

Assurance of Student Learning Reflection 2024-2025	
CEBS	SLPS
Workforce Administration- 739	
Dr. Said Ghezal	
Is this an online program? ☐ Yes ☒ No	Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf. Indicate verification here ☐ Yes, they match! (If they don't match, explain on this page under Evaluation)

Instructions: For the 2024-25 assessment, we are asking you to reflect on the last three-year cycle rather than collect data. It's important to take time to look over the results from the last assessment cycle and really focus on a data-informed direction going forward. In collaboration with your assessment team and program faculty, review each submitted template from 2021-2024 and consider the following for each Program Learning Outcome, add your narrative to the template, and submit the draft to your **ASL Rep** by **May 15, 2025**.

Program Student Learning Outcome 1	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Add the Program Student Learning Outcome from CourseLeaf HERE Students will demonstrate foundational knowledge in business management.
Evaluation	Using the last three assessment cycles, is this program learning outcome still relevant, or should it be changed? If it has recently changed, please explain. Other things to examine: Is the outcome measurable? Is it double or triple barreled? Does it include measurable verbs following Bloom's Taxonomy? Do you have the appropriate numbers of SLOs to measure regularly? Please consider choosing the most important. The CourseLeaf has no SLOs listed. Yes, the SLO is still relevant. The program is an applied supervision program. Students are expected to graduate with working knowledge on supervision and applied business management skills. The measure is clear and focuses on the basic supervisory skills. It includes 'demonstrate' as a measurable verb following Bloom's Taxonomy.
Measurement Instruments	Are the measurement instruments actually measuring the outcome? If you change the SLO, is this still the best instrument to use? Is this a direct or indirect measure? Is your artifact appropriate? If not, what other options are there? Will the rise in the use of AI affect the assignment and measurement? If there are rubrics, do they need to be altered to better fit the learning outcome? Does the rubric (if using) work or does it need to be adjusted? The WFA 300 course project allows students to demonstrate their understanding of the planning process as a fundamental managerial skill. Yes, the instrument measures students knowledge of planning for business activities. It is a direct measure that is appropriate for this SLO. It provides students with an exercise to apply theories and analyze data. In addition, by planning for a business activity, students must use critical thinking and problem-solving skills. The project was designed to specifically assess students knowledge of the planning process from a managerial standpoint. We believe that the use of AI by students, for this type of assignment, may affect the measurement. The assignment is evaluated using a rubric, which might need to be adjusted if criteria for success are changed.

Criteria & Targets	Does Criteria for Success (level of performance students will have achieved for your program to have been successful--ex., students will have earned 4/5 for documentation and citation on capstone essays) need to be changed? What about targets? If you have successfully made your targets consistently, consider a more challenging target. The criteria for success were set to a pass rate of 70% of the sample on the course project and 70% pass rate on each dimension of the rubric. We don't see any reason for changing neither the criteria nor the target unless we suspect any use of AI. In that case, we will need to modify both the instrument and rubric. We will, for example, focus the rubric's dimensions on the process and not only the product itself. We can also require students to provide a short statement on their use of AI while developing their paper.
Results & Conclusion	<u>Results:</u> Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle over the past three years? Explain The results were as expected. Students were able to articulate key steps to hypothetical supervisory scenarios, and use relevant planning frameworks and models. <u>Conclusions:</u> What worked? What didn't? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool. We believe the assigned course work (readings, weekly discussions, quizzes, and the short weekly written assignments) provided students with activities that helped them absorb the material and learn how to apply it. The learning activities were designed to directly support the SLO. These activities provided a context for students to interact with the readings, with each other, and with the instructor. We believe the course structure and delivery worked because students, in general, showed they can develop well-organized business plans that demonstrate both conceptual knowledge and practical execution.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a three-year plan for the following assessment cycle (2025-26, 2026-27, 2027-28) – this process assists in “closing the loop.” For example, you may decide to: • collect a more appropriate artifact • create new program outcomes • adjust targets because they are consistently exceeded or not met • need to reconstruct your curriculum map • sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided Whatever your plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. You will be expected to implement any needed changes before the next assessment cycle. For the next assessment cycle, we will collect data from a sample of 30% of the course paper of those who take WFA 300 and enroll in the WFA program. We will keep the same criteria for success and targets. We will, however, keep watching for any potential use for AI as any use of AI aids by students may trigger the need for modifications of the criteria and targets.

Program Student Learning Outcome 2	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Add the Program Student Learning Outcome from CourseLeaf HERE Student will demonstrate competency in building and sustaining strong business reputation.
Evaluation	Using the last three assessment cycles, is this program learning outcome still relevant, or should it be changed? Other things to examine: Is the outcome measurable? Is it double or triple barreled? Does it include measurable verbs following Bloom's Taxonomy? There is no listing of SLOs on CourseLeaf. Yes, the SLO is still relevant. The building and sustaining of business reputation is crucial in the business environment. It impacts the success of any business organization. And as managers and supervisors shape both the internal culture and external perception of their organizations, being able to build and sustain a positive reputation of their businesses is a core capability they need to be developed. The SLO can be perceived as a double barreled outcome. However, the building of a good business reputation and sustaining it are two complementary skills that must be developed together. In other words, the ability to build and the discipline to sustain a strong business reputation are inseparable and equally important. The SLO is measurable and uses 'demonstrate' as a measurable verb.
Measurement Instruments	Are the measurement instruments actually measuring the outcome? If you change the SLO, is this still the best instrument to use? Is this a direct or indirect measure? Is your artifact appropriate? If not, what other options are there? Will the rise in the use of AI affect the assignment and measurement? If there are rubrics, do they need to be altered to better fit the learning outcome? Does the rubric (if using) work or does it need to be adjusted? Yes, the instrument prompts students to demonstrate their understanding of customer relationships as a key concept of building and maintaining positive business reputation. If the SLO were to be changed with no mention to customer relationships and/or business image, the instrument would not be valid anymore. The instrument is a direct measure that is appropriate for this SLO. It was designed to assess students' understanding of the broad concept of customer relationships. The measurement instrument consisted of developing a survey instrument for customers' feedback that would measure customer satisfaction. Students were instructed to develop survey items that reflect their understanding of the process of building lasting customer relationships. The use of AI will definitely affect the measurement. The assessment of the artifact is based on a rubric, which would need adjustment and modifications if AI were to be used by students as an aid for working on their assignment.
Criteria & Targets	Does Criteria for Success (level of performance students will have achieved for your program to have been successful (ex., students will have earned 4/5 for documentation and citation on capstone essays) need to be changed? What about targets? The criteria for success and targets were to have a pass rate of 70% of the sample on the course project and 70% pass rate on each dimension of the rubric. We believe the fair performance of students does not warrant any change of the criteria for success. However, we plan on reinforcing learning by assigning more activities geared towards the applications of the concepts thereby increasing the success rate.
Results & Conclusion	<u>Results</u> : Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle over the past three years? Explain Yes, the results were as expected. Students demonstrated an ability to use industry vocabulary and real-world examples to support their understanding. They could differentiate between poor and excellent service behavior. <u>Conclusions</u> : What worked? What didn't? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology

	(detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool. We believe what worked well for students is the design of the weekly learning activities that culminated in a final project. Students progressively built on their weekly learning activities to produce a well-developed final project. Through consistent engagement with weekly tasks, they were able to lay the foundations for a good culminating project. Students were instructed to develop survey instrument designed to measure customer service with survey items that reflect their understanding of the process of building lasting customer relationships. In addition, they were requested to write a reflection narrative explaining their approach to developing the survey instrument. Students often expressed their satisfaction with going through the concepts by discussing them as a class on a weekly basis and applying those same concepts to weekly case studies. This approach helped them work on the survey by developing items that addressed all concepts learned from the course materials. We think that's what worked well because of students testimonies and also their performance. The surveys they developed covered a wide range of customer service concepts.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a three-year plan for the following assessment cycle (2025-26, 2026-27, 2027-28) – this process assists in “closing the loop.” For example, you may decide to: • collect a more appropriate artifact • create new program outcomes • adjust targets because they are consistently exceeded or not met • need to reconstruct your curriculum map • sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided Whatever your plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. You will be expected to implement any needed changes before the next assessment cycle. For the next assessment period, we will continue to collect data from a sample of 30% of students' surveys. We will keep the criteria for success unchanged but will include, as weekly assignments, self-assessments, reflections, and peer reviews to help students build and increase their awareness on how they learn and think. We will collect data from a sample of students enrolled in both the course (WFA 347) and the WFA program.

Program Student Learning Outcome 3	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Add the Program Student Learning Outcome from CourseLeaf HERE Students will demonstrate competency in problem-solving skills and decision-making.
Evaluation	Using the last three assessment cycles, is this program learning outcome still relevant, or should it be changed? Other things to examine: Is the outcome measurable? Is it double or triple barreled? Does it include measurable verbs following Bloom's Taxonomy? There is no listing of SLOs on CourseLeaf. Yes, the SLO is still relevant. Business environments require constant problem-solving and decision-making from operational issues to strategic decisions. When equipped with strong problem-solving and decision-making skills, business professionals, who constantly face

	complex challenges, reduce and/or mitigate well costly mistakes and adapt quickly to changes in the environment. The SLO is measurable including ‘demonstrate’ as a measurable verb following Bloom’s Taxonomy. It is a double barreled SLO; however, problem-solving and decision-making skills go hand and hand and are interdependant steps in addressing business challenges effectively. Thus, the need for them to appear in the same SLO.
Measurement Instruments	Are the measurement instruments actually measuring the outcome? If you change the SLO, is this still the best instrument to use? Is this a direct or indirect measure? Is your artifact appropriate? If not, what other options are there? Will the rise in the use of AI affect the assignment and measurement? If there are rubrics, do they need to be altered to better fit the learning outcome? Does the rubric (if using) work or does it need to be adjusted? The measurement instrument requires students to use a problem-solving model to decide about a business challenge. It is a direct measure developed to assess how students can move from identifying a problem to making a well-informed and justifiable decision using a problem-solving model. The measure provides a clear insight into skill mastery. If we changed the SLO, the instrument would change as well. It was developed specifically for this SLO. With the rise of AI use, we believe that both the assignment and measurement might need modifications or adjustments depending on how AI is going to be used and to what extent. The measure is assessed using a rubric, which might need adjustment as well should students use AI as an assignment aid to generate content or structure the assignment.
Criteria & Targets	Does Criteria for Success (level of performance students will have achieved for your program to have been successful (ex., students will have earned 4/5 for documentation and citation on capstone essays) need to be changed? What about targets? The criteria for success were set at a pass rate of 70% of the sample on the collected artifact and 70% pass rate on each dimension of the rubric. At this time we don’t see any reason for changing the criteria for success or targets as evidence from student performance does not show a large majority exceeding expectations. Conversely, we don’t see many students fail.
Results & Conclusion	<u>Results:</u> Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle over the past three years? Explain Yes, the results met our expectations. Students, in general, accurately identified core issues, and demonstrated an ability to define the problem, including relevant constraints and stakeholders. They often developed clear and focused problem statements. They also showed competency in using problem-solving models and apply the steps to arrive to well-reasoned and realistic decisions. <u>Conclusions:</u> What worked? What didn’t? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool. The instrument is about problem-solving and decision-making in a project management environment. Students are exposed during the term to the process from a request for a proposal to winning a bid to delivering the project. The final project that measures the learning outcome is broken down into weekly projects with goals of using tools that keep a project on track, planning for resources, assessing risk, and making informed decisions. The approach of breaking the final project into weekly small projects worked well with students for this type of assignments because it supported learning through scaffolding, and manageable workload. It allowed them to focus on a few skills at a time, and reinforced practice as they submit weekly.

	What did not work well, however, is time management and accountability. Students struggled with deadlines each week as they had to submit weekly deliveries although it helped them stay engaged. We think the structure of the course and assignments worked because students showed consistent indicators of growth, application, and confidence. Their performance kept improving each weekly submission.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a three-year plan for the following assessment cycle (2025-26, 2026-27, 2027-28) – this process assists in “closing the loop.” For example, you may decide to: • collect a more appropriate artifact • create new program outcomes • adjust targets because they are consistently exceeded or not met • need to reconstruct your curriculum map • sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided Whatever your plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. You will be expected to implement any needed changes before the next assessment cycle. For the next assessment period, we will continue to use the same measure and collect data the same way we've done it for this cycle from a sample of students who enrolled in both the course (WFA 443) and the WFA program. We will, however, include time management in the rubric to help students address their struggle with timely submissions and deadlines.

To add more outcomes, if needed, select the table above and copy & paste below.