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 – No assessment of writing occurred in the Fall 2010 semester. During the Spring 2011 semester, the AOL committee drew a random sample of 50 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 Fall 2009- Spring 2011.

BBA Goal 1a Writing Skills
% meets/exceeds expectations
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- Conventions
- Clarity
- Rhetorical choices
The findings from the Spring 2011 assessment show that students met the criteria for conventions (91%), but did not for clarity (64%) or rhetorical choices (69%). 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** – None

**AOL Committee Recommendations** – The AOL Committee recommends that the Undergraduate Committee continue their efforts to identify means by which to improve student writing.
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 2010, the Marketing Department assessed 260 students out of 307 (84.7%) enrolled in MKTG 303. During the Spring 2011 semester, the Marketing Department assessed 123 students out of 380 (32.3%) enrolled. Marketing Department faculty in conjunction with the doctoral students scored the oral communications presentations using the rubric.

The following graph and table below present the Oral Communication goal’s assessment results for Fall 2009- Spring 2011.
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The findings from the Fall 2010 assessment show that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations with respect to Professionalism (98%), Content (97%), and delivery (91%).

The findings from the Spring 2011 assessment show that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations with respect to Professionalism (98%), Content (100%), and delivery (85%).

**Assessment Changes** – None

**AOL Committee Recommendations** – None at this time given that students exceed expectations on all three criteria.
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 44 of the 245 (17.8%) students enrolled in Fall 2010 and 86 out of the 233 (36.9%) students enrolled in Spring 2011. 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 Fall 2009- Spring 2011.
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BBA Goal 2 - Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BBA Goal 2 - Diversity</th>
<th>Fall 2010 (n = 44)</th>
<th>Spring 2011 (n = 86 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify stereotypes</td>
<td>Below: 0%  Meets: 13%  Exceeds: 87%</td>
<td>Below: 4%  Meets: 47%  Exceeds: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discern different stereotypes</td>
<td>Below: 4%  Meets: 29%  Exceeds: 67%</td>
<td>Below: 24%  Meets: 34%  Exceeds: 42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify individual characteristics</td>
<td>Below: 4%  Meets: 20%  Exceeds: 76%</td>
<td>Below: 9%  Meets: 28%  Exceeds: 63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings from the Fall 2010 assessment show that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations with respect to identifying stereotypes [100%], discerning different stereotypes [96%], and identifying individual characteristics [96%].

The findings from the Spring 2011 assessment show that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations with respect to identifying stereotypes [95%], near expectations on discern different stereotypes (76%) and exceeds on identify individual characteristics (91%).

**AOL Committee Recommendations** – None given that students met or close to meeting all three criteria.
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 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 2010, IS faculty assessed 128 out of the 198 (64.6%) business students enrolled in BCIS 338. In Spring 2011 IS faculty assessed 195 out of the 247 (78.9%) 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 Spring 2009-Spring 2011.
The findings from the Fall 2010 assessment show that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations for the Information Technology performance criteria with respect to acquiring information (95%), manipulating information (91%), and disseminating information (86%).

The findings from the Spring 2011 assessment show that 80% or more of the students met or exceeded expectations for manipulating data [87%], near expectations on dissemination information [79%] and acquiring information (77%).

Assessment Changes – None.

AOL Committee Recommendations – None given that students met or near the standard on all three criteria
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 243 out of the 245 (99%) students enrolled in Fall 2010 and 189 out of the 222 (87.8%) students enrolled in Spring 2011 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 Fall 2009-Spring 2011.

Goal 4a Problem Solv
% meets/exceeds expectations
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The findings from the Fall 2010 assessment show that students met the performance standard on all three objectives: translates (94%), Analyzes (84%), and Communicates (87%). The findings from Spring 2011 show that students met the performance standard on all three objectives: translates (88%), Analyzes (86%), and Communicates (87%).

Assessment Changes – None

AOL Committee Recommendations – None given that students met all three criteria.
**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 56 out of the 88 (63.6%) students enrolled in Fall 2010 and 86 out of the 112 (76.7%) students enrolled in Spring 2011 ECON 304 courses. Faculty scored the assignments. The following graph and table below present the Critical Thinking goal’s assessment results for Fall 2009 - Spring 2011.
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**Goal 4b Critical Thinking**  
% meets/exceeds expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Understands</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fa 09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NMSU – College of Business – BBA Program Assessment Report – 2010 - 2011
The findings from the Fall 2010 assessment show that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations with respect to demonstrating an understanding of the problem [83%], discerning between relevant and irrelevant information [82%], identifying the appropriate principle (82%), but only 64% could write a clear and comprehensive recommendation.

The findings from the Spring 2011 assessment show that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations with respect to demonstrating an understanding of the problem [91%], discerning between relevant and irrelevant information [83%], identifying the appropriate principle (81%), but only 66% could write a clear and comprehensive recommendation.

**AOL Committee Recommendations** -- AOL recommends that the Undergraduate Committee continue their efforts to improve student writing.
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 316 completed a written assignment.

Instrument Development – Instructors developed the assignment and used the college rubric for assessment of legal issues beginning in the fall of 2009.

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 316 faculty teaching the course assessed of 168 of the 222 (75.6%) of the students in the Fall 2010 semester using a rubric. During spring 2011, faculty assessed 170 of the 194 (87.6%) students enrolled in BLAW 316. The graph below presents the Legal Issue goal’s assessment results for Spring 2010- Spring 2011.
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BBA Goal 5a - LEGAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2010 (n = 168)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 2011 (n = 170)</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>Identify issue</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguish sides</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe personal views</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings for the Fall 2010 assessment indicate students met expectations on identifying a legal issue (92%), distinguish different sides of the issues (89%), and describe personal views (93%).

The findings for the Spring 2011 assessment indicate students met expectations on identifying a legal issue (93%), distinguish different sides of the issues (87%), and describe personal views (87%).

Assessment Changes – None

AOL Committee Recommendations – None at this time given that students met the expectations on all three criteria
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 – During the Fall 2010 semester, faculty assessed 118 out of the 245 (48.1%) student enrolled in MGT 309. For the Spring 2011 semester, faculty assessed 124 out of the 232 (53.4%) students enrolled in MGT 309. The instructors scored the student papers using a rubric. The graph and table below present the Ethical Comprehension goal’s assessment results for Spring 2010-Spring 2011.
The Fall 2010 assessment shows that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations on the following criteria: discuss ethical perspectives [86%], identify relevant stakeholders [99%], propose alternatives [93%], and explain appropriateness [79%].

The Spring 2011 assessment shows that more than 80% of the students did not meet expectations on discuss ethical perspectives [69%], but exceeded expectations on identify relevant stakeholders [99%], propose alternatives [87%], and explain appropriateness [83%].

**Assessment Changes** – None

**AOL Committee Recommendations** – None at this time given students met the expectation on all 4 criteria.