

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

### College of Business and Technology

Division or Department: **School of Business (Business Administration, BS)**

Prepared by: **Dr. Marcia Hardy**

Date:

Approved by: **Dr. Margaret Kilcoyne, Dean**

Date:

**Northwestern Mission.** Northwestern State University is a responsive, student-oriented institution that is committed to the creation, dissemination, and acquisition of knowledge through teaching, research, and service. The University maintains as its highest priority excellence in teaching in graduate and undergraduate programs. Northwestern State University prepares its students to become productive members of society and promotes economic development and improvements in the quality of life of the citizens in its region.

**College of Business and Technology Mission.** The College of Business and Technology is dedicated to providing a high quality – market responsive business and technology education, preparing our diverse student population for successful careers and enriched lives in the public, private and nonprofit sectors, and enhancing our students' academic experiences through our research and scholarly activities. (Adopted September 28, 2015, 04/13/2018)

**School of Business Mission.** The mission of the School of Business is to **provide our diverse student population with a business education that prepares them for successful careers and responsible citizenship roles in the world of business.** (Adopted 2017-2018 Mission wording was revised to include, "our diverse population". As such, NSU's School of Business is committed to...

**Providing students with a business education.** This means that we strive to provide students with opportunities to become effective communicators, critical thinkers, develop knowledge across the business disciplines, and global perspective. (Revised 2012 and approved 2013).

**Preparing them for successful careers and citizenship roles.** This means that we provide education experience and opportunities.

**...In the world of Business.** This implies developing a global perspective that involves managing activities that foster the transfer of goods and services in organizations of all types wherever found.

**Business Administration Program Mission Statement:** The mission of the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration in the School of Business at Northwestern State is to prepare our diverse student population for careers as business professionals in public, private and nonprofit sectors, and/or for advancement into graduate programs. This purpose will be met by providing quality online and face-to-face business and technology instruction and academic support with high academic standards, superior teaching,

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

quality research, significant service, and effective use of technology for the citizens of our region. (Approved by BUAD faculty on 04/05/2017; 04/13/2018)

**Purpose:** To prepare students for careers as business professionals in the public, private and nonprofit sectors, and/or for advancement into graduate programs.

**Methodology:** The assessment process for the School of Business is as follows: A variety of assessment tools (quantitative, qualitative, direct and indirect) are used to collect data for analysis for each of the five Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Data is collected and summary results are analyzed to determine if students have achieved or “met” the measurable outcomes. When necessary, proposed action steps are created by each SLO chairman in collaboration with the SLO committee members, faculty teaching core courses, and the program coordinator. Following discussion and review by faculty, if needed, proposed recommended action steps and recommended changes are implemented by the faculty responsible for teaching the courses tied to the SLO.

### Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs):

In the past, each degree program in the School of Business shared four SLOs. This was acceptable to our accreditation agency, the AACSB. However, to make our assessment process more robust and strive for continuous improvement, in AY 2016-2017, the School of Business decided to develop a fifth SLO for each degree program. Rather than shared among all degree programs, the fifth SLO would be specific and unique to each degree program. This change would increase fidelity to our individual degree assessments. Therefore, in AY 2016-2017, a fifth SLO was designed for the Business Administration program and was implemented in AY 2017-2018.

Overall, in AY 2017-2018, for the Business Administration degree program, numerous direct and indirect measures gathered evidence of student performance, and most targets were met at the acceptable or ideal level. Baseline data for SLO 5 was established in AY 2017-2018.

**SLO 1. Effective Communicators.** Students should be able to:  
**Objective 1a: Produce professional quality business documents;**  
**Objective 1b: Deliver professional quality oral presentations; and,**  
**Objective 1c: Demonstrate communication skills in team settings.**

Course Map: Tied to course syllabus objectives.

BUAD 2200 Business Reports and Communication (Foundational Course)  
MGT 4300 Strategic Management and Policies (Capstone Course)  
CIS 4600 Advanced Systems Development (Capstone Course)  
UNIV 1000 The University Experience (Support Course)  
MKTG 3230 Principles of Marketing (Foundational Course)

**Measure 1a.1 (Direct – Exam; BUAD 2200 Objective Measures)**

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

**Details/Description:** In BUAD 2200, a pre-test was developed that included a comprehensive overview of the business communication requirements and contained such topics as: (1) Laying communication foundations, (2) Using the writing process, (3) Corresponding at work, (4) Reporting workplace data, and (5) Developing speaking and technology skills. This same test is intended to be given as a posttest at the end of the semester.

**Acceptable Target:** At least 75% of the students must earn 70% or better on the posttest.

**Ideal Target:** At least 85% of the students must earn 70% or better on the posttest.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** This measurement is completed each semester in BUAD 2200.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key/Responsible Personnel: School of Business faculty teaching BUAD 2200 are responsible for this measurement.

**Findings:** The acceptable target was met.

**Analysis:** The table below compares the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 academic year results for Measure 1a.1.

**Table 1: AY 2016-2017 vs. AY 2017-2018 Comparison**

Measure 1a.1				
Academic Year	n (# of students)	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target	Actual Results
2016-2017	163	75%	85%	82%
2017-2018	206	75%	85%	75%

Percentages indicate the percent of students scoring 70% or better on the measure.

**AY 2016-2017:** 163 students took the BUAD 2200 objective measure (post-test). Of these students, 82% scored 70% or better on the post-test. The acceptable target was exceeded. However, the ideal target was not met.

**AY 2017-2018:** 206 students were given the BUAD 2200 objective measure (post-test). Of these students, 75% of the students, scored 70% or better on the post-test. The acceptable target was met. However, the ideal target was not met.

The evidence indicates that students were able to demonstrate an understanding and comprehension of the course materials. The results also indicate that the student learning outcomes are being met. However, there was a decline from 82% to 75% from AY 2016-2017 to AY 2017-2018. When only looking at data from students who did not meet the ideal target, a further investigation revealed that 53% of those students were in face-to-face courses, 26% were in an online section, and 21% were in the distance learning section. It was unanticipated that in AY 2017-2018 students participating in the

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

face-to-face courses would be more likely to fall below the ideal target at a lower level than in AY 2016-2017.

When faculty compared face-to-face results to online results, it was determined that the face-to-face courses employed a 'no open book / no notes' policy whereas the online course instructors provided an 'open book/notes and resources' policy during the exam. Another discrepancy between face-to-face and online/distance learning results may be attributed to demographic differences. For example, older business professionals or students who work during the day often take online or evening distance learning courses, and they may take their education and time commitments more seriously than the typical university sophomore in face-to-face sections. To be clear, the compressed video course had a mixture of traditional and non-traditional students, but in our experience, non-traditional students are typically more likely to take online or compressed video courses.

Last, in prior years, distance learning courses, which are taught to multiple campuses via compressed video, have been more likely to have problems with student attrition. These problems were likely caused by a combination of the format and technical issues. For BUAD 2200, the normal format had been to offer the course two days a week rather than as a single day offering, except for a one-day a week night class. In a change for AY 2017-2018, to assist working, professional students who are unable to attend traditional day-time offerings or attend on-campus classes, the course was offered in a single three-hour session once a week through compressed video to provide better accessibility. To overcome problems that have historically been present in distance learning (compressed video) courses, special attention was given to ensuring that technical problems were minimized. These changes for the AY 2017-2018 were an attempt to better meet our students' needs, improve the student learning experience, and improve assessment outcomes.

However, despite the successful implementation of the new distance learning course, students course evaluations revealed that the students felt stressed and were concerned by the amount of material covered and activities assigned during one class period. While the faculty took note of this concern, similar student concerns about other one-day-a-week classes are not unusual. Still, as this was the first time the course was taught as a distance learning course, the instructor noted this concern for future consideration.

The evidence of student learning from the newly formatted distance learning course was better than expected. However, in AY 2017-2018, the change to the single three-hour compressed video course format did not minimize the student attrition typical of distance learning courses.

**Action - Decision:** Although the overall acceptable target was met, it was unanticipated that students participating in face-to-face and online courses would fall below the ideal target and at a lower level than results from AY 2016-2017. In response, the faculty will provide an additional comprehensive overview of the business

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

communication requirements in both the face-to-face and online courses. Additionally, the “no open book / no notes” policy will be discussed prior to the beginning of AY 2018-2019 to ensure that all instructors are using a consistent policy, whether open book or not, across the entire School of Business.

While the results from the newly formatted distance learning course were encouraging, instructors will re-evaluate the distance learning course design and look for possible ways to improve the course and other distance learning courses even further. Since the course format has only been in service for one semester, additional experience and information may be necessary before major data-driven changes to the course can be made with confidence. Faculty will also review the student workload in the course and consider keeping better demographic data about the number of non-traditional students for better data comparisons to traditional daytime offerings in the future.

Faculty members teaching BUAD 2200 will continue to utilize a variety of pedagogical methods to assist students. Best practices include professors continuing to embed model examples of various business report documents into the course and voice-narrated videos. These videos provide step by step project/assignment directions for use by students. Faculty will re-evaluate the distance learning process, course design, and delivery system and make necessary technical corrections and implement student retention measures with each campus prior to implementing another distance learning section.

### **Measure 1a.2 (Direct – Student Artifact; MGT 4300/CIS 4600 Written Document)**

**Details/Description:** In MGT 4300/CIS 4600, students are required to create a business letter addressing a business problem and deliver the letter as an attachment.

**Acceptable Target:** At least 75% of the students must earn 70% or better on the final business document.

**Ideal Target:** At least 85% of the students must earn 70% or better on the final business document.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** This measure should be completed each semester as part of the School of Business Common Body Knowledge Exam (SoBUSKE).

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** The School of Business faculty teaching MGT 4300 / CIS 4600 are responsible for completing this measurement.

**Findings:** The ideal target was met.

Note: This measurement was normally taken as part of the School of Business Common Body Knowledge Exam (SoBUSKE), but since the exam was not given this year, the measure was taken from an experimental pilot study using new teaching methods in MGT 4300, rather than through the SoBUSKE section typically administered in this course.

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

The assignment itself was identical to the SoBUSKE assignment. However, the pilot study results are *not* directly comparable to the SoBUSKE results as the pilot class included a chance for revision and peer intervention, while the student submissions for the SoBUSKE did not. Therefore, these findings should only be used as initial evidence that student learning is improving. When the new SoBUSKE exam is instituted, more directly comparable evidence of student learning after exposure to the pedagogical changes will be available.

Please See “A note on the School of Business Knowledge Exam:” under SLO2 for more information about the status of the School of Business Common Body Knowledge Exam (SoBUSKE).

**Analysis:** The table below compares the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 academic year results for Measure 1a.2.

**Table 2: AY 2016-2017 vs. AY 2017-2018 Comparison**

Measure 1a.2				
Academic Year	n (# of students)	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target	*Actual Results
2016-2017	56	75%	85%	68%
2017-2018	24	75%	85%	100%

Percentages indicate the percent of students scoring 70% or better on the measure.  
\*AY 2016-2017 results were gathered through the SoBUSKE, while AY 2017-2018 results were not.

**AY 2016-2017:** Of the fifty-six students who participated in the written document exercise, 68% of the students (n=56), scored 70% or better on the MGT4300/CIS4600 Written Document. The acceptable target was not met.

**AY 2017-2018:** As a pilot, twenty-four students in MGT 4300 participated in a written business document exercise, 100% of the students (n=24) scored 70% or better on the MGT 4300 Written Document. The ideal target was exceeded. While the method of teaching the assignment was new in the pilot, the assignment was identical to the assessment assignment given in the School of Business Common Body Knowledge Exam (SoBUSKE) in AY 2016-2017. The methodology of evaluation for the student artifacts was also identical. However, as previously stated, the AY 2017-2018 experimental pilot study results are *not* directly comparable to the SoBUSKE results as the pilot class included a chance for revision and peer intervention, while the student submissions for the SoBUSKE did not. Therefore, these findings should only be used as initial evidence that student learning is improving. Again, when the new SoBUSKE exam is instituted, more directly comparable evidence of student learning after exposure to the pedagogical changes will be available.

After reviewing the results of the 2016-2017 written document measure, during AY 2017-2018 faculty included additional instruction and practical application exercises in BUAD 2200. Beginning in Fall 2017, the course was updated in several ways. Instructors included a special unit on letter writing, a short video explaining how to create the business letter and the e-mail for MGT 4300 and CIS 4600, and a BUAD 2200 faculty

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

member also provided a special instruction section to MGT 4300 students on business letter development and email construction. Then, in Spring 2018, a peer intervention business letter pilot study was conducted.

As planned, the School of Business Knowledge Exam (SoBUSKE) was not administered in AY 2017-2018. The faculty teaching MGT 4300 used this time to experiment with new instruction methods to better enhance student learning. In order to address the results deficiency of AY 2016-2017 1a.2, a peer learning intervention experimental pilot study was conducted. In Spring 2018, a business letter of introduction was developed by each of five experiential project teams in MGT 4300. The initial letter was crafted and presented by each team during class. Students rated each team on the team's projected mastery across categories of best format, content, written, and least mistakes. Students evaluated each letter and proposed recommendations. Initially, the acceptable target was not met. That is, 4 of 5 teams did not earn 70% or better on the business document. However, each group was given a chance to revise their work after further researching the written document requirements and using peer input. Then, the re-crafted introductory letter was again presented during class. For the final business letter of introduction, 100% of the students (n=24) scored 70% or better on the MGT 4300 Written Document. The ideal target was exceeded. The analysis of the written document exercise suggests evidence that student learning is taking place.

**Action – Decision.** MGT 4300 faculty determined the written document peer learning exercise was a success and the business letter of introduction will be introduced as an integral portion of the curriculum. By adjusting the curriculum to include this exercise, it will be of value to students in enhancing their written communication skills. Due to its success, this suggested recommendation will be shared with CIS 4600 for consideration in AY 2018-2019. When the revised SoBUSKE is given in AY 2018-2019, the faculty hope that these changes to the pedagogical methods will yield improved results for this measure.

### **Measure 1a.3 (Direct – Student Artifact; UNIV1000 Written Document)**

**Details/Description:** In UNIV1000 (The University Experience), students are required to create a business letter addressing a business problem and deliver the letter as an email attachment.

**Acceptable Target:** At least 75% of the student must earn 70% or better on the final business document.

**Ideal Target:** At least 85% of the students must earn 70% or better on the final business document.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** This written document is created by the UNIV1000 School of Business FIG (Freshmen Interest Group) section in the fall semester.

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** School of Business Faculty Teaching UNIV1000 School of Business FIG.

**Findings:** Measurement instrument under revision.

As planned, this measurement was not taken in AY 2017-2018. Please see the “A note on the School of Business Knowledge Exam” section under SLO2 for further information.

**Analysis:** The analysis below summarizes AY 2016-2017 results and again addresses AY 2017-2018.

**AY 2016-2017:** Of the 79 students only 58 completed the School of Business Common Body Knowledge Exam (SoBUSKE); however, only one student completed the written business document to be sent as an e-mail attachment. This student scored unsatisfactory on this assessment. The acceptable target was not met. As this a baseline starting point for all students without instruction, faculty expected this result as students would be introduced to this knowledge and these skills in BUAD 2200 - Business Reports and Communication.

**AY 2017-2018:** As planned, the School of Business Knowledge Exam (SoBUSKE) measure was not administered in AY 2017-2018 and therefore this data was not collected or measured in Fall 2017. Again, please see the “A note on the School of Business Knowledge Exam” section under SLO2 for further information.

**Action – Decision.** Recognizing this group of students should not have any prior knowledge of the skills being assessed. The faculty agreed this group should still be collected to provide benchmark evidence. A new SoBUSKE is currently being created and will be introduced to UNIV 1000 FIG in Fall 2018.

### **Measure 1a.4 (Direct – Student Artifact; BUAD 2200 Written Document)**

**Details/Description:** In BUAD 2200 students are required to create a business letter addressing a business problem and deliver the letter as an email attachment.

**Acceptable Target:** At least 75% of the students must earn 70% or better on the final business document.

**Ideal Target:** At least 85% of the students must earn 70% or better on the final business document.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** This assignment is given in BUAD 2200 each semester.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** The School of Business faculty teaching BUAD 2200 are responsible for this measure.



## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

**Findings:** The acceptable target was met.

**Analysis:** The table below compares the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 academic year results for Measure 1a.4.

**Table 3: AY 2016-2017 vs. AY 2017-2018 Comparison**

Measure 1a.4				
Academic Year	n (# of students)	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target	Actual Results
2016-2017	163	75%	85%	80%
2017-2018	206	75%	85%	80%

Percentages indicate the percent of students scoring 70% or better on the measure.

**AY 2016-2017:** 80% of the students (n=163), scored 70% or better on the written objective (Letter). The acceptable target was exceeded. The 70% acceptable target was met.

**AY 2017-2018:** In the academic year 2017-2018, 206 students were given the BUAD 2200 written document measure to complete during BUAD 2200- Business Reports and Communications. It was found that 80% of the students (n=206), scored 70% or better on the written objective (Letter). The acceptable target was met. The ideal target was not met.

In AY 2016-2017 the 70% acceptable target was met. However, in an effort to improve the classroom learning experience, it was recommended that other classes should request a one-page business letter be sent as an attachment to the professor at least twice during the semester. It was also suggested a short video be created explaining how to create the business letter and the e-mail for MGT 4300 and CIS 4600. The changes were implemented in AY 2017-2018. In AY 2017-2018, the result of the measure 1a.4 written document exercise indicated the acceptable target was not only met but was exceeded. This indicated that the students were able to demonstrate an appropriate use of business reporting understanding, knowledge and skill by providing an acceptable form of written communication, that is, the formal business letter.

**Action – Decision.** Although the 70% acceptable target was met, the faculty recommended that other classes be identified and short business writing assignments be given. Additionally, a School of Business Faculty Lunch and Learn Program was initiated in Fall 2017 inviting all faculty to participate in recognizing and discussing the need for additional business writing assignments in the classroom. A copy of the rubric would be made available to score the written document for faculty wishing to assist in the continuous improvement of the student written communication skills within their classroom environment. MGT 4300 implemented a pilot study in Spring 2018 employing a project letter of introduction for business partners to further enhance the students' written document skills. Lunch and Learns covering various topics have become and will continue to be a valuable professional development program and discussion forum for our faculty.

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

### Measure 1b.1 (Direct – Student Artifact; BUAD 2200 Oral Presentation)

**Details/Description:** In BUAD 2200 (Business Reports and Communication), students are required to develop and deliver a 5 minute presentation about conducting business in a foreign country. This presentation is graded with a rubric shared with all students and the professors. Scores of all the raters are compared to provided a final grade.

**Acceptable Target:** : On the final class presentation, a minimum of 90% of students will score at least acceptable (70%).

**Ideal Target:** On the final class presentation, a minimum of 95% of students will score at least acceptable (70)%.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** This measurement is completed each semester in BUAD2200.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** School of Business Faculty teaching BUAD 2200 are responsible for this measurement.

**Findings:** The acceptable target was met.

**Analysis:** The table below directly compares the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 academic year results for Measure 1b.1.

**Table 4: AY 2016-2017 vs. AY 2017-2018 Comparison**

Measure 1b.1				
Academic Year	n (# of students)	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target	Actual Results
2016-2017	165	90%	95%	83%
2017-2018	206	90%	95%	91%

Percentages indicate the percent of students scoring 70% or better on the measure.

**AY 2016-2017:** 83% of the students (n=165), scored 70% or better on the final presentation. On the final class presentation, the target goal was a minimum of 90% of students to score at least acceptable (70%). The acceptable target was not met. After reviewing the student results and the scoring of the raters, interrater agreement was analyzed and it was determined differences existed. It was determined one rater did not include a presentation and therefore, presentation scores were absent and the final outcome was skewed with a lower than average composite score. This appeared to be a contributing factor to the acceptable target not being achieved. Therefore, it was determined that faculty teaching BUAD 2200 who are responsible for this measurement will participate in an Inter-rater Reliability Workshop to assure inter-rater reliability among raters.

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

**AY 2017-2018:** 91% of the students (n=206), scored 70% or better on the final presentation. The acceptable target was met. In 2016-2017 the target had not been met. The issue of interrater reliability appeared to be a contributing factor and was discussed with faculty during a Faculty Lunch and Learn professional development session. Faculty worked closely with one another to assure their rating sensitivities were in sync prior to rating student responses in 2017-2018. Additionally, the faculty agreed to intentionally set and maintain a high minimum target of 90% in order to push students toward a higher standard of acceptable oral presentation skills. In business, the ability to present facts and intelligently follow a formal presentation protocol are essential. The ideal target was not met, but year-to-year scores improved from an 85% to a 91%, an increase of 6%.

**Action – Decision.** Based on the results of the analysis, in an effort to assure continuous improvement in the curriculum and assessment process, in AY 2018-2019 the faculty will continue to assure reliable interrater scoring and will strive toward exceptional, high quality ratings in student oral presentation skills. The BUAD 2200 faculty members will continue to utilize a variety of pedagogical methods to assist students with all presentations. Best practices include professors continuing to embed model examples of various business presentation documents into the course and voice-narrated videos. These videos provide step by step project/assignment directions for use by students.

### Measure 1b.2 (Direct – Student Artifact; MKTG 3230 Team Presentation)

**Details/Description:** In MKTG 3230, students are divided into small groups (3 to 4 students) and are required to develop a marketing plan for a "newtotheworld" product. In addition to developing a written report, the groups are required to orally present their reports. A grading rubric was developed following the BUAD 2200 rubric and with changes to account for the content and level change. Marketing faculty independently used four metrics and evaluated group presentations as Exemplary, Good, Satisfactory, or Unacceptable.

**Acceptable Target:** At least 75% of the groups will earn an Exemplary or Good score on at least three of the four areas of the grading rubric.

**Ideal Target:** At least 85% of the groups will earn an Exemplary or Good score on at least three of the four areas of the grading rubric.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** This measurement is completed in MKTG 3230 each semester.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** School of Business faculty teaching MKTG 3230 are responsible for this measurement.

**Findings:** The acceptable target was met.

**Analysis:** The table below directly compares the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 academic year results for Measure 1b.2.

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

**Table 5: AY 2016-2017 vs. AY 2017-2018 Comparison**

Measure 1b.2				
Academic Year	n (# of groups)	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target	Actual Results
2016-2017	21	75%	85%	85%
2017-2018	18	75%	85%	83.3%
Percentages indicate the percent of student groups scoring “Exemplary” or “Good” on the measure.				

**AY 2016-2017:** 85% (n=21 groups) of the groups scored Exemplary or Good on 3 of the 4 rubrics. The students met the Ideal Target of 85%.

**AY 2017-2018:** 83.3% (n=18 groups) scored at 75% or better. The acceptable target was met.

In the academic year 2016-2017, 85% (n=21 groups) of the groups scored Exemplary or Good on 3 of the 4 rubrics. Meanwhile, in the academic year 2017-2018, 83.3% (n=18 groups) scored at 75% or better. The results were nearly the same from year to year.

The evidence indicates that the team presentation acceptable targets were met and the students almost met the ideal target of 85%. While the evidence indicated a negligible decrease in student learning (85% to 83.3%), this result is potentially due to the differing sample sizes or natural semester-to-semester variation.

As in AY 2016-2017, in AY 2017-2018 the MKTG 3230 faculty reviewed best practices for professional business presentations with the students in the weeks before their presentations. This practice has led to consistently acceptable and ideal or nearly ideal results. Additionally, in AY 2017-2018, the faculty integrated more classroom exercises in which students were asked to speak in front of the class. When discussing the presentations, numerous students stated that they became worried and nervous when presenting in front of a group, and these exercises were meant to better acclimate students to public speaking and potentially alleviate the nervousness often associated with the formal presentation. While discussions with students indicated that this was helpful for some, the overall Measure 1.1b.2 results were not substantially different.

In summary, students have met the acceptable target in the last two academic cycles and met or nearly met the ideal target in the same time period. While the faculty changed the coursework to improve student learning, the evidence indicates that student learning was mostly stable rather than improved. In the future, improved research into and better targeting of overall student deficiencies may be helpful in improving results.

**Action – Decision.** Since the results from AY 2016-2017 to 2017-2018 were very stable, no major changes to the rubric or assignment were planned for academic year 2017-2018. However, based on the analysis of the evidence and to drive continuous improvement, the faculty teaching the MKTG 3230 presentation will review presentation grades and notes and attempt to reinforce areas in which students are not scoring in the “good” or “exemplary” categories.

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

Each academic year, the faculty review the rubrics and determine their continued validity for the modern classroom and assessment goals. The faculty will continue this practice. Also, each semester, the MKTG 3230 faculty review best practices for professional business presentations with the students in the weeks before they present. This review appears to have been helpful in helping students reach near the ideal target and the review will be continued in the future.

However, as stated above and in a change from prior years, the faculty will research the specific areas that students need place special emphasis on areas that students have shown weakness during academic years 2016-2017 and 2017-2018. A review of the grading rubrics indicated that student groups sometimes have trouble with transitions from person to person (functioning seamlessly as a group). Additional in-class group work could be helpful in familiarizing students with the group project and their group members. Therefore, additional class time will be dedicated to group-work. More time functioning as a group in-class may result in improved functioning as a group at the end of the semester in their formal group presentation. Also, in AY 2018-2019, faculty will engage in pre- and post-presentation dialogue with students about the presentation to further research which areas students find the most troublesome. Combining these discussions with examinations of post-presentation rubrics may identify other areas in need of instructional enhancement.

### **Measure 1c.1 (Direct - Student Artifact; BUAD 2200 Team Document and Presentation)**

**Details/Description:** In BUAD 2200, students are required to complete a document and presentation as a team.

**Acceptable Target:** At least 75% of teams will perform at a competent (3) level.

**Ideal Target:** At least 75% of teams will perform at an excellent (3) level.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** This measurement is completed in BUAD2200 each semester.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** School of Business faculty teaching BUAD2200 are responsible for this measure.

**Findings:** The acceptable target was met.

**Analysis:** The table below directly compares the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 academic year results for Measure 1b.2.

**Table 6: AY 2016-2017 vs. AY 2017-2018 Comparison**

<b>Measure 1c.1</b>
---------------------

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

Academic Year	n (# of teams)	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target	Actual Results
2016-2017	37	75% competent	75% excellent	86% (competent)
2017-2018	51	75% competent	75% excellent	98% (competent)

**AY 2016-2017:** 86% of the teams, 37 teams, (n=165 students) scored competent or above (70% or better). The acceptable target was exceeded. No program changes were recommended.

**AY 2017-2018:** 52 teams completed the Team Document and Presentation Measure 1c.1. Of these 52 teams, it was found that 98% of the teams, 51 teams (n=206 students), scored competent or above (70% or better). It can also be noted that the Ideal Target was not met, only 73% of the teams scored an 80% or better on the team project. The acceptable target was met.

When compared with 2016-2017, the AY 2017-2018 acceptable target was exceeded. It was determined the team document and presentation acceptable targets were met. In analyzing the differing results between AY 2016-2017 and AY 2017-2018, please note that partial sampling was used in AY 2016-2017, whereas, in AY 2017-2018 the full student census was used. This move from a partial sampling to full census was made to enhance the robustness of the assessment process. Additionally, a mock presentation for the students prior to their actual group presentations took place. Also, a comprehensive review of the rubrics used to grade the material was emphasized and further explanation was given. The analysis reflects the improvement and growth in student learning in the team documents and presentations.

**Action-Decision:** Based on the analysis of evidence, in an effort to determine if the evaluation measure was reflective of the desired outcomes for the documents and presentations, the faculty will re-assess the existing rubrics to identify subject areas within the existing rubric to be expanded or deleted and determine validity. Additionally, faculty will scrutinize and assess the rubrics to identify topic areas where students have performed at a lower level and create necessary curricular improvements to address these weaker topic outcomes.

**SLO 2. Integration of Knowledge across Business Disciplines.** Students should be able to: **Demonstrate understanding of key concepts and theories in various functional areas of business.**

Course Map: Tied to course syllabus objectives.

BUAD 2120 Basic Business Statistics (Foundational Course)  
CIS 4600 Advanced Systems Development (Capstone Course)  
FIN 2150 Personal Finance (Foundational Course)  
MGT 4300 Strategic Management and Policies (Capstone Course)  
MKTG 3230 Principles of Marketing (Foundational Course)

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

UNIV 1000 The University Experience (Supporting Course)

### **A note on the School of Business Knowledge Exam (SoBUSKE):**

Data for SLO2 measures 1a.2, 1a.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 4.3 are usually gathered through the NSU School of Business Knowledge Exam (SoBUSKE). This exam has been administered for over ten years. However, as part of our plan at the end of AY 2016-2017, the exam was only partially administered in AY 2017-2018. As SLO2 relies heavily on the SoBUSKE for measurements, a deeper explanation of this decision can be found below.

After many faculty discussions at the end of AY 2016-2017, a review of the current SoBUSKE was conducted. The decision was made under the direction of the SLO2 Committee to discuss, vote, and subsequently suspend the administration of the complete and partial SoBUSKE in 2017-2018 and approve the creation of a new SoBUSKE to replace the current exam. The School of Business CISPAC (Continuous Improvement, Strategic Planning and Accreditation Committee) approved this recommendation. The formal discussion and recommendation from SLO2 Committee and CISPAC was brought before the School of Business faculty for a vote and was unanimously approved. In Spring 2018, under the direction of the SLO2 Committee, the School of Business faculty across eleven (11) discipline areas embarked in the process of creating a new SoBUSKE. The faculty tasked with the creation of the new exam were representatives from the following discipline areas: accounting, economics, management/operations management, quantitative statistics, finance, marketing, legal/social issues, information systems (MIS), ethics, and international business issues. These faculty members are currently teaching current key and core concepts within their course curriculum or recognize these new concepts should be incorporated into the learning environment and will require curricular changes. In an effort to continue to present the latest and most viable theories and concepts to our students preparing them to pursue their business goals, the faculty began the SoBUSKE creation process. The update process began in AY 2017-2018 and is expected to be complete for implementation in AY 2018-2019.

Furthermore, as the School of Business has an upcoming visit from our accrediting agency, the AACSB, a consulting group was hired to examine our program and identify strengths and weaknesses. One weakness they identified is that the School of Business is likely performing assessment too regularly. Page 21 of the report stated “Also, the AOL [Assurance of Learning] system should be reviewed as to the frequency of assessments. Overdoing the process beyond what is essential to support an effective curricula management system is not necessary.” Therefore, with the consulting report and redesign of the SoBUSKE in mind, the complete exam was not given in AY 2017-2018. The SoBUSKE results that were gathered from 2017-2018 are partial results from classes in which the old SoBUSKE exam content was usually integrated into the course itself, rather than treated as a separate piece conducted only for assessment purposes. Thus, all partial data is from Spring 2018.

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

Additionally, the SLO2 Committee in concert with faculty discussions agreed that the current number of 164 questions were too many. During an SLO2 Lunch & Learn, the disparate number of questions per discipline area was again discussed. As mentioned previously in this document, Lunch and Learns are professional development and discussion sessions for School of Business faculty. The SLO2 Committee, CISPAC and the School of Business faculty made the decision to limit the number of questions for each SoBUSKE discipline question bank to a total number of questions not to exceed ten (10). It was agreed and approved that a formal request and justification for more questions, if warranted, would be forwarded to the SLO2 Committee for consideration and approval. In Spring 2018, new questions were formulated and existing questions reviewed by faculty to decide which key questions will be included in the new SoBUSKE.

The implementation timetable for administering the new SoBUSKE within the School of Business is scheduled for Fall 2018. While implementing this new SoBUSKE plan, both full and partial assessments will be administered in AY 2018-2019. Faculty will determine if the newly created SoBUSKE is meeting the expectations of our faculty and the needs of our students. Exam modifications will be made as needed.

A second key decision was also made by the faculty striving for continuous improvement in the classroom. Faculty agreed to implement a “Providing Evidence Process (PEP)” to identify among discipline area instructors where and how the core information being tested in the new SoBUSKE is being introduced and reinforced in the curriculum and classroom. This decision was implemented in 2017-2018. The “PEP” responses and materials are being collected as the revised, modified and new SoBUSKE discipline area questions are being created. Faculty responsible for teaching the core theories and concepts are providing a list of actions taken and evidence of impactful, innovative and engaging activities associated with teaching the core curricular materials. For example, a list or study guide; a worksheet or quiz, exercise, assignment, community project, Lunch and Learn, etc. employed to enhance the learning process for SoBUSKE key concepts and theories are being identified. Instructors are providing artifacts to demonstrate these key concepts are being taught or will be taught using engaging and innovative methods as well as tried and true standard practices. Faculty are also identifying the actions taken to improve student learning outcomes associated with the SoBUSKE.

A third area of concern requiring a School of Business faculty decision related to student learning outcomes and assessment centered around the debate as to whether to continue or discontinue the national Education Testing Services School of Business (ETS) Business Exam. The exam is costly and is currently administered two times every five years. Based on conversations with fellow AACSB International colleagues, the ETS measure is a common concern and is routinely changed which impacts measurability over time. After discussion and faculty approval the decision was made to continue administering the ETS business exam. It will be administered in AY 2018-2019. It was determined the ETS exam is our best current benchmark measure for evaluating our student progress as related to regional and national standard norms. Faculty will re-evaluate its benefit in AY 2018-2019. As we strive to assure our students remain competitive in the business market locally as well as nationally, the ETS exam will be a



## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

yard stick for measuring our evaluative efforts and foundational business theory norms against national norms.

### **Measure: 2.1. (Direct – Exam; Partial School of Business Knowledge Exam)**

**Details/Description:** Portions of the School of Business Knowledge Exam are given in the following classes: BUAD 2120 (Basic Business Statistics), FIN 2150 (Personal Finance), and MKTG 3230 (Principles of Marketing). These classes provide intermediate measurements for specific components of the School of Business Knowledge Exam.

**Acceptable Target:** At least 75% of students will score higher than the ETS average in the particular knowledge area.

**Ideal Target:** At least 85% of students will score higher than the ETS average in the particular knowledge area.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** These partial School of Business Knowledge Exams are given each semester the class is offered.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** School of Business faculty teaching these courses are responsible for the measurement.

**Findings:** Measurement instrument under revision. Partial results show that improvement was seen in all areas.

**Analysis:** The national Education Testing Systems (ETS) Major Field Test (MFT) was taken in the spring of 2015 to be used as a national baseline norm over the course of the next 5 years examining the students' comprehensive knowledge of materials over 9 school of business areas of discipline. It was determined NSU students taking the ETS MFT received a mean score of 30%. Each year the students are given the partial SoBUSKE, our internal exam, focusing on the specific discipline areas. We compare these results against corresponding discipline areas of the nationally normed ETS MFT in business.

Although School of Business faculty decided to suspend the administration of the SoBUSKE partial and complete exams for AY 2017-2018, several discipline areas administered the partial SoBUSKE as part of their integrated course assessment process and normal classroom operation. Some instructors phased the exam out of their courses after Spring 2017. Therefore, the following AY 2016-2017 and AY 2017-2018 partial test results are found in Table 7 below.

**Table 7: AY 2016-2017-AY 2017-2018 Partial SoBUSKE Results**

<b>Discipline</b>	<b>NSU ETS 2015</b>	<b>Fall 2016</b>	<b>Spring 2017</b>	<b>Averages AY 2016-2017</b>	<b>Spring 2018</b>
<b>Finance</b>	31%	53%	51%	52%	*

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

<b>Marketing</b>	51%	67%	63%	65%	72%
<b>Statistics</b>	30%	53%	47%	49%	51%
Percentages indicate the student mean percentage on the discipline area tests. Data was collected from courses in which the SoBUSKE discipline area questions were embedded into the course materials. *Data was not collected as the SoBUSKE was being phased out and the SoBUSKE discipline content was not normally integrated into the course, but given as a separate exam outside the normal operation of the course.					

Based on the partial SoBUSKE discipline area results, it was determined business discipline area student scores improved across all evaluated areas when comparing Spring 2017 and Spring 2018, or when comparing the AY 2016-2017 overall results to the Spring 2018 results. When compared to the ETS School of Business exam administered in Spring 2015, it was also determined that student scores in business discipline areas improved across all evaluated areas when compared with Fall 2016, Spring 2017, comparing the AY 2016-2017 overall results, and Spring 2018 results.

**Finding: BUAD 2120 Basic Business Statistics:** The acceptable target was met.

**Analysis (BUAD only):** The table below directly compares the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 academic year results for Measure 2.1a statistics business discipline area.

**Table 7a: AY 2016-2017-AY 2017-2018 Partial SoBUSKE Results**

<b>Discipline</b>	<b>NSU ETS 2015</b>	<b>Fall 2016</b>	<b>Spring 2017</b>	<b>Averages AY 2016-2017</b>	<b>Spring 2018</b>
<b>Statistics</b>	30%	53%	47%	49%	51%
Percentages indicate the student mean percentage on the discipline area test. Data was collected in courses where the partial SoBUSKE was normally embedded as part of the course materials.					

Note: The scores in the chart above are the unprocessed student mean scores. These are presented for easy interpretation of student trends. For our assessment measures, faculty further scrutinize the scores (e.g. the number of students scoring above or below the measure benchmark) and compare detailed score information to NSU ETS scores. The discussion of this analysis in terms of the assessment measure can be seen below.

**AY 2016-2017:** 123 students were given the portion or partial of the SoBUSKE that relates only to the area of statistics. Following compilation of these scores, it was determined the SoBUSKE mean score in statistics was 49%. The NSU ETS MFT mean score was 30%. Comparing the results between the SoBUSKE and the NSU student ETS MFT mean scores, it was determined that 86% of the students scored above 30% on the SoBUSKE. The target was met.

**Spring 2018:** 75 students were given the partial of the SoBUSKE that relates only to the area of statistics. Following compilation of these results, it was determined the SoBUSKE mean score in statistics was 51%. The NSU ETS MFT mean score was 30%. Comparing the results between the Spring 2018 SoBUSKE and the NSU student ETS MFT mean

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

scores, it was determined that 93% of the students scored above 30% on the SoBUSKE. The target was met.

**Action – Decision (BUAD only):** The AY 2017-2018 statistics results when compared to the AY 2016-2017 results show a slight improvement since last year. Although improvement is suggested, the margin is less significant than expected. A new member joined the statistics faculty in Spring 2018 and an introduction to assessment, coordination of teaching efforts and the exchange of knowledge is underway. In AY 2018-2019 statistics faculty are implementing a “Providing Evidence Process (PEP)” creating teaching methods for core information tested in the new SoBUSKE and fortifying in the curriculum and classroom to assure beneficial changes are made in the classroom to support key concept learning and improved student learning outcomes.

**Finding: FIN 2150 Personal Finance:** Measurement instrument under revision.

**Analysis (FIN only):** The table below directly compares the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 academic year results for Measure 2.1b:

**Table 7b: AY 2016-2017-AY 2017-2018 Partial SoBUSKE Results**

Discipline	NSU ETS 2015	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Averages AY 2016-2017	Spring 2018
<b>Finance</b>	31%	53%	51%	52%	*
Percentages indicate the student mean percentage on the measure. Data collected where the partial SoBUSKE was integrated into the course. * Data not collected as SoBUSKE was being phased out and not integrated into the course.					

Note: The scores in the chart above are the unprocessed student mean scores. These are presented for easy interpretation of student trends. For our assessment measures, faculty further scrutinize the scores (e.g. the number of students scoring above or below the measure benchmark) and compare detailed score information to NSU ETS scores. The discussion of this analysis in terms of the assessment measure can be seen below.

**AY 2016-2017:** 120 students were given the portion or partial of the SoBUSKE that relates only to the area of personal finance. Following compilation of these scores, it was determined the SoBUSKE mean score in finance was 43%. In comparison, the NSU ETS MFT student mean score in finance was 31%. It was determined 76% of the students scored above 31% on the SoBUSKE. It was determined of the 120 students taking the SoBUSKE partial exam in finance, 76% of the students scored above 31%.

Therefore, it was determined that the student learning outcome was met with more than 75 % of the students scoring higher than the ETS average of 31% in this particular knowledge area and met the Acceptable Target. The acceptable target was met.

**Spring 2018:** In AY 2017-2018, the finance portion of the partial SoBUSKE was not administered to students. In accordance with the development of the new SoBUSKE,

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

faculty were not required to administer the old exam in AY 2017-2018 because it was being phased out. Some discipline areas (e.g. business administration and marketing) did administer the old exam because it was embedded into their courses. However, this was not the case in finance. Instead, as planned, the finance faculty focused on the development of new questions for the revised SoBUSKE to be administered in AY 2018-2019. Additionally, one new finance faculty member was introduced to the team in Spring 2018 and efforts were made to familiarize the newest member of the team with the principles of assessment and key concepts in both the older and newer versions of the finance portion of the SoBUSKE under construction in AY 2017-2018.

**Action – Decision (FIN only):** Based on the 2016-2017 results, faculty reviewed the individual question results on the finance portion of the SoBUSKE to assure that adequate time and attention was given to those question areas where additional improvement could be achieved. The finance portion of the SoBUSKE was modified as suggested and in AY 2018-2019 finance faculty, including the newest member of the team, are implementing a “Providing Evidence Process (PEP)” for core information tested in the new SoBUSKE fortifying the curriculum and classroom experience to strengthen outcome results in the classroom and on the finance portion of the new SoBUSKE. These new principles and practices are being implemented in preparation for the new SoBUSKE.

**Finding: MKTG 3230 Principles of Marketing:** The acceptable target was met.

**Analysis (MKTG only):** The table below directly compares the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 academic year results for Measure 2.1c.

**Table 7c: AY 2016-2017-AY 2017-2018 Partial SoBUSKE Results**

Discipline	NSU ETS 2015	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Averages AY 2016-2017	Spring 2018
<b>Marketing</b>	51%	67%	63%	65%	72%
Percentages indicate the student mean percentage on the discipline area test. In this course, the SoBUSKE discipline area test is embedded into the course materials.					

Note: The scores in the chart above are the unprocessed student mean scores. These are presented for easy interpretation of student trends. For our assessment measures, faculty further scrutinize the scores (e.g. the number of students scoring above or below the measure benchmark) and compare detailed score information to NSU ETS scores. The discussion of this analysis in terms of the assessment measure can be seen below.

**AY 2016-2017:** 87 students were given the marketing portion or partial of the SoBUSKE. It was determined the mean score in marketing was 56%. In comparison, the NSU ETS MFT mean score in marketing was 51%. It was determined 71% of the students scored above 51% on the SoBUSKE. As the acceptable target was 75% of the students scoring higher than the ETS average of 51% in this knowledge area, the acceptable target was missed by 4%. The acceptable target was not met.

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

**Spring 2018:** 30 students were given the marketing portion or partial of the SoBUSKE. It was determined the mean score in marketing was 72%. In comparison, the NSU ETS MFT mean score in marketing was 51%. It was determined 80% of the students scored above 51% on the SoBUSKE. As the acceptable target was 75% of the students scoring higher than the ETS average of 51% in this knowledge area, the acceptable target was met.

The AY 2017-2018 marketing results have shown improvement since last year. As part of the plan from AY 2016-2017, new faculty reviewed the marketing area questions of the SoBUSKE and provided additional instruction and reinforcement in these topic areas. As the new faculty were unfamiliar with the assessment process at NSU, this review as well as attending Lunch and Learn professional development sessions and with engaging with assessment committees helped better inform the new faculty as to the needs of the assessment process and the topics in need emphasis in the classroom. As the new faculty members knowledge of the assessment process and SoBUSKE have increased, their attention to relevant topics in the classroom has also increased. Therefore, upward trend in the results is seen as a positive development indicating that the new faculty are better understanding the assessment process and are making beneficial changes to enhance student learning in their classrooms.

**Action – Decision (MKTG only):** Based on the 2016-2017 evidence of student learning, marketing faculty reviewed the individual question results on the marketing portion of the SoBUSKE and spent additional instructional time and attention on those question areas where additional improvement could be achieved. Based on the Spring 2018 results, improvements were made. In an effort to build on this success, the marketing portion of the SoBUSKE was reviewed and modified as suggested and in AY 2018-2019. Marketing faculty are implementing a “Providing Evidence Process (PEP)” introducing and reinforcing the subject materials in the curriculum and classroom to strengthen outcome results. The 2017-2018 individual question results will also be examined and content areas where students struggled with receive additional instruction in these areas in preparation for similar content on the new SoBUSKE.

### **Measure 2.2 (Direct – Exam; UNIV 1000 Complete School of Business Knowledge Exam)**

**Details/Description:** Portions of the School of Business Knowledge Exam are given in the following classes: BUAD 2120 (Basic Business Statistics), FIN 2150 (Personal Finance), and MKTG 3230 (Principles of Marketing). These classes provide intermediate measurements for specific components of the School of Business Knowledge Exam.

**Acceptable Target:** At least 75% of students will score higher than the ETS average in the particular knowledge area.

**Ideal Target:** At least 85% of students will score higher than the ETS average in the particular knowledge area.

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** These partial School of Business Knowledge Exams are given each semester the class is offered.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** School of Business faculty teaching these courses are responsible for the measurement.

**Findings:** Measurement instrument under revision.

**Analysis:** As planned, the School of Business Knowledge Exam (SoBUSKE) was not given in AY 2017-2018. Therefore, there is no analysis data to present.

**Action-Decision:** The UNIV 1000 classes providing measurements for the complete SoBUSKE will measure the results of the new SoBUSKE in AY 2018-2019 in order to establish the baseline results for students entering the School of Business program prior to program course instruction. The implementation timetable for administering the new SoBUSKE within the School of Business and for baseline data collection from UNIV 1000 (Measure 2.2) is scheduled for Fall 2018. Faculty will determine if the newly created SoBUSKE is meeting the expectations of our faculty and the needs of our students. Exam modifications will be made as needed.

### **Measure 2.3 (Direct - Student Artifact; MGT 4300/CIS 4600 Complete School of Business Knowledge Exam)**

**Details/Description:** The entire School of Business Knowledge exam (SoBUSKE) (<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/N8DNVXT>) should be given in either MGT 4300 or CIS 4600. The following areas are covered in this exam: Accounting, Economics, Management, Quantitative (Statistics and Operations Management), Finance, Marketing, Legal, Information Systems, International Business, and Ethics.

**Acceptable Target:** Average score on School of Business Knowledge exam should be higher in all areas of the exam than the ETS Mean Percentage.

**Ideal Target:** Average scores on School of Business Knowledge exam should be 10% higher in all areas of the exam than the ETS Mean Percentage.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** The School of Business Knowledge exam is given each semester MGT 4300 and/or CIS 4600 is offered.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** School of Business Faculty teaching either MGT 4300 or CIS 4600 are responsible for this measure.

**Findings:** Measurement instrument under revision.

**Analysis:** As planned, the full SoBUSKE was not given in AY 2017-2018. Therefore, there is no analysis data to present. See measure 2.1 for discussion of the partial results.

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

**Action-Decision:** In Spring 2018, faculty across eleven (11) discipline areas began developing the new SoBUSKE for implementation in AY 2018-2019. It is currently underway. In an effort to continuously improve the learning environment for our students, faculty members also began updating their curriculum to reflect current key and core concepts incorporated into the new SoBUSKE administered in AY 2018-2019. Faculty attend conferences throughout the country to assure latest knowledge of the most viable theories and concepts to present to our students preparing them to pursue their business goals.

Additionally, faculty are implementing a “Providing Evidence Process (PEP)” identifying among discipline area instructors where and how the core information being tested in the new SoBUSKE is being introduced and reinforced in the curriculum and classroom. “PEP” responses and materials are being collected as the revised, modified and new SoBUSKE discipline area questions are being created. Faculty responsible for teaching the core theories and concepts are providing a list of actions taken and evidence of impactful, innovative and engaging activities associated with teaching the core curricular materials.

**SLO2 Summary.** As described earlier, data for SLO2 measures 1a.2, 1a.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 4.3 are usually gathered through the SoBUSKE. As part of our plan at the end of AY 2016-2017, the complete SoBUSKE was not given in AY 2017-2018. Therefore, there is no analysis data to present for Measure 2.2 (UNIV 1000) and 2.3 (MGT 4300 and CIS 4600). However, the exam was partially administered in AY 2017-2018 as partial SoBUSKEs are given each semester within the class where it is offered. Faculty teaching these courses are responsible for the measurement. These partial results are presented in Measure 2.1. The creation of the new SoBUSKE is underway in AY 2017-2018 and will be administered in AY 2018-2019.

Being pro-active and to enhance student learning, faculty began making curricular changes teaching latest core concepts and theories in the classroom and attending conferences bringing latest up-to-date knowledge into their specialty fields. Faculty striving for continuous improvement in the classroom are implementing a “Providing Evidence Process (PEP)” to identify where and how core information being tested in the new SoBUSKE is being introduced and reinforced in the curriculum and classroom. Faculty are providing evidence of these curricular changes as related to the new SoBUSKE questions bank. Following implementation of the new SoBUSKE, the exam will be evaluated and modified as necessary.

As we strive to assure our students remain competitive in the business market locally as well as nationally, the ETS exam will be the benchmark for measuring our evaluative efforts and foundational business theory norms against national norms. Faculty will be evaluating its effectiveness after the next administration in AY 2018-2019 to determine whether to continue its use and evaluating other standard national norms.

**SLO 3. Critical Thinking.** Students should be able to: **Demonstrate the ability to generate and compare alternative solutions to business problems; and Objective**

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

### **3c: Demonstrate the ability to select feasible solutions to complex business problems.**

Course Map: Tied to course syllabus objectives.

FIN 3090 Business Finance (Foundational Course)  
 FIN 4200 Financial Policies and Practices (Foundational Course)  
 MGT 4300 Strategic Management and Policies (Foundational Course)  
 UNIV 1000 The University Experience (Supporting Course)

#### **Measure 3.1 (Direct – Other; FIN 3090 Critical Thinking Quiz)**

**Details/Description:** In order to access critical thinking skills, two articles are presented that cover current topics in business. Students are given a 10-question quiz covering the arguments made in the articles, evidence supporting the arguments, and deductive reasoning based on the arguments. The questions were a bonus opportunity for students so that they would be motivated to do their best.

**Acceptable Target:** The acceptable target is an average of 75% and 70% of the students achieving a 70% or greater.

**Ideal Target:** The ideal target is an average of 80% and 80% of the students achieving a 70% or greater.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** This measure is given annually in the FIN 3090 class.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** School of Business faculty teaching FIN 3090 are responsible for this measure.

**Findings:** The acceptable target was met.

**Analysis:** The table below directly compares the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 academic year results for Measure 3.1.

**Table 8: AY 2016-2017 vs. AY 2017-2018 Comparison**

<b>Measure 3.1</b>				
Academic Year	n (# of students)	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target	Actual Results
2016-2017	41	Average score of 75%	Average score of 80%	Average =81% 87% scored 70% or better
2017-2018	37	and	and	Average =75%



## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

		70% of students receiving scores of 70%+	80% of students receiving scores of 70%+	73% scored 70% or better
--	--	--	--	--------------------------

**Ay 2016-2017:** The average score on the quiz was 81.2% and 87.8% of students achieved a 70% or better. The acceptable target was met, but the ideal target was not.

**AY 2017-2018:** The average grade on the quiz was 75.7% and 73% of students made a 70% or better. Therefore, the acceptable target was met, but the ideal target was not met.

**Analysis:** The results for AY 2017-2018 were, unfortunately, a little lower than the results for 2016-2017 when the average score was 81.2% and 87.8% of students achieved a 70% or better. Possible explanations discussed include 1) differences in the difficulty of the questions asked, 2) polarization of opinion affecting answer choices, 3) differences in students, 4) new faculty member teaching course in Spring 2018 and 5) inappropriate response taken.

We also realize that due to a modernization of FIN 3090 and 4200 course materials this may have negatively affected the result for comparison of results between AY 2016-2017 and AY 2017-2018.

The articles and questions used in AY 2016-2017 were taken from [criticalthinking.org](http://criticalthinking.org) and were familiar to students who had taken standardized exams like the ACT or SAT. These were generic in emphasis and unrelated to business. For AY 2017-2018, we chose current articles related to business regulation because this topic areas are more relevant to students and assesses material being taught in the classroom. This makes the exam more difficult and consequently may have negatively impacted the results. Questions were developed by the faculty. Students also have opinions about regulations that may have influenced their answer choices. For instance, answering questions based on their views instead of the articles viewpoint. One of the important goals of critical thinking is to be able to question one’s own biases and as related to the business world and believe this exercise helps students to do this even if it resulted in lower scores.

The quiz was given to FIN 3090 students (as a measure of critical thinking skills) while the classroom discussion of regulation was given in Fin 4200 because that is where it fits into the curriculum. Fin 3090 is required for all School of Business majors and FIN 4200 is required of all BUAD majors (not ACCT or CIS).

Further analysis was performed to evaluate the relationship between the quiz and student grades. Students who got an A for the class had a quiz grade of 85 compared to 69 and 71 for the students who got a B or C in the class. While the quiz grade does have a direct impact on the class grade, the results suggest that critical thinking skills and class performance are positively correlated.

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

**Action-Decision:** In order to improve student critical thinking skills, the Fin 3090 and 4200 classes were updated in Fall of 2017. The revised 4200 class includes more discussion of current events involving finance, specifically laws and regulations that might affect businesses. A business simulation game was also introduced in Fin 4200 where students are tasked with managing a fictional company. While these efforts are expected to improve the critical thinking skills of our BUAD graduates, the intervention comes after the annual critical thinking measurement in Fin 3090. The new critical-thinking ‘business regulations’ quiz introduced in AY 2017-2018 will be administered again in AY 2018-2019 and comparable assessment results will be analyzed.

**SLO 4. Global, Cultural, and Ethical Perspective. Students should be able to: Identify cultural/global challenges facing management in doing business in the international arena.**

Course Map: Tied to course syllabus below.

ACCT 2000 Financial Accounting (Foundational Course)  
 BUAD 2200 Business Reports and Communications (Foundational Course)  
 BUAD 3270 International Business (Foundational Course)  
 CIS 4600 Advanced Systems Development (Capstone Course)  
 MGT 4300 Strategic Management and Policies (Capstone Course)  
 UNIV 1000 The Student Experience (Supporting Course)

**Measure 4.1. (Direct – Exam; BUAD 2200 – Country Report Updated 5/29/18)**

**Details/Description:** Written document measure (BUAD 2200)

**Acceptable Target:** 70% of the students will score 70% or better.

**Ideal Target:** 90% of the students will score 70% or better.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Ongoing in BUAD 2200.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** School of Business Faculty Teaching BUAD 2200.

**Findings:** The ideal target was met.

**Analysis:** The table below directly compares the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 academic year results for Measure 4.1.

**Table 9: AY 2016-2017 vs. AY 2017-2018 Comparison**

<b>Measure 4.1</b>				
Academic Year	n (# of teams)	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target	Actual Results
2016-2017	37	70%	90%	95%
2017-2018	51	70%	90%	98%

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

Percentages indicate the percent of teams scoring 70% or better on the measure.
---

**AY 2016-2017:** The school term 37 groups (n= 165 students) completed the BUAD 2200 Country Report.

**AY 2017-2018:** The school term 51 groups (n=206 students) completed the BUAD 2200 Country Report 98% of the students in the teams (51), scored 70% or better on the BUAD 2200 Country Report. The acceptable target was exceeded. The ideal target was met.

Compared to 2016-2017 academic year, the 2017-2018 results suggest a passage rate increase of 3% over last year's [2016-2017 95% versus 2017-2018 98%). It should be noted that results suggest that for both academic years, the ideal target was met. In AY 2016-2017 it was recommended the faculty include an exemplary model demonstration and group discussions. The faculty responsible for BUAD 3270 created video and face-to-face presentations of an exemplary model presentation available to students for their review. Additional group discussion periods in a co-worker environment were also implemented. As a result of the analysis, these additional curricular changes appear to have been effective.

**Action-Decision:** Faculty members teaching BUAD 2200 will continue to utilize a variety of pedagogical methods to assist students with their group written country reports. Best practices include professors continuing to embed model examples of various business report documents into the course and voice-narrated videos. These videos provide step by step project/assignment directions for use by students. Additionally, as we are continually hitting the ideal target, we will consider raising the minimum acceptable target from 70% of students scoring 70% to a score of 75%, and the ideal target from 90% of students scoring a 70% or above to scoring 75% or above to strengthen the targets. Faculty will also re-evaluate the existing rubric to determine if it is necessary to increase its rigor.

### **Measure 4.2 (Direct – Exam; BUAD 3270 International Business Plan)**

**Details/Description:** Middle measure of student knowledge of cultural/global perspectives; a written document measure in BUAD 3270.

**Acceptable Target:** 70% of the students will score 70% or better.

**Ideal Target:** 90% of the students will score 70% or better.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Ongoing in BUAD 3270 class.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** School of Business Faculty Teaching BUAD 3270.

**Findings:** The ideal target was met.

**Analysis:** The table below directly compares the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 academic year results for Measure 4.2.

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

**Table 10: AY 2016-2017 vs. AY 2017-2018 Comparison**

<b>Measure 4.2</b>				
Academic Year	n (# of students)	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target	Actual Results
2016-2017	180	70%	90%	95%
2017-2018	191	70%	90%	98%
Percentages indicate the percent of teams scoring 70% or better on the measure.				

**AY 2016-2017:** In Fall 2016, 82 students were registered in BUAD 3270 classes. The semester average grade for the written document results in Fall 2016 was 81% and in the spring 2017 semester was 82% with a 1point increase in mean score. The semester average grade for the final project (final report plus presentation) was 81%. In Spring 2017, 98 students were registered in BUAD 3270 classes. The semester average grade for this final project was 85%, excluding 6 incomplete project reports. If the 6 incomplete project reports are included in the calculation, the Final Report project result would be 81%.

**AY 2017-2018:** In Fall 2017, 102 students were registered in BUAD 3270 classes. 98 students participated in written final report of International Business Plan group project. The semester average grade of these 98 students for the written document results in fall 2017 was 88%. All 98 students scored 70% or better. That is, 100% of the students in the Fall semester exceeded the acceptable target and met the ideal target.

In Spring 2018 semester, 93 students registered in BUAD 3270 classes. 92 students participated in written final report of International Business Plan group project. The semester average grade of these 92 students for the written document results in Spring 2018 was 85%. 88 students scored 70% or better. That is, 96% of the students in the Spring semester exceeded the acceptable target and met the ideal target.

According to the above data, the average grade for the written document in AY 2017-2018 academic year was 86%, 98% of the students in the year scored 70% or better. We met the Acceptable Target and Ideal Target.

Compared to AY 2016-2017 academic year, the mean final report grade increased by 3%; the percentage of students achieving 70% or better increased by 3% too. The percentage of students achieving below 70% was reduced.

Each class provided different methods to strengthen the group reports. In one class, the improvement was attributed to continuing the AY 2016-1017 good practices, i.e., the video and face-to-face presentation exemplary model demonstration, as well as additional group discussion periods and a co-worker environment in coaching this project in all classes.

In another, the improvement was attributed to the interventions given after each of the first two portions of the report were submitted as well as to the multiple opportunities given for students to present (written and/or orally), material as a group or as individuals.

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

**Action-Decision:** The faculty responsible for BUAD 3270 are providing coaching and providing model examples of success for this project in each class. Moving forward, the faculty will also provide students with occasions to submit written sections of the report for review and additional time for individual and group oral demonstrations providing opportunities for increased mastery.

### Measure 4.3 (Direct – Exam; School of Business Knowledge Exam)

**Details/Description:** School of Business Knowledge Exam Given in UNIV 1000, BUAD 3270, and MGT 4300/CIS 4600.

**Acceptable Target:** Average score should be equal or higher than the ETS International Business score.

**Ideal Target:** Average score should be 10% higher than the ETS International Business score.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Ongoing in UNIV 1000, BUAD 3270, and MGT 4300/CIS 4600 sections.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** School of Business Faculty Teaching UNIV 1000, BUAD 3270, and MGT 4300/CIS 4600 Sections.

**Findings:** Measurement instrument under revision.

**Analysis:** As planned, the School of Business Knowledge Exam (SoBUSKE) was not given in AY 2017-2018. Therefore, there is no analysis data to present.

**Action-Decision:** The implementation timetable for administering the new SoBUSKE within the School of Business and for AY 2017-2018. This assessment will provide the baseline data or future analysis. For this academic year, the School of Business collectively decided not to administer the SoBUSKE to collect data for review. A new SoBUSKE is under development and will be implemented in AY 2018—2019.

**SLO 5. Business Administration. Students will demonstrate the ability to solve problems from an integrated multi-disciplinary business perspective.**

Course Map: Tied to course syllabus objectives.

ACCT 2000 Financial Accounting (Foundational Course)  
BUAD 2200 Business Reports and Communications (Foundational Course)  
BUAD 2120 Basic Business Statistics (Foundational Course)  
FIN 3090 Business Finance (Foundational Course)  
MGT 3220 Organizations and Management (Foundational Course)  
MKTG 3230 Principles of Marketing (Foundational Course)

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

MGT 3580 Operational Management (Foundational Course)  
MGT 4300 Strategic Management and Policies (Capstone Course)

### **Measure 5.1. (Direct- Student Artifact; BUAD 4300 Business Case Study Written Document)**

**Details/Description:** Business administration students will solve problems from an integrated multi-disciplinary business perspective using a business case study. In MGT 4300 (Strategic Management & Policies) students will complete an integrated multi-disciplinary business case analysis utilizing a conceptual framework model and business ratio formulation and analysis to identify a company's situation and position, company issues, and implications. Students will provide solutions to the identified business problems and submit a final case study report.

**Acceptable Target:** The acceptable target was established as 70% of the students will score 70 % or better on the business case study.

**Ideal Target:** The ideal target was established as 75% of the students will score 75% or better.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** The comprehensive exam will be created in the 2016-2017 academic year with the actual testing of students beginning in 2017-2018.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** The MGT 4300 faculty will be responsible for administering the exam, gathering and analyzing results and providing actions, recommendations and decisions.

**Findings:** The ideal target was met.

**Analysis:** In 2016-2017 academic year, the School of Business, Business Administration faculty developed the fifth student learning outcome and its measure the direct, student artifact, the BUAD 4300 Business Case Study Written Document. The 2017-2018 academic year represents the baseline year for Business Administration Program's Student Learning Outcome 5.1. Summary results and discussion are below.

**AY 2016-2017:** Not measured. AY1718 is the baseline year.

**AY 2017-2018:** The 70% target was met. The 75% ideal target was also met.

The actual percentages and more detailed results across the two subject areas, conceptual framework and business ratios, are shown below in Table 11: Measures 5.1 AY 2017-2018 Business Case Analyses Results.

**TABLE 11 Measure 5.1 AY 2017-2018 Business Case Analyses Results**

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

<b>Business Case Analyses: 100 Points</b> Responses Sections MGT 4300 Capstone Course	<b>Fall 2017</b> N=35 01N/02I	<b>Spring 2018</b> N=68 01N/01I/02I
<b>Section 1: Conceptual Framework</b> <b>50 Total Points</b>	<b>Fall 2017</b> 2 Sections  Percentage Correct 100% N=9 90% N=26	<b>Spring 2018</b> 3 Sections  Percentage Correct 86% N=20 94% N=24 98% N=24
<b>Section 2: Business Ratios</b> <b>50 Total Points</b>	<b>Fall 2017</b> 2 Sections  Percentage Correct 88% N=9 82% N=26	<b>Spring 2018</b> 3 Sections  Percentage Correct 77% N= 20 78% N=24 78% N=24
<b>Total Business Case Written Document :</b> <b>Conceptual Framework +Business Ratios</b> <b>100 Total Points</b>	<b>Fall 2017</b> 2 Sections  Total Percentage Correct 94% N=9 88% N=26	<b>Spring 2018</b> 3 Sections  Total Percentage Correct 82% N=20 86% N=24 87% N=24

In 2017-2018, SLO 5.1 was implemented and the acceptable target of 70% was met. The 75% ideal target was also met. Although SLO 5.1 is a new student learning outcome, analysis was conducted on the results. The results suggest that the majority of the students (n=103) enrolled in MGT 4300 in the AY 2017-2018 across both fall and spring semesters students successfully met the target (70%) and also met the ideal target. (75%) [Fall: 94%,88%,82%; Spring: 82%, 86%, 87%]

Following review of the results, two potential issues were identified. Due to the fact students met or exceeded the acceptable and ideal targets on this first attempt, these positive results may be suspect. First, the written document assignment or rubric may have been less rigorous than needed. Secondly, the established acceptable and ideal targets set by faculty may have been set too low.

The faculty identified the business case conceptual framework and the selected business ratios as fundamental concepts and experiential learning activities key to success in the business work environment. To achieve a positive learning outcome, faculty provided:

- (a.) in-class teaching and multiple on-line videos for both conceptual framework and business ratios utilizing peer teaching learning exercises.
- (b.) practice assignments, study guides, and case studies.

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

- (c.) in-class peer group demonstrations and online student group video demonstrations with like-kind business ratios and problem-solving were provided to enhance the learning experience.
- (d.) community service experiential learning projects which included the use of the conceptual framework to evaluate the organization, its business issues and proposed solutions during the course of the project.

Faculty prepared the business case study and rubric with the high expectations the information required to succeed would be presented and available in multiple teaching modalities. However, the faculty had a moderate expectation for student success. In other words, the faculty did provide numerous opportunities for students to achieve success and therefore targets were met. If this is the case, analysis of student achievement for this SLO is evidence that student learning is taking place and at a higher level than faculty expectations.

However, the faculty must explore the possibility that the business case and/or rubric may need additional rigor. Evaluating both instruments is recommended to assure the high level of achievement demonstrated by the students is due to the student learning experience and curriculum.

**Action-Decision:** Based on the analysis of data and suggested evidence of student learning reflected in the results, the Business Administration faculty made two key decisions regarding actions to be taken. First, faculty will review the newly devised written document assignment and rubric. In an effort to assure continuous improvement, faculty will analyze the current written document assignment and measure to determine if the appropriate, required rigor and robustness is being employed in the written document assignment and assessment tool measure. A sample will be pulled and pre-selected faculty members will be asked to evaluate them to determine inter-rater reliability. If deemed appropriate, the faculty will determine if the assignment or rubric need further development and modify these instruments to assure maximum student results on this key component for success in the workforce.

Secondly, striving for excellence in student performance and workforce productivity, faculty members will continue to provide a positive learning environment including in-class instruction and exercises and on-line videos for both conceptual framework and peer teaching learning exercises. In class peer learning and online student group video demonstrations to enhance the learning experience will continue to be provided in the curriculum.

Furthermore, faculty will review the current acceptable and ideal targets to determine if there is a need to raise these target levels.

### Measure 5.2 (Direct-Student Artifact: Exam)



## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

**Details/Description:** In MGT 3580 (Operations Management) students will complete an integrated multi-disciplinary exam solving business problems across multiple disciplines using analytical tools (such as Excel) or models. Students will provide solutions to specific business problems and submit the results to the exam for evaluation. The faculty member of the course grades the exam.

**Acceptable Target:** The acceptable target was established as 70% of the students will score 80 % or better on the business case study.

**Ideal Target:** The ideal target was established as 85% of the students will score 80% or better.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** The comprehensive exam will be created in the 2016-2017 academic year with the actual testing of students beginning in 2017-2018.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** The MGT 3580 faculty will be responsible for administering the exam, gathering and analyzing results and providing actions, recommendations and decisions.

**Findings:** The target was not met.

**Analysis:** SLO 5 is a new SLO, and all measures are new. Further details, summaries, and explanation are below.

**AY 2016-2017:** SLO 5 not measured. AY 2017-2018 is the baseline year.

**AY 2017-2018:** The acceptable target of 70% scoring 80% or better was not met.

The actual percentages and detailed results are found in the Table below.

Grade %	Fall 2017		Spring 2018	
	Number of Students	Percent	Number of Students	Percent
90-100	8	9%	6	7%
80-89	19	21%	13	16%
70-79	16	18%	20	25%
60-69	17	19%	12	15%
50-59	13	15%	11	14%
<50	16	18%	19	23%
<b>Grade Average</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>63%</b>
Grade >80%	27	30%	19	23%
Grade >70%	43	48%	39	48%
Grade >60%	60	67%	51	63%
Grade >50%	73	82%	62	77%

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

In AY 2017-2018, in Measure 5.2, the acceptable target of 70% scoring 80% or better was not met. In Fall 2017, the average grade was 68% and 28% students scored 80% or better. In Spring 2018, the average grade was 63% and 25% students scored 80% or better.

AY 2017-2018 is the first academic year that we developed the comprehensive, problem-solving questions populating the MGT 3580 Final Exam for Measure 5.2. Due to the fact that 72% and 75% students are below the acceptable target on this first attempt, the first issue we identified is that the problem-solving skills will need to be enhanced in this class.

The second potential issue to consider is that the established acceptable and ideal targets which aim at a grade of 80% may have been set too high.

**Action-Decision:** The faculty will enhance the problem-solving skills, especially related to Excel skills in this class. The faculty will consider aiming at an acceptable target of 70% of students scoring 70% or better in the next AY 2018-2019.

To enhance problem-solving skills, we suggest our faculty members take the following two measures in MGT 3580:

First, the faculty will modify Exam 1 and Exam 2 in MGT 3580 to include more problem-solving questions. Additionally, at least one essay question will be added to Exam 1. Exam 2 will be exclusively a problem-solving instrument. The faculty will require the use of Excel for all exam computations.

Secondly, MGT 3580 will make curricular changes to enhance the problem-solving learning experience of the student while striving to improve their skills. Several examples include:

- (a.)making current 'optional' Practice Sheets required assessment activities. Practice Sheets currently are used only for bonus points. The faculty suggests making all Practice Sheets required while asking students to submit Excel for calculated solutions as of fall 2018. More Practice Sheets on Productivity, Forecasting, Line Balancing and Location Analysis, etc. are recommended to be added to relative Moodle modules to reflect each of the problem-solving skills measured in the final exam.
- (b.)incorporating McGraw Hill Connect and LearnSmart components of the text into the homework assignments. These innovative assignments allow students unlimited time to complete the homework assignments and the assignments change each time they start over forcing them to practice the assignment problems.
- (c.)reviewing more thoroughly statistics in chapter one of the course and lecturing on how to use Excel templates in all relative chapters for both face-to-face and online classes. This action will assist students in becoming more familiar with basic

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

statistics and Excel skills which will in turn provide them with a stronger foundation for problem solving.

### Comprehensive summary of key evidence of improvements based on analysis of results.

Note: In accordance with the School of Business' accrediting agency, the AACSB, all School of Business degree programs (Accounting, Computer Information Systems, and Business Administration) share four SLOs. However, the School of Business began an initiative of updating our knowledge exam and implementing an SLO 5 specific to each degree program in AY 2017-2018. These changes are meant to drive continuous improvement, increase student learning, and make our assessment process more robust and specific to each degree program in the overall School of Business. And, of course, as these are School of Business-wide plans, the Business Administration degree program is included in these changes. Activities regarding the four shared SLOs as well as Business Administration program-specific discussion can be found below.

Student learning outcome data was collected, analyzed, and reported across the Business Administration degree program. Measures used to collect data include partial SoBUSKE results, reports, case studies, projects, additional exams, presentations, and written exercises.

An analysis of student outcomes data in AY 2017-2018 presented a profile of overall success in meeting the student learning outcomes established as Acceptable Targets and in many cases the Acceptable Targets were met and exceeded (n=9). Several Ideal Targets were also met (n=4).

Additionally, a new, fifth SLO was introduced and implemented with baseline data being collected for the first time this AY 2017-2018 in the Business. The initial target for SLO 5 measure 1 was met, but the target for SLO 5 measure 2 was not met. Again, this was a first-time data collection for this SLO which is specific to the Business Administration program.

From these results, there were several key actions recommended and decisions made to enhance the student experience and student learning outcomes with the focus on assuring students meet and exceed target expectations.

After reviewing the results BUAD 2200 objective measures, it was decided instructors will re-evaluate the distance learning delivery format and look for possible ways to improve the course delivery. Also noted was that this was a trial of the distance learning delivery in a three hour once a week setting. It is possible that this time and delivery method would need to be modified to increase student performance. However, the evidence of student learning in the distance course in AY 2017-2018 were trending positive, so modifications may not be necessary.

Upon review of the results of the written document measure, to improve student written communications, a peer learning intervention was conducted in AY 2017-2018. A pre and

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

post-business letter of introduction was developed by each of five experiential project teams in MGT 4300 with the result that the ideal target was met and exceeded. The analysis of the written document exercise suggested evidence that student learning is taking place. MGT 4300 faculty determined the written document peer learning exercise was a success and the business letter of introduction will be introduced as a MGT 4300 direct, student artifact. By adjusting the curriculum to include this exercise, it will be of value to students in enhancing their written communication skills. Due to its success, this suggested recommendation will be shared with another School of Business course, CIS 4600, for consideration in AY 2018-2019.

BUAD 2200 faculty addressed a concern identified in AY 2017-2018 related to inter-rater reliability issues in oral presentation evaluations. Consequently, following close work between faculty, faculty team evaluations improved resulting in a more uniform assessment process and inter-rater reliability outcome.

An additional key finding in AY 2016-2017 was that new faculty members were unfamiliar with the SoBUSKE. In order to “close the loop” several instructive sessions and a Lunch and Learn professional development meeting were provided for all faculty to attend and discuss area questions and to provide additional insight into the existing SoBUSKE.

In fact, a series of School of Business Faculty Lunch and Learns was initiated in Fall 2017. Inviting all faculty to participate in discussions concerning communication, SoBUSKE, critical thinking, and student preparation for outside employment opportunities are a few of the topic areas addressed. In recognizing and discussing the need for additional business writing assignments in the classroom, a copy of the assessment rubric was made available to score the written document for faculty wishing to assist in the continuous improvement of the student written communication skills within their classroom environment.

It has also been suggested for several years and after many faculty discussions that a new SoBUSKE be created. In AY 2017-2018 a review of the current SoBUSKE was conducted and the decision was made to create a new SoBUSKE to replace the current, outdated exam. The CISPAC (Continuous Improvement, Strategic Planning and Accreditation Committee) subsequently approved this recommendation as did the entire faculty. It is expected this move will improve the quality of our teaching and the assessment tool while streamlining the question bank. Faculty began introducing new key theories and concepts into the classroom environment which will be assessed in the SoBUSKE in AY 2018-2019.

In an effort to upgrade our curricula to include new concepts and teaching strategies, another key advancement was also introduced this year by the faculty striving for continuous improvement in the classroom. Faculty are implementing a “Providing Evidence Process (PEP)” to identify among discipline area instructors where and how the core information being tested in the new SoBUSKE is being introduced and reinforced in the curriculum and classroom. This decision was implemented in AY 2017-2018. The “PEP” responses and materials are being collected as the revised, modified and new

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

SoBUSKE discipline area questions are being created. Faculty responsible for teaching the core theories and concepts are providing a list of actions taken and evidence of impactful, innovative and engaging activities associated with teaching the core curricular materials. Instructors are also providing artifacts to demonstrate these key concepts are being taught or will be taught using engaging and innovative methods as well as tried and true standard practices. Additionally, faculty are identifying the actions taken to improve student learning outcomes associated with the SoBUSKE.

Students are also engaged in reflection essays across several courses such as the capstones, marketing and management. While reflection is an important aspect of critical thinking, key course content and review sessions are also being provided throughout the semester and will continue next year.

In order to improve critical thinking skills of students, the Fin 3090 and 4200 classes were revised in Fall 2017. The revised 4200 class includes more discussion of current events involving finance, specifically laws and regulations that might affect businesses. A business simulation game was also introduced in Fin 4200 where students are tasked with managing a fictional company. While these efforts are expected to improve the critical thinking skills of our BUAD graduates, the intervention comes after the annual critical thinking measurement in Fin 3090.

Best practices include professors continuing to embed model examples of various business report documents into the course and voice-narrated videos related to global, cultural and ethical perspectives. These videos provide step by step project/assignment directions for use by students.

It should be noted that in AY 2017-2018, the School of Business added a new finance professor, a new accounting professor, and an instructor received her doctorate in management. Therefore, by virtue of these additions, the School of Business has a more robust and well-educated set of faculty teaching than in the past, and it is hoped that these changes will be correlated with improvements in evidence of student learning in various degree programs as these faculty teach students throughout the School of Business. These new faculty will be teaching classes that include measurements used for assessment in the Accounting program and other School of Business degree programs.

School of Business faculty responsible for BUAD 3270 are continuing their efforts in coaching and modelling success for their projects in each class.

Again, the 2017-2018 academic year was the baseline year for SLO 5 measurements for Business Administration, so we have no AY 2016-2017 data for comparison. The SLO was new. However, for newly developed BUAD SLO Measure 5.1, findings suggest the SLO 5 acceptable and ideal targets for AY 2017-2018 were met indicating students are well versed in preparing a comprehensive conceptual framework for business case analyses and business ratio evaluations. These are both considered key performance indicators for business success. However, the BUAD SLO 5 measure 5.2 did not meet

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

the target which indicate students may have some issues supporting their abilities with underlying knowledge and theory.

Overall, the Business Administration program assessment targets were usually met or exceeded in AY 2017-2018. The faculty will continue to make changes to the curriculum based on assessment, advisory council feedback, and student needs.

### Plan of action moving forward.

Note: In accordance with the School of Business' accrediting agency, the AACSB, all School of Business degree programs (Accounting, Computer Information Systems, and Business Administration) share four SLOs. However, the School of Business began an initiative of updating our knowledge exam and implementing an SLO 5 specific to each degree program in AY 2017-2018. These changes are meant to drive continuous improvement, increase student learning, and make our assessment process more robust and specific to each degree program in the overall School of Business. And, of course, as these are School of Business-wide plans, the Business Administration degree program is included in these changes. Future activities regarding the four shared SLOs as well as Business Administration program-specific discussion can be found below.

The Business Administration program is encouraged by the improvements made by faculty during the AY 2017-2018 and recognize it is necessary to strive for continuous improvement needed every year to achieve model student learning outcomes.

As noted previously, faculty will be reviewing the current business case analysis written document, rubric and MGT 3580 Exam 1 and Exam 2 to identify weaknesses and improve these instruments moving forward. Modifications will be made as needed. We will work with faculty teaching the multi-disciplinary courses to review the results and ask for any additional curricular or instrument improvements. Furthermore, faculty will review the current acceptable and ideal targets to determine if there is a need to raise target levels in Measure 5.1 and lower the acceptable and ideal levels in Measure 5.2.

Oral presentation results appear to suggest stability in AY 2017-2018 and no major changes to the rubric or assignment are planned. Based on the analysis of the results and to drive continuous improvement, the faculty providing oral presentation experiences will reinforce excellence by reviewing presentation grades and notes and attempt to reinforce areas in which students need improvement. Reflection documents are currently used and will be introduced in a variety of courses.

Each academic year, faculty review rubrics and determine their continued validity for the modern classroom and assessment goals. The faculty will continue this practice.

Faculty will also place special emphasis on areas that students have shown weakness during academic years 2016-2017 and 2017-2018. To discover which areas students score the lowest in or are least prepared for, the faculty may engage with pre- and post-presentation dialogue with the students and examine which rubric areas score the lowest.

## AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

In striving to continue to improve our students learning and assessment process, a new SoBUSKE is currently being created and will be introduced for implementation in AY 2018-2019. It is expected this effort will provide evidence of new learning and successful assessment to meet our goals and those of our students.

As we attempt to assure our students remain competitive in the business market locally as well as nationally, the ETS exam will continue as a benchmark for measuring our evaluative efforts and foundational business theory norms. The faculty will re-visit the usefulness of this assessment tool moving forward.

MGT 3580 faculty are expected to make curricular changes to enhance the problem-solving learning experience of the student while striving to improve their skills. Optional Practice Sheets will be required assessment activities and students will be asked to submit Excel for calculated solutions as of fall 2018. More Practice Sheets will also be added to relative Moodle modules to reflect each of the problem-solving skills and excel mastery measured in the final exam. Innovative assignments will be incorporated into the curriculum and a more thorough foundational review of statistics at the beginning of each semester will lay a stronger foundation for computational problem-solving.

Through continued weekly School of Business lunches, Lunch and Learn Programs, advisory board meetings, and embracing open dialogue among faculty, we have established a platform for faculty members to discuss what is currently being taught and expected of students in their respective classrooms. This initiative provides us with the knowledge and resources faculty need to support our students and one another.

In conclusion, as faculty reflect on what additional needs should be addressed moving forward, in the future, improved research into and better targeting of overall student deficiencies should be helpful in improving results.