

## **College of Business and Public Administration**

### **Undergraduate Business Program Assessment of Learning**

Academic Year 2014-2015

*The Assessment Committee was made up of the members of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee: Lei Dong, Martine Duchatelet (ex-officio, in lieu of the Associate Dean), Brian Grinder, Dean Kiefer (chair), Fred Liu, Synthia Shin, and Duanning Zhou.*

Our AACSB approved assessment plan for the BAB provides for the assessment of a subset of our program SLOs in each academic year. Instructors in all sections of designated courses assess one or more SLO in Fall and Spring of the academic year (say, year 1.) This allows us to make up for eventual missing assessment data points in Winter and in Summer of that same year.

The assessment committee reviews the Fall assessment results in Winter and may open quick to implement loops to be closed with the subsequent Spring assessment. Also, the winter assessment conversations revolve around insuring that the Fall assessment was completed as planned and in detecting any issues with the course mapping.

During the following academic year (year 2), the assessment committee continues to discuss the assessment results of the previous year and generates whatever program adjustments might remedy any revealed weaknesses in the students learning relative to the targeted SLOs. These program adjustments may include curriculum changes, teaching delivery changes, pre-requisite changes, and other adjustments. The assessment committee discusses those changes with the relevant faculty and eventually with the entire faculty, if appropriate. The assessment committee communicates the agreed upon adjustments widely to all concerned and insures that they are in place for the following academic year (year 3) when the targeted subset of SLOs are reassessed and another loop is closed on the adjustments put in place during year 2. Meanwhile another subset of SLOs are assessed in Fall and Spring of year 2, to be followed in year 3 by reflection of the assessment results by the assessment committee and implementations of adjustments, etc. The cycle repeats itself indefinitely until SLOs are revised and a new cycle is implemented.

The table below seeks to detail the process.

<b>Learning Goal</b>	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
Ethics	X		X		X
Critical Thinking	X		X		X
Written Communications	X		X		X
Global & Multicultural Awareness		X		X	
Quantitative Reasoning		X		X	
Teamwork & Collaboration		X		X	
Core/Discipline Knowledge (Exam or Embedded Items)					
Master Field Test	X				
Capsim Comp XM		X	X	X	X
Indirect Assessment	X	X	X	X	X

In 2018-2019 and following years the cycle is repeated.

\*\*\*

According to our AACSB-approved comprehensive assessment plan, the academic year 2014-2015 was to be devoted to assessing the following SLOs: *Multicultural and Global Awareness*, *Quantitative Reasoning*, and *Teamwork and Collaboration*. Additionally, we were to assess our students' learning of core discipline knowledge. Our indirect assessment (annual alumni survey) is ongoing.

By and large, the assessment of SLOs happened in all the courses that had been identified through a course mapping. There were some incidences of non-compliance due to mis-communication with adjuncts or mis-alignment with regular faculty. The missing data points were collected off-sequence during the winter and/or summer terms.

The 2015-2016 Assessment Committee under the leadership of Dr. Morris Kalliny will assess the results collected in 2014-2015 in greater depth.

**SLO: Multicultural and Global Awareness**

*Students will develop an awareness and understanding of the cultural issues that impact business operations in a global and/or multicultural society.*

- *Our students will know international elements, factors, and/or forces affecting businesses;*

<b>Identification and Explanation of Global Factors</b>	<b>Exceeds Expectations (4)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (3)</b>	<b>Marginally Meets Expectations (2)</b>	<b>Does Not Meet Expectations (3)</b>	<b>Meets or Exceeds Expectations Fall 2014</b>
Student demonstrates awareness of different practices affected by “macro” factors (economic, political, historical, financial, infrastructural, legal, historical, etc.)					<b>100%</b>
Student identifies relevant “micro” factors in the local environment affecting the business, customers, or employees (local tastes, daily practices, lifestyles, cultural preferences, etc.)					<b>100%</b>
Student can explain or describe characteristics of each factor identified					<b>100%</b>
<b>Exploration of International/Multicultural Resources</b>					
Student uses books, references, maps, and/or other written resources to learn additional information about relevant international/cultural aspects					<b>100%</b>
Student talks with other students, faculty, or staff about their experiences or knowledge of relevant international/cultural/subcultural aspects					<b>100%</b>
<b>Analysis of International Environment and Strategic Choices</b>					
Student demonstrates understanding of choices open to firms engaged in international/multicultural business					<b>85%</b>
Student recognizes differences in beliefs and practices necessary for operating or participating in international/multicultural markets and businesses					<b>87%</b>
Student provides supporting evidence or persuasive arguments for which choice or position best fits the situation					<b>82%</b>

<b>Application of Analysis to Specific Management Situation</b>					
Student makes a recommendation or takes a position about business performance in the specific situation					<b>90%</b>
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>					<b>84%</b>

- *Using case studies or designated exercises, our students will identify and describe “macro” and “micro” factors in a nation’s environment that affect business activities, organizations and people;*
- *Our students will learn about other countries and multicultural differences by referencing information and/or talking to students and people with experience in other countries and/or domestic subcultures;*
- *Using case studies or designated exercises, our students will describe differences that must be taken into account when making decisions about business in other countries.*

This SLO was mistakenly assessed in MGMT 470 (International Business Management.) This course is not a core business course. This SLO will re-assessed early in 2015-2016 in core business courses to provide valid data points. This SLO was slated to be assessed across sections in MGMT 326 (Organizational Theory and Behavior) and MGMT 423 (Business and Society.) The assessment committee noted that global and multicultural awareness are not taught in a dedicated course in the business core. This makes it somewhat tricky to determine at what stage into the business curriculum it should be assessed.

### **SLO: Quantitative Reasoning**

Students can identify and perform appropriate quantitative analyses when given a particular business problem.

- Our students will know how to correctly complete fundamental mathematical computations;
- Our students will use mathematical skills to solve problems related to business;
- Our students will understand data and how to use data;
- Our students will know how to uses software, applications, calculators, and other technical tools for solving quantitative problems;
- When solving quantitative problems, our students will clearly show work and demonstrate proper reasoning by correctly applying formulae and procedures, making computations, sequencing steps, interpreting results, and drawing conclusions.

This SLO was assessed across sections in three core courses for the undergraduate Business Program: FINC 335 (Financial Management), DSCI 346 (Advanced Data Analysis for Business) and OPSM 330 Operations Management.) The following rubric was used:

## UG Quantitative Reasoning Rubric

**Quantitative Reasoning Learning Goal** -- Students can identify and perform appropriate quantitative analyses when given a particular business problem.

	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Meets Expectations (3)	Marginally Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (1)	Meets or Expectations	Exceeds
					Fa. '14	Sp. '15
<b>Understands the Data and Problem Statement</b>						
Knows which data or information to use to solve the problem					83%	94%
Makes any necessary data conversions (such as unit conversions, rounding, converting to percent, etc.)					70%	94%
Uses the correct number(s) for each variable if using formulas, software, spreadsheet or other tool					78%	93%
Understands what the problem is asking by representing the answer with the correct term(s)					83%	93%
<b>Performs (compute) the appropriate analyses with the use of appropriate tools.</b>						
Uses correct formula(s)/technique for solving the problem					84%	90%
Performs the right sequence of procedures to solve the problem					77%	92%
Clearly shows the work necessary to get result(s)					83%	94%
Knows how to properly use software, spreadsheet, calculator, or other tool(s)					91%	91%
Produces results that are accurate					65%	84%
<b>Interpretation of the results.</b>						
Can interpret the results in the context of the assignment					75%	92%

<b>Draws conclusions or makes recommendations.</b>						
Clearly communicates conclusions which are supported by the results.					71%	87%
<b>Limitations.</b>						
Knows the limitations or assumptions involved in the analysis, results, and recommendations, if asked					45%	88%
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>						

The fall assessment revealed variable results with 45% to 91% of students meeting or exceeding expectations for items scored in the rubric. The worst scores were associated to students failing recognizing the limitations of the analysis. The next weakest scores were associated to the accuracy of results, their interpretation in the context of the assignment and the ability of students to communicate a conclusion supported by the results. Scores associated with data conversion and with using the correct sequence of procedures to solve problems were also quite poor.

The assessment committee made several simple suggestions for improving the students' learning. The instructors need to provide very prompt (one week) feedback on homework with graphic and specific discussion of the analysis and the results. The instructors need to place more emphasis on the interpretation and implications of results possibly by giving applied business cases.

The spring assessment revealed marked improvement for every item in the rubric into acceptable ranges. The opened loop was positively closed within the year 2014 2015.

### **SLO: Teamwork and Collaboration**

Students will understand and use team building and collaborative behaviors to accomplish group tasks.

- Our students will know concepts necessary for guiding effective teamwork;
- While working in groups, our students will engage in effective team behavior and produce high quality work using the talents of all group members

This SLO was assessed across sections in MGMT 490, the capstone core course for the undergraduate Business Program. The following rubric was used:

### **UG Teamwork Rubric – Instructor Evaluation including output evaluation**

**Teamwork Learning Objective** – While working in teams, students will engage in effective team behavior and produce high quality work using the talents of all group members

<b>Commitment</b>	<b>Exceeds Expectations (Always) (4)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (Mostly) (3)</b>	<b>Marginally Meets Expectations (Rarely) (2)</b>	<b>Does Not Meet Expectations (Never) (1)</b>	<b>Meets or Exceeds Expectations (Fall 2014)</b>
Regularly attends group meetings					89%
Demonstrates commitment to the project by being 100% prepared for the group meeting					100%
Follows up on ideas and suggestions from previous meetings & reports findings to the group					100%
<b>Contributions</b>					
Offers helpful ideas or suggestions that contribute to problem-solving					95%
Assists in writing the project report or presentation					100%
<b>Time Management</b>					
Introduces suggestions & ideas that are relevant to the task					89%
Completes assigned work in a timely and acceptable manner					100%
Monitors the team's progress and works to					95%

make the team more effective					
Plans and schedules for completion of goals					<b>100%</b>
Uses meeting agendas to stay on track					<b>100%</b>
<b>Leadership</b>					
Shows respect to all group members					<b>100%</b>
Gives recognition and encouragement					<b>95%</b>
Recognizes conflicting viewpoints and seeks resolution through open discussion and compromise					<b>89%</b>
Listens actively & shows understanding by paraphrasing or by acknowledging & building on others' ideas					<b>100%</b>
Ensures that all members of the team are involved in decision-making					<b>89%</b>
Is comfortable and confident when exercising leadership duties within the group					<b>89%</b>
<b>Output</b>					
Team's output/result is integrated and cohesive (e.g., no redundant material across team members' sections/output )					<b>53%</b>
Team accomplished					<b>53%</b>



goals of the assignment					
Team completed its work on time					53%
Team's output/result is high quality and professional					53%
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>					

The first round of assessment results showed that 89% to 100% of our students met or exceeded expectations in terms of Commitment, Contribution, Time Management, and Leadership, but only 53% of students met or exceeded expectations in terms of Output.

The assessment committee members were perturbed by this revealed deficiency and asked the following crucial question: was the rubric scored in terms of individual students or in terms of teams? To be valid the assessment should be of individual students, not of groups or teams. Several suggestions for improvement came out: make class time available for teamwork; use blind reviewing of group work by other groups who provide specific feedback (while self-diagnosing and learning for themselves.)

#### **4. Setting up the Assessment for the SLO: Business Core Disciplinary Knowledge to be assessed in 2015-2016**

We have for many years tested the disciplinary knowledge of our students by administering the Major Field Test (MFT) to graduating seniors, every term including summer. The MFT is a standardized test produced by ETS (Educational Testing Service) that allows us to compare the performance of our students in the business disciplinary areas to that of students across the USA. By and large, our students performed better than average. This gave us positive reinforcement that we served our students well. But, we have found it very frustrating to deal with ETS that sells and norms the MFT because we do not have access to the questions asked of our students. We do not know what concepts are tested. We do not know how the questions in a disciplinary area align with what we have determined was the appropriate knowledge content for our students (in light of our mission.)

At a meeting of the business faculty at large in October 2014, we discussed the advisability of continuing using the MFT in spite of its limitations or to find a better way to assess the core business disciplinary knowledge of our students. We discussed replacing the MFT by another commercial test where our students' learning could be benchmarked against that of a wide pool of students but where we could access information as to what particular deficiencies our students might have of important concepts in each discipline. We also discussed designing our own capstone exam in house.

After long deliberations and a vote several days later, the faculty decided at a majority to adopt the Capsim exam for disciplinary knowledge assessment. Capsim is a well-known producer of business simulation technology used for the development and assessment of business understanding. Our decision meant that our business capstone course that so far had been taught in very different ways by various instructors would, starting Fall 2015, be taught using a Capsim business simulation. Two pilots section of the business capstone course (MGMT 490) were conducted in Spring 2015: one at Bellevue College and one at Cheney/Spokane.

The pilot sections showed us unambiguously how much assessment of core business disciplinary knowledge we can glean from the Capsim Comp-XM. Each student's scores are tracked for each questions allowing us to identify specifically where our students have a weakness in business foundational knowledge. Using Capsim, starting Fall 2015 will allow us to take steps to improve the learning.

For the record, our students engaged in the pilot instances of the comp-XM compared favorably to their peers across the nation.

	Cheney/Spokane MGMT Class (25 students)	Bellevue College MGMT 490 Class (23 students)	National Results (All Capsim Capstone Students in the Nation)
<b>Business Acumen</b>	66%	75%	
Financial	73%	73%	59%
Internal Business Processes	74%	72%	58%
Customer	76%	82%	70%
Learning & Growth	85%	82%	68%
<b>Business Knowledge</b>	56%	65%	
Accounting	71%	72%	59%
Finance	66%	69%	61%
Strategy	73%	69%	59%
Marketing	69%	75%	60%
Operations	71%	69%	53%
HR	66%	73%	63%

\*\*\*