Fall 2014 Assessment Report
Data Analysis
Business Administration Department
Business Administration (Undergraduate)

1. Which program outcomes were you assessing this year? (Please indicate the full text of the outcome along with any numbering system.)

PLO #1—Business Administration Basic Exam
PLO# 2—Business Writing

2. How did you assess each outcome? Please explain how this was an effective measure of the specified outcome.

PLO #1—Business proficiency exam—a department-created exam—was administered in MGMT 150, MKTG 310, and MGMT 430 in August, October, and January in all venues. Full-time Business Administration faculty created an exam based on years of teaching experience at CC with the clear intent of measuring student mastery of skills needed for the business major.

The exam was designed to demonstrate knowledge in the functional areas of business with consideration of the legal, ethical, economic, technological, and global environment.

PLO #2—Business writing sample was administered in MGMT 479 and MKTG 310 at various venues, including Day, Evening, extended sites and online during Fall 2014 sessions. Instructors were given considerable latitude in selecting the writing topic. All online sections of MKTG 310 were asked to write on new product development. A grading rubric was provided each instructor. For many years employers have complained about poor writing skills of graduates of business programs. Therefore, it seemed important to measure these skills with a writing sample based on a business-related topic.

3. What were the results of these assessments? Feel free to use tables or graphs as appropriate.

PLO #1—The results from administering the Business Proficiency Exam are valuable, but serious concern is voiced over the fact that not all instructors gave the exam. For example, of 34 sections of MGMT 150 five sections did not participate or submitted results from only a few of the students enrolled in the section. The same concern is voiced for MKTG 310 and MGMT 430. Of 29 sections of MKTG 310 ten sections reported no results or the results of only a small number of students enrolled. In the case of MGMT 430, instructors for all 11 sections involved administered the exam, but four sections reported less than 60% participation.

The range of average scores in all venues follows.
MGMT 150 (29 sections): 36%-54%
MGMT 310 (19 sections): 44%-65%
MGMT 430 (seven sections): 55%-67%

The rather narrow distribution within each cohort seems reasonable. The progression of scores from the lower level courses matched the expectations of the department.
PLO #2—Instructors of twelve sections of MKTG 310—eight of which were online—were required to administer the writing sample to their students. As in the case of the administration of the Business Proficiency Exam (PLO #1), full participation did not occur. For example, one online section had no participation. In a number of cases instructors did not complete the assessment exam rubric. One instructor completed the rubric for 50% of the students who submitted a writing sample.

Other factors include
  a. The rubric was completed by most instructors;
  b. Different writing assignments were used depending upon the venue. All online sections completed a writing assessment for new product development.

Advanced skills proficiency ranged from 0% to 88%. Home campus (HC) advanced proficiency was 22%.

Various subcategories within the writing assignment were assessed with the following resultant ranges:
  a. Grammar and spelling—15%-100% (HC 59%)
  b. Format—4%-100% (HC 4%)
  c. Content—9%-79% (HC 53%)
  d. Transitions—6%-83% (HC 35%)
  e. Sentences—12%-100% (HC 35%)
  f. Audience analysis—43%-96% (HC 47%)

Due to the extremely wide range of scores reported it is virtually impossible to draw any conclusions from the data generated. However, note was made of two concerns: sentence and paragraph structure and the use of headings and subheadings. Students must be made aware of the fact that much of business writing is not usually done in narrative form.

Much like MKTG 310, full participation in the MGMT 479 sections did not occur. Of the 20 sections of the course required to complete the assignment, only ten complied. Both sections in the Day program completed the assignment. Due to the very limited amount of data received, drawing any meaningful conclusions is impossible.

4. **Do you plan to change any of your outcomes based on these assessments? Please explain.**

   No changes in assessment outcomes are planned at this time. Fall 2014 marked the Department’s initial implementation of the assessment plan. As more data are gathered and converted into meaningful information, decisions about changes to the plan may occur.

5. **Did your assessment opportunities effectively assess your specified outcomes? Please explain.**
As noted above, the value of the results of the assessment opportunities is mixed. For those students who completed the Business Proficiency Exam (PLO #1), it provides a good insight into student mastery of fundamental business skills. Although the business writing sample (PLO #2) grants an opportunity to measure effectively student writing skills, much focus must be made on implementation.

6. To improve student learning, what actions do you intend to take on these data? Please explain.

The full-time faculty of the Business Administration Department has carefully reviewed its assessment plan and the results for Fall 2014. As a whole the plan appears sound. The greatest concern is that of implementation. The Department intends to implement the following recommendations.

a. All instructors must administer the assessment opportunity in their respective courses. Full-time faculty in the Day program have performed assessment duties as assigned. However, many instructors in other venues do little, if anything, in terms of fulfilling assessment requirements. This must change.

b. Assessment opportunities associated with each course should be included on the Master Syllabus and the course syllabus.

c. Assessment opportunities should be administered at the designated time in the term. For example, the Business Proficiency Exam in MGMT 150 should be administered only at the start of the term. Following this method allows for consistency.

d. Again taking into account the need for consistency, the same writing assignment (PLO #2) must be used in each course.

e. There appears to be considerable subjectivity in grading writing samples. Instructors in online and at extended site locations consistently scored writing samples higher than was the case for Day instructors. Training in grading and scoring is recommended.

f. The rubric and scoring guide needs to be revisited and possibly revised.

g. There also needs to be consistency in the way in which faculty manage assessment opportunities. For example, some faculty make the assessment opportunity a graded assignment; others do not. Some offer the opportunity as a means for students to acquire extra credit; others do not.

h. The business writing assessment (PLO #2) should provide more specific instructions. For example, rather than stating that students can misspell a “few” words to achieve a certain level of proficiency, the rubric would in state “no more than five” misspelled words. This should lead once again to greater consistency in scoring across all venues.
MBA

1. Which program outcomes were you assessing this year? (Please indicate the full text of the outcome along with any numbering system.)

   PLO #2—MBA Writing
   PLO #3—Group Collaboration

2. How did you assess each outcome? Please explain how this was an effective measure of the specified outcome.

   PLO #2—Students in selected sections of BUSI 508 and BUSI 595 were asked to communicate a complex business issue in written form.

   PLO #3—Students in selected sections of BUSI 508 and BUSI 595 were asked to utilize advanced team building skills and management behaviors to lead a team task that results in effective team performance within a diverse environment.

   For both PLO #2 and PLO #3 the skills assessed—writing and group collaboration—have long been recognized as important valuable skills needed by successful business executives.

3. What were the results of these assessments? Feel free to use tables or graphs as appropriate.

   PLO #2—In BUSI 508 three on-line sections participated. In the first section, all 11 students scored 100% in every category. In the second section, all ten students scored 90% in every category. In the third section, only one student was assessed and scored 100% in each category. In BUSI 595, two online sections and one in seat section participated for a total of 32 students. Scores were widely distributed with no pattern emerging, no meaningful data.

   PLO #3—A total of 23 students participated—one online section (15 students), one site section (7 students), and one home campus section (1 student). Results are inconclusive due to lack of data.

4. Do you plan to change any of your course outcomes based on these assessments? Please explain.

   No changes in assessment outcomes are planned at this time. Fall 2014 marked the Department’s initial implementation of the assessment plan. As more data are gathered and converted into meaningful information, decisions about changes to the plan may occur.

5. Did you assessment opportunities effectively assess your specified outcomes? Please explain.

   Due to the limited number of students participating, it is difficult to determine if the results effectively assess our desired outcomes.
6. To improve student learning, what actions do you intend to take based on these data? Please explain.

A number of issues have surfaced with regard to both PLO #2 and PLO #3. Either instructors are not taking seriously the process of assessment, or they do not understand the process, or the rubric is not sufficient.

The Business Administration Department makes the following recommendations based on the results of Fall 2014:
   a. Group (PLO #3) is defined as three-to-five students.
   b. Directions for administration of the assessment opportunity need revision.
Spring 2015 Assessment Report
Data Analysis
Business Administration Department
Business Administration (Undergraduate)

1. Which program outcomes were you assessing this semester? (Please include the full text of the outcome along with any numbering system.)

   PLO #1—Business Administration Basic Exam
   PLO# 2— Business Writing Sample

2. How did you assess each outcome? Please explain how this was an effective measure of the specified outcome.

   PLO #1—Business Proficiency Exam—a department-created exam—was administered in MGMT 150, MKTG 310, and MGMT 430 January and March in all venues. Full-time Business Administration faculty created an exam based on years of teaching experience at CC with the clear intent of measuring student mastery of skills needed for the business major.

   The exam was designed to demonstrate knowledge in the functional areas of business with consideration of the legal, ethical, economic, technological, and global environment. The Business Proficiency Exam consists of 75 multiple choice questions.

   PLO #2— Business Writing Sample was administered in MGMT 479 and MKTG 310 at various venues, including Day, Evening, extended sites and online during Spring 2015 sessions. Instructors were given considerable latitude in selecting the writing topic. All online sections of MKTG 310 were asked to write on new product development. A grading rubric was provided each instructor. For many years employers have complained about poor writing skills of graduates of business programs. Therefore, it seemed important to measure these skills with a writing sample based on a business-related topic.

3. What were the results of these assessments? Feel free to use tables or graphs as appropriate.

   PLO #1
   During the January and March sessions there were 33 sections of MGMT 150, 29 sections of MKTG 310, and 13 of MGMT 430.

   MGMT 150
   Of the 33 sections of MGMT 150 there were 3 sections that did not have any students take the exam.

   MKTG 310
   Of the 29 sections of MKTG 310 there were 2 sections that did not have any students take the exam, 2 sections only had 1 student take the exam, and 2 sections had 2 students take the exam.

   MGMT 430
In the 13 sections of MGMT 430 there were 3 sections that did not have any students take the exam, 1 section had only 2 students take the exam, and 1 section had 3 students take the exam.

The range of average scores in all venues follows.
MGMT 150 (33 sections): 36%-54%
MKTG 310 (29 sections): 43%-88%
MGMT 430 (13 sections): 54%-77%

The rather narrow distribution within each cohort seems reasonable. The progression of scores from the lower level courses matched the expectations of the department.

PLO #2
MKTG 310
Of the 28 sections of MKTG 310 offered across all venues, 6 did not administer the Business Writing Sample. Instructors of 22 sections of MKTG 310 administered the Business Writing Sample to their students.

Advanced skills proficiency ranged widely from 17% to 100% across all for the overall Business Writing Sample (grammar and spelling, format, content, transitions, sentences and paragraphs).

Various subcategories within Business Writing Sample were assessed as advanced for the Home Campus (HC):
   a. Grammar and spelling—16%
   b. Format—28%
   c. Content—20%
   d. Transitions—12%
   e. Sentences—8%

Due to the extremely wide range of scores reported it is virtually impossible to draw any conclusions from the data generated. As more sections participate in the Business Writing Sample solid conclusions and recommendations can be made.

MGMT 479
Full administration of the Business Writing Sample in MGMT 479 sections did not occur. Of the 24 total sections of the course 19 administered the Business Writing Sample.

Both sections in the Day program did not completed the assignment Business Writing Sample.

Advanced skills proficiency for the overall Business Writing Sample ranged from 27% to 93% across online and evening campus venues (the Business Writing Sample was not administered in the Day program) for all components of the Business Writing Sample (grammar and spelling, format, content, transitions, sentences and paragraphs).

4. Do you plan to change any of your course outcomes based on these assessments? Please explain.
No changes in assessment outcomes are planned at this time. Spring 2015 marks only the second round of data collection. The Department’s initial implementation of the assessment plan took place Fall 2014. As more data are gathered and converted into meaningful information, decisions about changes to the plan may occur.

However, due to an initial examination of assessment results MGMT 330 has been added as a course in which the Business Proficiency Exam and the business writing sample will be implemented. MGMT 330 has traditionally been a course which business majors enroll in approximately in middle of their course sequence for a business degree.

5. **Did your assessment opportunities effectively assess your specified outcomes? Please explain.**

As noted above, the value of the results of the assessment opportunities is mixed at this time. For those students who completed the Business Proficiency Exam (PLO #1), it provides a good insight into student mastery of fundamental business skills. The Business Proficiency Exam has been implemented over more venues in the Spring 15 sections than in Fall 14. As we increase the number of sections, venues, and students whom take the exam more meaningful improvements, changes, and actions can be designed.

Although the Business Writing Sample (PLO #2) grants an opportunity to measure effectively student writing skills, much focus must be made on implementation. Again, the number of venues and sections whom took the business writing sample, however this number needs to be increased.

6. **To improve student learning, what actions do you intend to take based on these data? Please explain.**

At the time this report was written, the full-time faculty of the Business Administration Department has not had an opportunity to carefully review the Spring 15 assessment plan results.

The below recommendations are general in nature and should not be taken as those of the faculty. The faculty will review the results and recommend specific changes in August or September 2015.

The greatest concern is that of implementation.

- All instructors must administer the assessment opportunity in their respective courses, including Day program faculty.
- Assessment opportunities associated with each course should be included on the Master Syllabus and the course syllabus.
- Assessment opportunities should be administered at the designated time in the term. For example, the Business Proficiency Exam in MGMT 150 should be administered only at the start of the term. Following this method allows for consistency.
- The same Business Writing Sample (PLO #2) must be used in each course to allow for consistent comparison and analysis.
• Training programs (such as a video or on campus workshop) may need to be developed to help ensure consistent utilization of the rubrics.
MBA

There are no spring results at this time.