Annual Report – Accredited Member

Institution: Lawrence Technological University
Academic Business Unit: College of Management
Academic Year: 2010-11
IACBE ANNUAL REPORT
For Academic Year: 2010-11

This annual report should be completed for your academic business unit and submitted to the IACBE by November 1 of each year.

General Information

Institution’s Name: Lawrence Technological University
Institution’s Address: 21000, West Ten Mile Road
City and State or Country: Southfield, Michigan Zip or Postal Code: 48075
Name of Submitter: Dr. Srikant Raghavan
Title: Associate Professor & Assessment Reports Coordinator
Your Email Address: sraghavan@ltu.edu
Telephone (with country code if outside of the United States): (248) 204-3072
Date Submitted: October 25, 2011

Accreditation Information

1. If applicable, when is your next institutional accreditation site visit? ___________ Year

2. When is your next reaffirmation of IACBE accreditation site visit? _______ 2012 Year

3. Provide the website address for the location of your public notification of accreditation by the IACBE: www.ltu.edu/management/accreditation.asp

4. Provide the website address for the location of your public disclosure of student learning results: www.ltu.edu/management/accreditation.asp

5. If your accreditation letter from the IACBE Board of Commissioners contains “notes” that identified areas needing corrective action, please list the number of the IACBE’s Accreditation Principle for each note in the table below. Indicate whether corrective action has already been taken or that you have made plans to do so. (Insert additional rows as necessary.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioners’ Notes</th>
<th>Action Already Taken</th>
<th>Action Planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Administrative Information**

1. Provide the following information pertaining to the current president/chief executive officer of your institution:

   Name: Dr. Lewis Walker
   Title: President
   Highest Earned Degree: Ph.D.
   Email: lwalker@ltu.edu
   Telephone (with country code if outside of the United States): (248) 204-2010
   Fax (with country code if outside of the United States): (248) 204-2018
   __ Check here if this represents a change from the previous year.

2. Provide the following information pertaining to the current chief academic officer of your institution:

   Name: Dr. Maria Vaz
   Title: Provost
   Highest Earned Degree: Ph.D.
   Email: mvaz@ltu.edu
   Telephone (with country code if outside of the United States): (248) 204-2400
   Fax (with country code if outside of the United States): (248) 204-2018
   __ Check here if this represents a change from the previous year.

3. Provide the following information pertaining to the current head of your academic business unit:

   Name: Dr. Alan McCord
   Title: Interim Dean
   Highest Earned Degree: Ph.D.
   Email: amccord@ltu.edu
   Telephone (with country code if outside of the United States): (248) 204-2411
   Fax (with country code if outside of the United States): (248) 204-2018
   __X__ Check here if this represents a change from the previous year.
4. Provide the following information pertaining to your current primary representative to the IACBE (if not the same as the head of the academic business unit):

Name: Dr. Srikant Raghavan
Title: Associate Professor & Assessment Reports coordinator
Highest Earned Degree: Ph.D. Email: sraghavan@ltu.edu
Telephone (with country code if outside of the United States): (248) 204-3072 Fax (with country code if outside of the United States): (248) 204-3099

☐ Check here if this represents a change from the previous year.

5. Provide the following information pertaining to your current alternate representative to the IACBE:

Name: Dr. Patty Castelli
Title: Associate Professor
Highest Earned Degree: Ph.D. Email: pcastelli@ltu.edu
Telephone (with country code if outside of the United States): (248) 204-3066 Fax (with country code if outside of the United States): (248) 204-3099

☐ Check here if this represents a change from the previous year.

Programmatic Information

1. Did you terminate any business programs during the reporting year?
   ☐ No
   ☑ Yes. If yes, please identify the terminated programs on a separate page at the end of this report.

2. Were changes made in any of your business programs?
   ☐ No
   ☑ Yes. If yes, please identify the changes on a separate page at the end of this report.

3. Were any new business programs (including new majors, concentrations, and/or emphases) established during the academic year?
   ☐ No (skip to the Outcomes Assessment section below)
   ☑ Yes. If yes, please identify the new programs on a separate page at the end of this report, and answer item 4 below.
4. If applicable, was approval of your institutional accrediting body required for any of the programs identified in item 3 above?

   ____ No

   ____ Yes. If yes, please attach a copy of the material that you sent to your institutional accrediting body.

Outcomes Assessment

1. Has your outcomes assessment plan been submitted to the IACBE?
   
   ____ Yes

   ____ No. If no, when will the plan be submitted to IACBE? ________________________________

2. Is the original or revised outcomes assessment plan that you submitted to the IACBE still current or have you made changes?

   ____ X The outcomes assessment plan that we have previously submitted is still current.

   ____ Changes have been made and the revised plan is attached.

   ____ We have made changes and the revised plan will be sent to the IACBE by: ________________________________

3. Complete the Outcomes Assessment Results form below and include it with this annual report to the IACBE. **Note: Section II of the form (Operational Assessment) needs to be completed only if you received first-time accreditation or reaffirmation of accreditation after January 1, 2011.**

An example of a completed form can be found in a separate document that is available for download on the IACBE’s website at: [www.iacbe.org/accreditation-documents.asp](http://www.iacbe.org/accreditation-documents.asp).

Section I (Student Learning Assessment) of the Outcomes Assessment Results form must be completed for each business program that is accredited by the IACBE (i.e., a separate table must be provided for each program).

Performance targets/criteria are the criteria used by the academic business unit in evaluating assessment results to determine whether intended outcomes have been achieved. For example, if the academic business unit is using the ETS Major Field Test as one of its direct measures of student learning, then a performance target might be that the Institutional Mean Total Score on the exam will place students in the upper quartile nationally; or if the academic business unit is using a comprehensive project in a capstone course as a direct measure of student learning, then a performance target might be that 80% of the students will score at the highest level (e.g., proficient, exemplary, etc.) on each project evaluation criterion.

Remember that your outcomes assessment plan needs to include two or more direct and two or more indirect measures of student learning. These measures should be used at the program level.

At the bottom of each section of the form, space is provided to identify changes and improvements that you plan to make as a result of your assessment activity.
Italicized entries in the form represent areas where the academic business unit should insert its own assessment information. Add tables and insert rows in the tables as needed.

**Other Issues**

Briefly comment on other issues pertaining to your academic business unit that you would like to share with the IACBE.

In mid-April 2011, Dean DeGennaro announced that he was stepping down as Dean effective June 30, 2011. On April 28, 2011, Dean DeGennaro sent a letter to IACBE requesting a one year extension for the College of Management’s self-study. This request was granted by the IACBE board in the Fall of 2011 and we are now set to have our self-study completed by May 2012 in preparation for a site-visit in Oct 2012.

This report includes our assessment results for the programs accredited by IACBE. The programs are:

1. Master of Business Administration (MBA)
2. Master of Science in Information Systems (MSIS)
3. Master of Science in Operations Management (MSOM)

In addition to these programs, we currently have the following programs which will be included in our 2011-2012 self-study. The new programs we will be seeking approval from you are:

1. Bachelor of Science in Information Technology (BSIT)
2. Bachelor of Science in Business Management (BSBM)
3. Doctorate of Business Administration (DBA)
4. Doctorate of Management in Information Technology (DMIT)

Respectfully submitted on Oct 28, 2011 by:
Srikant Raghavan, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Outcomes Assessment Coordinator
College of Management
Lawrence Technological University
21000 West Ten Mile Road
Southfield, MI 48075-1058
(248) 204-3072
sraghavan@ltu.edu
# Outcomes Assessment Results

**For Academic Year:** 2010-11

## Section I: Student Learning Assessment

### Intended Student Learning Outcomes for (MBA):

1. Understand the basic strategic management concepts of analysis, planning and implementation.
2. Formulate strategic vision and mission for the organization.
3. Understand how to analyze the external competitive environment.
4. Develop the skills to evaluate the internal strengths and weaknesses.
5. Identify the opportunities and threats facing the organization.
6. Learn to align the corporate mission with the values and culture of the organization.

### Assessment Tools for Intended Student Learning Outcomes

**Direct Measures of Student Learning:**

1. Administer the Strategic Management Capstone exam
   - **Performance Targets/Criteria for Direct Measures:**
     - 80% of the students taking the exam should score 85% or better.

**Indirect Measures of Student Learning:**

1. Graduating class survey: A number of questions were asked as part of the survey. However, we focus on one question which is “to what extent did the program you graduated from meet your expectations regarding the objectives of that program.” Students were to answer the question on a 4 point scale with 1 being the lowest and 4 being the highest.
   - **Performance Targets/Criteria for Indirect Measures:**
     - The target was to do as well as or better than the previous year’s score, which was 3.30. If they scored lower, it should be within 5% points, the normal allowance for error. (The second target is being established as the score is already very favorable and it is not logical to keep increasing at these levels.)

2. Noel Levitz Survey: This is a student satisfaction survey that is conducted once in 4 years. The last survey was conducted in 2010 and the one before in 2006. This survey is designed to find the gap
   - **Performance Targets/Criteria for Indirect Measures:**
     - The target was to do as well as or better than the previous year’s score, which was 0.39. If the score is higher, it should be within 5% points, the normal allowance for error.
between student expectations and the actual realization of the various aspects of the University. A score of “0.0” is the ideal and a score of “1.0” or less is acceptable. A score of more than “1.00” should be of concern and a score of “2.00” or more is unacceptable. Of the many questions asked in the survey, this one focused on Instructor effectiveness.

3. Noël Levitz Survey: This question from the survey focused on the University being “student centered” in its operations. The target was to do as well as or better than the previous year’s score, which was 0.14. If the score is higher, it should be within 5% points, the normal allowance for error.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Target Was...</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 20 students took the graduating class survey and the average score on question of focus was 3.46. This is higher than the previous year’s score of 3.30.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A random sample of students in the College of Management were administered the Noël Levitz Survey. Their average score on the Instructor effectiveness was 0.62. This was higher than the previous year’s score of 0.39. As the target was not met, the alternate target was computed to be 59%, which was much more than 5%. Both targets were not met, but the score is definitely in the acceptable range. As a comparison, the national score for this question was 0.94.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. On the Noël Levitz Survey question on “student centeredness”, the average score for the College of Management students was 0.46. This was higher than the previous year’s score of 0.14. As the target was not met, the alternative target computed to be 229%, which is way over the 5% allowance. However, two things need to be mentioned. The previous year’s score was unusually low and the national average for this question is 0.85.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Areas for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:
1. The two targets that were not met were in the Noel Levitz Survey questions. In both cases, the previous year’s score was very, very good and hence it is not unusual that it is not abnormal to be less successful. However, in both questions, the scores were far better than the national averages. Nevertheless, it was decided by the faculty to review and update the student advising a servicing activity. The faculty were also told to look for opportunities to go to workshops to improve their pedagogical skills.

---

### Student Learning Assessment for (MSIS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended Student Learning Outcomes for (MSIS):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The students must understand all the underlying concepts of each of the areas of IT, as represented by the core courses in the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tools for Intended Student Learning Outcomes—Direct Measures of Student Learning:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pre and post tests scores administered to the Data Base class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Targets/Criteria for Direct Measures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either the post test avg score should be 80% or better or the improvement of the post test score over the pre test score should be over 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. Pre and post tests administered to the Analysis & Design class |
| Either the post test avg score should be 80% or better or the improvement of the post test score over the pre test score should be over 50% |

| 3. Pre and post tests administered to the Project Management class |
| Either the post test avg score should be 80% or better or the improvement of the post test score over the pre test score should be over 50% |

| Assessment Tools for Intended Student Learning Outcomes—Indirect Measures of Student Learning: |
| Graduating class survey: A number of questions were asked as part of the survey. However, we focus on one question which is “to what extent did the program you graduated from met your expectations regarding the objectives of that program.” Students were to answer the question on a 4 point scale with 1 being the lowest and 4 being the highest. |
| Performance Targets/Criteria for Indirect Measures: |
| The target was to do as well as or better than the previous year’s score, which was 3.30. If they scored lower, it should be within 5% points, the normal allowance for error. (The second target is being established as the score is already very favorable and it is not logical to keep increasing at these levels.) |
Noel Levitz Survey: This is a student satisfaction survey that is conducted once in 4 years. The last survey was conducted in 2010 and the one before in 2006. This survey is designed to find the gap between student expectations and the actual realization of the various aspects of the University. A score of “0.0” is the ideal and a score of “1.0” or less is acceptable. A score of more than “1.00” should be of concern and a score of “2.00” or more is unacceptable. Of the many questions asked in the survey, this one focused on Instructor effectiveness.

The target was to do as well as or better than the previous year’s score, which was 0.39. If the score is higher, it should be within 5% points, the normal allowance for error.

Noel Levitz Survey: This question from the survey focused on the the University being “student centered” in it’s operations.

The target was to do as well as or better than the previous year’s score, which was 0.14. If the score is higher, it should be within 5% points, the normal allowance for error.

### Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Target Was…</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> For the 19 students that took the tests, the average pre test score was 35% and the average post test score was 60%. Hence the post test average was not 80% or better. However, the improvement was 25/35 = 71%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> For the 18 students that took the tests, the average pre test score was 43.5% and the average post test score was 72.5%. Hence the post test average was not 80% or better. However, the improvement was 29/43.5 = 66.67%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> For the 26 students that took the tests, the average pre test score was 57.75% and the average post test score was 92.2%. Hence the post test average was 80% or better. In addition, the improvement was 34.45/57.75 = 59.5%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Target Was…</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> 20 students took the graduating class survey and the average score on question of focus was 3.46. This is higher than the previous year’s score of 3.30.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> A random sample of students in the College of Management were administered the Noel Levitz Survey. Their average score on the Instructor effectiveness was 0.62. This was higher than the previous year’s score of 0.39. As the target was not met, the alternate target was computed to be 59%, which was much more than 5%. Both targets were not met, but the score is definitely in the acceptable range. As a comparison, the national score for this question was 0.94.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. On the Noel Levitz Survey question on “student centeredness”, the average score for the College of Management students was 0.46. This was higher than the previous year’s score of 0.14. As the target was not met, the alternative target computed to be 229%, which is way over the 5% allowance. However, two things need to be mentioned. The previous year’s score was unusually low and the national average for this question is 0.85.

Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Areas for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:

1. (Indirect measures 2 & 3): The two targets that were not met were in the Noel Levitz Survey questions. In both cases, the previous year’s score was very good, and hence it is not unusual that it is not abnormal to be less successful. However, in both questions, the scores were far better than the national averages. Nevertheless, it was decided by the faculty to review and update the student advising service activity. The faculty were also told to look for opportunities to go to workshops to improve their pedagogical skills.

---

### Student Learning Assessment for (MSOM)

#### Intended Student Learning Outcomes for (MSOM):

1. **Learn the concepts and techniques necessary for successfully managing the operations of industrial and business entities.**

#### Assessment Tools for Intended Student Learning Outcomes—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Measures of Student Learning:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure of learning in the foundation course by administering a pre and post test to the students in that class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure of learning from the capstone course by administering a pre and post test to the students in that class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Performance Targets/Criteria for Direct Measures:

1. The average score in the post test should be 85% or the improvement from the pre test score should be over 50%.
2. The average post test score should be at least 85% or the improvement from the pre test score should be over 50%.

#### Assessment Tools for Intended Student Learning Outcomes—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Measures of Student Learning:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduating class survey: A number of questions were asked as part of the survey. However, we focus on one question which is “to what extent did the program you graduated from meet your expectations regarding the objectives of that program.” Students were to answer the question on a 4 point scale with 1 being the lowest and 4 being the highest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Performance Targets/Criteria for Indirect Measures:

The target was to do as well as or better than the previous year’s score, which was 3.30. If they scored lower, it should be within 5% points, the normal allowance for error. (The second target is being established as the score is already very favorable and it is not logical to keep increasing at these levels.)
2. Noel Levitz Survey: This is a student satisfaction survey that is conducted once in 4 years. The last survey was conducted in 2010 and the one before in 2006. This survey is designed to find the gap between student expectations and the actual realization of the various aspects of the University. A score of “0.0” is the ideal and a score of “1.0” or less is acceptable. A score of more than “1.00” should be of concern and a score of “2.00” or more is unacceptable. Of the many questions asked in the survey, this one focused on Instructor effectiveness.

The target was to do as well as or better than the previous year’s score, which was 0.39. If the score is higher, it should be within 5% points, the normal allowance for error.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:</th>
<th>Performance Target Was...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The average test scores for the pre and post tests were 74.5% and 87.2%, respectively. The average post test scores exceeded the target 85%. Since the pre test average was 74.5%, the improvement was only 17%. However, the target was met because of the high average post test score.</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The average score of the pre and post tests were 85% and 93.5%, respectively. The target was met with the average pre test score in addition to the average post test score. Since the average pre test score was high, the improvement over that was only 10%.</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Noel Levitz Survey: This question from the survey focused on the University being “student centered” in its operations.

The target was to do as well as or better than the previous year’s score, which was 0.14. If the score is higher, it should be within 5% points, the normal allowance for error.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:</th>
<th>Performance Target Was...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 20 students took the graduating class survey and the average score on question of focus was 3.46. This is higher than the previous year’s score of 3.30.</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A random sample of students in the College of Management were administered the Noel Levitz Survey. Their average score on the Instructor effectiveness was 0.62. This was higher than the previous year’s score of 0.39. As the target was not met, the alternate target was computed to be 59%, which was much more than 5%. Both targets were not met, but the score is definitely in the acceptable range. As a comparison, the national score for this question was 0.94.</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. On the Noel Levitz Survey question on “student centeredness”, the average score for the College of Management</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
students was 0.46. This was higher than the previous year’s score of 0.14. As the target was not met, the alternative target computed to be 229%, which is way over the 5% allowance. However, two things need to be mentioned. The previous year’s score was unusually low and the national average for this question is 0.85.

Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Areas for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:

1. *(Indirect measures 2 & 3): The two targets that were not met were in the Noel Levitz Survey questions. In both cases, the previous year’s score was very, very good and hence it is not unusual that it is not abnormal to be less successful. However, in both questions, the scores were far better the national averages. Nevertheless, it was decided by the faculty to review and update the student advising a servicing activity. The faculty were also told to look for opportunities to go to workshops to improve their pedagogical skills.*