**#2. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Student Outcomes**

To be completed by Departments and submitted by the Department Chair to the Assessment Blackboard Site.

|  |
| --- |
| **Department:** **Business Date:** **1/15/2015** |
| **Members involved with analysis of artifacts:** **C. Beck, T. Heidorn, A. Sailer, A. Langewisch, J. Moberly** |
| **See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Student Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology* |
| **Analysis of artifacts:**  *1).* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* For BUS 261, Marketing, 21 artifacts were each scored by two of the four department members present, using the rubric provided. A chi-squared analysis showed the rater was independent of the distribution of scores assigned. For BUS 443, Organizational Behavior, 8 group projects were scored by 4 department members using the rubric provided. |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:**  *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):*  Are students demonstrating an understanding of key concepts from business and able to integrate relevant sources? Are they writing well?  *2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.*  BUS 261: See the attached chart. In terms of organization and length, students followed instructions well. The weakest trait observed was application, which makes some sense, as this is an introductory course. As for writing care, besides typical undergraduate word-choice flaws, we noted that some students wrote conclusions unconnected to their prior analyses, adding what appeared to be whatever words came to mind. The formatting of sources and styles was bimodal; either students "got it" or they didn't. There was no doubt that students were submitting original work in their own words. Students clearly understood that they were to write their own papers, and did.  BUS 443: See the attached chart. For all six measured traits, student work as a whole met department goals for acceptable or exemplary work. Students articulated well each organization's background and competitive landscape. They justified using fundamental business and organizational behavior principles why an organization should be considered an excellent company. They connected their assessments to Christian principles that would help an organization be recognized like a "beacon on a hill." They incorporated analyses of ethical issues that the organizations faced. Lastly, they wrote well--as upper-level students might be expected to do.  *3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  For BUS 261, yes, we can tell from our collective impressions that fundamental marketing concepts were frequently and correctly used. Students are indeed learning about key marketing/business topics. The process of scoring and aggregating scores reinforced for us that we had a valuable assignment, that we are measuring and evaluating the right traits associated with the assessment questions, and that the students generally submitted very good work. Most students connected their analyses with referenced text sources and outside sources. While student writing can always be improved, the papers scored here were just shy of meeting the 80% acceptable or exemplary target, so we would judge that they are writing reasonably well.  For BUS 443, yes, the high scores support the conclusion that the students do understand key concepts from business, are able to integrate relevant sources, and they are writing well. As with BUS 261, the process confirmed for us that we had a very good assignment, a very good method of measuring, and very good results. |
| **Sharing of Results:**  *When were results shared? Date:* 2015-01-16  *How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* Met as a department, refined via email.  *Who were results shared with? (List names):* C. Beck, T. Heidorn, A. Langewisch, J. Moberly, A. Sailer |
| **Discussion of Results –ACTION\*- Summarize your conclusions including:**  *1.How will what the department learned from the assessment POTENTIALLY impact the teaching/learning process in your department starting the next academic year?*  We observed that several students in BUS 261 analyzed the advertisement and minimally talked about the organization. The professor could provide more clarity that the selected advertisement is just to help illustrate points. Make sure the students understand they should focus on an analysis of the organization first. Also, as a department we should be more consistent about our expectations for referencing outside sources. We might review what is being covered in BUS 281 Business Communications, and establish a common goal.  *2. How will the program POTENTIALLY use the results to improve student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*  If students follow these clearer directions, student achievement would potentially improve. |
| ***If action is taken – it is recommended that the same plan be used for a second assessment cycle.***  **FEEDBACK\* - Reassess outcomes if ACTION\* has been taken.** **TBD** |
| ***What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future?*** **This should be a good question to track distributions of rubric scores over time, and to monitor the efficacy of continuing improvement efforts.** |
|  |
| **Submitted by:** **A. Langewisch** |
| **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):** **2/16/15** |
| **Department Chair notified/additional action needed:** **na Date posted to Assessment site:** **2/17/15** |