Goal 1a: Written Communication Skills: Students can write effectively

Specific Learning Objectives:
Grammar (Knowledge of writing conventions):
- Writing follows normal conventions of spelling and grammar thorough and has been carefully proofread.
- Appropriate conventions for style and format are used consistently.
- Sources documented thoroughly and competently.

Clarity and coherence:
- Sentences are structured and words are chosen to communicate ideas clearly.
- Sequencing of ideas within paragraphs and transitions between paragraphs are easy to follow.

Rhetorical choices:
- Focus, organization, style/tone, and content communicate clearly and effectively.
- Writing follows all requirements for the assignment.

Assessment Instrument – For Goal 1a, students in ACCT 503 completed a memo written as part of a business plan project.

Instrument Development  Instructor developed the assignment and used the college rubric for assessment of writing skills. Each of the last 3 semesters the instructor has developed the written-memo assignments. The context for the assignment varied across semester. In Fall 2008 and Spring 2009, students reviewed a self-selected business plan from bplans.com and prepared a memo to the bank president reflecting a recommendation to loan money to the business.
In Fall 2009, students reviewed a Standard & Poor’s Industry Survey. Students then identified industry trends that would affect the assigned company’s business plan and wrote a memo addressing areas of plan that would need to be modified and whether or not these modifications would affect lender’s interest in the company. The memo was worth 20 of the 90-point assignment and 20 of 600 possible points for the course.

In Spring, 2010, the instructor asked students to prepare an additional memo. The instructor also increased the point value of the memo to encourage more effort in completing the tasks. The students were given an opportunity to become prepared for the writing assessment by writing a memo earlier in the semester recommending the investment of a restaurant company. At the end of the semester, students reviewed a business plan, responded to questions regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the plan, and then wrote a memo with the student’s decision regarding a loan to the company that prepared the business plan. The memo was worth 40 of the 120 point assignment and 40 of 600 possible points for the course.

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 writing skills.
Assessment Results – The instructor and two Masters of Accountancy graduate assistants assessed the student memos. See Exhibit 1 for paper requirements. A rubric was used to assess each of the three specific learning objectives for each writing sample (See Exhibit 1). Scores ranged from 1 to 3: below expectations (1), meets expectations (2), exceeds expectations (3).
Exhibit 1. Writing Skills Assessment Results -- % meet or exceed expectations for Spring 2009, Fall 2009 and Spring 2010

Table 1. Writing Skills Assessment Results -- % meet or exceed expectations for Spring 2009, Fall 2009 and Spring 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1a: WRITE -- % Meet/exceeds expectations</th>
<th>Spring 2009 (n=31)</th>
<th>Fall 2009 (n=73)</th>
<th>Spring 2010 (n=39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All 39 students taking the course in ACCT 503 completed the assessment. Twelve students met face-to-face each week, while the remaining students completed the course online. Findings indicate the following % of students that met or exceeded expectations: grammar (82%), clarity (59%), and rhetoric (69%).

A comparison with the Spring 2009 assessment which involved the same population of students (majority taking course online), shows that students in Spring 2010 did not perform as well on clarity and rhetoric as Spring 2009 students. This could be due, in part, to the nature of the assignment.

A comparison with Fall 2009 shows student performance to be about the same. Although the instructor required an additional memo to be prepared early in the semester, this assignment appeared to have little impact on the student’s performance.

In addition, because students met the performance standard in spring 2009 but not fall 2008 or fall 2009, a further analysis was performed to review writing results by location for the last two semesters.
The results in Table 2 indicate that performance varies substantially by location. During the fall 2009 semester, students at LANL met the performance standard with respect to convention and clarity, but failed with respect to rhetoric. Students at Sandia met the standard with respect to clarity, but failed with respect to convention and rhetoric. However, main campus students failed to meet the standard on all three objectives. Additional analysis indicated that a number of weaker students are students with English as a second language.

**Goal 1b: Oral Presentation Skills - ORAL**

**Objective 1b:** Students will present effectively

Specific Learning Objectives:
- Demonstrate an adequate level of knowledge presenting information in a logical sequence.
- Present readable, professional slides at an appropriate level of detail emphasizing main points with no grammatical errors or misspellings.
• Project voice clearly, pronounce words correctly, maintain eye contact, and dressing appropriately for a business setting

**Assessment Instrument** – For Goal 1b, students in BA590 made an oral presentation of their team’s paper to committee members. The presentations were taped in Fall 2009 but not in Spring 2010.

**Instrument Development** – Members of the Graduate committee approved a rubric in Fall, 2008.

**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 oral communications.

**Assessment Results** – Committee members (course instructor and two college faculty) for each team assessed teach team member’s portion of the taped oral presentation in Fall 2009 and during presentation in Spring 2010. Oral presentations for all 45 students in Fall 2009 and 35 of the 37 students enrolled in Spring 2010 course were assessed. The committee members used a rubric to assess each of the performance criteria. Scores ranged from 1 to 3: below expectations (1), meets expectations (2), exceeds expectations (3).

Findings indicate that all student performance met or exceeded expectations:
In Fall 2009: organization (98%), subject knowledge (96%), quality of slides (98%), mechanics (100%), eye contact (85%), elocution (98%), and attire (100%).
In Spring 2010: organization (91%), subject knowledge (89%), quality of slides (86%), mechanics (100%), eye contact (94%), elocution (100%), and attire (100%).
Table 1: M.B.A. Distribution for ORAL by semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBA Oral Presentation</th>
<th>Fall 2009 (n=45)</th>
<th>Spring 2010 (n=35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% meets or exceeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Knowledge</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Slides</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elocution</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attire</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal 2: Critical Thinking - THINK
Students can think critically to solve problems

Specific Learning Objectives:
- Identify all relevant components and define problems regarding a business situation
- Appropriately apply business tools and concepts to any problems and related issues identified
- Use business knowledge to make appropriate decisions and draw relevant conclusions related to any problems and issues identified

Assessment Instrument – For Goal 2, students in MKT 503 completed a case analysis.

Instrument Development – Instructors developed the assignment and used the college rubric for assessment of critical thinking.

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 critical thinking.

Assessment Results – The Marketing Department representative on the AOL performed the assessment. The instructor used a rubric to assess each of the three specific learning objectives for each student artifact (See below). Scores ranged from 1 to 3: below expectations (1), meets expectations (2), exceeds expectations (3).

The work 19 of 36 students in MKT 503 were assessed.
Findings indicate that fewer than 80% of the students met expectations for all performance criteria. Student work shows a lack of effort. Many seemed to scan or skim the case and dumped words on the page just to have a tangible document to submit. Very few demonstrated critical thinking.

### Goal 3: Quantitative Analysis - QUANT

Students can solve problems using quantitative information

**Specific Learning Objectives:**
- Translate verbal or written assertions into appropriate mathematical expressions and can properly apply a method of quantitative analysis
- Accurately interpret quantitative data, provide complete analyses and logical interpretation
- Communicate results and recommendations with quantitative information in a coherent, logical manner.

**Assessment Instrument** – For Goal 3, students in FIN 503 completed an open-ended exam question. Students were asked to calculate an interest rate using the appropriate formula and provide an answer with support.

**Instrument Development**—Finance faculty developed the assignment and used the college rubric for assessment of quantitative skills. Assignment and rubric are shown below.

**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 quantitative analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THINK MKT 503</th>
<th>Fall, 2009 (n=27)</th>
<th>Spring, 2010 (n = 19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance criteria</td>
<td>(%) Meets/ Exceeds</td>
<td>(%) Meets/ Exceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Analyze situation</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Define problem</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide alternative solutions</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Make decision</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Results – Two finance faculty members performed the assessment. The instructors used a rubric to assess each of the three specific learning objectives for each student artifact (See below). Scores ranged from 1 to 3: below expectations (1), meets expectations (2), exceeds expectations (3).

The work of all 52 students (students located at 3 sites: Sandia (13), Santa Fe (19), Main (20)) enrolled in FIN 503 was assessed.
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Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBA Quantitative Skills</th>
<th>Sp 09 (n=32)</th>
<th>Fa 09 (n=64)</th>
<th>Sp 10 (n=52)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Translate</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. % of students meeting or exceeding expectations by location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBA Quantitative Skills Spring, 2010</th>
<th>Sandia (n=13)</th>
<th>Santa Fe (n = 19)</th>
<th>Main (n = 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Translate</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings indicate that student performance in Spring 2009 and 2010 is lower than student performance in Fall, 2009. Further analysis by site indicates that student performance at main campus contributed primarily to lower performance scores for translate and analyze performance criteria. Student performance at all three sites did not meet the 80% performance standard.

Some of the differences between Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 were caused by one instructor using different guidelines in preparing and assessing student. In the Spring 2010 semester, the instructor administered the assessment toward the end of the semester. The assessment was unannounced. Students were allowed to use notes and book but could not collaborate. Instructor reviewed material from FIN 241 and solved lots of problems in class and for homework but did not work the same problem in class. In Fall 2009, the same instructor solved the exact same assessment question in class. Students did well because they had their notes and access to the question.

Additional comments from instructor follow:
“I have taught FIN 503 and it is a rigorous course. A baby version of a math/stat course geared to brush up their background will help. They have pre-requisites but many years ago. Many have forgotten what they learnt. Also, one thing is “skill” and the other is “disposition”. The problem in closing the loop is tougher because it is their disposition that (I feel) needs to change. The teaching and the curriculum is fine in my opinion. They know they will not fail and they don’t care. I think the loop has to close by changing the student’s expectations about the requirements for quantitative analysis in the MBA program. I don’t think it is instruction or curriculum. There is an old saying “You can take a horse to a pond but you can’t make it drink”.
“I don’t discuss the question beforehand. It is a fin 341 type question. I have done plenty of examples in class for them to put it together. I can only say that they are not having some basic quantitative and critical thinking skills.”

**Goal 4: Interpersonal Skills - INTERPER**
Students can interact effectively with others in a team environment.

Specific Learning Objectives:
- Demonstrate professionalism in a team environment
- Demonstrate initiative when working with others
- Make effective contribution in a team environment

**Assessment Instrument** – For Goal 4, students in BA590 completed peer evaluations four times during the semester. Instructors also completed a peer evaluation on each student based on observations of team meeting with instructor.

**Instrument Development** – BA 590 faculty developed the assessment instrument in summer 2008.

**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 interpersonal skills.
**Assessment Results** – Four peer evaluation sheets were completed by 36 students [spring 200], 42 students [fall 2009], and 37 students [spring 2010]. A sample of 19 student’s fourth evaluation was assessed using a peer evaluation sheet.

For purposes of assessing student performance, the average score received by each team member for each of the three attributes was calculated. Scores ranged from 1 to 3: below expectations (1), meets expectations (2), exceeds expectations (3). Students averaging a score of 5 exceeded expectations; a score of 4 to 4.9 met expectations, and below 4 were below expectations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBA Interpersonal Skills</th>
<th>Fall 2009 (n=42)</th>
<th>Spring 2010 (n=19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Criteria</td>
<td>% meets or exceeds</td>
<td>% meets or exceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluations of a sample of 19 of the 42 student students in BA 590, spring of 2010, were assessed. Findings indicate that all student performance met or exceeded expectations: professionalism (95%), initiative (95%), and effective contribution to team (95%).

**Goal 5a: Ethical Issues:**
Students can comprehend ethical implications in business

Performance Criteria: Students can
- describe alternative ethical perspectives
- identify and explain relevant ethical issues within a business context
- identify the stakeholders affected by the decision
• propose alternative solutions
• explain why each alternative may or may not be appropriate

**Assessment Instrument** – In Fall 2009, students in ACCT 503 completed a written assignment relating to a business scenario. After completing a segmented income report, students addressed an ethical dilemma requiring reclassification of an expense.

In Spring 2010, students in MGT 503 read a case and completed a written assignment answering questions related to the case.

**Instrument Development** – In Fall 2009, the instructor developed the assignment and used the college rubric for assessment of ethical issues. In Spring 2010, 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** –
In Fall 2009, the course instructor scored the student papers using a rubric. All (73 of 73) of the students enrolled in ACCT 502 provided papers for assessment.

In Spring, 2010, the instructor scored the student papers using a rubric. Forty-two of the 44 students enrolled in MGT 503 provided papers for assessment. The figure below presents the distribution of ethical comprehension scores for the meets or exceeds category.

**Exhibit 1. Ethics Assessment Fall 2009**
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Table 1. Assessment of MBA ethics skills -- Fall 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All sites (n = 73)</th>
<th>Main (n=46)</th>
<th>Santa Fe (n=16)</th>
<th>Sandia (n=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Meet/</td>
<td>% Meet/</td>
<td>% Meet/</td>
<td>% Meet/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exceed</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>exceed</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stkhldrs</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt Sols</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approp</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recomm</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a group, students met the standard with respect to identifying stakeholders and writing a recommendation. However, students failed to meet the standard with respect to describing the dilemma, identifying the pertinent facts, providing alternative solutions and explaining the alternative solutions. The results were somewhat better with respect to the individual sites. Students at Santa Fe met the standards on three of the six objectives while students at Sandia met two of the six. However, students at the main campus failed to meet the standard on all six objectives.

Exhibit 2. MBA Ethics Assessment Spring 2010
Exhibit 2. MBA Ethics Assessment Spring 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBA Goal 5A ETHICS -- Spring 2010 (n = 42)</th>
<th>Below expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Perspectives</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Stakeholders</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propose alternatives</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain appropriateness</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This semester the ethics assessment was moved from ACCT 503 to MGT 503, so this is a pilot study for the assessment of MBA ethics learning goal. In previous assessment, students met the standard with respect to identifying stakeholders and writing a recommendation. However, students failed to meet the standard with respect to describing the dilemma, identifying the pertinent facts, providing alternative solutions and explaining the alternative solutions.

The Spring 2010 assessment shows that the 80% performance standard was not achieved for ethical perspectives [76%], propose alternatives [50%] and explain appropriateness of alternatives [48%]. However, 85% could identify relevant stakeholders.

Instructor comments:
“I think there are two main things that impacted the results, but in my opinion, the biggest is that the class was taught on-line. I posted the material in Blackboard and incorporated the material into an exam, but I am skeptical that people in the class really took the information seriously. In my 309 class, I think the assignment went over well because there was discussion involved. Another issue with 503, which I did not have in 309, was that several students commented that they thought the materials covering the different forms of ethics were poorly worded. Almost all the international students (which was a fair number) commented on this issue. In fact, a lot of the international students left several of the questions unanswered.

To be honest, another issue I had in general with that section of 503 was that the students tended to do poorly on all the exams. Even though the course was taught on-line, the exams were proctored. It would be an understatement to say the exam scores of the students who had proctored exams were significantly lower than those whose exams were not proctored in prior semesters. Noteworthy is that the ethics assessment material was assessed on a proctored exam.”

**Goal 5b [LEGAL]**
Students can comprehend legal implications in business.

Performance Criteria: Students can
- Identify and explain relevant legal issues within a business context
- Distinguish the various sides of a legal issue
- Thoroughly describe personal views on the legal

**Assessment Instrument** – For Objective 5b, students in BLAW 502 completed a written assignment.

**Instrument Development** – Instructors developed the assignment and used the college rubric for assessment of legal issues. Exhibit 1 includes the assignment.

**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** – Two BLAW 502 faculty teaching the course online (10 students) and face to face on Main Campus (39 students) assessed the student papers using a rubric.

The work of 47 of the 49 students in BLAW 502 completed the assignment in Fall 2009. Forty-four students enrolled in BLAW 502 completed the assignment in Spring 2010.

The findings for fall 2009 assessment indicate that 100% of students met or exceeded expectations on discussing different sides of the issue and providing a solid personal perspective, while 86% of students met/exceeded expectations in identifying a legal issue.

The findings for the spring 2010 assessment indicate that 86% of students met/exceeded expectations on identifying a legal issue and 100% of students could discuss different sides of the issues and provide a solid personal perspective. A comparison of findings over 3 semesters shows consistent performance of this learning goal.