BBA – Report on 2009-10 Assessment Results
NMSU College of Business

Goal 1: Students are effective communicators
Goal 1a: Students can write effectively. [WRITE]

Objective 1: Students use Standard English conventions
Objective 2: Students write clearly and coherently
Objective 3: Students use appropriate rhetorical choices

Assessment Instruments -- Students in BCIS 338 complete three tasks as part of the assessment process. The first task is to use information technology to gather data from a variety of sources. The second task requires students to manipulate the acquired data into a specific form such as a pivot chart and table. Finally, students export the manipulated data to a memo communicating their results to a business audience. The AOL Committee uses the memo portion of the assignment to assess written communications skills.

Instrument Development -- During 2008 – 2009, the IS faculty developed both the tasks required for using information technology and the written memo. For the Spring 2010 semester, the writing assignment for the memo was revised with the intention of improving student understanding of the assignment.

Performance Standard -- The AOL Committee uses the standard that at least 80% of students score in the meets or exceeds category on all the objectives relating to written communications.

Assessment Results – For assessment purposes, members of the AOL Committee drew a random sample of 50 students (22.83% of 219 students) in Fall 2009 and 50 students (26.5% of 188 students) in Spring 2010 students enrolled in BCIS 338. The Assessment coordinator and a MAcc graduate student scored the assignments using the rubric. The following graph and table below present the Written Communication goal’s assessment results for 2009-10.
The findings from the Fall 2009 assessment show that less than 80% of the students met the criteria for conventions, clarity, and rhetorical choices (70%, 32%, 32%). The findings in the Spring 2010 assessment indicate that 86% of the students met or exceeded expectations for conventions, but less than 80% met the clarity and rhetorical choices criteria (76% and 69%, respectively).

The main difficulty students had was in clearly stating the purpose of the memo. In most cases, if students had been allowed to revise and resubmit, the scores would have improved sufficiently to meet or exceed the target.

**Assessment Changes** -- Formal assessment of writing in BCIS 338 began in fall 2009. Due to the poor results that semester, the AOL committee reviewed the assignment and suggested that the course instructors restructure the memo requirements. The BCIS faculty representative on the AOL committee worked with the Assessment Coordinator to revise the assignments for the written memo portion of a class project. As a result, students showed significant improvement in the writing assignment.

**AOL Committee Recommendations** -- The AOL Committee working in conjunction with IS faculty to provide students online resources regarding memo writing and to provide additional structure in the assignment.

**Undergraduate Committee Recommendations** –

**Goal 1: Students are Effective Communicators.**

**Goal 1b: Students can make effective oral presentations. [ORAL]**

Objective 1: Students dress professionally and use appropriate language

Objective 2: Students use speech targeted to appropriate audience

Objective 3: Students use effective delivery methods including eye contact, tone and flow

**Assessment Instruments** -- For BBA Goal 1b, students in MKT 303 prepared a digital oral presentation. Students were given an option to prepare a brief presentation for a job interview by highlighting personal strengths.

**Instrument Development** – The Marketing Department Chair and the AOL Representative in conjunction with the Assessment Coordinator designed and implemented a new oral communications assignment beginning in Fall 2009.

**Performance Standard** -- The AOL Committee uses the standard that at least 80% of students score in the meets or exceeds category on all the objectives relating to oral communications.

**Assessment Results** -- In Fall 2009, the AOL Committee drew a random sample of 7.65% (16 out of 209) enrolled in MKTG 303 to assess oral communication skills. The small sample size relates to the piloting
of the new assignment during fall 09. Marketing Department faculty in conjunction with the Assessment Coordinator scored the oral communications presentations using the rubric.

In Spring 2010, the AOL Committee drew a random sample of 12% (24 out of 200) enrolled in MKTG 303 to assess oral communication skills. The small sample size relates to a revision of the first pilot and the option students had in the spring to complete the assignment. Marketing Department faculty scored the oral communications presentations using the rubric. The following graph and table below present the Oral Communication goal’s assessment results for 2009-10.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BBA Goal 1b - Oral Communication</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings from the Fall 2009 assessment show that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations with respect to Professionalism (94%), Content (94%), and delivery (75%).

The findings from the Spring 2010 assessment show that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations with respect to Professionalism (96%), Content (83%), and delivery (96%).

**Assessment Changes** – Because of the large class size for MKT 303, the faculty instructor has developed a plan to integrate the oral communications assignment into the course. In Fall 2009, the assignment used for the Oral Communication assessment was optional for the semester. Thus only a small portion of the population chose to complete the oral communication assignment. The process of recording the oral presentation appears the process works well with a limited number of students involved, but there are logistical problems in requiring that the assignment be completed by 200+ students.

In Spring 2010, the instructor adjusted the assignment to increase the number of submissions, but the assignment was still optional.
For Fall, 2010, the instructor plans to provide all students the opportunity to either prepare an oral presentation relevant to interviewing for a position or a PowerPoint slideshow with voice over to persuade an angel investor to provide funding for a new business.

**AOL Committee Recommendations** – The AOL Committee is concerned that some students will submit a recorded presentation that allows for assessment of visual elements of the learning goal. However, other students will be submitting a voice-over slideshow that will not allow for assessment of the visual elements. The committee requests that the Undergraduate Committee clarify the performance criteria for the goal and to consider whether these two assessment methods are compatible.

**Undergraduate Committee Recommendations** –

**Goal 2: Students can demonstrate knowledge of diversity [DIVERSITY]**

Objectives: Students can
1. Identify stereotypes
2. Discern between helpful and detrimental stereotypes
3. Identify individual characteristics that affect social perception and strategies that counter negative influence on social perception

**Assessment Instrument** – For Objective 2, students in MGT 309 read a case and completed a written assignment answering questions related to the case.

**Instrument Development** – Instructors in the management department developed the assignment and rubric for assessment of ethical implications

**Performance Standards** – The AOL Committee uses the standard that at least 80% of students score in the meets or exceeds category on all the performance criteria relating to diversity.

**Assessment Results** – Faculty teaching MGT 309 assessed 83.25% (184 out of 221) of the students enrolled in Fall 2009 and 89.2% (83 of 93) students enrolled in Spring 2010. Individual management faculty scored the assignments using the rubric. Course instructors scored the student papers using a rubric. The following graph and table below present the Diversity goal’s assessment results for 2009-10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BBA Goal 2 - Diversity</th>
<th>Fall 2009 (n = 126)</th>
<th>Spring 2010 (n = 83)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify stereotypes</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discern different stereotypes</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify individual characteristics</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings from the Fall 2009 assessment show that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations with respect to identifying stereotypes [98%], discerning different stereotypes [90%], and identifying individual characteristics [88%].

The findings from the Spring 2010 assessment show that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations with respect to identifying stereotypes [84%], but only 72% of students could discern different stereotypes and 66% of the students could identify individual characteristics.

**AOL Committee Recommendations** – A review of the assessment process for the Diversity goal indicated the following:

1. The instructors decided early in Spring 2010 to use only one video clip (My Cousin Vinny) versus allowing instructors to choose from two different ones as had been done the previous term.
2. **For Spring 2010, the course instructors also revised the assignment questions and rubric.** What was happening was that in Fall 2009, some rubric criteria were measuring two different things in one and the instructors were having a hard time using that original rubric to score the assignments. (This may have resulted in instructors giving students the benefit of the doubt, and so original scores from Fall 2009 may not have been accurate due to inconsistencies in grading. Also, there was some variation in Fall 2009 in terms of how the assignment was being made, e.g., homework vs. exam question. (We are still working on this, though.)

3. Thus, what appears to be a ‘dip’ in Spring 2010 may actually reflect a more true assessment. We should know better after reviewing assessment data from term.

AOL committee recommends that the Undergraduate Committee draw on the successes of this department’s faculty in creating materials and implementing assessment methods consistently across all sections of the core course. The committee would like to see the Undergraduate Committee create a college-wide, recognized process whereby core course faculty use the same assessment instrument in all courses and agree on a weighting of course points sufficient for students to take the assessment seriously. The committee also suggests a periodic review of the course materials, assignments, and assessment instrument to ensure the assessment will satisfy the performance criteria and rubric for the learning goal.

**Undergraduate Committee Recommendations** –

**Goal 3: Students are Effective Users of Information Technology. [TECH]**

Objective 1: Students can acquire information using relevant information technologies.
Objective 2: Students can use information technology to manipulate information into a form usable in business decision making
Objective 3: Students can use information technology to disseminate information to others

**Assessment Instrument** – Assessment is based on a series of graded IS projects in BCIS 338. The projects require students to use information technology to acquire data in a variety of formats (objective 1), to manipulate acquired data in a variety of manners (objective 2), and imbedding the transformed data into a written memorandum (objective 3).
**Instrument Development** – The IS Department embeds assessment in course assignments in BCIS 338. IS faculty designed the assignments used in BCIS 338.

**Performance Standards** – The AQL Committee uses the standard that at least 80% of students score in the meets or exceeds category on all objectives relating to using information technology.

**Assessment Results** – In Fall 2009, IS faculty assessed 95.59% (217 out of 227) business students enrolled in BCIS 338. In Spring 2010 IS faculty assessed 95% (180 out of 189) business students enrolled in BCIS 338. Faculty teaching the course scored the assignments. The following graph and table below present the Information Technology goal’s assessment results for 2009-10.

The findings from the Fall 2009 assessment show that less than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations for the Information Technology performance criteria with respect to acquiring information, manipulating information, and disseminating information.

The findings from the Spring 2010 assessment show that 80% or more of the students met or exceeded expectations for manipulating data [84%] and dissemination information [80%], with 77% of the students meeting or exceeding expectations on acquiring information.

**Assessment Changes** – Responding to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee’s recommendation, the IS Department stopped using grades to assess student performance as in the past. Moreover, the IS Department redesigned the assignments and piloted them in spring and summer 2008. Full implementation of the new assignments began in fall 09 and remained the same in spring 2010.
AOL Committee Recommendations – At this time, the AOL Committee does not recommend any changes to the assessment process.

Undergraduate Committee Recommendations –

Goal 4: Critical Thinking: Students can solve problems and think critically
Objective 4a: Students can solve problems [PROBSOLV]

Assessment Instrument – For Objective 4a, the Finance Department uses a short case presented to students for analysis (see appendix). Students are required to demonstrate their level of problem solving skills by translating a financial language from written to mathematical expression, solve the problem using the appropriate financial tool and write a short recommendation based upon their analysis.

Instrument Development – The Department of Finance faculty developed the short case and rubric during several meetings over the fall semester.

Performance Standards – The AOL Committee uses the standard that at least 80% of students score in the meets or exceeds category on all the objectives relating to problem solving and critical thinking.

Assessment Results –
The FIN 341 course faculty assessed 87.8% (202 of 230) of the students enrolled in Fall 2009 and 98.8% (162 of 164) students enrolled in Spring 2010 FIN 341 courses. Finance faculty scored problem-solving responses using the rubrics contained in the appendix. The following figures provide a distribution of student performance on problem solving. The assessment rubric included the following performance criteria: translates verbal or written assertions and applies appropriate procedures, analyzes the problem, and communicates the results. The following graph and table below present the Problem Solving goal’s assessment results for 2009-10.
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BBA Goal 4a Prob Solving –
% meets/ exceeds expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Translates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4a Prob Solv</td>
<td>Fall 2009 (n=202)</td>
<td>Spring 2010 (n=162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translates</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzes</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings from the Fall 2009 assessment show that students met the performance standard on all three objectives: translates (96%), Analyzes (81%), and Communicates (93%). The findings from Spring 2010 show that students met the performance standard on all three objectives: translates (91%), Analyzes (88%), and Communicates (85%).

**Assessment Changes** – For the Fall 09 semester, the Finance Department expanded the problem solving assignment to allow assessment of student performance on separate objectives adopted for the problem solving process. This allows the collection of data to pinpoint where a student may have difficulty in solving financial problems. Changes made in Fa09 were used in spring assessment.

**AOL Committee Recommendations** – At this time, the AOL committee does not have any recommendations concerning the process for assessment of Objective 4a of Goal 4.

**Undergraduate Committee Recommendations** –

---

**Goal 4b: Students can think critically.[THINK]**

Objective 1: Students demonstrate an understanding of the problem  
Objective 2: Students use appropriate theoretical tool  
Objective 3: Students can discern between relevant and irrelevant information  
Objective 4: Students can form a clear and comprehensive recommendation

**Assessment Instruments** – For Goal 4b, the Economics and International Business Department uses a short scenario describing an economic situation. Students read the case and answer a series of questions concerning this situation.

**Instrument Development** – The Department of Economics and International Business Curriculum Committee developed both the critical thinking assignment and scoring rubric. This committee consisted of five faculty members all having input into the development of the assessment instrument and rubric.

**Performance Standards** – The AOL Committee uses the standard that at least 80% of students score in the meets or exceeds category on all the objectives relating to critical thinking.

**Assessment Results** – The Economics Department faculty assessed 100% (97 of 97) of the students enrolled in Fall 2009 and 100% (87 of 87) students enrolled in Spring 2010 ECON 304 courses. Faculty in one section of Econ 304 and the Chair of the AOL Committee scored the assignments. The following graph and table below present the Critical Thinking goal’s assessment results for 2009-10.
The findings from the Fall 2009 assessment show that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations with respect to demonstrating an understanding of the problem [87%] and discerning between relevant and irrelevant information [84%], while only 58% of the students identified the appropriate principle and 44% formed a clear and comprehensive decision.

The findings from Spring 2010 assessment show that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations with respect to discerning between relevant and irrelevant information [87%], while only 70% of the students demonstrated an understanding of the problem, 73% identified the appropriate principle, and 45% formed a clear and comprehensive decision.

The committee gathered information indicating that variability existed across courses regarding work assigned to students to develop the skill, the way in which the assessment was administered (embedded in course materials vs. bonus question on final exam), and value placed on the student work relative to total course points.

**AOL Committee Recommendations**

AOL committee recommends that the Undergraduate Committee create a process whereby core course faculty use the same assessment instrument in all courses and agree on a weighting of course points sufficient for students to take the assessment seriously. The committee also suggests a periodic review of the course materials, assignments, and assessment instrument to ensure the assessment will satisfy the performance criteria and rubric for the learning goal.

Committee also recommends that the Undergraduate Committee address the need to improve student performance of this goal. How extensively is critical thinking being developed in the business core curriculum? Do the College faculty understand the Undergraduate Committees interpretation of critical
thinking as set forth in the objectives and performance criteria for the learning goal? How can we get faculty involved and focused on improving critical thinking skills?

Closing the Loop — The Committee notes that the AOL chairperson will meet with faculty teaching the course to review and redesign course materials, assignments, and assessment instrument to better focus on the development of critical thinking skills in all sections. The faculty will also reach consensus on the value of the assignment relevant total points available for the course.

Undergraduate Committee Recommendations —

Goal 5: Legal and Ethical: Students can recognize legal and ethical issues
   Goal 5a: Students can recognize legal issues. [LEGAL]

Performance Criteria: Students can
   • Identify situations in business contexts that involve the law (e.g., regulatory, contract, employment or other laws)
   • Demonstrate proper use and understanding of legal terminology

Assessment Instrument — For Objective 5a, students in BLAW 306 completed a written assignment.

Instrument Development — Instructors developed the assignment and used the college rubric for assessment of legal issues.

Performance Standards — The AOL Committee uses the standard that at least 80% of students score in the meets or exceeds category on all the performance criteria relating to legal issues.

Assessment Results — The BLAW 306 faculty teaching the course assessed 100% (207 of 207) student papers using a rubric. The graph below presents the Legal Issue goal’s assessment results for Spring, 2010.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BBA - LEGAL - Spring, 2010 (n=207)</th>
<th>Below</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Exceeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify issue</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguish sides</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe personal views</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings for the spring 2010 assessment indicate that 92% of students met/exceeded expectations on identifying a legal issue and 90% of students could discuss different sides of the issues and 95% of students provided a solid personal perspective.

**Assessment Changes** – Prior to Spring 2010, business law faculty had developed and assessed student performance on a 4-part project. The results presented involved the number of assignments completed correctly. Due to variation across sections regarding data collection and use of correct rubric, the results were not reliable and have been excluded from this analysis. The faculty teaching the course significantly redesigned the assignment guided by the performance criteria for the learning goal and the rubric. The Spring 2010 reflect the changes made, and the Fall 2009 assessment results were excluded from this analysis.

**AOL Committee Recommendations** – At this time, the AOL Committee does not recommend any changes to the assessment process.

**Undergraduate Committee Recommendations** --

---

**Goal 5b: Students can comprehend ethical implications in business**

Performance Criteria: Students can
- describe the ethical dilemma
- list pertinent facts
- identify the stakeholders involved in the decision making process
- propose alternative solutions
- explain why each alternative may or may not be appropriate

**Assessment Instrument** – For Objective 5b, students in MGT 309 read a case and completed a written assignment answering questions related to the case.

**Instrument Development** – Instructors in the management department developed the assignment and rubric for assessment of ethical implications

**Performance Standards** – The AOL Committee uses the standard that at least 80% of students score in the meets or exceeds category on all the performance criteria relating to ethics.

**Assessment Results** – The instructors scored the student papers using a rubric. 92.4% (86 of 93) of the students enrolled in MGT 309 provided papers for assessment. The graph and table below present the Ethical Comprehension goal’s assessment results for Spring 2010.
The Spring 2010 assessment shows that less than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations on the following criteria: discuss ethical perspectives [79%], identify relevant stakeholders [71%], propose alternatives [48%], and explain appropriateness at a meet/exceed expectations level [49%].

In Fall 2009, the assessment was designed and implemented in MKT 303 course. Instructors used short ethical scenarios. Results indicated that students performed well. More than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations on five performance criteria: identify an ethical dilemma [90.2%], list relevant facts [94.1%], list stakeholders [100%], propose alternatives [94.1%], and explain alternatives [94.1%].
**Assessment Changes** – The Undergraduate Committee approved moving the assessment of ethics from MKT 303 to MGT 309 beginning Spring 2010. This move was based on two actions. First, the AOL Committee reviewed of the assessment method used in the marketing course to assess ethics. The committee was concerned that the questions students answered did not meet the performance criteria established by the Undergraduate Committee. Second, the Undergraduate Committee recognized that the Management faculty wanted to lead in the development of ethics resources and assignments as part of the Daniels Fund initiative. As a result of this decision, management faculty who teach MGT 309 developed the assignment, study materials, and rubric for assessment. The Spring 2010 semester was considered a trial run of new materials.

**AOL Committee Recommendations** –

AOL committee recommends that the Undergraduate Committee draw on the successes of this department’s faculty in creating materials and implementing assessment methods consistently across all sections of the core course. The committee would like to see the Undergraduate Committee create a college-wide, recognized process whereby core course faculty use the same assessment instrument in all courses and agree on a weighting of course points sufficient for students to take the assessment seriously. The committee also suggests a periodic review of the course materials, assignments, and assessment instrument to ensure the assessment will satisfy the performance criteria and rubric for the learning goal.

*Closing the loop* – The AOL Committee notes that the core course faculty for MGT 309 agreed to use the same textbook for all sections. The book includes ethics assignments at the end of each chapter to reinforce student comprehension of ethical implications in business.

**Undergraduate Committee Recommendations** –