I. Drawing upon the goals and objectives contained in the department/program student learning assessment plan, what was the focus of the department’s student learning assessment for the past academic year?

The Marketing Department has two undergraduate programs: a General Marketing program and an Integrated Marketing Communications program. Assessment efforts were undertaken for each program during the past year.

The General Marketing program has two goals, each with corresponding student learning outcomes. They are:

Goal 1: Understand the role and practice of marketing within an organization including theoretical and applied aspects of the marketing discipline.

Learning Outcomes:
- Ability to demonstrate an understanding of key concepts such as market segmentation, targeting, positioning, and branding; and the role of product/service planning, pricing, distribution, and promotion in the marketing process.
- Ability to demonstrate an understanding of how marketing decisions are influenced by various forces in the external business environment as well as significant trends and developments affecting current and future marketing practices.

Goal 2: Understand how to develop and evaluate strategic and tactical marketing plans and programs and assess marketing performance.

Learning Outcomes:
- Ability to demonstrate a proficiency in the development of marketing strategies and plans that include various elements of the marketing mix.
- Ability to demonstrate a proficiency in the analysis of marketing strategies and plans that include various elements of the marketing mix.
- Ability to demonstrate a proficiency in analyzing markets and customers utilizing secondary sources of information.
- Ability to demonstrate a proficiency in analyzing markets and customers utilizing primary sources of information.

Both of these goals were assessed in the past year. The department focused on Goal #1 during Spring 2006 and Goal #2 during Fall 2006.

The Integrated Marketing Communications program is relatively new (begun in 2002-2003). Prior to the past academic year there has not been a separate
assessment effort mounted for this program. In the past year however, the focus of assessment efforts for the IMC program has been the determination of program goals and student learning outcomes.

II. What information was collected, how much, and by whom?

Methodology varied across the two goals assessed for the Marketing major and for the IMC program. Each of the three is discussed in this section.

Marketing Major – Goal #1 (and two corresponding student learning outcomes)
This goal covers nine content areas in marketing that students should demonstrate understanding of. The department uses a multiple choice question pool containing items addressing each of these content areas. The question pool was created in Summer 2004 by assigning departmental faculty members to the content areas based on their expertise and asking them to provide at least ten questions on the subject. The resulting 120 question pool has been modified/improved once since that time based on analysis of the questions. To assess Goal #1, a quota sample of items (to ensure coverage of all 9 content areas) is drawn. Using this method a 40 item multiple choice exam is administered in all sections of MKT 479, the capstone course for marketing majors. The exam has been administered three times, most recently in Spring 2006. In Spring 2006 70 students took the exam, this represented 81.4% of all students registered in the capstone course.

Marketing Major – Goal #2 (and four corresponding student learning outcomes)
This goal was assessed in Fall 2006 using two comprehensive case analyses (Golf Logix and Frito-Lay) that were assigned to students in MKT 479, the capstone course for marketing majors.
• SLO #1 was assessed using the response to one specific question from the Golf Logix case which required students to develop a distribution strategy (part of a marketing strategy).
• SLO #2 was assessed using the response to a specific question from the Golf Logix case that required students to analyze the firm’s marketing strategy (in this case with specific attention to distribution strategy).
• SLO #3 was assessed using a holistic evaluation of the Golf Logix case which provided significant information from secondary sources.
• SLO #4 was assessed using a holistic evaluation of the Frito-Lay case which provided significant information from primary sources.

Individual rubrics were developed for the assessment of each of the four student learning outcomes. These rubrics are attached in Appendix I of this report. A sample of student case analyses were drawn to be used in the Goal #2 assessment. For the Golf Logix case, 26 papers were randomly drawn from a pool of 61 cases (42.6%). For the Frito-Lay case, 6 cases were randomly
drawn from a pool of 31 cases (19.4%). Two independent raters assessed the sample of cases using the appropriate rubrics.

**IMC Program**
Since the IMC program is new to assessment as a stand alone program, emphasis in the past year (as noted in Part I of this report) has been on the development of program goals and student learning outcomes. The IMC Advisory Board met to discuss and establish goals and SLOs for the program. Since IMC is a specialization within the broader Marketing program it was determined that the goals and student learning outcomes for the General Marketing program were also goals and student learning outcomes for the IMC program. It was determined, however, that the IMC program has two additional goals (and corresponding student learning outcomes). These are:

**Goal 3: Understand the role of and practice of integrated marketing communications including theoretical and applied aspects.**

Learning Outcomes:
- Ability to demonstrate an understanding of how IMC decisions are influenced by internal and external environmental factors.
- Ability to demonstrate an understanding of the role of IMC in the overall marketing communication communications program.

**Goal 4: Understand how to develop and evaluate strategic and tactical IMC plans and programs and assess communications effectiveness.**

Learning Outcomes:
- Ability to demonstrate a proficiency in the development and analysis of IMC strategies and plans that include various elements of the promotional mix including advertising, public relations, sales promotion, direct marketing, and the Internet and interactive media.
- Ability to demonstrate a proficiency in developing an integrated marketing communications plan.

**III. What conclusions were drawn on the basis of the information collected?**

**Marketing Major – Goal #1**
The results of the multiple choice test administered to assess this goal are found in Appendix II. The appendix provides results from all three administrations of the exam for comparative purposes. Average performance in Spring 2006 was 64.6%, an increase of 1.9 percentage points from the previous two times the test was given. Using the standard of 60% to indicate an adequate level of performance in each of the content areas, the Spring 2006 administration indicated that students met the learning outcomes for seven of the nine areas. This is an improvement from six of nine in Spring 2005 and five of nine in Fall 2004. In Spring 2006 students did not demonstrate ability to adequately meet the objectives in Pricing and Distribution. These two
content areas were also problems in the two previous administrations of the exam. With the beginnings of a set of longitudinal data, the Marketing department has concluded that these two content areas (Pricing and Distribution) are the weakest areas in the program from the standpoint of student learning.

**Marketing Major – Goal #2**

Using the 4 point rubrics provided in Appendix I to this report, it was determined that a score of 3 or above would be deemed acceptable. Further, if 70% of the cases assessed were deemed acceptable it would be concluded that the program was achieving the second goal and its corresponding learning outcomes.

- SLO #1: A total of 88% of the cases rated scored a “3” or “4” on this student learning outcome. It was therefore concluded that students were demonstrating fairly strong learning in the area of marketing strategy development.
- SLO #2: A total of 38.5% of the cases rated scored a “3” or “4” on this student learning outcome. Conclusion: very weak performance – the students are not able to demonstrate adequate learning in the area of marketing strategy analysis.
- SLO #3: A total of 77.4% of the cases rated scored a “3” or “4” on this student learning outcome. It was concluded that students were demonstrating adequate learning in the area of analysis using secondary sources.
- SLO #4: A total of 50% of the cases rated scored a “3” or “4” on this student learning outcome. Conclusion: weak performance – the students are not able to demonstrate adequate learning in the area of analysis using primary sources.

The general conclusion drawn from assessment of Goal #2 is that the program is not providing adequately for student learning in the areas of the following two student learning outcomes:

- Ability to demonstrate a proficiency in the analysis of marketing strategies and plans that include various elements of the marketing mix.
- Ability to demonstrate a proficiency in analyzing markets and customers utilizing primary sources of information.

It is interesting to note that the case used did not assess all of the various elements of the marketing mix but rather specifically the distribution element of the marketing mix. Since students showed weak ability to analyze strategies and plans for distribution, this finding is consistent with the findings related to Goal #1 – that distribution is one of our weakest program areas. It should be noted however, that students did demonstrate relatively strong ability to develop distribution strategies. It will be important in the future assessment efforts related to Goal #2 to be sure that other areas of the marketing mix are
considered in addition to distribution. The need to do this will be incorporated into case study choices for assessment as we move forward.

IMC Program
The IMC program assessment effort is in its infancy and a complete assessment plan is still being developed. This process is to be undertaken during the 2007 calendar year and will include a methodology for measuring Goals #3 and #4 and a timeline for measurement/data collection. Immediately, however, the IMC program will be included in data collection for the two goals it has identified as having in common with the General Marketing program. It is hoped that if all goes according to plan, the first data collection effort for IMC program assessment of its two unique and additional goals will take place during the 2007-2008 academic year.

IV. How will the information be used to inform decision-making, planning, and improvement?

Marketing Major – Goal #1
The Marketing department faculty has discussed the results of the Spring 2006 administration of the assessment exam as well as the implications suggested by the three exam administrations that have been undertaken to date. Clearly the content areas of pricing and distribution present significant challenges to our students and hence program alterations to provide more coverage and greater depth in these two areas are suggested by the data. Unfortunately, existing resources in the department do not allow for the development of new, stand alone courses in each of these content areas. The department, therefore, has concluded that the best strategy for strengthening these two areas among our students is to have faculty devote more attention to the topics in various existing courses that lend themselves to coverage of the topical areas. Readings, exercises, and case studies should be assigned that focus on distribution and pricing. Greater in-class time (in terms of lectures) should be spent on distribution and pricing. The specific marketing courses where these recommendations could be implemented are:

• MKT 370 (Introduction to Marketing)
• MKT 371 (Consumer and Buyer Behavior)
• MKT 372 (Retail Marketing Methods)
• MKT 376 (Global Marketing Strategy)
• MKT 474 (Business Marketing)
• MKT 475 (Global Marketing Applications)
• MKT 479 (Strategic Marketing Management)

This strategy has begun to be implemented to some extent. Please note reference to the Golf Logix case used in the Marketing major Goal #2 assessment effort. This case study places special focus on distribution decisions.

Marketing Major – Goal #2
The marketing department has discussed the results of the first-ever assessment efforts for Goal #2. While pleased with the findings regarding our students’ abilities to develop marketing mix (in this case, distribution) strategies and analyze using secondary sources the department was disappointed in the demonstrated abilities in the areas of marketing mix analysis and analysis using primary sources. While these skills should arguably be learned and strengthened over the course of a student’s entire program, there are two primary courses that seek to teach the skills:

- MKT 479 (Strategic Marketing Management) is the capstone course in the major and its primary objective is to build strong analysis skills in our students.
- MKT 470 (Marketing Research) is a required course in the major and its primary objective is to build strong skills in the area of acquisition and analysis of information derived from primary sources.

The department has agreed that additional assessment of these two student learning outcomes is important before any definitive conclusions can be drawn (since this was the first attempt to assess these SLOs) however it also feels that it is appropriate to put greater emphasis on the skills noted in the two required courses mentioned above. Specifically, Marketing Research instructors will be asked to be certain that they balance their course adequately between teaching research acquisition skills and research analysis skills. Likewise, Strategic Marketing Management instructors will be asked to put stronger emphasis on strategy analysis skills through the use of additional case studies that focus on this area. Further, Strategic Marketing Management instructors are encouraged to add some lecture material on analysis.
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Appendix I

Rubrics for Assessing Marketing Major Goal #2

Student Learning Outcome #1:
An ability to demonstrate a proficiency in the development of marketing strategies and plans that include various elements of the marketing mix.

GOLF LOGIX CASE STUDY QUESTION:
If you were to go retail with the Golf Logix system, what channel of distribution would you pursue?

4 – Demonstrates strong proficiency in the development of strategies and plans with regard to the distribution element of the marketing mix. Strategy related to distribution channel clearly demonstrates an understanding of distribution theory.

3 – Demonstrates some proficiency in the development of strategies and plans with regard to the distribution element of the marketing mix. Strategy related to distribution channel demonstrates some understanding of distribution theory.

2 – Demonstrates weak proficiency in the development of strategies and plans with regard to the distribution element of the marketing mix. Strategy related to distribution channel demonstrates relatively little understanding of distribution theory.

1 – Demonstrates virtually no proficiency in the development of strategies and plans with regard to the distribution element of the marketing mix. Strategy related to distribution channel demonstrates no understanding of distribution theory.

Student Learning Outcome #2:
An ability to demonstrate a proficiency in the analysis of marketing strategies and plans that include various elements of the marketing mix.

GOLF LOGIX CASE STUDY QUESTION:
Why is the successful lease-in of the complete system such an important element of the Golf Logix business model? What information, however, suggests that it will be much more difficult to sell players on this system relative to the distance only system?

4 – Demonstrates strong proficiency in the analysis of marketing strategies and plans. Analysis demonstrates significant insight regarding appropriate marketing strategy.

3 – Demonstrates some proficiency in the analysis of strategies and plans. Analysis demonstrates some insight regarding appropriate marketing strategy.

2 – Demonstrates weak proficiency in the analysis of strategies and plans. Analysis demonstrates limited insight regarding appropriate marketing strategy.

1 – Demonstrates virtually no proficiency in the analysis of strategies and plans. Analysis demonstrates very limited or no insight regarding appropriate marketing strategy.
Student Learning Outcome #3:
An ability to demonstrate a proficiency in analyzing markets and customers utilizing secondary sources of information.

GOLF LOGIX CASE STUDY:
Holistic assessment of performance on the Golf Logix case study.

4 – Demonstrates strong proficiency in analyzing markets and customers using the secondary sources of information provided in the case. Consistently uses appropriate information for analysis. Demonstrates clear and appropriate application of chosen information sources to decision making.

3 – Demonstrates some proficiency in analyzing markets and customers using the secondary sources of information provided in the case. Use of most of the appropriate information for analysis. Demonstrates generally clear and appropriate application of chosen information sources to decision making.

2 – Demonstrates weak proficiency in analyzing markets and customers using the secondary sources provided in the case. Misses/does not use most of the appropriate information for analysis. Demonstrates weak application of information sources to decision making.

1 – Demonstrates virtually no proficiency in analyzing markets and customers using the secondary sources of information provided in the case. Uses little, if any, of the appropriate information for analysis. Demonstrates very weak or no application of information sources to decision making.

Student Learning Outcome #4:
An ability to demonstrate a proficiency in analyzing markets and customers utilizing primary sources of information.

FRITO-LAY CASE STUDY:
Holistic assessment of performance on the Frito-Lay case study.

4 – Demonstrates strong proficiency in analyzing markets and customers using the primary sources of information provided in the case. Consistently uses appropriate information for analysis. Demonstrates clear and appropriate application of chosen information sources to decision making.

3 – Demonstrates some proficiency in analyzing markets and customers using the primary sources of information provided in the case. Use of most of the appropriate information for analysis. Demonstrates generally clear and appropriate application of chosen information sources to decision making.

2 – Demonstrates weak proficiency in analyzing markets and customers using the primary sources provided in the case. Misses/does not use most of the appropriate information for analysis. Demonstrates weak application of information sources to decision making.

1 – Demonstrates virtually no proficiency in analyzing markets and customers using the primary sources of information provided in the case. Uses little, if any, of the appropriate information for analysis. Demonstrates very weak or no application of information sources to decision making.
Appendix II
Results for Assessing Marketing Major Goal #1

MARKETING MAJOR ASSESSMENT EXAM PERFORMANCE
40 Multiple Choice Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th># of Qs</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>SPRING 2006 (N=70)</th>
<th>SPRING 2005 (N=43)</th>
<th>FALL Mean (N=43)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61.40%</td>
<td>55.10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51.80%</td>
<td>49.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.10%</td>
<td>35.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends in Marketing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35.70%</td>
<td>31.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Environment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34.60%</td>
<td>48.90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmentation/Targeting</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32.80%</td>
<td>34.10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positioning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.10%</td>
<td>27.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.60%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product/Svc Planning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.10%</td>
<td>22.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students got an average of X% Qs wrong on this topic:

Mean = 64.6 (25.8) SPG '06 (Worst-Best)
Mean = 62.7% SPG '05 (Worst-Best)
Mean = 62.7% SPG '06 (Worst-Best)

Students got an average of X% Qs wrong on this topic:

Mean = 64.6 (25.8) SPG '06 (Worst-Best)
Mean = 62.7% SPG '05 (Worst-Best)
Mean = 62.7% SPG '06 (Worst-Best)