

AOL Report Management Engineering Program Assessment (2017)

The Management Engineering (ME) Program pursues excellence in academic research based on great emphasis on scientific methodology and theoretical expertise.

The research areas include Accounting, Managerial Economics, Finance, Organization & Strategic Management, Marketing, IT Management, and Operations Strategy & Management Science. Students in this program intensively learn various theories and analytical skills to be highly achieved scholars.

- Total Course: 50 (Spring, 2016:29 / Fall, 2016:21)
- Number of Graduate: 56 (Master: 36, Ph.D.: 20)
- Total Enrollment: Spring 152/ Fall 237 (Master: 79/73, Ph.D.: 123/114)
- Sample: 5~32 (15% of 56 = 8)
- Assessment Course:

Learning Goal 1	Qualification Exam - Sample: 5 (9% of Graduate 56)
Learning Goal 2	Defense of Dissertation
Learning Goal 3	- Sample: 32 (57 % of Graduate 56)
Learning Goal 4	BA554 marketing Channels Management BA561 IT Management - Sample: 8 (14% of Graduate 56)

Overview of Assessment

Management Engineering Program Assessment: Learning Goal 1		
Our graduates will have skills (or ability) to conduct quality research.		
Learning Objective	Sample	Methods
(L11) Graduate will have basic quantitative skills for research. (L12) Graduate will have basic theory, analytical research tools , and background about their research area.	Qualification Exam in Fall Semester (N= 5)	- Qualification Exam evaluation
<p>- Professor in charge evaluates doctoral students who took qualification exam.</p> <p>* 1 (Fails to Meet Expectations) 2 (Meets Expectations) 3 (Exceed Expectation)</p>		

Management Engineering Program Assessment: Learning Goal 2		
Our graduates will be effective professional communicators.		
Learning Objective	Sample	Methods
(L21) Our student will create well-written professional papers on a research topic. (L22) Our students will deliver an effective oral presentation on a research topic.	Defense of Dissertation in Fall Semester (N= 32)	- Dissertation evaluation
<p>- Uses dissertation evaluation in defenses of dissertation.</p> <p>* 1 (Fails to Meet Expectations) 2 (Meets Expectations) 3 (Exceed Expectation)</p>		

Management Engineering Program Assessment: Learning Goal 3		
Learning Goal Our graduates will be capable researchers.		
Learning Objective	Sample	Methods
1. Our student will identify and diagnose management/research problems. (L31) 2. Our students will engage in management research and present the findings of such research effectively. (L32)	Defense of Dissertation in Fall Semester (N= 32)	- Dissertation evaluation
- Uses dissertation evaluation in defenses of dissertation * 1 (Fails to Meet Expectations) 2 (Meets Expectations) 3 (Exceed Expectation)		

Management Engineering Program Assessment: Learning Goal 4		
Our graduates will use team building successfully.		
Learning Objective	Sample	Methods
(L41) Our students will know how to build an academic team successfully.	Student enrolled in BA561 or BA554 (N=8)	- Course-embedded survey (peer evaluation)
- Using Course-embedded survey in BA 561 and BA554 for peer review among team * 1 (Fails to Meet Expectations) 2 (Meets Expectations) 3 (Exceed Expectation)		

Data Analysis and Results

Assessment Learning Goal 1: Qualification Exam									
Professor in charge evaluates the 1 st year doctoral students									
Student Number	L11					L12			
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3
2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
4	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
5	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3
3 point total	4	5	2	5	5	5	5	3	5
2 point total	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	0
1 point total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	2.80	3.00	2.40	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.60	3.00

* Criteria: 1 (Fails to Meet Expectations) 2 (Meets Expectations) 3 (Exceeds Expectations)

Assessment Learning Goal 2: Defense of Dissertation

Committee member evaluates the master or doctoral students

Student Number	L21						L22						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	2
2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3
4	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3
5	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
6	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3
7	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3
8	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3
9	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
10	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3
11	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3
12	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3
13	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	3
14	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
15	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	3
16	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	3
17	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	3
18	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
19	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3
20	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3
21	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	2
22	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3
23	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
24	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
25	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3
26	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2
27	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
28	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
29	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2
30	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2
31	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
32	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3

3 point total	29	19	24	28	29	29	25	25	20	24	27	14	25
2 point total	3	13	8	4	3	3	7	6	12	7	5	17	7
1 point total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Mean	2.91	2.59	2.75	2.88	2.91	2.91	2.78	2.75	2.63	2.72	2.84	2.41	2.78

* Criteria: 1 (Fails to Meet Expectations) 2 (Meets Expectations) 3 (Exceeds Expectations)

Assessment Learning Goal 3: Defense of Dissertation												
Committee member evaluates the master or doctoral students												
Student Number	L31							L32				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	3
3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
4	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
5	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2
6	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
7	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
8	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
9	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
11	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
12	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	3
13	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3
14	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
15	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3
16	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3
17	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	2	2	3
18	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	3
19	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
20	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3
21	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2
22	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	2

23	3	3	3	3	3	3	3					
24	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
25	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
26	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
27	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
28	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
29	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
30	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
31	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3
32	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
3 point total	29	18	27	23	26	24	29	28	26	23	22	26
2 point total	3	14	5	9	6	8	3	3	5	8	9	5
1 point total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	2.91	2.56	2.84	2.72	2.81	2.75	2.91	2.90	2.84	2.74	2.71	2.84

* Criteria: 1 (Fails to Meet Expectations) 2 (Meets Expectations) 3 (Exceeds Expectations)

Assessment Learning Goal 4: BA 561 and BA 554				
Using course-embedded survey (peer evaluation)				
Student Number	L41			
	1	2	3	4
1	3	3	3	3
2	2	3	2	2
3	3	2	3	2
4	3	3	3	3
5	3	3	3	3
6	2	3	3	3
7	2	2	2	2
8	3	3	3	3
3 point total	4	5	5	4
2 point total	3	2	2	3
1 point total	0	0	0	0
Mean	2.57	2.71	2.71	2.57

* Criteria: 1 (Fails to Meet Expectations) 2 (Meets Expectations) 3 (Exceeds Expectations)

Result Interpretation and Comments

- Learning Goal 1 – Objective 1 (L11)

An overall score for L11 is 2.84. The results imply that the graduates have enough quantitative skills for their research. In particular, the average score for ‘Identification of research problems’, ‘Application of quantitative tools’ and ‘Consistent conclusions’ are 3.00. The graduates develop a well-integrated statement of their research issues, and show strong understanding of application of quantitative techniques. In addition, they can suggest consistent conclusions based on strong analysis. Generally, average scores went up compared to the last year. More emphasis on literature search skill to find reliable information is needed.

- Learning Goal 1 – Objective 2 (L12)

An overall score is 2.90 for L12. The results imply that the graduates have enough knowledge about their research areas, theories and research tools. In particular, all the average score is 3.00 except for “Proper use of effective research tools”. It shows the graduates well understand most aspects of basic theory, and employ the theory to support research arguments. In contrast, the average score for ‘Proper use of research tools’ is 2.60. Although it is still a high score, it is the lowest one among other criteria. Therefore, the college also needs to put more emphasis on how to use research tools.

- Learning Goal 2 – Objective 1 (L21)

An overall score is 2.82 for L21. The results imply that the graduates are able to write well-written professional papers. In particular, average score for ‘Logic & Organization’, ‘Purpose and Audience’ and ‘Format’ are 2.91. It shows our graduates can propose their ideas clearly with well-organized format. However, average score for ‘Language’ is 2.59. The score on ‘Spelling and grammar’ was very low for five consecutive years. It suggests that more education on English skill is required.

- Learning Goal 2 – Objective 2 (L22)

An Overall score is 2.70 for L22. The results imply that the graduates can deliver an effective oral presentation. The average score for ‘Professionalism’ is 2.84. It shows the graduates dress as a working professional with high quality, style. However, the average score for ‘Use of media/rapport with audience’ is 2.41 the lowest. It strongly recommend that more education on effective slides and speech.

- Learning Goal 3 – Objective 1 (L31)

An overall score is 2.79 for L31. The results imply that our students can diagnose research problems effectively. In particular, average score for ‘Identify research issues’ and ‘Ethical

solutions' is 2.91. The results show that the college's effort to emphasize, "Asking the right question" was successful. However, in terms 'Identifying alternative options', our graduates show relatively poor score 2.56. Hence, more activities to enhance creativity are required.

- Learning Goal 3 – Objective 2 (L32)

An overall score is 2.81 for L32. The results imply that our students can approach research problem in a proper way. Every criterion scored higher than 2.71, which is quite impressive. Above all, "Preparation fact finding" shows best score 2.90, which imply the graduates' research go beyond "literal" categories.

- Learning Goal 4 – Objective 1 (L41)

Overall score for L41 is 2.64. Evaluation on L4 was based on a peer review. The highest average score are 2.71 for 'Balance between task and relations' and 'Contributions', while the lowest are 2.14 for 'Commitment' and 'Stays on track'. The result shows the students open their information freely to their colleagues with good relation.

- Overall Comments

In general, most of the graduate achieved more than the college expected. Their understanding of theories, ethics, and presentation skills was distinctive. In addition, the college needs to improve on several aspects such as English skills or speech. In general, most scores had slightly gone up compared to the last year. More effort such as additional courses and feedback system to improve graduates' qualities is required, such as creativity.