

3211 Providence Drive  
Anchorage, AK 99508  
907.786.1050

3211 Providence Drive  
Anchorage, AK 99508  
907.786.1050





3211 Providence Drive  
Anchorage, AK 99508  
907.786.1050

- Changes in program policies/procedures
- Changes to Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)
- Collegewide initiatives (e.g. High Impact Practices)
- Faculty, staff, student development

Other

No changes were implemented in AY21.

If you checked "Other" on the survey, please provide details in the comments section.

Metric	Definition	Rationale
COURSE PASS RATES BY COURSE LEVEL (Undergraduate lower division, undergraduate upper division, and graduate).	The percentage of students who receive a passing grade (A, B, C, D) for all undergraduate students and (A, B, P) for graduate students in a course offered by a program compared to the same rate calculated for all courses at that level. Based on a 5-year trend. Included in the denominator for undergraduate courses are the grades D, F, W, I, NP, NB. Included in the denominator for graduate level are the grades C, D, F, W, I, NP, NB. Discipline acts as a proxy for a program. Data source: RPT end-of-term freeze files. Disaggregate as per accreditation	specific major, can provide actionable information for departments.  Low pass rates are one critical way to identify courses that are barriers to student success and degree completion. Failing key courses correlates with low retention and more major switching. Mitigation strategies can be internal or external to the course itself, including, among other things, the use of high-impact pedagogical practices, appropriate placement, course sequencing, tutoring, and other means to ensure student success within a particular course. This metric and the disaggregation of the data can inform planning, decision making, and the allocation of resources.

1. Based on the program's responses above, what guidance and support do you have for the program moving forward? Is there a particular area the program should focus on? (750 characters or less)  
The students are meeting program goals set at 70%. I suggest raising it to 75%. Faculty should consider increasing the goal incrementally beyond 75% in the coming years. The Assurance of Learning (AoL) committee has improved the assessment process and has designated staff support to assist. The AoL committee has scheduled a meeting with faculty to share best practices. I suggest the AoL committee continue to refine the assessment process and keep faculty highly involved to maintain awareness. Going forward, faculty should consider ways to better demonstrate program success. I suggest faculty start documenting examples of core competency communication for the 2022 assessment
2. Is there something the program is doing particularly well in terms of its processes for the assessment and improvement of student learning, including the closing of equity gaps, that might serve as a model for other programs? If yes, please explain. You may skip this question (750 characters or less)  
The assessment process has evolved to include more faculty input. The current chairs of the AoL committee have helped to establish a more structured process that has been documented and shared with faculty. This has increased awareness about assessment and thus, improved student learning. Management courses have several experiential activities in BA, BBA 489 and BA A495 (Internships) BA A48 and BA A388 have assignments that build student self awareness. BA A489 requires students to make investor pitches. Mgmt recently added several CECs Entrepreneurship, Business Leadership, and Business Analytics which overlap with the BBA. A mentoring program for CBP students is the Tom Case Leadership Fellows

Dean's signature



Date: 11/4/2021