

#2. 2017 – 18 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: 5/11/2018
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: T. Heidorn, A. Langewisch, C. Beck, T. Johnson	
See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for: a) <i>Student Outcome</i> ; b) <i>Background</i> ; c) <i>Question(s)</i> ; d) <i>Methodology</i>	
Analysis of artifacts: 1). PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> For BUS 261, Marketing, 11 of 25 submitted artifacts were randomly selected and scored by department members, using the rubric provided. Two faculty members scored each submission.	
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Are students demonstrating an understanding of key concepts from business and able to integrate relevant sources? Are they writing well? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> See the chart attached. While students on all criteria met our performance targets, there was considerable variability in in-text citations in terms of frequency. We noticed significant variability in how the content was organized and explained. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> 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 outside sources. While student writing and use of references can always be improved, the papers scored here were well written, and met the 80% acceptable or exemplary target. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i>	
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 5/11/2018 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> in person and electronically <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> A. Langewisch, T. Heidorn, T. Johnson, C. Beck, S. Leinen	
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION* - <i>How will what the department learned from the assessment impact:</i> a. <i>Teaching:</i> Two years ago BUS 261 students were allowed to choose their own companies for their Marketing Plan Project, which sometimes led to students choosing cases for privately held companies. Beginning in 2017 the selection process was guided to ensure that the companies selected had adequate publicly available resources. b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> This course was designed to allow the students to submit several edited drafts and benefit from successive refinement. We are not sure that all students took advantage of this structure, and wish to reinforce that structure. Historically, the students who utilize the Writing Center are helped. Students in this course should take advantage of this resource. Also, we believe the marketing content rubric should be expanded to guide the content with more clarity. c. <i>Program:</i> no significant changes d. <i>Assessment:</i> continue with current assessment 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i>	

At least 80% of students in BUS 261 will meet or exceed performance targets in all criteria.

3. **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS** – *Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the **ACTION*** (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course).* none

If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.

What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future? We will continue to assess the same outcome.

Submitted by: A. Langewisch
5/17/18

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):

Department Chair notified/additional action needed: NA

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: NA

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 6/18