

# Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary

## *Bachelor of Business Administration, BBA* *Business Administration*

*School of Management*  
*2014-2016*

**Submitted by: Mark Herrmann**  
**Contact Information: x7461**  
**Date: May 2016**

### **1. Assessment information collected:**

#### **A. Communication**

- i. Communication Written: Writing samples are collected from all “W” designated courses in BBA.
- ii. Communications Oral: Oral presentations are recorded in all “O” designated courses in BBA.

#### **B. Problem Solving**

- i. Problem Solving General: The Watson Glaser exam was given in BA 330 (The Legal Environment of Business).
- ii. Problem Solving Econometrics: Questions imbedded in Econ 227 (Intermediate Statistics for Economics and Business) exams.
- iii. Problem Solving Accounting: Questions imbedded in Acct 262 (Accounting Concepts and Uses II) exams.

#### **C. Ethical Knowledge**

- i. Questions imbedded in the final exam for BA 323 (Business Ethics).

#### **D. Technical Knowledge**

- i. General Business: The ETS exam is given each semester in BA 462 (Corporate Strategy).
- ii. Business Fields of (a) leadership, (b) finance, (c) marketing, and (d) economics. Embedded questions of various types given in BA 325 (Financial Management), BA 343 (Principles of Marketing), BA 390 (Organizational Theory and Behavior) and Econ 202 (Principles of Macroeconomics).

**Note:** Data is collected every semester, assessment is done every two years by faculty. In AY15 Communication and Technical Knowledge were assessed. In AY16 Problem Solving and Ethical Knowledge were assessed.

## 2. Conclusions drawn from the collected information summarized above

### A. Communications:

**(i) Written:** During the AY14-AY15 time period, students meeting or exceeding expectations on all six components averaged 83% on 42 student papers.

*Percent of Students achieving minimal standards*

Categories	Percent
Appropriate Content	90
Critical Thinking Evident	79
Appropriate for Intended Audience	90
Coherence	83
Clarity	90
Conciseness	83
Average	83

The minimal standards for the written communication (75%) were met.

**(ii) Communications Oral:** During the AY14-AY15 time period, students meeting or exceeding expectations on all six components averaged 74% on 42 student papers.

*Percent of Students achieving minimal standards*

Categories	Percent
Sense of Audience	76
Organization and/or Development	82
Detail to Support Ideas	76
Understanding of Topic	82
Mannerism of Presentation	76
Clarity of Speech	66
Enthusiasm for Topic	63
Average	74

The minimal standards for the written communication (75%) was not met

**B. Problem Solving:****(i) Watson Glaser:**

	2015 (n=25)	2016 (n=37)	Total (n=62)
<b>Recognize Assumptions</b>	80%	84%	82%
<b>Evaluate Arguments</b>	60%	59%	60%
<b>Draw Conclusions</b>	72%	81%	77%
<b>Overall</b>	40%	54%	48%

Minimal Standards:

Overall Exam: min standard 50% at 50<sup>th</sup> percentile or above

By Category: min standard 70% at “average” or “high”

Generally scores improved from 2015 to 2016. The minimum standard for the overall score (50<sup>th</sup> percentile) was met in 2016 but not 2015. The minimal standards (70%) for “recognize arguments” and “draw conclusions” was met in both years. However, for “evaluate arguments” the minimal standard was not met in either year.

**(ii) Hypothesis Testing:****Inclass:**

**Students:** 132

**Mean:** 84.8%

**Online:**

**Students:** 44

**Mean** 84.1%

Min. Standard: 70% percent of students meet expectations

Minimal standards were met and, additionally, scores were very similar between the inclass and online students.

**(iii) Financial Information and business problem solving:**

**(i) Inclass**

**Means**

**(a) Special Order:** 62% (n=200)

**(b) Sell or Process:** 86% (n=163)

**(c) Drop a Product:** 77% (n=130)

**(d) Make or Buy:** 78% (n=163)

**(ii) Online**

**Means**

**(a) Special Order:** 38% (n=18)

**(b) Sell or Process:** 61% (n=18)

**(c) Drop a Product:** 56% (n=18)

**(d) Make or Buy:** 56% (n=18)

**Min. Standard:** 70% of students getting 75% or above in each category.

In the online course students met or exceeded expectations in all but the “Make or Buy” category. In the online course, with a much smaller sample size, the students did not meet or exceed expectations in any category.

### **C. Ethical Knowledge:**

#### **Inclass**

**Students:** n=147

#### **Means**

- |  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>(a) Differentiate between ethical models:</b>   | <b>73%</b> |
| <b>(b) Understand laws that relate to ethically related business decisions:</b>              | <b>88%</b> |
| <b>(c) Identify and understand whether certain business conduct is legal and/or ethical:</b> | <b>90%</b> |
| <b>(d) Situationally apply what they have learned:</b>                                       | <b>88%</b> |

#### **Online**

**Students:** n=71

#### **Means**

- |  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>(a) Differentiate between ethical models:</b>   | <b>78%</b> |
| <b>(b) Understand laws that relate to ethically related business decisions:</b>              | <b>89%</b> |
| <b>(c) Identify and understand whether certain business conduct is legal and/or ethical:</b> | <b>61%</b> |
| <b>(d) Situationally apply what they have learned:</b>                                       | <b>70%</b> |

**Min. Standard:** 70%

For the inclass students the minimal standard was met for each of the four categories. For the online courses. For the online students the minimal standard declined for the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> category and fell below the minimal standards for the third category.

**D. Technical Knowledge (General) (i) ETS exam (AY15):**

*Percentile for the ETS Business Exam by Area*

Area	AY14-15
SOM Students	77
SOM as a School	95
Accounting	97
Economics	90
Management	88
Quantitative	95
Finance	92
Marketing	96
Legal	79
Info Systems	81
International	89

Sixty-three students took the exam and, nationwide, SOM student's average scores were at the 77th percentile and SOM average scored at the 95th percentile as a school.

In terms of specific areas, SOM ranked at the 97th percentile for accounting and well above the minimal standard of 50<sup>th</sup> percent for every functional area.

**ii. Embedded Questions:**

- a. Technical Knowledge Finance:** Ten questions embedded into BA 325 (Financial Management). The questions tested time value of money questions. During the AY14-AY15 time period students scored on average 89.5% which exceeded the minimal acceptable standard of 70%.
- b. Technical Knowledge Marketing:** A question was imbedded into the in-class BA 343 that asked students to "Explain the two elements of marketing strategy. List an example for each marketing mix variable. How does marketing affect your everyday life?" There is a 10-point rubric which measures four components of the question. The minimal standard is 70% of the students achieving a minimal acceptable level or above.

**Students Meeting or Exceeding Expectations on Marketing Question (AY14-AY15)**

Semester/Year	Number of Students	Students Exceeding Minimal Acceptable Level (%)
Fall 2013	30	66
Spring 2014	37	57
Fall 2014	28	54
Spring 2015	34	60

Marketing students are not coming out of the core marketing course (BA 343) retaining, or being able to synthesize, basic marketing concepts.

- c. **Technical Knowledge Leadership:** Ten leadership questions are embedded into the final exam for Business Administration 390 (Organizational Theory and Behavior) each Fall. The students are scored into four levels. The minimal acceptable level for each student requires at least 6 correct answers and demonstrates that the student has achieved a moderate understanding of leadership. During the AY14-AY15 time period assessment data from 78 students was collected. The students exceeded minimal standards 84.5% of the time which exceeded minimal standards of 70%.
- d. **Technical Knowledge Economics:** Assessments were supposed to be performed during this time period but because of a new instructor it fell through the cracks. Economics will be assessed in the next cycle.

### 3. Curricular changes resulting from conclusions drawn above

**In General:** For all assessments here on out, SOM will gather data from both inclass and online courses separately using the same instruments. Assessments will be made on both but assessors will not be told which is inclass vs. online.

- A. **(i) Communication Written:** Although the minimal standard for written communication was met, the BBA AOL Committee decided to encourage all instructors of W courses to add to their syllabi the link to the Purdue Online Writing Lab (OWL) <https://owl.english.purdue.edu/>. Additionally, we have a communications committee working on the new communications requirements that was passed by the UAF faculty senate. We are using assessment data from several years to help assist with the plan formation. We also had a faculty retreat on January 30, 2016 to work on the new communications plan.

The communications plan will affect the Assurance of Learning written communications plan. This plan currently has an overall objective of **1a. Written: Students should be able to** develop a paper using cogent arguments or opinions on topics pertaining to the field of study.

The new plan will have greater specificity targeted at business writing skills and these skills will be taught in a wide variety of courses. A **rough draft** is below (we will have this plan finalized before the end of 2016).

#### **Written Communication: Students should be able to:**

- 1a. write using cogent arguments or opinions on topics pertaining to the field of study.
- 1b. prepare business related plans.
- 1c. synthesize information for executive summaries.
- 1d. write a professional e-mail.
- 1e. develop a professional resume
- 1f. write a professional memo

We will continue to work on these objectives, rubrics to assess the objectives and the mapping of the courses in which these skills will be taught at data collected and assessed.

**(ii) Communications Oral:** Minimal standards were not met. The faculty will close the loop on this after the results of the UAF Faculty Senate decision on the new communication core requirements. In response to previous concerns from the AACSB accrediting body, future assessment that involve group presentations will be made on individual performances within the group as well as the group as a whole.

Additionally, we have a communications committee working on the new communications requirements that was passed by the UAF faculty senate. We are using assessment data from several years to help assist with the plan formation. We also had a faculty retreat on January 30, 2016 to work on the new communications plan.

The communications plan will affect the Assurance of Learning written communications plan. This plan currently has an overall objective of **1b. Oral: Students should be able to** deliver a professional Powerpoint presentation and field questions related to presentation with confidence and poise.

The new plan will have greater specificity targeted at business oral communication skills and these skills will be taught in a wide variety of courses. A **rough draft** is below (we will have this plan finalized before the end of 2016).

**Oral Communication: Students should be able to**

- 1a. deliver a professional presentation, using various modes of technology, and field questions related to presentation with confidence and poise.
- 1b. develop professional interviewing skills
- 1c. successfully network with peers

We will continue to work on these objectives, rubrics to assess the objectives and the mapping of the courses in which these skills will be taught at data collected and assessed.

**B. Problem Solving:**

**(i) The Watson-Glaser Problem** exam used for assessment was previously given in Acct 404 (Advanced Cost Accounting and Controllorship, BA 423 (Investment Analysis) and Econ 227 (Intermediate Statistics for Economics and Business) on a trial basis. It was decided that, starting this cycle, that the Watson-Glaser exam used for assessment would be now given in BA 330 (The Legal Environment of Business) as it closely aligns with courses materials and questions on the LSAT exam. This will allow us several years of consistent data.

The last two years of WG data shows a student weakness in “evaluating arguments”. To address this, Mr. Jim Arkell who coordinates the Business Ethics course, will be spending more time on examples aimed at the critical thinking components of evaluation.

**(ii) Hypothesis Testing:** After several years of fairly good results in regard to students being able to formulate hypothesis tests it was decided, because of the proliferation of online students, to break these two groups out and assess them separately. So, these assessments were performed both in the inclass and online Econ 227 (Intermediate Statistics for Economics and Business) course.

The results were very consistent with 84.8% of the students meeting expectations in the inclass course and 84.1% in the online course. We were both surprised and pleased by the constancy as there has



been some concern about whether quantitative skills can be taught just as well online vs. inclass. We will continue to monitor this for another two years.

**(iii) Financial Information and business problem solving:** As with the hypothesis testing, after several years of fairly good results in regard to students analyzing financial information and solving business problems, it was decided, because of the proliferation of online students, to break these two groups out and assess them separately. So, these assessments were performed both in the inclass and online Acct 262 (Principle of Managerial Accounting).

Unlike hypothesis testing, the results between the inclass and online students varied dramatically. The inclass students met the minimal standard in 3 of the 4 categories that were tested falling below minimal standards in the “Special Order” problem. However, for the online course, the students fell dramatically below the minimal standard in every category. It is possible that sample size contributed here as the inclass sample was between 130 and 200 students while the online sample was 18 students. It is also likely that because the online accounting course was brand new that the lower scores were a reflection of a first time instructor experience of teaching online.

To continue to improve the online course, Ruth Prato who teaches Acct 262, took part in the Chancellor’s Innovation in Technology and Elearning (CITE) Fellows two-year Program (AY14 and AY15.) Dr. Prato writes the following: “Regarding my Acct 262 Managerial Accounting classes, recent data collected from the online courses has not met our establish objective to have, at least, 70% of the students achieve a score 75% or higher on decision making assessments. I continue to make ongoing improvements to the course in response to the data AOL collection provides. For example, in the online courses, I’m working with UAF eLearning to provide narrated and closed captioned video examples of sample assessment problems worked out by myself in order for the students to listen to my thought process as I solve the problems. In addition, I’m going to provide more practice examples for the students so that by the time the assessment comes around, they should perform at the level set by our objective.”

In both the inclass and online courses special attention was paid to “Special Orders”. The Acct 262 instructors are doing the following. "Currently, we give students the special order price and ask them what the impact will be on net income if they accept the special order price. We will develop other examples where the students analyze costs and determine the lowest special order price they will be willing to accept. The idea is that if they analyze the costs from another perspective, they will be able to grasp the concept better. More homework problems will be given that analyze special orders from a few different perspectives."

- C. **Ethical Knowledge:** To address inconsistencies in prior assessments on Ethical Knowledge, such as student having difficulties identifying between ethical and unethical behavior, In FY14 we hired Mr. Jim Arkell, JD to head our Business Ethics efforts. MR. Arkell has his JD from Texas Tech and specialized in Business Ethics. Previous to coming to UAF he taught for over 10 years in a School of Law in Shenzhen China.

Dr. Arkell also changed the objective from

**Students should be able to** identify an ethical dilemma and distinguish between legal, illegal, ethical and unethical behavior.

to

**“Students should be able to:** (a) differentiate between ethical models; (b) understand laws that relate to ethically related business decisions; (c) identify and understand whether certain business conduct is legal and/or ethical and (d) situationally apply what they’ve learned.”

We have seen great improvement in the inclass Business Ethics courses since Mr. Arkell was hired. This cycle we concentrated on separately assessing the inclass and online courses. As noted previously, in the inclass assessment in all categories students met minimal standards. For the online course, the results were nearly identical for two of the categories but were less impressive in the other two categories and fell below the minimal standard in “Identify and understand whether certain business related conduct is legal and/or unethical”. This is the area that we were working on before.

To address this concern the Jim has met with the online instructors. It was determined that possible the instrument was causing the difference as the inclass and online courses were using different texts and syllabi and that possible two of the ten embedded questions were more test specific then generic. Therefore, the instrument has been altered and it will be seen if in the next two years there is still a difference still exists.

- D. **Technical Knowledge (i) General Business:** The school is extremely pleased with the results on the ETS functional business exam which places the school at the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile, and its students at the 77<sup>th</sup> percentile. In particular, the accounting scores were very impressive (97<sup>th</sup> percentile). SOM improved in the functional area of information systems from the 79<sup>th</sup> percentile to the 97<sup>nd</sup> percentile over a two-year period. We will continue to monitor these scores.

SOM placed at the 79<sup>th</sup> percentile in the legal functional areas. Although this is well-above the minimal standard of the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile it was still below the previous assessment score at the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile. The school has hired its first full-time law faculty member and we hope to boost this score.

**Technical Knowledge (ii) Embedded Questions (a) Finance:** The students are doing well on the time value of money questions. We are now focusing on the online course to make sure that is getting similar results to the inclass courses.

**Technical Knowledge (ii) Embedded Questions (b) Marketing:** Marketing Instructor Tammy Traggis created a new group project over the summer to address the shortfalls found in the assessment and present it to the BBA AOL committee in the Fall.

**Technical Knowledge (ii) Embedded Questions (c) Leadership:** Despite meeting minimal standards, the two faculty charged with instructing Organizational Behavior have met and 1) decided to use the same text and version for the course, 2) rewrote the instrument to make the items clearer and updated some items in order to ensure that the assessment is up to date with recent leadership theories, 3) are using the assessment in both online and in class exams and 4) plan to move the acceptable pass rate from 6 correct items to 7 correct items.

**Technical Knowledge (ii) Embedded Questions (d) Economics:** Assessments were not performed during this time period. Rather, the new instructor, Chris Wright, redid the intended objective and will spend this summer redoing the instrument and rubric.

**4. Identify the faculty members involved in reaching the conclusions drawn above and agreeing upon the resulting curricular changes**

All undergraduate BBA changes were addressed by the BBA Assurance of Learning Committee which consists of the following members:

Thomas Zhou, Chair  
Jim Arkell  
Jungho Baek  
Jim Collins  
Josh Lupinek  
Jim McDermott  
Debbie Fristoe (AOL Support)