



Business Administration | 2016-2017 Assessment Report

1. Please give a brief overview of the assessment data you collected this year.

Program Learning Level Goal (PLLG) 1: Interdisciplinary Perspective

PLLG 1 was assessed in Fall 2016 by evaluating 15 students' answers to an essay question on an exam administered in the two sections of Marketing Research (BUS ADM 424) and 15 students' written case assignments collected by the instructor in the two sections of Consumer Behavior. The exam question required the students to recommend a strategic marketing plan covering product, price, promotion and place (the so-called "four P's" in Marketing) based on a data set provided in the question. The case assignment involved launching a product in a foreign country and a discussion of the four P's. The essay question and cases were evaluated by a team of instructors from the Austin E. Cofrin School of Business (AECSB). The team included four instructors from Management, one from Accounting and one from Marketing who did not teach either of the two courses involved in the assessment.

The tables below show the students' performance with respect to each trait included in the rubric and compares the students' performance for the past three years. The AECSB has set as the benchmark that 75% of the students should score at the level of satisfactory or exemplary. As can be seen in the tables, the students did not meet the benchmark with respect to any of the traits (although they narrowly missed with respect to the first trait) and the performance declined in 2016 from 2015, despite the fact that the intervention implemented in Fall 2015 continued into the 2016-2017 academic year.

PLLG 1:

Traits	Unsatisfactory	Needs improvement	Satisfactory	Exemplary
Trait 1	6.7%	16.7%	60%	13.3%
Trait 2	6.7%	23.4%	60%	6.7%
Trait 3	16.7%	33.3%	43.4%	6.7%

Trait 1: Usage of concepts and principles from at least two disciplines in the work

Trait 2: Does the student use disciplinary knowledge accurately and effectively

Trait 3: Do the conclusions drawn from the work indicate that understanding has been advanced by the integration of disciplinary views?

PLLG 1: Satisfactory and above

Traits	2014	2015	2016
Trait 1	60%	97.7%	73.3%
Trait 2	53.3%	80%	66.7%
Trait 3	53.3%	73.3%	50.1%

PLLG 2: Problem Solving

Case assignments from a section of Corporation Finance (BUS ADM 343) were collected in Spring 2017. The assignments required the students to determine the value of a small company owned by two partners using several valuation techniques and then consider whether the owners should accept an offer to buy their company. As the assignments were collected at the end of the semester, they will be evaluated in early Fall 2017. The Assurance of Learning (AoL) Committee is testing the effectiveness of an intervention to enhance students' problem-solving skills. The intervention was for instructors in the core courses (e.g., Introductory Accounting, Corporation Finance, Introductory Marketing) to incorporate one exercise (e.g., written case, in-class exercise) in which the instructor would conduct a debriefing after the students completed the exercise to indicate how the situation would have been analyzed under the rubric.

PLLG 3: Teamwork

In Spring 2016, sixty-four students in one instructor's two sections of Organizational Behavior (BUS ADM 389) were required to complete surveys evaluating the performance of each of their three teammates for a group project as well as their own performance. The results of the survey were analyzed in Fall 2016 and are summarized in the table below. As in the previous assessment of PLLG 3, the students exceeded the benchmark of 75% performing at an acceptable or exemplary level with respect to each of the traits that comprise teamwork. Similar data were collected from another instructor's sections of Organizational Behavior in Spring 2017. The data will be analyzed in Fall 2017.

	Organizational Skills	Interpersonal Skills	Contribution to team goals and process	Dependability
Exemplary	41.57	46.07	52.81	52.43
Acceptable	47.19	43.82	36.33	35.96
Exemplary or Acceptable	88.76	89.89	89.14	88.39
Needs improvement	10.11	8.61	8.24	8.61
Unacceptable	1.12	1.12	2.62	2.62

PLLG 4: Corporate Social Responsibility

PLLG 4 was evaluated in Fall 2016 by reading 30 students' responses to an exam question in Introductory Marketing (BUS ADM 322) involving Coca Cola's response to public criticism that its products were harmful to children's health. The essays were evaluated by a team of six

AECBS instructors (four from Management, one from Accounting and one from Marketing who did not teach this course).

The tables below show the students' performance with respect to each trait included in the rubric and compares the students' performance for the past three years. The AECBS has set as the benchmark that 75% of the students should score at the level of satisfactory or exemplary. As can be seen in the tables, the students met the benchmark with respect to the first two traits and narrowly missed it with respect to the third trait in 2016. The performance in 2016 was not significantly different from 2015, indicating that the intervention implemented in Fall 2015 continued to enhance the students' understanding and application of corporate social responsibility concepts.

PLLG 4: Corporate social responsibility

Traits	Unsatisfactory	Needs improvement	Satisfactory	Exemplary
Trait 1	6.7%	10%	66.7%	16.7%
Trait 2	-	20%	66.6%	13.3%
Trait 3	-	26.7%	56.6%	16.7%

PLLG 4: Satisfactory and above:

Traits	2014	2015	2016
Trait 1	33.3%	76.3%	83.4%
Trait 2	33.3%	80%	79.9%
Trait 3	23%	77.7%	73.3%

Trait 1: Identify underlying social/environmental issues

Trait 2: Understand the importance of corporate social responsibility in decision making

Trait 3: Applications of social responsibility concepts in decision making

2. How will you use what you've learned from the data that was collected?

In Fall 2017, the AoL Committee will consider the factors that could have contributed to the students' declining performance with respect to solving problems with an interdisciplinary approach (PLLG 1). If the failure to meet the benchmark appears to be attributable to gaps in the curriculum, as opposed to random factors that could be avoided or expected to be non-recurring, the Committee will determine an appropriate intervention to be implemented in Spring 2018.

With respect to teamwork (PLLG 3), it appears that courses offered in the AECBS are providing a sufficient number of group projects to permit students to develop their teamwork skills. Similarly, the students appear to be learning corporate social responsibility concepts (PLLG 4) in Business Administration courses and curricular changes are not warranted at this time.