
- Faculty who have real work experience, conduct research, and have contacts in the field in order to bring that into the classroom and provide opportunities for students to enter outside organizations
- Precise and measurable criteria within the rubrics. “Always knew what was expected of me.”
- Instructors approachable and available for further learning and advising

- In line with SHRM learning outcome criteria. “Feel we are in line with the highest standards in the field.”
- Program is successful in students feeling competent in problem solving, leadership, working in teams, conducting research, developing and presenting cogent arguments, serving the community, noting and navigating ethical business behavior, utilizing technology, and being successful on the job.
- Students not only demonstrate learning in pay, selection, and performance structures, but also in aligning such structures with the strategy and culture of the organization.
- \*Focus group data surfaced that those who had taken the SHRM certification test (as part of the HRM590 Practicum course), stated that the HRM534 course appropriately prepared them for all questions concerning total pay on the exam. At this point in time, SHRM does not have the ability to provide universities with specific “item by item” analysis of scores. However, we are in conversations with them to eventually be able to supply us with this data. This would add further verification/reliability to our outcomes assessment.

<b>Opportunity for improvement (refer to appendix data as needed)</b>	<b>Planned curricular or program improvement</b>
<p>1. With the direct data and the focus group data, most of the scores were lower (still within established standard, but lower) for Part Two of the outcomes assignment (with two students falling below the standard). Further analysis and questioning through the focus group indicate this is due to the following factor: The skill and confidence of entering an organization, dealing face-to-face with a real client, and gathering data, adds a dimension that is not sufficiently covered in the HRM534 curriculum. To further validate this, the 24 students were further divided into those who had taken OD521 or HRM533 (both of which further cover “entering an organization and gathering data”). Students who took those two courses (11 of the students) performed anywhere between 2 to 5 points better than those who didn’t have those courses yet.</p>	<p>1. Several improvement actions will be taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A consulting module for entering an organization, gathering appropriate data, and navigating client relations will be added to the course and throughout the curriculum (linked with the material already existing in OD521 and HRM533).</li> <li>b) Another “on the client site” assignment will be added to the course to further prepare students before the final.</li> <li>c) Gathering data and interacting with the client will be added as a rubric criterion for the course.</li> </ul>
<p>2. Though students met the criteria through the direct measure for managing cultural and global issues, the indirect measure surfaced a weakness in this area. Again, only 7 students form that test group, but it warrants attention. Given that the graduating survey includes students who have completed the entire curriculum (including the Global HRM course), this is puzzling. When posed as a curiosity in the focus group, students shared that a) though they were aware, appreciate, and feel “somewhat competent” in handling such situations, they still found it uncomfortable. They also stated that having more specific scenarios with real global people would enhance the learning. There were also statements like “when you get into global pay systems, it starts getting very complicated and it is hard enough to learn the U.S. systems.”</p>	<p>2. For HRM 534, instructors will now include a guest speaker from an international organization who will personally share the experience of developing and managing total pay systems in global situations. In the Global HRM course, three outside guests will share difficult HRM global issues through skype/webinar and a “panel event” will be included with people from different countries talking about global HRM issues. Instructors will also be encouraged to use the international students in class to illustrate issues “first hand.” The Director of the HRM program will hold a seminar on “discussing difficult global HRM issues” to prepare instructors for such discussions.</p>

<p>3. Close analysis of the direct criteria average scores (in relationship to the acceptable standard score) indicated that students score lower on certain aspects of designing pay systems; specifically, in job evaluation points, regression analysis, and market pay line equation. This would never have surfaced without the rubric criteria analysis.</p>	<p>3. More exercises and examples will be included in the course on these three pay structure calculations. These criteria demand more rigid math work and more drills. This is one of the more demanding skill sets in HR (along with selection calculations to prevent adverse impact).</p>
--	---

**Learning Outcome 4:** Appraise alignment of HR/OD initiatives concerning employment law, ethics, labor and international relations, and diversity, and create a plan for improved initiatives in line with “best in practice” guidelines.

**Assessment Activity**

<p><b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p><b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p><b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss how the data was collected and describe the student population</i></p>	<p><b>Analysis</b> <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>
<p>--LA535: Employment Law: Appraise alignment of HR/OD initiatives concerning law (and associated ethics, labor, international relations, and diversity issues) requiring research, analysis, and planned actions using real case scenarios (that represent the five most relevant HRM/OD legal/diversity/ethical issues as stipulated through SHRM guidelines and employment law resources.) Students must identify the law/ethical issues, standards/case law supporting necessary actions for such issues, and develop appropriate action plans addressing legalities, HR policy, and organizational strategic factors. *Test scenarios are from real life corporate/organizational cases (see appendix). Due to the high confidentiality of HRM legal/ethics issues, students</p>	<p>--90% of enrolled students score 80 points across the defined components of the assignment rubric and no students score fewer than 78 points (aligned with program learning outcomes and course objectives) on the final assignment, as evaluated by the instructor. In addition, two outside professional readers score representative samples of final outcomes within six points of the instructor rating, but no lower than 80.  --90% of students will score no lower than 80% of allowable points for each criterion.</p>	<p>--For 28 HRM students, instructor provided rubric used on culminating project, as described in first column and demonstrated in appendix. Instructor evaluated each outcome using the rubric. --Two outside professionals, coached by the instructor, used the same rubric to evaluate a representative sample of product outcomes.</p>	<p>90% of the students met the performance standard of 80 points across the defined components. Specifically: --8 students were above standard by 10 points (90 and above) --15 students were moderately above standard by 4 – 9 points (84 – 89) --3 students were at or slightly above standard (80 – 83) --2 students were below the 80 points but above the 78. They were required to retake the course.</p> <p>Actual numbers are being used instead of percentages. Given the low number of the group (28), percentages would be deceiving (i.e., 10% of 28 people is 2.8 people).</p> <p>The outside readers came within six points of that of the instructor scoring, validating the alignment among raters and alignment between the assignment, learning outcomes, and program outcomes.</p> <p>90% of students scored no lower than 80% of allowable points for each criterion (see Criterion Analysis in appendix).</p> <p>The direct assessment results indicate that the learning outcome as presented in the program meets the performance standard.</p> <p>However, a breakdown of the scoring surfaces findings that need to be addressed for further improvement and the</p>

<b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	<b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	<b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss how the data was collected and describe the student population</i>	<b>Analysis</b> <i>1) Describe the analysis process.  2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
<p>cannot personally collect legal/ethic issues from organizations. Thus, “real life” cases are brought to them through instructor research and instructor relationships with organizations. The instructor is always an employment lawyer so appropriate confidentiality issues are upheld. Furthermore, the scenarios are vetted by the HRM Director to be in line with SHRM guidelines and testing protocol.</p> <p><b>Direct:</b> Evaluation of final outcome product by professor using rubric with defined criteria directly aligned to program assessment outcome #4 (see attached LA535 assignment and rubric).</p> <p><b>Direct:</b> Evaluation of representative sample of final product by two outside experts using rubric with defined criteria directly aligned to program assessment outcomes.</p> <p><b>Direct:</b> Item evaluation (point system) of each criterion within the outcome assessment rubric</p>			<p>attainment of higher outcome learning (comparison to other HRM courses in the curriculum). This is explained in the supporting comments below the chart.</p>
<p><b>Indirect:</b> Student focus group held with class participants (28) conducted by outside expert, tied to learning outcome 4. See</p>	<p>90% of participants rate each learning outcome, course objective (aligned to outcome), and rubric criteria (aligned to objectives), as being achieved at</p>	<p>An outside professional donated her time to conduct an end-of-course focus group for the 28 students taking LA535. This followed qualitative research</p>	<p>90% of participants rated learning outcome (and supporting course objectives and rubric criteria) as being achieved at 3.5 or better:  --15 students rated the learning outcome achievement at 4.0 or higher</p>

<b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	<b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	<b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss how the data was collected and describe the student population</i>	<b>Analysis</b> <i>1) Describe the analysis process.  2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
explanation below this chart and appendix.	3.5 or better on a 5.0 scale. General comments were coded using qualitative analysis.	protocol. Survey answers were tabulated and focus group answers were coded and summarized.	--10 students rated the learning outcome achievement at 3.8 or higher --3 students rated the learning outcome achievement at 3.5 --1 student rated the learning outcome achievement at 3.0
<b>Indirect:</b> Graduate survey conducted by institutional effectiveness.	80% of participants rate items aligned to assessment outcomes at very good or high. Chosen aligned topics: <i>Ability to...</i> --find job/be successful on job --produce coherent written/spoken argument on a position --determine ethical responses --conduct research --transfer skills to community service --demonstrate leadership --use technology in the field --solve problems in the field --work/lead a team --appreciate global/diverse issues --make decisions	Conducted by institutional effectiveness surveys. Have two years of data.	Results of two years in a row: 80% of participants rated relevant items at very good or high except for one area: appreciation of global issues/diversity (which is discussed below).

### Interpretation of Results

**Describe the extent to which this learning outcome has been achieved by students** (*Use both direct and indirect measure results*):

Outcome learning objective #4 is being met in line with the established standards.

The direct assessment results indicate that the learning outcome #4 is being achieved according to the two direct measures on the culminating class assignment (as ascertained by the instructor and two outside readers). The culminating activity in LA535 require students to understand, analyze and interpret both the surface and underlying issues in legal HRM scenarios (taken from real companies); research employment case law for supporting critical analysis; research appropriate HRM policy for appropriate procedural actions; and recommend actions to appropriately manage the situation—aligning all legal, ethical, international, diversity, cultural, and strategic issues. The instructor’s measure was further validated through the measures of two outside evaluators who found the same result. Evaluators all scored within the established standard of 6 points of the instructor. This year’s evaluators had specific expertise in Employment Law: Attorney Paul Mathis and Attorney Thomas Sawyer.



Learning outcome level	Instructor Rating	Outside Professional Rating	Outside Professional Rating
High sample	95	100	94
Good sample	90	92	90
Acceptable or just below (78 – 80)	83	85	82

Combination of Direct/Indirect: Focus group data resulted in 90% of participants rating the learning outcome as being achieved at 3.5 or better. When asked to rate each objective for LA535 (each aligned with learning objective #4) and the criteria on the rubric for the LA535 culminating activity, students rated each at 3.5 or higher. See actual results in the appendix, LA535 Focus Group Data. Thus, the focus group data further supports that learning objective #4 is being achieved by the curriculum. However, there are areas for improvement when all the data is analyzed further, which will be included in the section on “opportunities for improvement.”

Indirect: Results of two years in a row of the graduate survey indicate that 80% of participants rated relevant items at very good or high, except for one area (global/diverse issues). Interesting patterns emerge when comparing the two survey results on the key areas pertinent to learning outcomes #2:

Measurement Area: Ability to...	2016 [total of 14 respondents]	2017 [total of 7 respondents]
Find job/be successful at job	87.7	100
Produce coherent written/spoken position arguments	85.7	100
Determine ethical responses	92.9	100
Conduct Research	78.6	85.7
Transfer skills to community service	85.7	100
Demonstrate leadership	92.9	100
Use technology in the field	78.0	85.7
Solve problems in the field	92.9	100
Work in/lead a team	92.9	100
Appreciate global/diverse issues	71.4	78.6

Notable findings from indirect graduate surveys [duplicate what was written for HRM534, same yearly data used]:

All findings for the graduate survey need to be kept in perspective since a rating pool of only 7 (2017 graduating student survey) is very low. However, some noted patterns include the following:

--Much higher scores in 2017. We believe this is due to gaining traction with the improved objectives, tighter and more detailed rubrics, and closer alignment between the objectives and caliber of the learning assignment (that actually measures the learning). The revised curriculum and testing better defined and emphasized the skills measured in the graduate survey.

--Big improvement with technology and research. Most likely a result of the inclusion of analytics in HRM534, 538, 539, and 533.

--Seems to be a weakness indicated with global/diversity. Will be discussed in areas for improvement.

**Briefly describe program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome and discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome**

We were able to analyze the data and dig deeper into the findings within this cycle because of the following actions:

- strengthening the rubrics, criteria, and learning outcomes

- breaking down assessment of the learning outcome by specific criteria to pinpoint more specific “learning” areas
- conducting a professional focus group AFTER the results of the final learning outcome project was submitted and scored, thus allowing us to question and gain a deeper understanding of the scores.

**Strengths as demonstrated through all direct and indirect measures:**

- Transfer of learning to real environments. Our students can get jobs and do the work on the job immediately.
- Use of real scenarios and case studies
- Faculty who have real work experience, conduct research, and have contacts in the field in order to bring that into the classroom and provide opportunities for students to hear from professionals in the field (guest organizational employment attorneys)
- Precise and measurable criteria within the rubrics. “Always knew what was expected of me.”
- Instructors approachable and available for further learning and advising
- In line with SHRM learning outcome criteria. “Feel we are in line with the highest standards in the field.”
- Program is successful in students feeling competent in problem solving, leadership, working in teams, conducting research, developing and presenting cogent arguments, serving the community, noting and navigating ethical business behavior, utilizing technology, and being successful on the job.
- Students not only demonstrate learning in identifying surface and underlying issues concerning employment law (and associated diversity, ethical, and global issues), but also in aligning such structures with the strategy and culture of the organization.
- \*Focus group data surfaced that those who had taken the SHRM certification test (as part of the HRM590 Practicum course), stated that the LA535 course was the most significant course in providing the necessary legal and overall HR employment policies for passing the SHRM exam. At this point in time, SHRM does not have the ability to provide universities with specific “item by item” analysis of scores. However, we are in conversations with them to eventually be able to supply us with this data. This would add further verification/reliability to our outcomes assessment.

<b>Opportunity for improvement (refer to appendix data as needed)</b>	<b>Planned curricular or program improvement</b>
<p>4. With the direct data and the focus group data, most of the scores were lower than the outcomes for other tests—and includes the greater number of students [2] who scored below the standard of 80. Further analysis and questioning through the focus group, indicates this is due to the following factors: This course is taught like a law course, not an HRM course. The instructor is an attorney and his standards are high. In the previous assessment cycle, the Director of the HRM Program worked with the instructor to ensure inclusion of more HRM policy and more “practical” scenarios to be in line with the SHRM outcomes. This was done. Students comment that the course is demanding and requires “a different kind of learning” (intense research, analysis, scenario planning and writing) than other courses. Yet the students admit that it is this course that provides</p>	<p>4. Several improvement actions will be taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d) Post on canvas more examples of narrative legal case analyses with accompanying rubric grading.</li> <li>e) Work with international students in using the “demonstrate practice in these two areas of improvement in your writing” and factor in only those writing issues when grading rather than penalize non-native English speakers for the whole gambit of writing protocol.</li> <li>f) Get students writing narrative explanation earlier in the course and kick-off the course with a module on critical thinking and writing (get module from Director of HRM Program).</li> </ul>