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Executive Summary

The Assurance of Learning Committee’s function is to oversee assessment activities related to AACSB assessment requirements for our undergraduate (BA and BBA) degrees. Each functional area in the College of Business (accounting, business law, economics, e-stat, finance, information systems, management, and marketing) is currently contributing to this assessment effort and each functional area has representation on the committee. The committee met on March 14, 2008. All functional areas were represented at the meeting. Minutes of this meeting were previously released via e-mail and are not fully repeated here.

At the March 14 meeting, Jim Shannon formally proposed a change in the assessment tool that accounting will use to assess writing skills. His proposal was approved. Committee members are responsible for updating the committee twice each year on the assessment activities of their respective functional areas. The committee discussed the difficulty committee members had delivering their spring reports to the chair by the spring convocation. The committee agreed to extend the spring reporting deadline. The committee also agreed that the committee chair will now provide only one updated report to the faculty per year, at the fall COB convocation. The committee also discussed the problem of functional areas making meaningful changes to their assessment tools without getting approval from the AOL committee. Discussions on this latter point will continue.

Each functional area mentioned above is currently responsible for assessing one learning goal (or subgoal). Individual assessment updates from these functional areas appear later in this report, immediately following the executive summary.

Regarding the assessment results since the fall 07 convocation, representatives from the functional areas generally report that students are currently meeting the standards established by the functional areas, indicating that the learning objectives are being met. Exceptions include the following:

1. The economics area is currently changing its assessment tool and has no recent results to report.
2. The E-stat area reports that students are not meeting the standard. E-stat has included possible explanations as to why this is the case.
3. The IS area reports that students are meeting the standard using data from all semesters in which assessment took place, but more recent assessment results are less encouraging.

The most important issue raised at the March 14 meeting was “closing the loop.” AACSB requires that assessment be conducted with the ultimate goal of improving curriculum. Using assessment results to motivate curricular changes is what “closing the loop” means. Our COB faculty members who have attended AACSB assessment seminars report that a very common reason why business schools failed in their assessment efforts is that they could not demonstrate how assessment activities drove curricular changes. Thus, the AOL Committee is concerned that our current failure (as a college) to close the loop represents our greatest assessment-related threat to continued AACSB accreditation.

Finance Area Update-Greg Roth

(a) What learning objectives have been assessed by your department?

Goal 5.4: Students can apply financial decision making skills to solving problems.

(b) What is the assessment tool being used?
Instructors teaching FIN 341 are giving an assessment quiz that covers 5 key topics with two questions per topic for a total of 10 questions.

(c) Briefly, how was this assessment tool developed (and whose input was included)?

A survey was taken, asking all full-time finance instructors with recent experience teaching FIN 341 which main finance topics they cover in FIN 341. There were six topics that all instructors covered. (Later two of these topics were combined into one topic.) Then, five different instructors each wrote 2 questions to be included in the assessment quiz. The end product is a 10-question assessment quiz that includes two questions from each of the five “most important topics.” After a series of elections, the finance faculty has also voted to approve many details regarding when and how the assessment tool will be administered.

(d) What data have your department collected?

The quiz was given by all FIN 341 instructors in all sections of FIN 341 during the fall 2006 semester and the fall 2007 semester. The finance faculty has committed to fall semester assessment and at least some faculty are also conducting spring semester assessment.

(e) What are the results of your department’s data collection?

(f) For purposes of determining whether the learning objective is being met, what is the standard that your department is using for each learning objective being assessed? (Example: A standard for an assessment quiz might be that 80% of students solve 70% or more of the questions correctly.)

(g) Are students passing the standard, indicating that the learning objective is being met?

The fall 2006 assessment quiz scores were very low. The finance area’s stated objective was that 80% of students would score 70% or better. (The effective standard was a 75% correct score on a 12 question quiz.) Only 10% of students scored better than 70% on the quiz. Students were not meeting the standard in fall 2006.

The fall 2007 assessment quiz scores were much higher. The finance area’s continued stated objective was that 80% of students would score 70% or better. (The effective standard is now consistent with the stated objective. That is, a 70% correct score on a 10 question quiz meets the objective.) In the fall of 2007 83.96% of students scored better than 70% on the quiz. Furthermore, 94.34% of students majoring in business were meeting the standard.

Although students overall were meeting the learning objectives as measured by the fall 2007 semester results, there was some variation in performance across skills assessed. Generally speaking, students performed relatively well in the following areas: bond valuation; bond concepts; the constant growth stock valuation model; time value of money and the weighted average cost of capital. Students struggled somewhat in the following areas: calculating required rates of return using the capital asset pricing model; calculating and making decisions with net present value and internal rate of return; and distinguishing between types of risk.

(h) What changes, if any, have been made in response to the data collected and analyzed?

(i) Describe any assessment discussions that took place in your department during the past semester. Include the dates when these discussions were held. (Example: You would include summaries of minutes from any department meetings or summaries of any assessment discussions occurring via e-mail.)

Preliminary discussions among finance faculty members suggest the following possibilities for the low fall 2006 scores: (1) Students did not have sufficient motivation to perform well on the quiz, because the quiz contributed very little to students’ final grades; (2) Students in many cases were given the quiz long after certain topics were covered (without the benefit of a review) and may have forgotten what they learned; (3) Students may not have been given sufficient time to complete the quiz; (4) Certain questions may have been inappropriate, because they reflected primarily a particular instructor's emphasis of, or approach to, a key topic; (5) Students perhaps should have been given the formula sheets in advance of the quiz, so they could familiarize themselves with the variety of formulas available; and (6) Instructors in some cases may not have given sufficient emphasis in class to certain topics.
Initially, the faculty focused on perceived problems of quiz implementation. Specifically, during this spring 2007 semester, Ben Taylor and Al Berryman gave the quiz after making the following changes. First, they raised the weight of the quiz in determining students’ final grades. Second, they gave students more time to complete the quiz. Third, they passed out the quiz formula sheets earlier in the semester, so that students had more time to familiarize themselves with this tool.

After these changes, the relatively small number of students assessed in the spring 2007 semester still did not meet the standard. In response, on August 15, 2007, the finance faculty members met to discuss the assessment quiz. They spent time reviewing the questions and concluded that certain questions were inappropriate, because they reflected primarily a particular instructor’s emphasis of, or approach to, a key topic. The assessment tool was found to be seriously flawed. The finance faculty had developed the initial assessment quiz without permitting any finance faculty member to veto another finance faculty member’s proposed assessment question. That policy was changed and the quiz was rewritten. In this first rewriting of the assessment quiz the faculty did collaborate more closely and some proposed assessment questions were modified or eliminated. The final product was vetted by all finance faculty members via e-mail and approved.

The finance faculty members met on December 12, 2007, to discuss the possibility of changing the assessment tool yet again—this time to a format other than a multiple choice instrument. The main alternative to the multiple choice quiz seemed to be a capital budgeting problem that would incorporate as many key topics as practicable. The finance faculty members voted to observe student performance using the revised assessment quiz for some time, rather than immediately moving toward another new assessment tool.

On January 25, 2008 the finance faculty met to discuss the fall 2007 assessment results. The faculty discussed ways in which student improvement could be achieved. The point was made that each FIN 341 instructor had an item analysis for assessment results in his or her course. This allowed each faculty member to focus on improving student performance in the specific areas where performance was less robust. At the January 25, 2008 meeting, the faculty voted unanimously to make no further changes to the current assessment tool.

(j) Please report any other assessment information for this functional area that you deem relevant.

BLAW Area Update-Greg Roth

a. What learning objectives have been assessed by your department?

   Goal 6.2: Students can recognize legal problems.

b. What is the assessment tool being used?

   “Business Law in the News” assignment. This tool is a four part project assigned in all BLAW 316 classes. The assignment requires students to locate current news articles and other documents relating to specific legal issues, identify and describe the legal issues in those articles and documents, in four different content areas, and to answer some basic questions about the legal issue.

c. Briefly, how was this assessment tool developed (and whose input was included)?

   As noted in our Fall 2007 report: The Business Law group (consisting of Liz Ellis, Nancy Oretskin, Don Garland and Nina Compton) unanimously agreed to use this tool beginning in the Fall 2007 semester.

   In Spring 2008 the BLAW assessment group met again to discuss minor modifications to the assessment tool and data collection. It was agreed that changes would be implemented Fall 2008.
d. What data have your department collected?
Projects were assigned in all BLAW 316 sections in the Fall 2007 semester.
- In one section, assignments were graded but not assessed using the agreed upon rubric, probably due to a misunderstanding on the part of the instructor.
- In two sections, the assignments were assessed, but the data was not collected in a way that makes it possible to analyze how many students met the goal.
- In two sections, the assignment was assessed and the data was properly collected.

Bottom line: proper data was collected in 2 of the 5 BLAW 316 sections.

e. What are the results of your department’s data collection?
98% of students enrolled in the two sections were assessed.
Of these, 87% could adequately recognize legal issues (which we defined as correctly recognizing and identifying legal issues in 3 out of 4 parts of the project). Conversely, 13% failed to adequately recognize legal issues.

f. For purposes of determining whether the learning objective is being met, what is the standard that your department is using for each learning objective being assessed? (Example: A standard for an assessment quiz might be that 80% of students solve 70% or more of the questions correctly.)

Goal: 80% or more of the students assessed will adequately recognize legal issues in at least 3 of 4 content areas.

g. Are students passing the standard, indicating that the learning objective is being met?
For Spring 2008, yes, the number of students meeting the standard exceeded our goal.

h. What changes, if any, have been made in response to the data collected and analyzed?
None at this time.

i. Describe any assessment discussions that took place in your department during the past semester. Include the dates when these discussions were held. (Example: You would include summaries of minutes from any department meetings or summaries of any assessment discussions occurring via e-mail.)

- Thursday, January 24, 2008 – see minutes below.

The Business Law assessment group met on Thursday, January 24, 2008. Nancy Oretskin, Don Garland and Liz Ellis were present.

The group discussed the Fall 2007 assessment that was conducted using the “Business Law in the News” project. The following issues were addressed:

- **Project Grading vs. Assessment.** We discussed the difference between grading criteria used by individual faculty to assign individual grades to students. We concluded that there was no need for faculty to use identical criteria for grading and that while factors such as use of proper grammar and punctuation were appropriate to use in the assignment of student’s numeric grades, these factors were not relevant for assessment of the learning objective.

- **Assessment Criteria.** The distinction between “adequately recognized” and “superior recognition” did not seem to be useful. We decided that for assessment purposes, we would distinguish only between “adequately recognized legal issue” and “failed to adequately recognize legal issue” for each topic in our data collection. This really seems to be a “yes” or “no” question for each topic.

- **Topic specific feedback from data.** Based on feedback from our department assessment coordinator (Greg Roth) we agreed to collect data by topic area so that we can identify any particular topic areas where students have been less successful in identifying legal issues. The
group did express some concern that this data could be misleading, since the topic areas that students select will be driven in significant part by the types of news stories that are prominent in any given semester. However, over time, we may be able to identify topics where students are not able to recognize legal issues and make curriculum changes to address that situation.

- **Reporting.** The group approved the proposed data reporting form with minor changes. Each faculty member will fill in the data for the sections they taught. Each faculty member will fill out the topic distribution sheet as well. To collect some sample student work product, we agreed to take one project from each BLAW section. In order to make the sample more or less random, we agreed to use the 10th student project (in alpha order) from section 1, the 20th student project from section 2, the 30th project from section 3, etc.
- **The group also discussed the need for minor changes in the assessment instrument.** Since the project has already been distributed to students for the Spring 2008 semester, we agreed that no changes would be made for assessment this semester. For Fall 2008, we agreed to add two new topic areas and to move topic 1-G (international business transactions) from Content Area One to Content Area Four.

j. Please report any other assessment information for this functional area that you deem relevant.

**Economics Area Update-Randy McFerrin**

A. What learning objectives have been assessed by your department?

Our department assess goal # 5.1: Students can develop an analytical and systematic approach to solving problems.

B. What is the assessment tool being used?

In the past, the department administered a quiz (essay fall 07 and multiple choice spring 08). The departmental undergraduate curriculum committee is currently developing a rubric for analyzing the results of these quizzes.

C. Briefly, how was this assessment tool developed and whose input was included?

The responsibility of developing an assessment tool and rubric is now the responsibility of the departmental undergraduate committee. This committee consists of 5 members of the economics faculty. We are discussing the potential to adapt an existing rubric developed by the Washington State University Critical Thinking Project. This rubric can be viewed at http://academic.pgcc.edu/~wpeirce/MCCCTR/Designingrubricsassessingthinking.html. Once the committee develops an assessment rubric and tool, it will be presented for discussion and a vote by the entire department faculty. Once the process is completed, all departmental faculty will have a chance to be involved in the discussions.

D. What data have your department collected?

During fall 07 we administered a short essay quiz in Econ 304. During spring 08 we administered a multiple choice quiz in Econ 304.

E. What are the results of your department’s data collection?

As explained below, we will be analyzing the results of the fall 07 data collection and the spring 08 data collection at a later date.

F. For the purpose of determining whether the learning objective is being met, what is the standard that your department is using for each learning objective assessed?

At this time, the departmental undergraduate committee is not only developing an assessment rubric and tool, but recommending a standard for student performance as well. Once this task is completed, we will assess the data collected in the fall 07 and spring 08 semesters.
G. Are students passing the standard, indicating that student the student learning objective is being met?

Once we have rubric and standard in place, we will report the results.

H. What changes, if any, have been made in response to the data collected and analyzed?

At this point no changes have been made.

I. Describe any assessment discussions that took place in your department during the past semester. Include the dates when these discussions were held.

Beginning in the fall 07 semester, the departmental undergraduate curriculum committee was reconstituted to address curriculum matters. It quickly became apparent that the committee should undertake a thorough review of the undergraduate curriculum offerings in economics with the ultimate goal of developing an assessment plan. An outcome of this review was extensive discussions of what objectives should the department strive to achieve. The result was the adoption of four learning objectives by the department as a whole. Once adopted, these objectives will form the foundation of our assessment activities. The next step for the committee is the design of an assessment tool and rubric, an adoption of performance standards and the development of a plan to assess each learning objective on a routine basis. This process will begin in the fall 08 semester with a goal of a rapid completion and implementation with respect to goal # 5.1(college wide goal) during the fall 08 semester. Then, we will turn our attention to completing the overall assessment plan for the department with respect to the four learning objectives adopted for the economics program.

As indicated above, extensive discussions of how the department should achieve assessment constituted a large part of the departmental undergraduate committee’s activities. The committee met on the following dates during the spring 08 semester (I don’t remember the dates during the fall 07 semester):

- February 2nd
- March 4th
- March 11th

J. Please report any other assessment information for this functional area that you deem relevant.

Assessment is now formally the responsibility of the department undergraduate curriculum committee charged with the goal of developing an assessment plan for the Department of Economics and International Business.

E-stat Area Update-Randy McFerrin

(a) What learning objectives have been assessed by your department?

Outcome of Assessment for Goal 5.2: Students can solve problems using statistical data analysis.

(b) What is the assessment tool being used?

The one business statistics course taught in the college, EST 251, uses several questions from the final exam regarding distribution calculations, hypothesis testing, confidence intervals, and regression to do assessment. These questions are specifically NOT multiple choice or true/false type questions, but are “worked solutions.”

(c) Briefly, how was this assessment tool developed (and whose input was included)?

An ad hoc committee of three faculty members from the EST program developed the tool and presented it for approval to the department head.
(d) What data has your department collected?
The final exam has been given and relevant data tallied starting in Fall 2006 to the present.

(e) What are the results of your department’s data collection?

**Fall 2006**
- Among all students taking the exam: 23% scored 75% or better (31 students).
- Among students passing the course with a C or better: 39% scored 75% or better (18 students).
(Note that as this is a new tool, the exam layout was changed in Spring 2007 to better facilitate evaluation of student ability in the specific evaluation areas.)

**Spring 2007**
- Among all students taking the exam: 48% scored 75% or better (31 students).
- Among students passing the course with a C or better: 71% scored 75% or better (21 students).

**Fall 2007**
- Among all students taking the exam: 50% scored 75% or better (11 of 22 students).
- Among students passing the course with a C or better: 78.6% scored 75% or better (11 of 14 students).

**Spring 2008**
- Among all students taking the exam: 31.3% scored 75% or better (10 of 32 students).
- Among students passing the course with a C or better: 50.0% scored 75% or better (10 of 20 students).

(f) For purposes of determining whether the learning objective is being met, what is the standard that your department is using for each learning objective being assessed?
70% of students score 75% or better.

(g) Are students passing the standard, indicating that the learning objective is being met?
No.

(h) What changes, if any, have been made in response to the data collected and analyzed?

Discussions between the course teaching assistants and the instructor indicate that students are not taking the time to come to office hours despite frequent in-class encouragement to do so. In fact, based on experiencing this in previous semesters, student use of office hours is now being tracked. In the current evaluation semester, only 7 of the 32 students taking the assessment exam ever came to office hours, for a total of 14 visits, despite repeated encouragement to seek assistance during office hours. Note that there were seventeen hours of assistance available to the students each week, and the available times were well distributed throughout the week.

The impact of students’ final exam scores on their final grades are counterbalanced by less comprehensive mid-term exams, quizzes, and homework scores, and may lead to less emphasis on preparing for the comprehensive final exam. Because regression is covered at the end of the semester after the last mid-term is given, it is a substantial component of the evaluation questions on the final exam, and hypothesis testing is evaluated in a regression context which is substantially more difficult, thus leading to lower scores than if hypothesis testing was evaluated in the context of testing a population mean value. Finally, these scores are not curved, whereas the overall final exam score was curved slightly, in part to help compensate for the difficulty in testing in a regression context.

(j) Please report any other assessment information for this functional area that you deem relevant.

**Management Area Update-Jim Bishop**

(a) What learning objectives have been assessed by your department?

No.2.2 Students demonstrate an adequate understanding of and appreciation for diversity including gender, age, ethnicity, and socioeconomic background.
(b) What is the assessment tool being used?

We used a video followed by a set of questions that are graded according to a rubric in which students will be asked to Identify Stereotypes, see cultural and ethnic identity (one’s sense of “belonging” to a group as complex, multiple, fractionated, and contradictory), and explain how self-serving bias in attribution contributes to unfavorable perceptions of disadvantaged groups.

(c) Briefly, how was this assessment tool developed (and whose input was included)?

The assessment is done in Management 309. All faculty who teach Management 309 gave input.

(d) What data have your department collected?

The department collected answers to diversity related questions that were based upon students viewing a video from the movie “Smoke Signals” illustrating various stereotypes.

(e) What are the results of your department’s data collection?

Smoke Signals Rubric Results for the Spring 2008 Semester

Mgt 309 section ___all____ Instructor ___all______

Number of Students Sampled ___241____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify Stereotypes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot identify 1-2 stereotypic images of American Indians on TV or in the Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can identify 1-2 stereotypic images</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can identify at least 1 stereotypic image and explain why it is inaccurate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can identify 2 stereotypic images and explain why 1 is inaccurate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can identify 2 stereotypic images and explain why both are inaccurate</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See cultural and ethnic identity formation as complex, multiple, fractionated, and contradictory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot recognize the concept of culturally-embedded identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See only one way of being a &quot;real&quot; member of a cultural group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See at least 2 ways of being a &quot;real&quot; member of a cultural group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See an infinite variety of ways of developing a culturally-embedded identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See an infinite variety of ways of being a &quot;real&quot; member of a cultural group.</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.83%</td>
<td>7.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explain how self-serving bias in attribution contributes to unfavorable perceptions of disadvantaged groups.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cannot see self-serving biases in perceptions of American Indians.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can identify at least 1 example of self-serving bias and 1 way to overcome it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can identify 2 examples of self-serving bias and 1 way to overcome it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can identify 2 examples of self-serving bias and 2 ways to overcome it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.97%</td>
<td>9.16%</td>
<td>15.83%</td>
<td>27.51%</td>
<td>41.91%</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(f) For purposes of determining whether the learning objective is being met, what is the standard that your department is using for each learning objective being assessed? (Example: A standard for an assessment quiz might be that 80% of students solve 70% or more of the questions correctly.)

On average the students scored a total of 12.86 points out of a possible 15. This puts them well above the criteria of 9 points required for full credit.

### Credit Summary 12.86

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Points from Above</th>
<th>&lt;4 Points</th>
<th>4 – 9 Points</th>
<th>&gt;9 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Credit</td>
<td>Half Credit</td>
<td>Full Credit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using % scale</td>
<td>&lt;6 = Failure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No credit</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-8 = 70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-11 = 80%</td>
<td>12-14 = 90%</td>
<td>15 pts = 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(g) Are students passing the standard, indicating that the learning objective is being met?

Yes, by a good margin.

(h) What changes, if any, have been made in response to the data collected and analyzed?

We used a medium that simulated a real life situation. We drilled the students on how to analyze such conditions.

(i) Describe any assessment discussions that took place in your department during the past semester. Include the dates when these discussions were held. (Example: You would include summaries of minutes from any department meetings or summaries of any assessment discussions occurring via e-mail.)

None. We implemented the plan we put together during the Fall semester.

(j) Please report any other assessment information for this functional area that you deem relevant.

**Marketing Area Update-Michelle Jasso**

(a) What learning objectives have been assessed by your department?
Goal 6.1: **Students can recognize ethical problems** (under Goal 6: Students have an understanding of ethical decision-making.)

(b) What is the assessment tool being used?

Marketing majors in MKTG 489 (the marketing capstone course) were given an exam that contained 10 scenarios concerning business ethics (randomly selected from a question database containing 50 scenarios). Students were asked to read the scenarios one at a time, and then answer a question addressing whether the scenario required an ethical decision or not. The ability to correctly discriminate between scenarios that did or did not require an ethical decision is taken as evidence that the students understand business ethics.

(c) Briefly, how was this assessment tool developed (and whose input was included)?

The assessment tool was developed by Professor Michael Hyman, who is our resident expert in ethics and measurement of ethics. Once Mike created the assessment tool, it was distributed to the other members of the marketing department for evaluation and subsequently was accepted by the department.

(d) What data have your department collected?

The assessment tool was used by MKTG 489 students in the Fall 2006, Spring 2007, Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 semesters.

(e) What are the results of your department’s data collection?

In Fall 2006 90 students took the test and the mean score was 7.66 out of 10, i.e., students correctly recognized whether or not the scenario constituted an ethical dilemma 77% of the time. 73/90 (81.1%) students obtained a score of 7 or more out of 10. In Spring 2007 55 students took the test and the mean score was 8.06 out of 10. 50/55 (90.9%) students obtained a score of 7 or more out of 10. In the fall 2007, 55 students took the test and the mean score was 7.75 out of 10. 46/55 (83.6%) students obtained a score of 7 or more out of 10. In the spring 2008, 44/51 (86.3%) students obtained a score of 7 or more out of 10.

(f) For purposes of determining whether the learning objective is being met, what is the standard that your department is using for each learning objective being assessed?

80% of students correctly categorize seven or more of the scenarios as involving an ethical dilemma or not.

(g) Are students passing the standard, indicating that the learning objective is being met?

Yes. Over the last three semesters, 84.9% of the students who took the test correctly categorize seven or more of the scenarios (213/251). The pattern of results has remained relatively stable over the assessment process.

(h) What changes, if any, have been made in response to the data collected and analyzed?

The assessment must include a broader sample of students. The assessment will be moved from the MKTG 489 course (capstone for marketing majors) to the MKTG 303 course (required of all business majors under curriculum revision accepted in Spring 2007). The change will be made in the Fall 2008 to allow the course instructor adequate time for incorporating the assessment into the course structure.

(i) Describe any assessment discussions that took place in your department during the past semester. Include the dates when these discussions were held. (Example: You would include summaries of minutes from any department meetings or summaries of any assessment discussions occurring via e-mail.)

Given the plan to move the assessment to the MKTG 303 class, the department head has had simply email/personal communications with the instructors for the fall MKTG 303 courses (mid
April and early July). The instructors are discussing between themselves the standards by which the assessment will be built into the course (e.g., if the assessment will count for course credit and how it will be administered). Their suggestions will be brought to the department for a vote in the opening fall meeting.

(j) Please report any other assessment information for this functional area that you deem relevant.

IS Area Update-Jim Shannon

a) What learning objectives have been assessed by your department?

Goal 4.0: Students are effective users of information technology.

b) What is the assessment tool being used?

Assessment is based on graded IS projects in BCIS 338 (a required course for all non-IS business majors). Students must use information technology effectively to successfully complete the projects.

c) Briefly, how was this assessment tool developed (and whose input was included)?

The assessment tool is embedded in the normal assessment for BCIS 338. Input for the assessment came from the IS faculty and the department head.

d) What data has your department collected?

Data was collected for all sections of BCIS 338 for Fall 2006, Spring 2007, Summer Session I 2007, Fall 2007, Spring 2008, and Summer Session I 2008 semesters. Students overall average grades on the IS projects were used for the assessment.

e) What are the results of your department’s data collection?

Overall results for each semester are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects Grade Range (%)</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Total All Semesters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;= 90</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;= 80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;= 70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;= 60</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;= 0</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) For purposes of determining whether the learning objective is being met, what is the standard that your department is using for each learning objective being assessed? (Example: A standard for an assessment quiz might be that 80% of students solve 70% or more of the questions correctly.)

Seventy percent of the students will average 70% or more on the IS projects.

g) Are students passing the standard, indicating that the learning objective is being met?

Yes. Using all data from all semesters, over 70% of students average 70% or more on the projects.

h) What changes, if any, have been made in response to the data collected and analyzed?
No changes.

i) Describe any assessment discussions that took place in your department during the past semester. Include the dates when these discussions were held. (Example: You would include summaries of minutes from any department meetings or summaries of any assessment discussions occurring via e-mail.)

During the Fall 2007 semester the faculty teaching the BCIS 338 classes had several informal discussions regarding the projects and the assessment process. No minutes or dates were recorded. Starting in the Spring 2008 semester, a more formal process will be used to document the discussions. No formal discussion occurred during the Spring 2008 semester.

j) Please report any other assessment information for this functional area that you deem relevant.

No other information to report at this time.

**Accounting Area Update-Jim Shannon**

a) What learning objectives have been assessed by your department?

   Goal 1.1: Students write effectively.

b) What is the assessment tool being used?

   Student writings from executive summary and business description from the first of two submissions for Fall, 2007 team project.

   Assessed 52 writing samples from 26 teams prepared by different individuals within the teams. (Total class size = 144 students; sample 3% of total (52/144)). See Exhibit 1 for project requirements for these three sections.

   One faculty member and one graduate assistant assessed the writing samples for the executive summary. Inter-rater reliability was 86%. One faculty member also assessed resubmitted executive summaries for second submission to determine any improvement in writing. One graduate student assessed the business description submissions.

   Assessors used a rubric to assess each of the three specific learning objectives for each writing sample. Scores ranged from 4 to 1: accomplished (4), competent (3), developing (2), and beginning (1). A score of 3 or 4 was considered acceptable.

c) Briefly, how was this assessment tool developed (and whose input was included)?

   The assessment assignment was a team project requiring a sensitivity analysis based on decisions about marketing and operations changes. This assignment was developed by the three faculty members for the course. The rubric used to evaluate the assignment was modified from one developed at another university.

d) What data has your department collected?

   Data was collected for all sections of BUSA 365 for Fall 2007.

e) What are the results of your department’s data collection?

   Overall results are shown below:
### Table 1. Percentage of Writing Samples Scoring Competent or Accomplished

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conventions</th>
<th>Clarity</th>
<th>Rhetoric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Results</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Summaries</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Descriptions</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**f)** For purposes of determining whether the learning objective is being met, what is the standard that your department is using for each learning objective being assessed? (Example: A standard for an assessment quiz might be that 80% of students solve 70% or more of the questions correctly.)

80% of the student writing will be competent or accomplished.

**g)** Are students passing the standard, indicating that the learning objective is being met?

Yes, overall, 81.00% student writings were competent or accomplished.

**h)** What changes, if any, have been made in response to the data collected and analyzed?

This is the last semester writing will be evaluated in BUSA 365.

**i)** Describe any assessment discussions that took place in your department during the past semester. Include the dates when these discussions were held. (Example: You would include summaries of minutes from any department meetings or summaries of any assessment discussions occurring via e-mail.)

Some of the faculty in accounting, at various times and places, discussed having a “fatal error” policy in writing, where no paper would be graded any further if three errors in punctuation or grammar are found. No conclusion with respect to imposition of this policy was arrived at.

**j)** Please report any other assessment information for this functional area that you deem relevant.

No other information to report at this time.