

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary

Bachelor of Business Administration, BBA

Economics

School of Management

2014-2016

Submitted by: Mark Herrmann

Contact Information: x7461

Date: April 21, 2015

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

- a) Problem Solving General: The Watson Glaser exam was given in BA 330 (The Legal Environment of Business).
- b) Problem Solving Econometrics: Questions imbedded in Econ 227 (Intermediate Statistics for Economics and Business) exams.
- c) 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. Macroeconomics: Instructors in Econ 324 (Intermediate Macroeconomics) will embed one essay question for the students that compares and contrasts the basic mechanism of fiscal and monetary policies to reduce the peaks and valleys of the business cycle.

- iii. Microeconomics: Instructors in Econ 321 (Intermediate Microeconomics) and 351 (Public Finance) will embed one essay question using Consumer Surplus (CS) and Producer Surplus (PS) in their exams each semester.

Note: Data is collected every semester, assessment every other year by faculty. This year **Communication** and **Technical Knowledge** were assessed.

2. Conclusions drawn from the collected information summarized above

Communication and **Technical Knowledge** were assessed.

(i) Communication 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)
Recognize Assumptions	80%	84%	82%
Evaluate Arguments	60%	59%	60%
Draw Conclusions	72%	81%	77%
Overall	40%	54%	48%

Minimal Standards:

Overall Exam: min standard 50% at 50th 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 (50th 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

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

Online

Students: n=71

Means

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

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 3rd and 4th 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 50th percent for every functional area.

- ii. **Technical Knowledge Macroeconomics:** An embedded essay question is used in Econ 324 (Intermediate Macroeconomics). 82% of students achieved a minimal acceptable level on questions focused on fiscal and monetary policies. The minimal acceptable level is 70%.
- iii. **Technical Knowledge Microeconomics:** An embedded essay question is used in Econ 321 (Intermediate Macroeconomics). 79% of students exhibited a satisfactory understanding of Consumer Surplus and Producer Surplus. The minimal acceptable level is 70%.

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 Controllershship, 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 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 95th percentile, and its students at the 77th percentile. In particular, the accounting scores were very impressive (97th percentile). SOM improved in the functional area of information systems from the 79th percentile to the 97nd percentile over a two-year period. We will continue to monitor these scores.

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.

(ii) Technical Knowledge Macroeconomics: The number of students meeting minimal standard substantially improved from 40% to 82% over a two-year period. Faculty will examine the next round of the data carefully to see if this trend holds up.

(iii) Technical Knowledge Macroeconomics: Minimal standards were met. Faculty will monitor the next round of the data to see if this trend holds up. Faculty will have students do more problems both in class and in homework in order to help students gain a more firm grasp of producer and consumer surplus.

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:

Joe Little, Chair
Doug Reynolds
Josh Greenberg
Sherri Wall
Mike Pippenger
Debbie Fristoe (AOL Support)