MBA – Report on Assessment Results
NMSU College of Business – Spring, 2010

Goal 1a: Written Communication Skills:
Students can effective communicators

Goal 1a: Students can write effectively.

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 -- The AOL Committee drew a random sample of 51 students out of 188 (or 27% of the enrollment) students enrolled in BCIS 338 for assessment purposes. The Assessment coordinator and a MAcc graduate student scored the assignments using the rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BBA WRITE</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventions</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical choices</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Fall 2009, assessment results indicated that less than 80% of the students met the criteria for conventions, clarity, and rhetorical choices (70%, 323%, 32%). In Spring 2010, assessment results 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, but the students do not meet the performance standard on any of the objectives. The AOL committee reviewed the assignment and felt that by restructuring the memo requirements, students would provide better submissions. So, the IS Department faculty 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 will revise the writing assignment to better clarify student expectations.

**Undergraduate Committee Recommendations** –
Goal 1: Students are Effective Communicators.

Goal 1b: Students can make effective oral presentations.

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.

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 contained in the appendix.

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 contained in the appendix.

<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>19%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Fall 2009, students met or exceeded expectations on all three attributes: Professionalism (94%), Content (94%), and delivery (75%). In Spring 2010, students met or exceeded expectations on all three attributes: Professionalism (96%), Content (83%), and delivery (96%).

**Assessment Changes** – The assignment used for the assessment was optional for the semester. Thus only a small portion of the population chose to complete the oral communication assignment. It appears the process works well with a limited number of students involved. The difficulty of managing this assignment as a required assignment for 200+ students could be daunting. 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** – At this time, the AOL Committee does not recommend changes to the assessment process for oral communications. The committee expects the process to be fully developed after the spring semester.

**Undergraduate Committee Recommendations** –

---

**BBA – Diversity**

**Report on Assessment Results**

**NMSU College of Business – Spring, 2010**

**Goal 2: Diversity (DIVERSITY):**

Students can demonstrate knowledge of 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** – The course instructors scored the student papers using a rubric. The 83 of the 93 students enrolled in MGT 309 provided papers for assessment. The figure below presents the distribution of scores.

<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>8%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Spring 2010 assessment shows that the 80% performance standard was not achieved for two objectives: discern different stereotypes (72% met or exceeded) and identify individual characteristics (66%).

**AOL Committee Recommendations** – At this time, the AOL Committee does not recommend changes to the assessment process for diversity goal.
Graduate Committee Recommendations –

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

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 AOL 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. Individual faculty scored the assignments. In Spring 2010 IS faculty assessed 95% (180 out of 189) business students enrolled in BCIS 338.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table: BBA Goal 3b - % of students meeting or exceeding expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Fall 2009 and Spring 2010, students performed at or near the standard in all subcategories of the objectives except in two areas.

**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** – No changes deemed necessary at this time.
*Assessment coordinator recommends assessing only once a year if the fall 2010 results are consistent.*

**Undergraduate Committee Recommendations** –

---

**BBA – Goal 4a – Problem Solving (PROBSOLV)**
Report on Assessment Results
NMSU College of Business – Spring, 2010

**Goal 4: Critical Thinking: Students can solve problems and think critically**
Objective 4a: Students can solve problems

**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** – During Spring 2010, the Finance Department assessed 162 of the 164 students enrolled in five sections of FIN 341. Finance faculty scored problem-solving responses using a rubric. The following chart provides 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 4a Prob Solv</th>
<th>Fall 2009 (n=202)</th>
<th>Spring 2010 (n=162)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translates</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</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>

With respect to problem solving, students met the performance standard on all three objectives: translates (91%), Analyzes (88%), and Communicates (85%).

**Assessment Changes** – 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 4: Students can Solve Problems and Think Critically.

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 (see appendix for assignment).

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 – During Spring, 2010 semester, the Economics Department assessed 100% (97 out of 97) of the students enrolled in Econ 304. Faculty in one section of Econ 304 and the Chair of the AOL Committee scored the assignments. The following figures provide a distribution of student performance on critical thinking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 4b THINK</th>
<th>Fall 2009 (n = 87)</th>
<th>Spring 2010 (n = 97)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approp Prin</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: B.B.A. Distribution on Critical Thinking
Figure 2. BBA Critical Thinking Comparison across sections - Spring 2010

Table 1. BBA Critical Thinking Comparison across sections – Spring 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Understand</th>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Recommend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M01</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M02</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M70</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. BBA Critical Thinking Comparison by Major – Spring 2010
Students only met the standard on one objective relating to critical thinking. Students met the standard with respect to discerning between relevant and irrelevant information [87.6%]. However, students failed to meet or exceed the standard with respect to understanding the problems [70.1%], selecting appropriate principles [74.2%], and writing a recommendation [46.4%].

**AOL Committee Recommendations** — Committee noted that course instructors did not consistently use the same materials, assignments, and assessments. In addition, different score weights were noted across sections. 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.

Committee also recommends that the Undergraduate Committee identify curriculum changes that will improve student critical thinking skills throughout the BBA program.

**Undergraduate Committee Recommendations** —

---

**BBA – Ethical and Legal Issues – LEGAL**  
Report on Assessment Results  
NMSU College of Business – Spring, 2010

**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 207 student papers using a rubric.

![Bar Chart](image)

The findings for the spring 2010 assessment indicate that 91.8% of students met/exceeded expectations on identifying a legal issue and 89.9% of students could discuss different sides of the issues and 94.7% of students provided a solid personal perspective.

Note: Prior to this semester, 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 results of this assessment are included here.

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

*Assessment coordinator suggests that we assess one more semester. If fall 2010 results are consistent, then we will reduce the frequency of assessment to once a year beginning fall 2011.*

**Graduate Committee Recommendations --**
BBA – Legal and Ethical Issues – ETHICS
Report on Assessment Results
NMSU College of Business – Spring, 2010

Goal 5: Legal and Ethical Issues: Students can recognize legal and ethical issues
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 instructor scored the student papers using a rubric. Eighty-six of the 93 students enrolled in MGT 309 provided papers for assessment. The figure below presents the distribution of ethical comprehension scores for the meets or exceeds category.
The assessment of ethics was moved from MKT 503 to MGT 503. Management faculty developed the assignment, study materials, and rubric for assessment. This semester was considered a trial run of new materials.

The Spring 2010 assessment shows that the 80% performance standard was not achieved. 79% of students discussed ethical perspectives, 71% identified relevant stakeholders, 48% proposed alternatives, and 49% explained appropriateness at a meet/exceed expectations level.

In Fall 2009, the assessment was designed and implemented in MKT 303 course. Instructors used short ethical scenarios. Results indicated that students performed well.

However, the Undergraduate Committee voted to move this assessment to the MGT 350 and the AOL Committee worked with Management faculty to redesign the assignments to better align with the performance criteria for this learning goal.

**AOL Committee Recommendations** –
AOL committee recommends that the management faculty meet to review the course materials, assignments, assessment instrument to ensure the assessment will satisfy the performance criteria and rubric for the learning goal.

**Undergraduate Committee Recommendations** –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BBA Goal 5A ETHICS -- Spring 2010 (n = 86)</th>
<th>Below expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe alternative perspectives</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify relevant stakeholders</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propose alternatives</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain appropriateness</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>