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 30 students (15% of 198 students) in Fall 2011 and 42 students (17% of 242 students) in Spring 2012 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 2012.
The findings from the Fall 2011 assessment show that students met the criteria for conventions (85%), but did not for clarity (74%) or rhetorical choices (58%). The findings in the Spring 2012 assessment indicate that students met or exceeded expectations for conventions (91%), almost met clarity (79%), but failed to meet rhetorical choices criteria (57%).

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.

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 2011, the Marketing Department assessed 209 students out of 245 (85.3%) enrolled in MKTG 303 to assess oral communication skills. During the Spring 2012 semester, the Marketing Department assessed 105 students out of 197 (52.3%) 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 2012.
### Oral Communications Results
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BBA Goal 1b - Oral Communication</th>
<th>Fall 2011 (n = 209)</th>
<th>Spring 2012 (n = 105)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings from the Fall 2011 assessment show that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations with respect to Professionalism (100%), Content (96%), and delivery (89%).

The findings from the Spring 2012 assessment show that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations with respect to Professionalism (97%), Content (93%), and delivery (87%).

**Assessment Changes** – None

**AOL Committee Recommendations** – None at this time given that students exceed expectations on all three criteria.

**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 133 of the 245 (54.3%) students enrolled in Fall 2011 and 136 out of the 193 (69.4%) students enrolled in Spring 2012. 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 2012.
The findings from the Fall 2011 assessment show that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations with respect to identifying stereotypes [97%], discerning different stereotypes [94%], and identifying individual characteristics [89%].

The findings from the Spring 2012 assessment show that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations with respect to identifying stereotypes [97%], discern different stereotypes (85%) and identify individual characteristics (91%).

**AOL Committee Recommendations** – None given that students met all three criteria.

**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 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 2011, IS faculty assessed 117 out of the 198 (59%) business students enrolled in BCIS 338. In Spring 2012 IS faculty assessed 140 out of the 223 (62.3%) 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 2012.
The findings from the Fall 2011 assessment show that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations for the Information Technology performance criteria with respect to acquiring information (96%), manipulating information (95%), and disseminating information (98%).

The findings from the Spring 2012 assessment show that 80% or more of the students met or exceeded expectations for manipulating data [97%] and dissemination information [96%], acquiring information (96%).

Assessment Changes – None.

AOL Committee Recommendations – None given that students met the standard on all three criteria

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 183 out of the 221 (82.8%) students enrolled in Fall 2011 and 208 out of the 242 (85.9%) students enrolled in Spring 2012 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 2012.
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The findings from the Fall 2011 assessment show that students met the performance standard on all three objectives: translates (94%), Analyzes (87%), and Communicates (89%). The findings from Spring 2012 show that students met the performance standard on all three objectives: translates (90%), Analyzes (88%), and Communicates (88%).

**Assessment Changes** – None

**AOL Committee Recommendations** – None given that students met all three criteria.

**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 87 out of the 88 (98.8%) students enrolled in Fall 2011 and 90 out of the 120 (75%) students enrolled in Spring 2012 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 2012.
The findings from the Fall 2011 assessment show that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations with respect to demonstrating an understanding of the problem [86%], discerning between relevant and irrelevant information [86%], identifying the appropriate principle (87%), but only 62% could write a clear and comprehensive recommendation.

The findings from the Spring 2012 assessment show that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations with respect to demonstrating an understanding of the problem [97%], discerning between relevant and irrelevant information [94%], identifying the appropriate principle (96%), but only 69% could write a clear and comprehensive recommendation.

**AOL Committee Recommendations** -- AOL recommends that the Undergraduate Committee continue their efforts to improve student writing.

**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 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 184 of the 222 (82.3%) of the students in the Fall 2011 semester using a rubric. During spring 2012, faculty assessed 117 of the 138 (84.8%) students enrolled in BLAW 316. The graph below presents the Legal Issue goal’s assessment results for Spring 2010- Spring 2012.
The findings for the Fall 2011 assessment indicate students met expectations on identifying a legal issue (89%), distinguish different sides of the issues (92%), and describe personal views (94%).

The findings for the Spring 2012 assessment indicate students met expectations on identifying a legal issue (92%), distinguish different sides of the issues (89%), and describe personal views (92%).

**Assessment Changes** – None

**AOL Committee Recommendations** – None at this time given that students met the expectations on all three criteria

**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 – During the Fall 2011 semester, faculty assessed 127 out of the 245 (51.8%) student enrolled in MGT 309. For the Spring 2012 semester, faculty assessed 120 out of the 193 (62.2%) 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 2012.
The Fall 2011 assessment shows that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations on the following criteria: discuss ethical perspectives [83%], identify relevant stakeholders [99%], propose alternatives [98%], and explain appropriateness [84%].

The Spring 2012 assessment shows that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations on the following criteria: discuss ethical perspectives [91%], identify relevant stakeholders [99%], propose alternatives [96%], and explain appropriateness [92%].

**Assessment Changes** – None

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

**Undergraduate Committee Recommendations** –