

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary

Bachelor of Business Administration, BBA *Business Administration*

School of Management
2016-2018

Submitted by: Mark Herrmann
Contact Information: x7461
Date: May 2018

1. Assessment information collected:

A. Communication

- i. Written:** All applicable courses for papers and business-related plans. BA 343 (Principles of Marketing), BA 360 (Operations Management), HSEM 445 (Business Continuity and Crisis Management), ACCT 262 (Principle of Managerial Accounting), and Professional Development and Enhancement (PDEP) courses.
- ii. Oral:** All applicable courses for professional presentations. BA 330 (The Legal Environment of Business) and Professional Development and Enhancement (PDEP) courses.

B. Problem Solving

- i. General:** The Watson Glaser exam given in BA 330 (The Legal Environment of Business).
- ii. Econometrics:** Questions embedded in ECON 227 (Intermediate Statistics for Economics and Business) exams.
- iii. Accounting:** Questions embedded in ACCT 262 (Accounting Concepts and Uses II) exams.

C. Ethical Knowledge

- i. General:** Questions embedded in the final exam for BA 323 (Business Ethics).

D. Technical Knowledge

- i. General:** The ETS exam given in BA 462 (Corporate Strategy).
- ii. Business Fields:** Questions embedded in BA 325 (Financial Management), BA 343 (Principles of Marketing), BA 390 (Organizational Theory and Behavior), and ECON 202 (Principles of Macroeconomics) to measure (a) **finance**, (b) **marketing**, (c) **leadership**, and (d) **economics** respectively.

Note: Data is collected every semester and assessment is done every two years by faculty. In AY18 the **Problem Solving** and **Ethical Knowledge** categories were assessed.

2. Conclusions drawn from the collected information summarized above:

A. Communication

- i. **Written:** During the AY16 to AY17 time period, students meeting or exceeding expectations, as an average of each of the components, was 84% on 63 student papers.

Percent of Students achieving minimal standards

Categories	AY14-AY15 (prior period)	AY16-AY17
Appropriate Content	90	89
Critical Thinking Evident	79	73
Appropriate for Intended Audience	90	87
Coherence	83	89
Clarity	90	79
Conciseness	83	87
Average	83	84
Number of Papers	42	63

The minimal standard for the written communication (75%) was met overall. The assessment average was not met was in the “Critical Thinking Evident” category. This was also the lowest score of the previous assessment cycle.

With the School of Management having expanded the BBA to a fully online program (in addition to fully in-class), the emphasis on this year’s assessment was on separating out the writings from the online sections vs. the in-class sections to see how the different teaching methods fare. This year a larger sample was taken from the online courses (48) as compared to the in-class sections (15).

Percent of Students achieving minimal standards for AY16 to AY17

Categories	In-class	Online
Appropriate Content	93	87
Critical Thinking Evident	75	72
Appropriate for Intended Audience	88	87
Coherence	100	85
Clarity	81	79
Conciseness	94	85
Average	88	83
Number of Papers	15	48

Because of the different sample sizes it is difficult to compare the two samples, and that was not the intention of this assessment. Rather, it was intended to get a first representative sample of online courses. Despite the differing sample sizes the scores are not all that different, with both samples exceeding the overall average minimum requirement of 75% and both having “Critical Thinking Evident” as the lowest assessed category.

- ii. **Oral:** During the AY16 to AY17 time period, students meeting or exceeding expectations, as an average of each of the components, was 79% on 44 student presentations.

Percent of Students achieving minimal standards

Categories	AY14-AY15 (prior period)	AY16-AY17
Sense of Audience	76	86
Organization and/or Development	82	84
Detail to Support Ideas	76	79
Understanding of Topic	82	84
Mannerism of Presentation	76	88
Clarity of Speech	66	80
Enthusiasm for Topic	63	52
Average	76	79
Number of Presentations	38	44

The minimal standard for the oral communication (75%) was met. Improvements in test scores were made from the previous cycle in all areas except for the “Enthusiasm for Topic” category, for which the score of 52% is very low for the second cycle in a row.

As with written communication, the emphasis on this year’s assessment was on separating out the writings from the online sections vs. the in-class sections in order to see how the different teaching methods fare. A larger sample was taken from the online courses (28) as compared to the in-class sections (16).

Percent of Students achieving minimal standards for AY16 to AY17

Categories	In-class	Online
Sense of Audience	85	89
Organization and/or Development	81	86
Detail to Support Ideas	75	81
Understanding of Topic	81	86
Mannerism of Presentation	94	82
Clarity of Speech	63	89
Enthusiasm for Topic	56	50
Average	76	80
Number of Presentations	16	28

As with the written assessments, because of the different sample sizes it is difficult to compare the two samples. The overall averages are similar with both exceeding the minimal requirement of 75%. The largest difference was in the “Clarity of Speech” category, where the online students performed much better. This might be explained, however, by the variable quality of the recordings of the in-class oral presentations. For both the in-class and online presentations “Enthusiasm for Topic” scored very low.

B. Problem Solving

- i. **General:** The Watson Glaser Exam was given for the AY16 to AY17 time period.

	AY16 (n=105)	AY17 (n=143)	Total (n=248)
Recognize Assumptions	84%	83%	83%
Evaluate Arguments	65%	72%	69%
Draw Conclusions	74%	78%	77%
Overall	49%	54%	52%

Min. Standard: 50% of students (n) at 50th percentile or above on the overall exam, 70% of students (n) at “average” or “high” per category.

Overall scores on the Watson Glaser Exam improved from AY16 to AY17. However, the requisite ratio of students did not meet the “average” or “high” rank in the Evaluate Arguments category for SOM to reach minimal standards for AY16. AY16 also fell below minimal standards for overall score. Though AY17 showed a marked overall improvement in the Evaluate Arguments category, the ratio of students at the “average” or “high” rank was not enough to reach minimal standards for the aggregate AY16/AY17 totals.

- ii. **Econometrics:** Questions were embedded into ECON 227 (Intermediate Statistics for Economics and Business) exams for the AY16 to AY17 time period.

In-class:

Students: 187
Mean: 85.2%

Online:

Students: 48
Mean: 85.4%

Min. Standard: 70% percent of students meet expectations.

The minimal standard was met and, additionally, scores were very similar between the in-class and online students. Jungho Baek, the professor who typically teaches ECON 227, was on sabbatical leave from Fall 2016 – Spring 2017. Data was not collected during the semesters he was absent.

- iii. **Accounting:** Questions were embedded into ACCT 262 (Accounting Concepts and Uses II) exams for the AY16 to AY17 time period.

In-class

Means

(a) Special Order: 55% (n=258)
(b) Sell or Process: 84% (n=180)
(c) Drop a Product: 72% (n=179)
(d) Make or Buy: 68% (n=180)

Online

Means

(a) Special Order: 52% (n=60)
(b) Sell or Process: 65% (n=60)

- (c) Drop a Product: 57% (n=60)
 (d) Make or Buy: 62% (n=60)

Min. Standard: 70% of students (n) getting 75% or above in each category.

For the in-class students, the minimal standard was met in categories (b) and (c). However, categories (a) and (d) did not have the requisite number of students reaching 75% or above in order to meet the minimal standard for the AY16 to AY17 time period. Additionally, the minimal standard was not met in any of the categories for the online students. Category (a) regarding Special Orders continues to be the online and in-class students' worst category.

C. Ethical Knowledge

- i. **General:** Questions were embedded into the BA 323 (Business Ethics) final for the AY16 to AY17 time period.

In-class

Students: 284

Means

- | | |
|---|-----|
| (a) Differentiate between ethical models: | 82% |
| (b) Understand laws that relate to ethically related business decisions: | 84% |
| (c) Identify and understand whether certain business conduct is legal and/or ethical: | 83% |
| (d) Situationally apply what they have learned: | 88% |

Online

Students: 226

Means

- | | |
|---|-----|
| (a) Differentiate between ethical models: | 71% |
| (b) Understand laws that relate to ethically related business decisions: | 90% |
| (c) Identify and understand whether certain business conduct is legal and/or ethical: | 58% |
| (d) Situationally apply what they have learned: | 67% |

Min. Standard: 70% of students meet expectations.

For the in-class students, the minimal standard was met for each of the four categories. For the online students, the minimal standard was not met in category (c), identifying and understanding whether certain business conduct is legal and/or ethical, or category (d), situationally apply what they have learned. Additionally, the mean for category (a) was quite low, barely meeting the minimal standard.

D. Technical Knowledge

- i. **General:** The ETS Business Exam was given for the AY16 to AY17 time period.

Area	AY14-15	AY16-AY17
SOM Students	77	76
SOM as a School	95	95
Accounting	97	99
Economics	90	80
Management	88	89
Quantitative	95	79
Finance	92	86
Marketing	96	89

Legal	79	98
Info Systems	81	88
International	89	83

These scores reflect Fall 2015 and Spring 2016. At this time raw scores are in for Fall 2016 but the comparative data is not yet available to calculate percentages. However, the raw Fall 2016 scores look very good. Scores are not yet available for Spring 2017.

71 students took the exam and nationwide SOM students' average scores were at the 76th percentile. SOM's overall average scored at the 95th percentile as a school.

In terms of specific areas, SOM ranked at the 99th percentile for accounting and well above the minimal standard of 50th percentile ranking for every functional area. The area of the largest decline was quantitative analysis (95th to 79th percentile) and the largest increase was legal (79th to 98th percentile).

ii. Business Fields: Questions were embedded in BA 325 (Financial Management), BA 343 (Principles of Marketing), BA 390 (Organizational Theory and Behavior), and ECON 202 (Principles of Macroeconomics) to measure (a) **finance**, (b) **marketing**, (c) **leadership**, and (d) **economics** respectively for the AY16 to AY17 time period.

- a. Finance:** A new instrument was formed for AY17. Six questions were embedded into BA 325 (Financial Management) to test various time value of money questions. During the AY14 to AY15 time period, students scored an average of 89.5% which exceeded the minimal acceptable standard of 70%. On this new, and slightly more rigorous set of questions, 77% of the 17 students met minimal standards. Only the in-class section was assessed during this period.
- b. Marketing:** A question was embedded into the in-class BA 343 that asked students to answer the following: "Explain the two elements of marketing strategy. List an example for each marketing mix variable. How does marketing affect your everyday life?" Assessors then utilize a 10-point rubric to measure 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 Questions

Semester/Year	Number of Students	Students Exceeding Minimal Acceptable Level (%)
AY15	129	59%
AY17 (in class)	107	74%
AY17 (online)	54	91%

In AY15 it was determined that marketing students are not coming out of the core marketing course (BA 343) retaining, or being able to synthesize, basic marketing concepts in sufficient numbers. In AY17, they have exceeded the 70% minimum standard in this respect. For the first time, we separated the data into in-class vs. online data with the online class performing slightly better in the assessment.

- c. Leadership:** Ten leadership questions were embedded into the final exam for BA 390 (Organizational Theory and Behavior). The minimal standard for each student

requires at least 6 correct answers and demonstrates that the student has achieved a moderate understanding of leadership.

Students Meeting or Exceeding Expectations on Leadership Questions

Semester/Year	Number of Students	Students Exceeding Minimal Acceptable Level (%)
AY15	78	85%
AY17 (in class)	40	78%
AY17 (online)	54	79%

During the AY17 time period, assessment data from 94 students was collected. The in-class students exceeded minimal standards 78% of the time and the online students 79%. These results exceed the minimum standard of 70% at a passing rate and are just slightly lower than the AY15 results.

- d. Economics:** Six questions were embedded in a macroeconomics course to assess basic macroeconomics knowledge. AY17 was the first time period that the economics objective was assessed.

Students Meeting or Exceeding Expectations on Economics Questions

Semester/Year	Number of Students	Students Exceeding Minimal Acceptable Level (%)
AY17 (in class)	31	88%
AY17 (online)	59	85%

The students in both the in-class and online sections exceeded the 70% minimum standard. Their performance was pretty similar.

3. Curricular changes resulting from conclusions drawn above:

A. Communication

- i. **Written:** Per Faculty Senate Request, a new Communications Plan was developed for the BBA Program.

Although the minimal standard for written communication using past assessment practices was met, the BBA AOL Committee decided to encourage all instructors to add to their syllabi the link to the Purdue Online Writing Lab (OWL). <https://owl.english.purdue.edu/>

Scores in AY16 to AY17 indicate that students had lower than benchmark scores on the “Critical Thinking Evident” category of evaluation. In order to address these low scores, we have decided to assess all BBA relevant courses on the following requirements:

- Write using cogent arguments or opinions on topics pertaining to the field of study.
- Prepare a business-related plan (potentially including but not limited to: marketing, business, hiring, business continuity plans, and innovation plans).

Additionally, we have developed a Professional Development and Enhancement Program (PDEP) that consists of 3 separate 1-credit courses (2 mandatory for completion of the BBA degree) that focuses on the following:

- Synthesize information for executive summaries.
- Write a professional e-mail.
- Develop a professional resume.
- Write a professional memo.

We will continue to work on these objectives by creating rubrics to assess the objectives and mapping the impact of these programmatic changes, especially as the development of our plan progresses and we get additional information from newly developed assessments and online courses. Presently, we have received approval for all three 1-credit hour communication courses to add into the BBA program requirements.

- ii. **Oral:** The minimal standard for oral communications were met during this assessment period.

Similar to written communication, oral communication is included in SOM’s new Communications Plan required by Faculty Senate. Scores in AY16 to AY17 indicate that students had lower than benchmark scores on “Enthusiasm for Topic” and in “Clarity of Speech” for in-class students only. In order to address these low scores, we have decided to assess all BBA relevant courses on the following requirement:

- Deliver a professional presentation using various modes of technology.
- Field questions related to presentation with confidence and poise.

Additionally, we have developed a Professional Development and Enhancement Program (PDEP) that consists of 3 separate 1-credit courses (2 mandatory for completion of the BBA degree) that focuses on the following:

- Develop professional interviewing skills.
- Successfully network with peers.

Between the in-class and online sections, the “clarity of speech” category of assessment was met by just 63% of the in-class students, whereas for the online sections it was met by 89%. On further examination of the presentations it appears that the difference may be due to some of the in-class recordings being of variable to poor quality. The School of Management plans to invest in equipment and training of videographers (i.e., student workers) to improve the recordings of in-class presentations.

We will continue to work on these objectives by creating rubrics to assess the objectives and mapping the impact of these programmatic changes, especially as the development of our plan progresses and we get additional information from newly developed assessments and online courses.

B. Problem Solving

- i. General:** The Watson-Glaser exam showed that students did not reach the requisite score in the Evaluate Arguments category to achieve the minimal standard.

For the next review cycle, we will focus specifically upon increasing the Evaluate Arguments scores on the Watson-Glaser. Scores have increased over the last evaluation cycle, and current scores for AY18 are quite high as well. Furthermore, scores went up between AY16 and AY17 on this assessment cycle. Currently, an entire class period is dedicated to studying for the different sections of the Watson-Glaser, and this likely attributes to the rise in scores.

However, we hypothesize that the scores continue to be negatively affected by the online sections. For the AY18 to AY19 time period, we will separate the scores for online and in-class students to explore the differences. More students take the course online than in class, so it is critical that we verify the online students’ retention of the subject matter.

Furthermore, we will record the class session devoted to studying for the Watson-Glaser and embed questions in the video to require online students to answer the questions before moving on. This will hopefully help ensure the online students get the same degree of focus on the Watson-Glaser preparation as the in-class students.

- ii. Econometrics:** The embedded questions for ECON 227 showed both the in-class and online student groups are achieving above the minimal standard.

As our classes continue to do very well, at the moment we will not recommend any curriculum changes. We will continue to monitor the students’ scores to make sure a disparity between the online and in-class students does not occur. For the AY18 to AY19 assessment, we hope to see results stay consistent.

- iii. Accounting:** The embedded questions for ACCT 262 showed both the in-class and online students are struggling with Special Order, and scores in all online categories fail to meet the minimal standard.

In response to the categories’ scores in AY14-AY15, the chapter containing the information assessed has been moved up in the class schedule for both Amy Cooper and Ruth Prato’s online and in-class courses. For Amy, the chapter is fourth from the end of the semester, and for Ruth, the chapter is second to the

end. Amy is going to try to reorder the categories as taught in her class to feature Special Order first. Amy tests the students three times over the material: twice during the chapter itself, and once during the final. Ruth tests the students twice. Amy reports all instances of testing to be assessed, while Ruth only reports the final exam. In order to increase the sample size for online students, Ruth will start reporting both of the test scores in AY18-AY19.

Overall course grades seem to stay more consistent than the assessed scores contained within this summary, which would imply that the problem is not a “bad batch of students,” but rather their comprehension of these specific categories of information. Both professors agree the questions aren’t particularly difficult, but do point out that the problems assessed are word problems, which might contribute to the students’ lack of comprehension versus a financial accounting course problem. Both agree that the problems in the chapter itself are complicated, and both create extra problems to help students with the material. Both in-class and online students are given access to these extra problems, though Ruth notes that for her online sections the problems aren’t an assignment, so she isn’t sure the students give them the same weight as the chapter. To address this, Ruth will make the extra problems an assignment on Blackboard, rather than presenting them as a handout, beginning in AY18.

Due to the continued position of Special Order as the worst category for both in-class and online students, both professors are going to look at how other teachers present Special Order to their students to see if there are alternate methods; they will do this beginning in the AY18-AY19 time period. Both say that their students appear to retain the information on Special Orders during the class interactions, but fail to do so for the tests. They will look into creating a new method of teaching Special Orders that would require students to “put pen to paper,” but which would still be interactive. For AY18-AY19, they will have the classes make their own Special Order problems and scenarios to then work out with the rest of the class. This will allow students to see the results of their problems, and therefore has the potential to help highlight areas of misunderstanding with the Special Order problems.

C. Ethical Knowledge

- i. General:** The embedded questions for BA 323 showed the online students are still falling under the minimal standard for category (c).

For the AY18 to AY19 time period, we will focus our efforts on our online students, most specifically on category (c). For the in-class course, all materials are cross-referenced with the Shaw textbook, and another textbook is used for teaching applied ethics. In order to ensure that we are giving a similar emphasis on these categories in our online courses, our in-class and online professors will meet to discuss how the embedded questions are being taught. Syllabi and teaching materials will be compared across the in-class and online sections, and ideas will be exchanged about how to prepare students for the test in which the questions are embedded.

D. Technical Knowledge

- i. General:** The minimal standard for the ETS exam was met during this assessment period.

The school is once again extremely pleased with the results on the ETS functional business exam which places the school at the 95th percentile, and its students at the 76th percentile. In particular, the accounting scores were very impressive (99th percentile). On the prior assessment we wrote that *“SOM placed at the 79th percentile in the legal functional areas. Although this is well-above the minimal standard of the 50th percentile it was still below the previous assessment score at the 90th percentile. The school has hired its first full-time law faculty member and we hope to boost this score.”* It is very pleasing that SOM, in the legal and social environment functional area over a two-year period, has risen from the

79th percentile to the 98th percentile. The addition of a full-time lawyer seems to have been very successful at boosting the students' performance on legal and social environment issues.

The one area of a significant decrease was on the quantitative scores (95th to 79th percentile). The scores making up the quantitative average were unusual, with the Fall 2015 score at 58th percentile our second lowest in a dozen years then rising to the 99th percentile in Spring 2016. We will continue monitor this to determine if this is an aberration or an area that needs further investment.

ii. Business Fields

- a. Finance:** The new instrument developed for AY17 showed that students continue to meet the minimal standard.

As reported, we have made another attempt to standardize the finance instrument for both in-class and online students. The current instrument was designed to be more challenging than the previous ones. We tested this in AY17 the in-class offering and 77% of the students met or exceeded the minimal requirements. Given the more rigorous instrument, we were pleased with this result and now will test more widely in both in-class and online sections.

- b. Marketing:** The embedded questions for BA 343 showed a marked improvement in retention in AY17 over AY15.

As planned, the marketing instrument was expanded to test both in class and online. Both sets of students exceeded minimal standards, addressing the previous assessment period in which students fell short of minimum standards. This may be partly due to a new group project that was created in Summer 2016 to address the shortfalls found in the previous assessment and the addition of a second faculty to teach the online portion of the principle of marketing course. The online students did test better than the in-class students; however, we likely need another assessment period to note if this is a trend.

- c. Leadership:** The embedded questions for BA 390 showed that students continue to meet the minimal standard.

Last assessment period, we planned to change the acceptable pass rate from 6 correct items to 7 correct items as a benchmark. In both online and in-class sections, the expected minimum level pass rate was found at 79% and 78% respectively. These pass rates are very similar between the delivery modes, indicating that leadership knowledge is being delivered successfully in both formats. We did note a drop in pass rates from the previous review cycle (from 85% passing). We will continue to monitor the outcomes over the next review cycle to determine if it is an anomaly or if we need to consider making additional changes to the BA 390 Organizational Theory and Behavior course.

- d. Economics:** The embedded questions for the macroeconomics course showed both the in-class and online student groups are achieving above the minimal standard.

After skipping a cycle, macroeconomics was assessed again using embedded questions. Both in-class and online students did quite well on this assessment and performed almost identically. As with the other areas, we are pleased to see that online sections are assessing similar to in-class sections. For the next cycle, microeconomics will be tested in ECON 321 (Intermediate Microeconomics).

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:

Nicole Cundiff, Chair

Jim Arkell

Peggy Keiper

Josh Lupinek

Kris Racina

Ashley Witt (AOL Support)

5. Has your SLOA plan been updated to include assessment of the program's Communication Plan, as required by the Faculty Senate Motion? Yes