

**Assurance of  
Learning Report  
on BBA Learning  
Goals**

**2008/2009**

## **Assurance of Learning Report on BBA Learning Goals 2008-09**

### **Executive Summary**

The 2008-09 Academic Year was a period of transition during which assessment efforts began evolving from the eight learning goals adopted for 2007-08 to the four learning goals adopted during 2008-09. During the year, faculty within the College of Business and Economics used a variety of direct and indirect measures to assess learning. The results of these efforts are provided in this workbook. Reported first are the assessment measures related to the learning goals adopted during 2008-09 followed by assessment of the 2007-08 learning goals.

The results of all assessment were presented to the COBE faculty during two separate “close-the-loop” meetings (spring and fall, 2009). During these meetings faculty members reviewed the outcomes of assessment efforts and provided suggestions on: (1) how to improve future assessment efforts; and (2) how to improve student learning. A summary of the results are to be presented to the COBE Curriculum Committees for the purpose of changing curricula during the 2009-10 academic year.

### **Summary of Outcomes and Faculty Comments from Assessment**

In addition to measuring the objectives for 2008/2009, faculty members identified four areas as a focus to use to generate a greater diversity of measures and to form the core for the new strategic plan and assurance of learning plan for 2009/2010. These four areas then resulted in the greatest changes in subsequent plans for curriculum and measures.

**Communication** was one of four areas selected as a focus for 2008/2009. For written communication outcomes, faculty reviewed assessment measures from several different courses and from the use of Criterion. The subsequent motions submitted for consideration by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (for 2009/2010) were to assess a fee to allow the use Criterion in all courses and to require an additional course in business and technical writing through the English department. For oral communication outcomes, faculty reviewed common rubrics and reviewed results from different courses. The request was to then use common rubrics across more classes for 2009/2010. For persuasive communication, better understanding by faculty is needed.

**Analytical skills** (aka cognitive applications) were another of the four areas selected as a focus for 2008/2009. Faculty members defined four categories of analytical skills to consider: 1. Identify problems; 2. Use statistical techniques to improve decision making; 3. Use financial statements to inform decisions; and 4. Understand the time value of money. As they reviewed the measures, faculty members expressed a need for better measures of how students use techniques and financial information to inform decisions. Another suggestion for consideration by the Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum Committees was the use of pivot tables and cases as methods to enhance logic and analytical skills.

**Collaboration (team work)** was a third of four areas selected as a focus for 2008/2009. Faculty members used measures of reflective thinking, peer ratings of team work, simulations, and discussions to gauge student skills in collaborating with others. As they reviewed results, faculty members identified a need

to address team skills earlier in the core business program. The idea would then be to see measures of team work appear in the assessment book for 2009/2010. In part as a result of the work in 2008/2009, the COBE entered the Global Innovation Tournament to spark teams competing as well as global issues.

**Cross cultural skills and ethics** was the final area of the four issues selected as a focus for 2008/2009. While global issues are covered throughout the curriculum, measures of learning outcomes need to be further developed. Exercises using reflective thinking show coverage of ethics, but, again, measures of learning outcomes need to be refined and included in the assessment book. In part as a result of the work in 2008/2009, the COBE entered the Global Innovation Tournament to spark work within teams and with global issues.

Faculty members reviewed and discussed data during two Close the Loop meetings. During these meetings, faculty members suggested changes to curriculum and to assessment approaches as summarized in the following lists for 2008/2009.

#### **Assessment Suggestions**

- Assess similar learning goals in more courses and across disciplines
- Use more common rubrics to increase the consistent of measures (i.e., teamwork)
- Achieve more comprehensive assessment of each learning goal (i.e. cross cultural skills)
- Tie assessment measures more closely to learning objectives
- Increase response options for rubrics from 3 to 5 or 7
- Use multi-trait, multi-method measures
- Have the GCC and UCC develop a complementary map for each degree program, identify course where pre-test and post-test measures would be administered
- Use a pre-test/post-test format
- Track individual students across courses and semesters
- Assess each of the 4C's in every class
- Increase the types and rigor of measures for analytical skills
- Expand the use of Criterion as an assessment devise and to improve communication outcomes
- Focus on persuasive skills (argument overall) and argument criteria, not just presentations

#### **Curriculum Revision Suggestions**

- Require written communications course in lieu of ITEC 100
- Emphasize problem solving in every semester and across relevant courses
- Consider developing a course in or across the curriculum to develop problem solving and decision-making skills
- Enhance faculty awareness of the difference between group and team projects
- Add a team-building workshop and improve team skills across the curriculum
- Revise the business core requirements for our majors to complete 56 SH and 8 specific courses prior to being admitted to the major
- Increase internships in number and assessment
- Improve the learning objectives for ECON 306, 305, and 495
- Begin round robin conversations to align the curriculum and topics covered

## BBA Assessment Workbook for 2008-09

### I. Assessment of Learning Goals Adopted 2008-09

| Learning Goal  | Course   | Data Received? | Closed loop? | Page |
|--|----------|----------------|--------------|------|
| <b>Cognitive Applications – Demonstrate analytical skills needed to solve problems and make decisions based on available information.</b>  |          |                |              |      |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Course-embedded assignment evaluated using a rubric and two independent raters.</li> </ul>  | BLAW 304 | YES            | YES          | 1    |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Course-embedded semester-long project evaluated using a rubric.</li> </ul>  | FINC 331 | YES            | YES          | 2    |
|  |          |                |              |      |
| <b>Communication – Demonstrate the ability to engage in effective written, oral and persuasive communications.</b>   |          |                |              |      |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Written: Notes accompanying student presentations assessed using a standard rubric.</li> </ul>  | MGNT 421 | YES            |              | 4    |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Written: Criterion online writing evaluation service was used to conduct pre-test/post-test.</li> </ul>   | BLAW 203 | YES            |              | 4    |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Written: Course-embedded assignment evaluated using a rubric.</li> </ul>  | MKTG 340 | YES            | YES          | 5    |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Written: Course-embedded assignment evaluated using a rubric.</li> </ul>  | MKTG 471 | YES            |              | 6    |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Written – Analysis of reference types used for research papers.</li> </ul>  | MKTG 471 | YES            |              | 6    |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oral/Persuasive – Two class presentations evaluated using a standard rubric.</li> </ul>   | MGNT 250 | YES            |              | 7    |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oral/Persuasive – Class presentations evaluated using a standard rubric.</li> </ul>   | MGNT 421 | YES            |              | 8    |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oral/Persuasive – Class presentations evaluated using a standard rubric.</li> </ul>   | MGNT 333 | YES            | YES          | 9    |
|  |          |                |              |      |
| <b>Collaboration – Collaborate with team members to accomplish goals.</b>  |          |                |              |      |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment of individuals’ collaborative skills, teamwork, and ability to work with others. Based on co-managers’ (teammates’) evaluation from Glo-bus simulation.</li> </ul> | MGNT 428 | YES            |              | 10   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment of class assigned teams and self using a standard rubric. (in Roanoke)</li> </ul>  | MGNT 421 | YES            |              | 11   |
|  |          |                |              |      |
| <b>Cross-cultural – Understand the importance of a global business perspective and the role cultural diversity has played in the development of global business.</b>   |          |                |              |      |

## II. Assessment of Learning Goals, from 2007-2008

| Goal  | Course   | Data Received? | Closed loop? | Page |
|---|----------|----------------|--------------|------|
| <b>BBA Program Goal 1: Students will be adaptive to dynamic business environments.</b>  |          |                |              |      |
| Objective 1.1: Macro-economic Environment   |          |                |              |      |
| ○ AOL 1.1a: Course-embedded measure of the macroeconomic environment  | ECON 105 | YES            |              | 12   |
| Objective 1.2: Global Marketplace   |          |                |              |      |
| ○ AOL 1.2a: Course-embedded measure of the global marketplace   | ECON 340 | YES            | YES          | 13   |
| ○ AOL 1.2b: Rubric of an International Marketing Memo   | MKTG 340 | YES            |              | 14   |
|   |          |                |              |      |
| <b>BBA Program Goal 2: Students will be effective communicators.</b><br>(see Communication results in prior section)                          |          |                |              |      |
| <b>BBA Program Goal 3: Students will effectively participate as team members.</b> (see Collaboration results in the prior section)            |          |                |              |      |
| <b>BBA Program Goal 4: Students will be competent decision makers</b> (see Cognitive Applications/analytical skills results in prior section) |          |                |              |      |
|   |          |                |              |      |
| <b>BBA Program Goal 5: Students will be knowledgeable of basic business functions.</b>  |          |                |              |      |
| Objective 5.1: Core Business Knowledge  |          |                |              |      |
| ○ AOL 5.1a: ETS test  | MGNT428  | YES            |              | 15   |
| ○ AOL 5.1b: Course embedded measure of financial accounting   | ACTG 211 | YES            | YES          | 16   |
| ○ AOL 5.1c: Course embedded measure of microeconomics   | ECON 106 | YES            |              | 17   |
| ○ AOL 5.1d: Course embedded pre-test/post-test measures of marketing knowledge  | MKTG 340 | YES            |              | 18   |
|   |          |                |              |      |
| <b>BBA Program Goal 6: Students will be ethically and socially aware.</b>   |          |                |              |      |
| Objective 6.1: Ethics and social responsibility   |          |                |              |      |
| ○ AOL 6.1a: Course embedded measure of knowledge  | MKTG 340 | YES            |              | 20   |
| ○ AOL 6.1b: Course embedded measure of knowledge  | BLAW 203 |                |              | 21   |
| ○ AOL 6.1c: Course embedded assessment of plagiarism issues   | MKTG 471 | YES            |              | 22   |

**I. Assessment of Learning Goals, from 2007-2008 (continued)**

| Goal  | Course   | Data Received? | Closed loop? | Page |
|---|----------|----------------|--------------|------|
| <b>BBA Program Goal 7: Students will be able to recognize the issues and challenges posed by diversity and understand its impact on business operations (see Cross Cultural results in the prior section)</b> |          |                |              |      |
|   |          |                |              |      |
| <b>BBA Program Goal 8: Students will be strategically oriented.</b>   |          |                |              |      |
| Objective 8.1: Students will be able to demonstrate a knowledge of strategic management   |          |                |              |      |
| o AOL 8.1a: Assessment of group's strategic planning and strategic thinking skills based on performance on Glo-Bus simulation.  | MGNT 428 | YES            |              | 23   |

**II. Other, Direct Measures**

| Goal   | Course      | Data Received? | Closed loop? | Page |
|--|-------------|----------------|--------------|------|
| Validation Tests VWAC and VWOM students            | ACTG & MNGT | YES            | YES          | 24   |
| California Critical Thinking Skills Test (2005-06) |             | YES            |              | 25   |

**III. Other, Indirect Measures Used to Assess the BBA Programs**

| Measure   | Course | Data Received? | Closed loop? | Page |
|---|--------|----------------|--------------|------|
| Survey of Graduating Seniors (spring and summer 2009) |        | YES            |              | 26   |
| Alumni Survey (fall 2008)                             |        | YES            |              | 27   |
| National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)          |        | YES            |              | 28   |
| Internship Evaluations by Employers (2008/2009)       |        | YES            |              | 31   |

**IV. BBA Degree Specific Measures (Accounting, Economics, Finance, Management, Marketing)**

| Degree Program Specific Areas and Measures                       | Course   | Data Received? | Closed loop? | Page |
|--|----------|----------------|--------------|------|
| BBA Accounting<br>AoL  | ACTG 221 | YES            |              | 32   |
| BBA Economics<br>AoL: ratings of group presentations of readings | ECON 495 | YES            |              | 33   |
| BBA Finance  |          |                |              | 37   |
| BBA Management<br>AoL – Leadership (Roanoke)                     | MGNT 421 | YES            |              | 39   |
| BBA Marketing  | MKTG 446 | YES            | YES          | 40   |

**Cognitive Applications (aka analytical skills)**

Demonstrate analytical skills needed to solve problems and make decisions based on available information.

**Measure:** Course-embedded assignment evaluated using a rubric and two independent raters. (BLAW 304 Business Law I; n = 8, fall 2008)

|   | Average Rater Scores <sup>1</sup> |       |        |       |       |       | Mean<br>score |
|---|-----------------------------------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|---------------|
| Problem A                               | 0-1.99                            |       | 2-2.99 |       | 3+    |       |               |
| Criteria                                | Count                             | %     | count  | %     | count | %     |               |
| Identify the problem and related issues | 5                                 | 62.5% | 2      | 25.0% | 1     | 12.5% | 1.56          |
| Decide how problem should be resolved   | 4                                 | 50.0% | 3      | 37.5% | 1     | 12.5% | 1.69          |
| Explain reasoning that led to decision  | 4                                 | 50.0% | 4      | 50.0% | 0     | 0.0%  | 1.69          |
| Support explanation with relevant facts | 5                                 | 62.5% | 2      | 25.0% | 1     | 12.5% | 1.75          |
|   |                                   |       |        |       |       |       |               |
| Problem B - Criteria                    |                                   |       |        |       |       |       |               |
| Identify the problem and related issues | 4                                 | 50.0% | 3      | 37.5% | 1     | 12.5% | 1.81          |
| Decide how problem should be resolved   | 1                                 | 12.5% | 5      | 62.5% | 2     | 25.0% | 2.25          |
| Explain reasoning that led to decision  | 2                                 | 25.0% | 5      | 62.5% | 1     | 12.5% | 2.19          |
| Support explanation with relevant facts | 2                                 | 25.0% | 4      | 50.0% | 2     | 25.0% | 2.13          |
|   |                                   |       |        |       |       |       |               |
| Combined Scores - both problems         |                                   |       |        |       |       |       |               |
| Identify the problem and related issues | 5                                 | 62.5% | 2      | 25.0% | 1     | 12.5% | 1.69          |
| Decide how problem should be resolved   | 3                                 | 37.5% | 4      | 50.0% | 1     | 12.5% | 1.97          |
| Explain reasoning that led to decision  | 3                                 | 37.5% | 5      | 62.5% | 0     | 0.0%  | 1.94          |
| Support explanation with relevant facts | 4                                 | 50.0% | 3      | 37.5% | 1     | 12.5% | 1.94          |

<sup>1</sup> Scale: 0 to 1.99=below expectations; 2 to 2.99=meets expectations; 3+=exceeds expectations.

**Outcome(s):** Faculty Comments reflected concerns for the small sample size (sampling is allowed for assessment readings). Faculty also emphasized the need to emphasize cause and effect, facts versus assumptions, priorities, and data sufficiency. Faculty suggested that cases and assessment results be added from other classes and that student skills be benchmarked against judgments by business professionals.

**Closing-the-Loop:** Undergraduate Curriculum and Assessment Committees charged with finding faculty who will use cases in different classes to judge analytical skills. Assessment committee asked to consider the use of EXCEL pivot tables as a means of encouraging conversations across types of courses for logic, data gathering, and supporting explanations with relevant data/facts.

**Cognitive Applications (aka analytical skills)**

Demonstrate analytical skills needed to solve problems and make decisions based on available information.

**Measure:** Faculty used a rubric in conjunction with a semester-long project to assess students' ability to make decisions. (FINC 331 Introduction to Business Finance)

| Element                      | Spring 2006 (n=22) |      |                          |                         | Fall 2008 (n=25) |      |                          |                         |
|------------------------------|--------------------|------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
|                              | Counts             |      |                          | Mean<br>scale<br>score* | Counts           |      |                          | Mean<br>scale<br>score* |
|                              | Very<br>good       | Good | Needs<br>improve<br>ment |                         | Very<br>good     | Good | Needs<br>improve<br>ment |                         |
| Select appropriate technique | 7                  | 9    | 6                        | <b>2.05</b>             | 11               | 2    | 12                       | <b>1.96</b>             |
| Apply appropriate technique  | 13                 | 4    | 5                        | <b>2.36</b>             | 17               | 6    | 2                        | <b>2.60</b>             |
| Obtain viable solution       | 11                 | 6    | 5                        | <b>2.27</b>             | 19               | 5    | 1                        | <b>2.72</b>             |

  

| Element                      | Spring 2009 (n=28) |      |                          |                         |
|------------------------------|--------------------|------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
|                              | Counts             |      |                          | Mean<br>scale<br>score* |
|                              | Very<br>good       | Good | Needs<br>improve<br>ment |                         |
| Select appropriate technique | 16                 | 3    | 9                        | <b>2.25</b>             |
| Apply appropriate technique  | 14                 | 7    | 7                        | <b>2.25</b>             |
| Obtain viable solution       | 16                 | 6    | 6                        | <b>2.36</b>             |

\*Scale: 1 = needs improvement, 2 = good, 3 = very good

**Outcome(s):**

- In assessing the quality of the decision making regarding the stock selection project, 68% of the students achieved a successful rating, while 32% were rated as unsuccessful in meeting the assessment objective. This result is short of the 70% standard applied for the assessment tool.

**Closing-the-Loop:**

- BBA Cognitive applications – need to improve on selection of financial analysis technique
- A great amount of effort was spent in assisting students in rudimentary mathematical calculations (Pre-Algebra Math) in Fall 2008. This effort resulted in dramatic improvement in success on rote calculations, however, this effort detracted from the goal of providing broad understanding of purpose of each analysis technique. A clearer focus on the culminating result of the project could be emphasized and less time expended in assisting students in the basic mathematical requirements. In response to the findings, the ensuing discussions of the Finance faculty focused on finding appropriate ways to increase the computational skills of the students



while retaining sufficient time in class discussions to convey the conceptual expectations within financial decision-making. These discussions contributed to the faculty decision to incorporate an online homework management system ("MyFinanceLab") during fall 2009 to increase the opportunities for students to engage in useful repetition of the calculations required in the conduct of the course.

- Instructors in FINC 331 need to better know the skill levels of the incoming students. To address this issue, one instructor completed an assessment of accounting and arithmetic skills of the incoming students. That separate assessment clearly indicated a high correlation between incoming skills in those areas and performance in FIN C 331. Requiring greater repetitions, outside of class, of the calculations needed in introductory finance should provide instructors more time to focus on the conceptual and overriding purposes of the work in the course. This effort will be greatly enhanced by our use of MyFinanceLab in course instruction and for assessment purposes, as noted above.

## Communication

Demonstrate the ability to engage in effective written, oral and persuasive communications.

**Measure: Written Communication** – Notes accompanying student presentations assessed using a standard rubric (MGNT 421 Leadership and Motivation, spring 2009, Roanoke class).

| Written Categories | Average Score |
|--------------------|---------------|
| Organization       | 3.95          |
| Content Knowledge  | 3.95          |
| Content Selection  | 3.45          |
| Neatness           | 3.90          |
| References         | 2.10          |
| Overall Average    | 3.47          |
|                    | (n=10)        |

*Scale: 1=poor, 2=needs work, 3=acceptable, 4=excellent*

**Measure: Written Communication** –Criterion Online Writing Evaluation Service ([criterion.ets.org](http://criterion.ets.org)) used to compare first assignment (pre-test) to last assignment (post-test) in terms of grammar, usage, mechanics, style and overall performance.

### Measure: Criterion Online Writing Evaluation

|   | Spring 2008 |           | Fall 2008 |           | Spring 2009 |           |
|---|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
|   | Pre-test    | Post-test | Pre-test  | Post-test | Pre-test    | Post-test |
| Percentage of students meeting expectations | 60.0        | 63.4      | 65.27     | 81.36     | 66.7        | 55.3      |
| Total number of students assessed           | 35          | 34        | 72        | 59        | 78          | 76        |

| Area Analysis                                | Spring 2008 |           | Fall 2008 |           | Spring 2009 |           |
|--|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
|  | Pre-test    | Post-test | Pre-test  | Post-test | Pre-test    | Post-test |
| Percent of students without grammar errors   | 17.0        | 20.0      | 20.5      | 22.2      | 21.8        | 41.3      |
| Percent of students without usage errors     | 20.0        | 14.0      | 23.3      | 30.4      | 14.1        | 36.0      |
| Percent of students without mechanics errors | 42.0        | 44.0      | 42.5      | 56.5      | 21.8        | 69.3      |
| Percent of students without style comments   | 12.0        | 14.0      | 24.7      | 28.9      | 32.1        | 23.3      |
| Overall performance (mean score)             | 3.80        | 3.90      | 3.81      | 4.26      | 3.93        | 3.60      |

**Outcome(s):** Style errors increased and the mean score decreased from pre-test to post-test although everything else improved. Style included “repetition of words” and many of the assignments *require* a repetition.

**Communication**

Demonstrate the ability to engage in effective written, oral and persuasive communications.

**Measure: Written Communication** – Faculty used a course-embedded instrument designed to measure written communication skills. (MKTG 340 Principles of Marketing)

**Measures: Rubric designed to assess written communication skills**

|                                | Average<br>Scale Score* |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Criteria                       | Fall 2008               |
| Content/Understanding of Topic | 3.00                    |
| Support for Ideas              | 3.00                    |
| Organization & Development     | 3.00                    |
| Clarity                        | 2.90                    |
| Format and Length              | 3.00                    |
| Grammar, Spelling & Mechanics  | 2.50                    |
|                                | (n=12)                  |

*\*Scale: 1=below expectations, 2=meets expectations, 3=exceeds expectations*

**Outcome(s):** Faculty commented on the small sample size, subjective rubric, and the need for more data. Faculty further thought that the 3.0 point scale should be expanded (while others commented on keeping it consistent and retaining a 3.0 scale for all measures)

**Closing-the-Loop:** Faculty suggested using Criterion as an enhancement in more classes to assist with improving grammar. This is a motion for consideration by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee for Fall 2009.

## Communication

Demonstrate the ability to engage in effective written, oral and persuasive communications.

**Measure: Written Communication** –Course-embedded rubric (MKTG 471, spring 2009)

| Aspect of Paper                 | Average Score,<br>Capitalism<br>(1 <sup>st</sup> paper) | Average Score,<br>Culture<br>(2 <sup>nd</sup> paper) |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Introduction                    | 7.0   | 7.8  |
| Content (logic, information)    | 5.3   | 7.1  |
| Content (credible, cited)       | 5.1   | 7.0  |
| Content (outcome, explanation)  | 5.4   | 7.2  |
| Summary (reflection)            | 5.3   | 7.3  |
| Thesis clear in the paper       | 7.5   | 7.6  |
| Two sides provided              | 3.7   | 7.3  |
| References and citations        | 5.8   | 7.5  |
| Format (professional, headings) | 7.4   | 8.5  |
| Grammar, structure, flow        | 6.7   | 7.6  |
|                                 | 10 points/ aspect<br>(n=31);<br>mean =60/100            | 10 points/aspect<br>(n=23);<br>mean=74/100           |

**Outcome(s):** Comments from the instructor for consideration: Scores improved, dramatically, with the extensive feedback provided on the first paper. The challenge may be in providing both “sides” of an issue (i.e. logic) and a coherent flow to the major point of the paper.

**Measure: Written Communication** – Reference types (MKTG 471, spring 2009)

| Type of reference used          | First<br>(Capitalism)<br>Paper | Second (Culture)<br>Paper |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Personal visits or lectures     | 1.7%                           | 1.5%                      |
| Wikipedia                       | 3.2%                           | 1.5%                      |
| Newspapers                      | 3.8%                           | 7.4%                      |
| Dictionaries                    | 6.9%                           | .7%                       |
| Novel ( <i>Atlas Shrugged</i> ) | 6.2%                           | 0                         |
| Online videos                   | 7.6%                           | 0                         |
| Books or encyclopedias          | 26.7%                          | 23%                       |
| Magazines                       | 12.3%                          |                           |
| Web sites, blogs, commentaries  | 22.3%                          | 49.6%                     |
| Journal articles                | 13%                            | 12.6%                     |
| Other                           | 6.9%                           | 3.7%                      |
|                                 | (n=130<br>references)          | (n=135<br>references)     |

**Outcome(s):** While instructions may have not been clear enough, students went for encyclopedias, blogs, and Wikipedia. What is the role of undergraduate research papers in shaping thought development? Where do they learn about judging the adequacy of references? Where in the business curriculum could this/should this topic be stressed?

## Communication

Demonstrate the ability to engage in effective written, oral and persuasive communications.

**Measure: Oral/Persuasive Communication** – Final presentations evaluated using a rubric (MGNT 250 Entrepreneurship and Innovation; n = 12).

| Element (points)             | Average points | Percent* |
|------------------------------|----------------|----------|
| Well organized/presented(5)  | 3.8            | 75.0     |
| Product/service explained(5) | 4.5            | 90.0     |
| Players/skills ID(5)         | 3.5            | 70.0     |
| Market opportunity ID(5)     | 3.8            | 75.0     |
| within 5 minutes(5)          | 4.4            | 88.3     |
| Passion shown(5)             | 4.3            | 85.0     |
| Need/want ID(5)              | 4.2            | 83.3     |
| Goals ID(5)                  | 3.9            | 78.3     |
| Quant Results presented(10)  | 7.3            | 73.3     |

*\*Percent is proportion of average points to total.*

### Elevator Pitch

| Element (points)               | Average points | Percent* |
|--------------------------------|----------------|----------|
| Introductory hook used (2)     | 1.3            | 66.7     |
| Product/service identified (2) | 1.7            | 83.3     |
| Players/skills identified (2)  | 1.4            | 72.2     |
| Some type of request made(2)   | 1.7            | 83.3     |
| Timing (within 90 seconds(2))  | 1.7            | 83.3     |
| Passion shown (3)              | 2.2            | 74.1     |
| Target Market ID(3)            | 2.1            | 70.4     |
| Revenue model explained (3)    | 1.9            | 63.0     |
| Competition addressed (3)      | 2.1            | 70.4     |
| Competitive advantage ID (3)   | 2.2            | 74.1     |

*\*Percent is proportion of average points to total.*

**Outcome(s):** Faculty comments focused on the greater bias due to the low scale (max points = 2) and that this course (MGNT 250) is a sophomore level course with many non-business majors (75% were not business majors). While this course should not be used to assess communication skills of business majors (2), its value would be in assessing how prepared students are for presentations as they come out of general education courses

**Communication** – Demonstrate the ability to engage in effective written, oral and persuasive communications.

**Measure: Oral/Persuasive** – Student presentations were assessed using a standard rubric (MGNT 421 Leadership and Motivation, spring 2009 in Roanoke).

| Presentation Categories | Average Score |
|-------------------------|---------------|
| Organization            | 3.85          |
| Content Knowledge       | 4.00          |
| Argument Overall        | 3.20          |
| Argument Criteria       | 3.35          |
| Mechanics               | 3.60          |
| Visuals                 | 3.85          |
| Delivery                | 3.65          |
| Overall Average         | 3.64          |
| N                       | 10            |

*Scale: 1=poor, 2=needs work, 3=acceptable, 4=excellent*

**Outcome(s):** Unsure if this really measures persuasive communication. Would like to see greater emphasis on the argument overall and the argument criteria as well as more comprehensive use across the curriculum.

**Communication** – Demonstrate the ability to engage in effective written, oral and persuasive communications.

**Measure: Oral/Persuasive** – Students (n=99) provide a presentation in (MNGT 333, fall 2008) which is graded with a rubric.

| Criteria                            | Score* |     |       |       |       |      |       |     |                        |
|-------------------------------------|--------|-----|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|-----|------------------------|
|                                     | 1      |     | 2     |       | 3     |      | 4     |     | mean<br>scale<br>score |
|                                     | count  | %   | count | %     | count | %    | count | %   |                        |
| Ums, Uhs, Ahs, You Knows (Crutches) | 8      | 8.1 | 52    | 52.5  | 39    | 39.4 | 0     | 0.0 | 2.31                   |
| Body Control                        | 0      | 0.0 | 18    | 18.2  | 80    | 80.8 | 1     | 1.0 | 2.83                   |
| Voice and Delivery                  | 0      | 0.0 | 31    | 31.3  | 64    | 64.6 | 4     | 4.0 | 2.73                   |
| Speed of Delivery                   | 0      | 0.0 | 14    | 14.1  | 84    | 84.8 | 1     | 1.0 | 2.87                   |
| Vocabulary                          | 0      | 0.0 | 6     | 6.1%  | 92    | 92.9 | 1     | 1.0 | 2.95                   |
| Clarity                             | 0      | 0.0 | 15    | 15.5% | 81    | 81.8 | 3     | 3.0 | 2.88                   |
| Use of Visual Aids                  | 0      | 0.0 | 11    | 11.1  | 87    | 87.9 | 1     | 1.0 | 2.90                   |

*\*Scale: 1=needs improvement, 2=minimally acceptable, 3=satisfactory, 4=excellent*

Summer I 2009 (n=24) MGNT 326 and MGNT 350

| Criteria                            | Score* |     |       |      |       |      |       |      | mean<br>scale<br>score |
|-------------------------------------|--------|-----|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|------------------------|
|                                     | 1      |     | 2     |      | 3     |      | 4     |      |                        |
|                                     | count  | %   | count | %    | count | %    | count | %    |                        |
| Ums, Uhs, Ahs, You Knows (Crutches) | 1      | 4.2 | 15    | 62.5 | 8     | 33.3 | 0     | 0.0  | 2.25                   |
| Body Control                        | 0      | 0.0 | 0     | 0.0  | 20    | 83.3 | 4     | 16.7 | 3.08                   |
| Voice, Delivery, Speed              | 0      | 0.0 | 7     | 29.2 | 13    | 54.2 | 4     | 16.7 | 2.81                   |
| Vocabulary                          | 0      | 0.0 | 0     | 0.0  | 18    | 75.0 | 6     | 25.0 | 3.19                   |
| Use of Visual Aids                  | 0      | 0.0 | 2     | 8.3  | 17    | 70.8 | 5     | 20.8 | 3.08                   |

*\*Scale: 1=needs improvement, 2=minimally acceptable, 3=satisfactory, 4=excellent*

**Outcome(s):** Faculty comments emphasized several issues but were generally not pleased with student performance in this area. The low score on “crutches” could have been addressed in a general education course. Do we really have a good rubric for persuasive communication yet? More oral presentations are needed, but class sizes are moving in opposite direction.

**Closing-the-Loop:** Changes recommended by faculty included consideration of using a practice presentation prior to the graded version. Faculty also suggested that we require a business/professional communication class (College core B) as part of the business curriculum. Further, we could use presentation skills and the same rubric at 300-level (MGNT 333), and then repeat in MGNT 357 to gauge improvement. Further, student input may aid the instructor’s assessment and provide feedback. We need to use standard rubrics across a greater variety of courses.

**Collaboration and Teamwork**

Collaborate with team members to accomplish goals.

**Measure:** Assessment of the individual's collaborative skills, teamwork, and ability to work well with others. Based on co-managers' (team mates') evaluation from Glo-bus simulation (MNGT 428, Business Policy and Strategy, n=145).

| Criteria                 | 2009            |          |          |
|--------------------------|-----------------|----------|----------|
|                          | Mean Percentile | $\delta$ | Range    |
| Leadership Skills        | 56.4            | 30.7     | 1 to 100 |
| Collaboration & Teamwork | 56.4            | 31.0     | 1 to 98  |
| (n = 145)                |                 |          |          |

Population Descriptives (2009): Students = 34,951, Companies = 11,787, Schools = 351, Countries = 30.

Descriptions of Glo-Bus criteria:

- Leadership skills are individual scores derived from co-manager's evaluations.
- Collaboration and teamwork skills are individual scores derived from co-managers' evaluations.

**Outcome(s):** No comments specifically addressed this measure.



### **Collaboration and Teamwork**

Collaborate with team members to accomplish goals.

**Measure:** Team Diagnostic – Self assessment of class assigned teams and self using a standard rubric (MGNT 421, Leadership and Motivation, spring 2009 in Roanoke)

|                           | <b>Average Scores</b> |              |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| <b>Category</b>           | <i>Individual</i>     | <i>Group</i> |
| Flexibility               | 4.27                  | 4.00         |
| Collaboration             | 4.18                  | 4.18         |
| Productivity & Efficiency | 3.90                  | 3.90         |
| Planning                  | 4.18                  | 3.72         |
| Operations Stability      | 4.18                  | 3.36         |
| Communication             | 3.54                  | 4.09         |
| Cohesiveness              | 3.36                  | 4.09         |
| Learning/Feedback         | 4.63                  | 4.27         |
| Overall                   | 4.03                  | 3.95         |
| n                         | 7                     | 7            |

*Scale: 1= Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree.*

**Outcome(s):** Need to distinguish team from group skills. Need to enhance faculty understanding of team skills. May need to hold a team-building workshop.

**BBA Program Goal 1: Students will be adaptive to dynamic business environments.**

**Objective 1.1: Macro-economic Environment**

Students will be able to recognize and analyze the macro environmental forces.

**AOL 1.1a:** Course-embedded instrument designed to measure knowledge of the macroeconomic environment (ECON 105, Macroeconomics).

**Table 1: Knowledge of Macro-economic Issues**

| Area                           | Percent of students answering correctly |           |             |
|--------------------------------|---|-----------|-------------|
|                                | Spring 2008                             | Fall 2008 | Spring 2009 |
| Gross domestic product         | 55.2                                    | 58.7      | 66.9        |
| Components of aggregate demand | 77.0                                    | 71.9      | 90.5        |
| Expansionary fiscal policy     | 82.6                                    | 83.1      | 87.5        |
| Inflation                      | 41.0                                    | 41.5      | 44.1        |
| Cost principle                 | 72.0                                    | 70.5      | 62.7        |
| Description of macroeconomics  | 87.3                                    | 95.4      | 93.5        |
| Economic growth                | 71.4                                    | 70.3      | 71.1        |
| The Fed and monetary policy    | 33.9                                    | 31.8      | 39.2        |
| Description of unemployment    | 25.7                                    | 27.8      | 35.7        |
| Average                        | 60.7                                    | 61.2      | 65.7        |
| Numbers of students assessed:  | 226                                     | 429       | 263         |

**Outcome(s):** Faculty comments included that some improvements in learning occurred but some areas decreased as well. Average remains low. Topics that challenge students over time are the test questions about: (a) unemployment, (b) monetary policy, (c) inflation, (d) gross domestic product, and (e) aggregate demand.

**Objective 1.2: Global Marketplace**

Students will be able to recognize and analyze the global marketplace.

**AOL 1.2a:** Faculty use a course-embedded instrument (multiple-choice questions) designed to measure knowledge of the global marketplace. (ECON 340 Global Economy and Business)

**Measures: Knowledge of Global Economy Issues**

| Area                               | Percent of students answering correctly |           |             |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------|-------------|
|                                    | Spring 2008                             | Fall 2008 | Spring 2009 |
| Globalization of Production        | 66.2                                    | 51.5      | 62.0        |
| Economic Systems                   | 54.7                                    | 53.1      | 49.2        |
| Comparative and Absolute Advantage | 66.2                                    | 60.0      | 60.4        |
| Tariffs and Quotas                 | 56.1                                    | 41.5      | 39.6        |
| Dimensions of Culture              | 71.9                                    | 52.3      | 57.8        |
| Dimensions of Political Systems    | 53.2                                    | 49.2      | 42.8        |
| Trade Creation vs. Trade Diversion | 59.7                                    | 46.2      | 49.7        |
| Currency Devaluation               | 81.3                                    | 77.7      | 70.6        |
| International Monetary Fund        | 70.5                                    | 68.5      | 74.3        |
| Floating Exchange Rates            | 61.9                                    | 70.8      | 54.5        |
| World Trade Organization           | 88.5                                    | 87.7      | 75.9        |
| Levels of Regional Integration     | 75.5                                    | 64.6      | 46.0        |
| Average                            | 67.1                                    | 60.3      | 56.9        |
| n                                  | 139                                     | 130       | 187         |

**Outcome(s):** Faculty discussed that the average dropped considerably across most areas. Students seemed to have the most difficulty with questions related to: (a) tariffs and quotas, (b) trade creation vs. trade diversion, (c) political systems, (d) globalization of production and (e) economic systems.

**Closing-the-Loop:** Changes suggested by faculty included to place more emphasis on tariffs, quotas, and globalization of production in preparation for MGNT 428; and, to use homework exercises that are more applied beyond readings.

### Objective 1.2: Global Marketplace

Students will be able to recognize and analyze the global marketplace.

**AOL 1.2b:** Faculty use a course-embedded instrument, assessed using a rubric, designed to measure ability to evaluate foreign markets (MKTG 340 Principles of Marketing).

| Criteria/points                      | Average Points/Percent of Total |       |           |        |              |       |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------|-----------|--------|--------------|-------|
|                                      | Spring 2008                     | %     | Fall 2008 | %      | Spring 2009* |       |
| Identification of foreign market (5) | 3.8                             | 75.0% | 3.8       | 76.0%  | 4.7          | 93.3% |
|                                      |                                 |       |           |        |              |       |
| Analysis of market with respect to:  |                                 |       |           |        |              |       |
| Trade issues (15)                    | 7.3                             | 48.3% | 12.6      | 84.0%  | 12.9         | 85.8% |
| Economic issues (15)                 | 8.3                             | 55.0% | 8.5       | 56.7%  | 11.1         | 74.2% |
| Cultural issues (15)                 | 9.0                             | 60.0% | 11.8      | 78.7%  | 12.7         | 84.4% |
| Political-regulatory issues (15)     | 10.3                            | 68.3% | 11.8      | 78.7%  | 10.0         | 66.7% |
|                                      |                                 |       |           |        |              |       |
| Selection of:                        |                                 |       |           |        |              |       |
| Market entry strategy (15)           | 14.3                            | 95.0% | 15.0      | 100.0% | 14.0         | 93.3% |
| Product strategy (10)                | 9.5                             | 95.0% | 9.4       | 94.0%  | 8.7          | 86.7% |
| Promotion strategy (10)              | 5.8                             | 57.5% | 7.6       | 76.0%  | 6.7          | 66.7% |
| Total                                | 68.0                            | 68.0% | 80.6      | 80.6%  | 80.7         | 80.7% |
| n                                    | 20                              |       | 17        |        | 15           |       |

\* Sample includes students in Roanoke

**Outcome(s):** Faculty discussions noted the improvements in student learning. Students seemed to have difficulty with identifying political-regulatory issues and types of promotional strategies (extension, modification, invention) for use in foreign markets. Initially, students were not familiar with formatting a professional memorandum (that written communication issue, again) but improved when provided with materials on formatting memos.

**BBA Program Goal 5:** Students will be knowledgeable of basic business functions.

**Objective 5.1: Core Business Knowledge.** Students will be able to demonstrate foundational knowledge in the functional areas of accounting, economics, finance, management and marketing.

**AOL 5.1a:** Faculty administered the ETS test (MGNT 428, spring semester, 2009).

|             | n   | Accounting |                  | Economics |                  | Business Law |                   |
|-------------|-----|------------|------------------|-----------|------------------|--------------|-------------------|
|             |     | RU mean    | Mean all schools | RU mean   | Mean all schools | RU mean      | Mean all schools* |
| Spring 2005 | 58  | 43.8       | 44.4             | 44.2      | 42.7             | 49.2         | 49.8              |
| Spring 2006 | 173 | 43.2       | 44.4             | 42.6      | 42.7             | 49.9         | 49.8              |
| Spring 2007 | 177 | 49.0       | 50.7             | 48.0      | 48.0             | 46.0         | 46.7              |
| Spring 2008 | 189 | 49.0       | 50.3             | 48.0      | 47.6             | 45.0         | 46.1              |
| Spring 2009 | 177 | 53.0       | 49.8             | 51.0      | 47.4             | 50.0         | 46.1              |
| Summer 2009 | 27  | 51.0       | 49.8             | 48.0      | 47.4             | 45.0         | 46.1              |

|             | n   | Finance |                  | International |                  | Management |                   |
|-------------|-----|---------|------------------|---------------|------------------|------------|-------------------|
|             |     | RU mean | Mean all schools | RU mean       | Mean all schools | RU mean    | Mean all schools* |
| Spring 2005 | 58  | 36.6    | 36.1             | 52.6          | 44.4             | 56.7       | 57.1              |
| Spring 2006 | 173 | 36.1    | 36.1             | 49.8          | 44.4             | 58.9       | 57.1              |
| Spring 2007 | 177 | 58.0    | 55.9             | 61.0          | 54.4             | 58.0       | 55.4              |
| Spring 2008 | 189 | 59.0    | 55.6             | 61.0          | 54.3             | 61.0       | 55.2              |
| Spring 2009 | 177 | 58.0    | 54.9             | 62.0          | 54.0             | 65.0       | 54.7              |
| Summer 2009 | 27  | 60.0    | 54.9             | 58.0          | 54.0             | 59.0       | 54.7              |

|             | n   | Marketing |                  | Quantitative |                  | Information Systems |                   |
|-------------|-----|-----------|------------------|--------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
|             |     | RU mean   | Mean all schools | RU mean      | Mean all schools | RU mean             | Mean all schools* |
| Spring 2005 | 58  | 49.1      | 46.8             | 58.9         | 56.4             |                     |                   |
| Spring 2006 | 173 | 50.8      | 46.8             | 46.6         | 56.4             |                     |                   |
| Spring 2007 | 177 | 56.0      | 55.9             | 49.0         | 47.0             | 58.0                | 58.7              |
| Spring 2008 | 189 | 58.0      | 52.6             | 47.0         | 46.5             | 59.0                | 58.5              |
| Spring 2009 | 177 | 61.0      | 52.0             | 49.0         | 46.2             | 62.0                | 58.0              |
| Summer 2009 | 27  | 59.0      | 52.0             | 45.0         | 46.2             | 59.0                | 58.0              |

|             | n   | Overall |                   |
|-------------|-----|---------|-------------------|
|             |     | RU mean | Mean all schools* |
| Spring 2005 | 58  | 152.5   | 151.5             |
| Spring 2006 | 173 | 152.3   | 151.5             |
| Spring 2007 | 177 | 153.0   | 152.5             |
| Spring 2008 | 189 | 154.0   | 152.1             |
| Spring 2009 | 177 | 157.0   | 151.6             |
| Summer 2009 | 27  | 154.0   | 151.6             |

\*All schools refers to 83,323 examinees at 564 other institutions.

**Objective 5.1: Core Business Knowledge (financial accounting)**

Students will be knowledgeable of financial accounting.

**AOL 5.1b:** Course-embedded instrument designed to measure knowledge of financial accounting (ACTG 211 Fundamentals of Financial Accounting).

| Element/question (label)             | Percent of students responding correctly |           | <i>Change</i> |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------|---------------|
|                                      | Fall 2007                                | Fall 2008 |               |
| FASB                                 | 90.5                                     | 81.4      | -9.1          |
| Accounting equation                  | 64.8                                     | 65.1      | 0.3           |
| Accounting process                   | 68.9                                     | 58.1      | -10.8         |
| Accounts receivable/sales on account | 34.1                                     | 38.2      | 4.1           |
| Accrual basis of accounting          | 59.5                                     | 48.8      | -10.6         |
| Balance sheet                        | 54.2                                     | 65.4      | 11.3          |
| Income statement                     | 59.3                                     | 66.7      | 7.4           |
| Cost of goods sold                   | 87.5                                     | 83.1      | -4.4          |
| Ending inventory                     | 48.1                                     | 52.2      | 4.1           |
| Inventory valuation                  | 54.9                                     | 60.1      | 5.2           |
| Internal control                     | 72.0                                     | 59.8      | -12.2         |
| Bank reconciliations                 | 43.2                                     | 50.8      | 7.6           |
| Full disclosure/financial statements | 72.0                                     | 66.2      | -5.8          |
| Write-off of bad debt                | 26.9                                     | 41.2      | 14.3          |
| Depreciation                         | 50.8                                     | 54.2      | 3.4           |
| Straight-line depreciation           | 84.8                                     | 67.8      | -17.1         |
| Contingent liabilities               | 68.6                                     | 72.1      | 3.5           |
| Warranty expense/liability           | 34.1                                     | 49.5      | 15.4          |
| Amortization of bond discount        | 57.2                                     | 71.8      | 14.5          |
| Premium on bond payable              | 36.0                                     | 50.8      | 14.8          |
| Stock dividends                      | 39.3                                     | 66.8      | 27.5          |
| Stockholders' equity                 | 67.8                                     | 62.5      | -5.3          |
| Accounting standards                 | 73.1                                     | 59.1      | -14.0         |
| Statement of cash flows              | 40.0                                     | 67.7      | 27.7          |
| Financial reporting                  | 51.8                                     | 60.6      | 8.8           |
| Extraordinary items                  | 54.5                                     | 51.0      | -3.5          |
| average                              | 57.5                                     | 60.4      | 3.0           |

**Outcome(s):** Faculty discussed several issues. Embedded questions selected to assess course objectives look discouraging, but the average score on any exam is usually between 60-65, 70 would be high. Should we have a different course for accounting versus non-accounting majors? Are all of the topics needed? Should we have another final evaluation? Are the objectives realistic for this course? Understanding cash flows and financial statements are necessary for finance courses and need more emphasis.

**Objective 5.1: Core Business Knowledge (Microeconomics)**

Students will be able to recognize and analyze the micro environmental issues.

**AOL 5.1c:** Course-embedded instrument designed to measure knowledge of the microeconomic issues (ECON 106, Microeconomics).

**Table 1: Knowledge of Micro-economic Issues**

| Area   | Percent Correct Responses |             |
|--|---------------------------|-------------|
|  | Fall 2008                 | Spring 2009 |
| Definition of Economics                              | 64.0                      | 69.8        |
| Elasticity Concept                                   | 60.2                      | 71.2        |
| Total Revenue Changes and Price Changes              | 77.4                      |             |
| Demand vs. Quantity Demanded                         |                           | 79.0        |
| Normal Profit  | 33.3                      |             |
| Economic Profit                                      |                           | 60.0        |
| Marginal Cost  | 61.8                      | 78.0        |
| Differences in Market Structure                      | 58.1                      | 46.3        |
| Profit Maximization                                  | 57.5                      | 57.1        |
| Short-Run Equilibrium for Perfectly Competitive Firm | 50.5                      | 53.7        |
| Long-Run Equilibrium for Perfectly Competitive Firm  | 59.1                      | 54.6        |
| Marginal Revenue and Market Structure                | 16.1                      |             |
| Demand Curve: Monopoly vs Perfectly Competitive Firm |                           | 74.1        |
| Identification of Elastic Segment of Demand Curve    | 35.5                      |             |
| Profit Maximization under Monopoly                   |                           | 43.9        |
| Production and Pricing Decision Under Monopoly       | 45.2                      | 52.2        |
| n  | 186                       | 205         |

**Outcome(s):** No comments specifically addressed these measures.

**Objective 5.1: Core Business Knowledge (marketing)**

Students will be knowledgeable of marketing.

**AOL 5.1d:** Course-embedded instrument designed to measure knowledge of marketing (MKTG 340, spring 2009).

| Area   | Percent Correct |           |
|--|-----------------|-----------|
|  | Pre-test        | Post-test |
| Definition of Marketing  | 91.7            | 94.2      |
| Marketing Mix  | 55.0            | 92.7      |
| Target Market  | 86.7            | 94.9      |
| Marketing Mix Elements   | 75.0            | 80.3      |
| Monopolistic Competition   | 15.8            | 48.1      |
| Oligopoly  | 24.2            | 60.0      |
| Barriers to Entry  | 83.3            | 94.1      |
| Ethical & Social Responsibility (Consumer Bill of Rights)        | 33.3            | 74.1      |
| Ethical & Social Responsibility (Green Marketing)                | 85.8            | 98.5      |
| Ethical & Social Responsibility (Ethics)                         | 88.3            | 93.3      |
| Ethical & Social Responsibility (Ethics & Laws)                  | 70.8            | 83.7      |
| Consumer Behavior (Extended Problem Solving)                     | 55.8            | 87.3      |
| Consumer Behavior (Reference Groups)                             | 52.5            | 82.0      |
| Consumer Behavior (Cognitive Dissonance)                         | 31.7            | 82.8      |
| Consumer Behavior (Routine Problem Solving)                      | 71.7            | 93.3      |
| Organizational Buying Behavior (Definition of Consumers)         | 33.3            | 81.2      |
| Organizational Buying Behavior (Types of Organizational Markets) | 3.3             | 57.1      |
| Organizational Buying Behavior (Definition of Industrial Firm)   | 37.5            | 69.2      |
| Global Marketing (Balance of Trade)                              | 37.5            | 75.6      |
| Global Marketing (US Balance of Trade)                           | 70.8            | 82.4      |
| Global Marketing (Protectionism)                                 | 14.2            | 89.3      |
| Marketing Research (Definition)                                  | 28.3            | 77.9      |
| Marketing Research (Definition of Sampling)                      | 77.5            | 97.7      |
| Marketing Research (Definition of Statistical Inference)         | 29.2            | 49.6      |
| Marketing Research (Types of Data)                               | 28.3            | 93.2      |
| Market Segmentation (Market Segmentation)                        | 39.2            | 58.8      |
| Market Segmentation (Market Segments)                            | 47.5            | 86.3      |
| Market Segmentation (Product Differentiation)                    | 55.0            | 82.4      |
| Market Segmentation (Mass Customization)                         | 76.7            | 86.3      |



Continued

| Area   | Percent Correct |           |
|--|-----------------|-----------|
|  | Pre-test        | Post-test |
| Product Strategy (Convenience Good)                            | 60.0            | 93.1      |
| Product Strategy (Derived Demand)                              | 28.3            | 56.5      |
| Product Strategy (Organizational Products Production Products) | 48.3            | 78.6      |
| Product Strategy (Trademark)                                   | 50.8            | 88.5      |
| Product Strategy (Product Life Cycle)                          | 75.0            | 93.9      |
| Product Strategy (Product Adoption)                            | 15.0            | 69.5      |
| Product Strategy (Product Adoption)                            | 20.8            | 67.2      |
| Product Strategy (Product Life Cycle)                          | 33.3            | 63.4      |
| Pricing Strategy (Price Fixing)                                | 41.7            | 67.7      |
| Pricing Strategy (Price Discrimination)                        | 43.3            | 58.5      |
| Pricing Strategy (Loss Leader Pricing)                         | 27.5            | 62.3      |
| Pricing Strategy (Penetration Pricing)                         | 42.5            | 90.8      |
| Distribution Strategy (Logistics)                              | 31.7            | 34.1      |
| Distribution Strategy (Logistics Functions)                    | 30.8            | 57.4      |
| Distribution Strategy (Supply Chain)                           | 35.0            | 82.9      |
| Distribution Strategy (Intermodal Transportation)              | 34.2            | 84.5      |
| Distribution Strategy (Reverse Logistics)                      | 28.3            | 92.2      |
| Promotion Strategy (Promotion Mix)                             | 38.3            | 84.1      |
| Promotion Strategy (Advertising)                               | 35.8            | 75.4      |
| Promotion Strategy (Personal Selling)                          | 39.2            | 76.2      |
| Promotion Strategy (Pull Promotional Strategy)                 | 15.0            | 78.6      |
| Average  | 45.5            | 78.0      |
| n  | 120             | 129       |

**Outcome(s):** Interesting to see the pre-test/post-test approach.

**BBA Program Goal 6: Students will be ethically and socially aware****Objective 6.1: Ethics and social responsibility**

Students will be able to recognize the issues of social responsibility and the factors that influence ethical decision-making.

**AOL 6.1a:** Faculty use a course embedded instrument designed to measure knowledge of ethics and social responsibility. (MKTG 340 Principles of Marketing)

**Measures:**

| Area                                     | Percent of students answering correctly |              |           |
|--|---|--------------|-----------|
|  | Spring 2007*                            | Spring 2008* | Fall 2008 |
| Definition of ethics                     | 92.2                                    | 94.4         | 76.0      |
| Definition of laws                       | 95.6                                    | 96.3         | 91.7      |
| Application of ethical Vs legal behavior | 86.7                                    | 84.7         | 89.0      |
| Consumer Bill of Rights                  | 94.1                                    | 92.5         | 85.0      |
| Slotting allowances/industry practice    | 59.6                                    | 68.8         | 63.3      |
| Ethics codes                             | 96.3                                    | 99.4         | 96.3      |
| Whistleblowers                           | 94.8                                    | 97.2         | 90.7      |
| Green marketing                          | 90.0                                    | 93.8         | 96.3      |
| Cause marketing                          | 65.2                                    | 68.8         | 69.7      |
| Unethical consumer practices             | 94.1                                    | 91.6         | 91.0      |
| Profit responsibility                    | 61.1                                    | 82.2         | 87.0      |
| Stakeholder responsibility               | 44.8                                    | 56.4         | 60.0      |
| Average                                  | 81.2                                    | 85.5         | 83.0      |
| n  | 270                                     | 321          | 154       |

\* Sample includes students in Roanoke.

**Outcome(s):** Observations include that the overall average dropped; improvements were observed in some areas, but declines in others.

**BBA Program Goal 6: Students will be ethically and socially aware**

**Objective 6.1: Ethics and social responsibility**

Students will be able to recognize the issues of social responsibility and the factors that influence ethical decision-making.

**AOL 6.1b:** Course embedded measure of knowledge related to the law (indirect ethical components)  
(BLAW 203, spring 2009)

| <b>Course Learning Objective</b>  | <b>Range of Correct Answers for all Questions for the Learning Objective</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Answering Correctly, (across all questions)</b> |
|---|--|---|
| Different courts within the state and federal systems (6 questions covered this topic)                  | 63%-94%  | 86%   |
| Constitutionally guaranteed rights of a person or organization (7 questions covered this topic)         | 74%-98%  | 86%   |
| Three branches of tort law and the liability associated with each area (5 questions covered this topic) | 71%-86%  | 81%   |
| When binding contracts are formed during contract discussions and negotiations (9 questions)            | 34%-88%  | 66%   |
| Basic remedies for breach of contract (8 questions)   | 19%-88%  | 72%   |
| Legal responsibility for contracts made or torts committed by agents (5 questions)                      | 52%-89%  | 72%   |
| Antitrust law (3 questions)   | 60%-97%  | 77%   |
| Law, common law, and employment discrimination (11 questions covered this topic)                        | 66%-099%   | 88%   |

**Outcome(s):** A start to measures.

**BBA Program Goal 6: Students will be ethically and socially aware**

**Objective 6.1: Ethics and social responsibility**

Students will be able to recognize the issues of social responsibility and the factors that influence ethical decision-making.

**AOL 6.1c:** Proportion of students warned of potential ethical/plagiarism problems for formal papers. (MKTG 471, Spring 2009)

| Was plagiarism a potential issue? (inadequate cites, lack of cites) | Capitalism Paper | Culture Paper |
|---|------------------|---------------|
| Yes   | 54%              | 9%            |
| No  | 46%              | 91%           |
|   | (n=31)           | (n=23)        |

**Outcome(s):** Students seem ill prepared to write a cited paper with appropriate citations. Results improved considerably for the second paper prompting the question of how we can foster greater clarity for this issue at an earlier point in the program (most of these students were graduating seniors, management majors).

## **BBA Program Goal 8: Students will be strategically oriented**

### **Objective 8.1: Strategically Oriented**

Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge of strategic management.

**AOL 8.1:** Assessment of group's strategic planning and strategic thinking skills based on performance on Glo-Bus simulation (MNGT 428, Business Policy and Strategy, n=145).

| Criteria                        | 2009            |          |          |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------|----------|
|                                 | Mean Percentile | $\delta$ | Range    |
| Leadership Skills               | 56.4            | 30.7     | 1 to 100 |
| Collaboration & Teamwork        | 56.4            | 31.0     | 1 to 98  |
| Financial Analysis              | 56.8            | 29.1     | 0 to 98  |
| Financial Management            | 55.7            | 19.6     | 9 to 85  |
| Operations Management           | 46.3            | 15.4     | 20 to 75 |
| Marketing Management            | 44.0            | 17.1     | 13 to 86 |
| Human Resources Management      | 46.2            | 25.0     | 4 to 86  |
| Strategic Analysis & Planning   | 66.5            | 21.7     | 20 to 96 |
| Corporate Social Responsibility | 42.6            | 23.4     | 6 to 92  |
| (n = 145)                       |                 |          |          |

Population Descriptives (2009): Students = 34,951, Companies = 11,787, Schools = 351, Countries = 30.

Descriptions of Glo-Bus criteria:

- Leadership skills are individual scores derived from co-manager's evaluations.
- Collaboration and teamwork skills are individual scores derived from co-managers' evaluations.
- Financial analysis skills are based on analyzing financial ratios and financial statements.
- Financial management is a rating of the group's ability to apply financial management principles (the company's ROE, credit rating, and stock price performance).
- Operations management is a rating of the group's ability to manage operations and to control cost (production cost per unit, capacity utilization, management of finished goods inventories).
- Marketing management is a rating of the group's ability to effectively market the company's product and to control costs (marketing image, marketing costs per unit sold).
- Human resources management is a rating of the group's proficiency in workforce management and labor costs (workforce compensation, productivity, and labor costs per unit sold).
- Strategic analysis and planning is a rating of the group's strategic planning and strategic thinking skills (scores achieved on the 3-year Strategic Plan exercise).
- Corporate social responsibility is a rating of the group's commitment to operating the company in a socially responsible manner (percentage of revenues spent on six responsibility initiatives).

**Outcome(s):** Taken as a whole, RU students perform well on the Glo-Bus simulation. The mean percentile ranking in Strategic Analysis and Planning is commendable for 2009.

### Other: Validation Exams for VWCC

Completed tests of equivalence for students from Virginia Western Community College (VWCC) entering RU as part of a defined articulation agreement (ended July 1, 2009). The results are summarized below for the tests completed in FY 2009.

| RU Course for which validation test provided <sup>1</sup> | VWCC student average score (n) |
|---|--------------------------------|
| Business Finance  | 73% (5)                        |
| Federal Taxation  | 69% <sup>2</sup> (4)           |
| Cost Accounting   | 65% (3)                        |
| Intermediate Accounting I                                 | 68% <sup>2</sup> (4)           |
| Human Resource Management                                 | 64% (4)                        |
| Management Principles                                     | 65% (5)                        |

<sup>1</sup>As part of the articulation agreement, VWCC students completed courses at VWCC and were awarded credit for RU courses. The validation exam tested the equivalency to RU students taking the courses at RU.

<sup>2</sup> This score is considered a passing grade by instructor.

**Outcome(s):** Given that D-grades do not transfer to RU, many of these students would not receive credit for these courses in the absence of the articulation agreement with VWCC. This agreement was ended as of July 1, 2009 so that no new students would be entered based on this agreement. After July 2, 2009, students from VWCC, similar to any other community college, could take challenge exams in these topics with a passing grade (of C or better) resulting in credit for the course.

**Other: California Critical Thinking Skills Test (2005/06)**

**Measure:** California Critical Thinking Skills Test administered to a sample of 461 Radford University students (82 junior, 379 senior) enrolled in 300- or 400-level courses during the 2005-06 AY.

|   |            | Highly Competent<br>(19 or better) | Competent<br>(14-18) | Not<br>(13 or Less) |
|---|------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| <b>University Scores</b>                      | <b>Srs</b> | <b>43.8%</b>                       | <b>34.8%</b>         | <b>21.4%</b>        |
|   | <b>Jrs</b> | <b>35.4%</b>                       | <b>42.7%</b>         | <b>21.9%</b>        |
| College of Arts and Sciences                  | <b>Srs</b> | 52.5%                              | 28.7%                | 18.8%               |
|   | <b>Jrs</b> | 36.4%                              | 51.5%                | 12.1%               |
| <b>College of Business and Economics</b>      | <b>Srs</b> | <b>41.7%</b>                       | <b>35.0%</b>         | <b>23.3%</b>        |
|   | <b>Jrs</b> | <b>42.9%</b>                       | <b>21.4%</b>         | <b>35.7%</b>        |
| College of Education and Human Development    | <b>Srs</b> | 25.9%                              | 48.1%                | 25.9%               |
|   | <b>Jrs</b> | 40.0%                              | 20.0%                | 40.0%               |
| College of Information Science and Technology | <b>Srs</b> | 85.7%                              | 14.3%                | 0.0%                |
|   | <b>Jrs</b> | 100.0%                             | 0.0%                 | 0.0%                |
| College of Visual and Performing Arts         | <b>Srs</b> | 58.6%                              | 27.6%                | 13.8%               |
|   | <b>Jrs</b> | 28.6%                              | 57.3%                | 14.2%               |
| Waldron College of Health and Human Services  | <b>Srs</b> | 32.8%                              | 41.0%                | 26.2%               |
|   | <b>Jrs</b> | 21.4%                              | 42.9%                | 35.7%               |

**Outcome(s):** When viewed in isolation, these results were not compelling to faculty who questioned administration, numbers and results. When viewed in context to other comments and concerns, the results reinforce the faculty's choice to focus on teaching methods that improve analytical skills across the curriculum in COBE.

## Other: Survey of Graduating Seniors (spring and summer, 2009)

### Employment Status

| Survey taken at graduation         | 2008 | 2009 |
|------------------------------------|------|------|
| Currently employed                 | 4%   | 5%   |
| Have accepted employment           | 24%  | 29%  |
| Seeking employment                 | 56%  | 60%  |
| Planning to attend graduate school | 3%   | 4%   |
| Not seeking employment             | 13%  | 2%   |
| n                                  | 217  | 77   |

| Follow-up Survey, 3 months         | 2008 |
|------------------------------------|------|
| Currently employed                 | 65%  |
| Have accepted employment           | 5%   |
| Seeking employment                 | 23%  |
| Planning to attend graduate school | 3%   |
| Not seeking employment             | 4%   |
| n                                  | 108  |

At graduation: average starting salary = \$43,553; primary source for the job: 44% RU, 56% self. By the third month: 79 percent of the jobs were in Virginia, average starting salary was \$40,580.

|                                    |  |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Abercrombie & Fitch                | IBM  |
| ACN                                | Johnson & Johnson                              |
| Adams, Jenkins, & Cheatham         | KPMG LLP                                       |
| Aflac insurance and Carpetland USA | Lanigan, Ryan, Malcolm & Doyle P.C.            |
| Airgas-National Welders            | ManTech International Corporation              |
| American General Financial         | Media General-Richmond Suburban Newspapers     |
| American Healthcare                | Michael B. Cooke, CPA PC                       |
| AOC Solutions, Inc                 | National College                               |
| Baker & McNiff P.C.                | Naval Operational Logistics Support Center     |
| Benchmark Construction Company     | New York Life                                  |
| Bonaventure                        | Northrup Grumman                               |
| Booz Allen Hamilton                | Océ North America                              |
| Buchanan Oil Corporation           | Overhead Door of Central Virginia              |
| Campus Crusade For Christ          | Popular, Inc                                   |
| Carilion                           | ProChem Inc.                                   |
| Caroline First Bank                | Red Robin International                        |
| Carpetland                         | Reznick Group, P.C.                            |
| Chipton Ross Inc.                  | Royall & Company                               |
| Coldwater Creek                    | SAIC   |
| Computer Sciences Corporation      | Sallie Mae                                     |
| Coppell ISD                        | Self employed / Tranced Out LLC                |
| Crossroads Music & Movies          | Sherwin-Williams                               |
| CSC                                | Shirley Contracting Company, LLC               |
| Data Consulting Group              | State Farm                                     |
| Davenport and Company LLC          | The Loan Modification Team                     |
| Direct Marketing Alliance          | United States Marine Corps                     |
| Dish Network                       | UVA School of Law                              |
| DLT Solutions, INC.                | Virginia Amateur Sports, Inc.                  |
| DMG Securities                     | Virginia Commonwealth University               |
| Dominion Resources Inc.            | Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State Univ. |
| Flux Tek Industries                | Wal-Mart                                       |
| Global Linguist Solutions          | Wells Fargo Financial                          |
| Gray's Family Department Store     | Wyland Grille                                  |



### **Other: Alumni Survey (fall 2008)**

On November 6, 2008 the COBE sent a brief survey to 1500 alumni with valid e-mail addresses. The purpose of the survey was to obtain alumni's opinions on two key aspects of our strategic focusing initiative. With 200 responses, the estimated response rate was approximately 13 percent.

### **Alumni Salaries for First Job after Completing Business Degree at Radford University**

#### **BBA Only**

|                      | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|
| Less than \$25,000   | 48        | 42.5%   |
| \$25,000 to \$49,999 | 43        | 38.05%  |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 10        | 8.84%   |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 4         | 3.53%   |
| More than \$100,000  | 8         | 7.07%   |
| Total                | 113       | 100%    |

#### **MBA Only**

|                      | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|
| Less than \$25,000   | 1         | 5%      |
| \$25,000 to \$49,999 | 8         | 40%     |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 7         | 35%     |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 3         | 15%     |
| More than \$100,000  | 1         | 5%      |
| Total                | 20        | 100%    |

### **Alumni responses to how important the following skills are to the success of a business graduate**

|                                  | Mean | Std.<br>Deviation | N   | Mode |
|----------------------------------|------|-------------------|-----|------|
| Oral Communication Skills        | 2.84 | .36               | 165 | 3    |
| Written Communication Skills     | 2.74 | .43               | 166 | 3    |
| Analytical Skills                | 2.66 | .48               | 166 | 3    |
| Ability to Collaborate on Teams  | 2.64 | .48               | 166 | 3    |
| Ability to Persuade Others       | 2.36 | .56               | 165 | 2    |
| Understanding of Global Cultures | 2.09 | .63               | 164 | 2    |

*Scale: 1 = not important; 2 = important; 3 = very important*

**Other: National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)**

| Item   | 2007 | 2008 | change |
|--|------|------|--------|
| Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions   | 2.62 | 2.76 | 0.14   |
| Made a class presentation  | 2.68 | 2.80 | 0.12   |
| Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in  | 2.17 | 2.55 | 0.38   |
| Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources   | 3.11 | 3.27 | 0.16   |
| Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments   | 2.38 | 2.40 | 0.02   |
| Come to class without completing readings or assignments   | 2.07 | 2.17 | 0.10   |
| Worked with other students on projects DURING CLASS  | 2.49 | 2.94 | 0.45   |
| Worked with classmates OUTSIDE OF CLASS to prepare class assignments   | 2.99 | 3.35 | 0.36   |
| Put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions  | 2.73 | 2.97 | 0.24   |
| Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary)   | 1.57 | 1.80 | 0.23   |
| Participated in a community-based project (e.g., service learning) as part of a regular course   | 1.43 | 1.37 | -0.06  |
| Used an electronic medium (listserv, chat group, Internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment   | 2.80 | 2.95 | 0.15   |
| Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor  | 3.33 | 3.59 | 0.26   |
| Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor   | 2.78 | 2.98 | 0.20   |
| Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor   | 2.38 | 2.49 | 0.11   |
| Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class  | 1.92 | 2.20 | 0.28   |
| Received prompt feedback from faculty on your academic performance (written or oral)   | 2.47 | 2.64 | 0.17   |
| Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations   | 2.56 | 2.80 | 0.24   |
| Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student life activities, etc.)   | 1.68 | 1.78 | 0.10   |
| Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.)  | 2.59 | 2.75 | 0.16   |
| Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own   | 2.73 | 2.77 | 0.04   |
| Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values  | 2.73 | 2.74 | 0.01   |
| Coursework emphasized: MEMORIZING facts, ideas or methods from your courses and readings so you can repeat them in pretty much the same form   | 2.74 | 3.09 | 0.35   |
| Coursework emphasized: ANALYZING the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components                            | 3.11 | 3.38 | 0.27   |
| Coursework emphasized: SYNTHESIZING and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships   | 2.83 | 3.02 | 0.19   |
| Coursework emphasized: MAKING JUDGMENTS about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions | 2.90 | 3.19 | 0.29   |

|   |      |      |      |
|---|------|------|------|
| Coursework emphasized: APPLYING theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations   | 3.11 | 3.38 | 0.27 |
| Mark the box that best represents the extent to which your examinations during the current school year challenged you to do your best work. | 5.48 | 5.63 | 0.15 |
| Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings  | 3.01 | 3.15 | 0.14 |
| Number of books read on your own (not assigned) for personal enjoyment or academic enrichment   | 1.81 | 1.89 | 0.08 |
| Number of written papers or reports of 20 PAGES OR MORE   | 1.39 | 1.53 | 0.14 |

| Item   | 2007 | 2008 | change |
|--|------|------|--------|
| Number of written papers or reports BETWEEN 5 AND 19 PAGES   | 2.39 | 2.50 | 0.11   |
| Number of written papers or reports of FEWER THAN 5 PAGES  | 3.21 | 3.05 | -0.16  |
| Number of problem sets that take you MORE than an hour to complete   | 2.41 | 2.79 | 0.38   |
| Number of problem sets that take you LESS than an hour to complete   | 2.67 | 2.80 | 0.13   |
| Attended an art exhibit, gallery, play, dance, or other theater performance  | 1.77 | 1.56 | -0.21  |
| Exercised or participated in physical fitness activities   | 3.05 | 3.06 | 0.01   |
| Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue  | 2.31 | 2.42 | 0.11   |
| Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective  | 2.58 | 2.70 | 0.12   |
| Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept  | 2.62 | 2.68 | 0.06   |
| Participated in activities to enhance your spirituality (worship, meditation, prayer, etc.)  | 1.74 | 1.71 | -0.03  |
| Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment  |      | 3.02 | 3.02   |
| Community service or volunteer work  |      | 2.95 | 2.95   |
| Participate in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together  |      | 2.29 | 2.29   |
| Work on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements   |      | 1.97 | 1.97   |
| Foreign language coursework  |      | 2.35 | 2.35   |
| Study abroad   |      | 2.06 | 2.06   |
| Independent study or self-designed major   |      | 2.01 | 2.01   |
| Culminating senior experience (comprehensive exam, capstone course, thesis, project, etc.)   |      | 2.99 | 2.99   |
| Quality: Your relationships with other students  | 5.75 | 6.08 | 0.33   |
| Quality: Your relationships with faculty members   | 5.31 | 5.48 | 0.17   |
| Quality: Your relationships with administrative personnel and offices  | 4.39 | 4.49 | 0.10   |
| Hours per 7-day week spent preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities)                                       | 3.40 | 3.98 | 0.58   |
| Hours per 7-day week spent working for pay ON CAMPUS   | 1.65 | 1.27 | -0.38  |
| Hours per 7-day week spent working for pay OFF CAMPUS  | 2.92 | 3.29 | 0.37   |
| Hours per 7-day week spent participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, social fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.) | 2.70 | 2.32 | -0.38  |
| Hours per 7-day week spent relaxing and socializing (watching TV, partying,  | 4.00 | 4.11 | 0.11   |

|   |      |      |       |
|---|------|------|-------|
| exercising, etc.)   |      |      |       |
| Hours per 7-day week spent providing care for dependents living with you (parents, children, spouse, etc.)                      | 1.36 | 1.59 | 0.23  |
| Hours per 7-day week spent commuting to class (driving, walking, etc.)  | 2.13 | 2.12 | -0.01 |
| Institutional emphasis: Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work                                      | 2.86 | 3.08 | 0.22  |
| Institutional emphasis: Providing the support you need to help you succeed academically   | 2.78 | 2.95 | 0.17  |
| Institutional emphasis: Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds    | 2.24 | 2.46 | 0.22  |
| Institutional emphasis: Helping you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)                           | 1.96 | 2.00 | 0.04  |
| Institutional emphasis: Providing the support you need to thrive socially   | 2.17 | 2.26 | 0.09  |
| Institutional emphasis: Attending campus events and activities (special speakers, cultural performances, athletic events, etc.) | 2.57 | 2.64 | 0.07  |
| Institutional emphasis: Using computers in academic work  | 3.40 | 3.46 | 0.06  |

| NESSE Survey, Item  | 2007 | 2008 | change |
|---|------|------|--------|
| Institutional contribution: Acquiring a broad general education   | 3.30 | 3.34 | 0.04   |
| Institutional contribution: Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills                          | 3.20 | 3.29 | 0.09   |
| Institutional contribution: Writing clearly and effectively   | 2.94 | 2.87 | -0.07  |
| Institutional contribution: Speaking clearly and effectively  | 2.99 | 2.94 | -0.05  |
| Institutional contribution: Thinking critically and analytically  | 3.24 | 3.25 | 0.01   |
| Institutional contribution: Analyzing quantitative problems   | 3.07 | 3.25 | 0.18   |
| Institutional contribution: Using computing and information technology                                  | 3.18 | 3.31 | 0.13   |
| Institutional contribution: Working effectively with others   | 3.22 | 3.38 | 0.16   |
| Institutional contribution: Voting in local, state, or national elections                               | 1.85 | 1.68 | -0.17  |
| Institutional contribution: Learning effectively on your own  | 2.99 | 3.02 | 0.03   |
| Institutional contribution: Understanding yourself  | 2.82 | 2.67 | -0.15  |
| Institutional contribution: Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds                 | 2.51 | 2.45 | -0.06  |
| Institutional contribution: Solving complex real-world problems   | 2.74 | 2.98 | 0.24   |
| Institutional contribution: Developing a personal code of values and ethics                             | 2.63 | 2.84 | 0.21   |
| Institutional contribution: Contributing to the welfare of your community                               | 2.16 | 2.10 | -0.06  |
| Institutional contribution: Developing a deepened sense of spirituality                                 | 1.67 | 1.62 | -0.05  |
| Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution? | 2.83 | 3.05 | 0.22   |
| How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?                          | 3.14 | 3.32 | 0.18   |
| If you could start over again, would you go to the SAME INSTITUTION you are now attending?              | 3.01 | 3.20 | 0.19   |

### Other: Internship Evaluations by Employers (2008-2009)

| <b>Work Behaviors</b>           | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Mode</b> | <b>Range</b> |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| Attendance                      | 4.8         | 5           | 4-5          |
| Attitude                        | 4.8         | 5           | 4-5          |
| Organization                    | 4.7         | 5           | 4-5          |
| Initiative                      | 4.6         | 5           | 3-5          |
|                                 |             |             |              |
| <b>Work Performance</b>         |             |             |              |
| Problem Solving                 | 4.6         | 5           | 3-5          |
| Quality of Work Performed       | 4.7         | 5           | 3-5          |
| Rate/Quantity of Work Performed | 4.7         | 5           | 2-5          |
| Quantitative Skills             | 4.5         | 5           | 4-5          |
| Communications Skills           | 4.5         | 5           | 4-5          |

Where, 5=Excellent; 4=Good, 3=Average, 2=Needs Improvement, 1=Poor; n=16 ratings

### Employer Comments (Counts) on Interns for 2008-09

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Amazing job  | Needs work with computer skills                     |
| Attention to detail (2)                                  | One of the best interns we have ever had            |
| Dependable (2)   | Organized (2)                                       |
| Did a great job  | Performed in the top 50% of employees in the region |
| Exceeded our expectations (2)                            | Problem solving skills                              |
| Excellent writing/communication skills (2)               | Rarely met someone as driven/organized              |
| Excellent research skills                                | Responsible   |
| Exceptional  | TEAM  |
| Far exceeded our expectations                            | Thorough  |
| Good worker/work ethic (3)                               | Tremendous help to our organization                 |
| Great attitude (4)                                       | Will be successful in the future                    |
| Great working relationships/incredible people skills (3) | Willing to help where needed                        |
| Joy/pleasure to work with or have around (5)             | Worked hard and when needed                         |

## BBA – Accounting

**AOL 5.1b:** Course-embedded instrument designed to measure knowledge of financial accounting (ACTG 211 Fundamentals of Financial Accounting).

| Element/question (label)             | Percent of students responding correctly |           | <i>Change</i> |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------|---------------|
|                                      | Fall 2007                                | Fall 2008 |               |
| FASB                                 | 90.5                                     | 81.4      | -9.1          |
| Accounting equation                  | 64.8                                     | 65.1      | 0.3           |
| Accounting process                   | 68.9                                     | 58.1      | -10.8         |
| Accounts receivable/sales on account | 34.1                                     | 38.2      | 4.1           |
| Accrual basis of accounting          | 59.5                                     | 48.8      | -10.6         |
| Balance sheet                        | 54.2                                     | 65.4      | 11.3          |
| Income statement                     | 59.3                                     | 66.7      | 7.4           |
| Cost of goods sold                   | 87.5                                     | 83.1      | -4.4          |
| Ending inventory                     | 48.1                                     | 52.2      | 4.1           |
| Inventory valuation                  | 54.9                                     | 60.1      | 5.2           |
| Internal control                     | 72.0                                     | 59.8      | -12.2         |
| Bank reconciliations                 | 43.2                                     | 50.8      | 7.6           |
| Full disclosure/financial statements | 72.0                                     | 66.2      | -5.8          |
| Write-off of bad debt                | 26.9                                     | 41.2      | 14.3          |
| Depreciation                         | 50.8                                     | 54.2      | 3.4           |
| Straight-line depreciation           | 84.8                                     | 67.8      | -17.1         |
| Contingent liabilities               | 68.6                                     | 72.1      | 3.5           |
| Warranty expense/liability           | 34.1                                     | 49.5      | 15.4          |
| Amortization of bond discount        | 57.2                                     | 71.8      | 14.5          |
| Premium on bond payable              | 36.0                                     | 50.8      | 14.8          |
| Stock dividends                      | 39.3                                     | 66.8      | 27.5          |
| Stockholders' equity                 | 67.8                                     | 62.5      | -5.3          |
| Accounting standards                 | 73.1                                     | 59.1      | -14.0         |
| Statement of cash flows              | 40.0                                     | 67.7      | 27.7          |
| Financial reporting                  | 51.8                                     | 60.6      | 8.8           |
| Extraordinary items                  | 54.5                                     | 51.0      | -3.5          |
| average                              | 57.5                                     | 60.4      | 3.0           |

**Outcome(s):** Faculty discussed several issues. Embedded questions selected to assess course objectives look discouraging, but the average score on any exam is usually between 60-65, 70 would be high. Should we have a different course for accounting versus non-accounting majors? Are all of the topics needed? Should we have another final evaluation? Are the objectives realistic for this course? Understanding cash flows and financial statements are necessary for finance courses and need more emphasis.

## **BBA – Economics**

**ECON 495. Behavioral Economics. Spring 2009.**

### **Course Objectives**

The students will be able to apply economic reasoning to explain everyday types of choices. They will be able to use both standard, neoclassical methods and methods developed in Behavioral Economics.

### **Method**

Each student was a member of a book club. Each group had 2-3 members and were self-selected. Each group made 4 presentations throughout the semester to the rest of the class based on an assigned group of chapters. A rubric was used describing the various categories on which the presentation would be graded. This was given to the students ahead of time. Results were shared during a meeting with each group following the presentation. The presentation for each part was graded on a scale of 1-5.

### **Results**

The average out of 5 points for each category for is reported in the table below. The grading was fairly subjective. Grading was easier for the first presentation than for later ones. Groups that performed well at the beginning tended to continue to do well; those that performed less well at the beginning tended not to rise. Thus the averages tended not to change. Students did do much better at drawing conclusions by the fourth presentation. Of the 17 students, 8 were Economics majors.

| <b>Category</b>  | <b>Presentation</b> |          |          |          |
|--|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|
|  | <b>1</b>            | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b> |
| Describe theoretical contributions - what new insights, twists to economic thinking are offered.   | 4.3                 | 3.9      | 3.8      | 4.0      |
| Methods - what types of experiments were conducted, what models were developed to test theories.   | 4.3                 | 4.3      | 4.4      | 4.3      |
| Data - what data was used, how was it collected or from where was it obtained.   | 4.3                 | 4.3      | 4.5      | 4.3      |
| Results - what were the results of any experiments, statistical analyses? Did these support the theories?  | 4.3                 | 4.2      | 4.3      | 4.2      |
| Conclusions - What do we know now we did not before? What impact might the results have on how economists work? What new directions for research are revealed? | 3.9                 | 3.8      | 3.8      | 4.3      |
| Submit a glossary of terms used in MS Word format.   | 4.8                 | 4.8      | 5.0      | 4.8      |

**ECON 305 Intermediate Macroeconomic Theory. Spring 2009.**

| <b>Learning Objective</b>                      | <b>In-class exercise</b> | <b>HW Assignment</b> | <b>Tests</b> | <b>Project</b> | <b>Final</b> | <b>List of Assessments Used</b> |
|--|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|---------------------------------|
| Introduction to the Science of Macroeconomics; | Yes                      | 0.33                 | 0.66         |                | 0.56         | ICE, HW1, TEST1, FINAL          |
| The Data of Macroeconomics                     | Yes                      | 0.33                 | 0.66         |                | 0.56         | ICE, HW1, TEST1, FINAL          |
| The Long Run:                                  |                          |                      |              |                |              |                                 |
| National Income                                | Yes                      | 0.69                 | 0.66         |                | 0.56         | ICE, HW2, TEST1, FINAL          |
| Money and Inflation                            | Yes                      | 0.69                 | 0.55         |                | 0.56         | ICE, HW2, TEST2, FINAL          |
| Unemployment                                   | Yes                      | 0.65                 | 0.71         |                | 0.56         | ICE, HW3, TEST3, FINAL          |
| Economic Growth                                | Yes                      | 0.69                 | 0.71         |                | 0.56         | ICE, HW4, TEST3, FINAL          |
| The Short Run:                                 |                          |                      |              |                |              |                                 |
| Introduction to Economic Fluctuations          | Yes                      | 0.57                 |              | 0.59           | 0.56         | ICE, HW5, TEST3, PROJECT, FINAL |
| Aggregate Demand and Aggregate Supply          | Yes                      |                      |              |                | 0.56         | FINAL                           |

| <b>ASSESMENT INSTRUMENT</b> | <b>PERFORMANCE</b> |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| HW1                         | 0.33               |
| HW2                         | 0.69               |
| HW3                         | 0.65               |
| HW4                         | 0.69               |
| HW5                         | 0.57               |
| TEST1                       | 0.66               |
| TEST2                       | 0.55               |
| TEST3                       | 0.71               |
| FINAL                       | 0.56               |
| PROJECT                     | 0.59               |

**Outcomes**

Scores indicate fraction of students scoring above 60% for HW assignments and project, and above 70% for tests and final exam.



**ECON 306: Intermediate Microeconomic Theory, Spring 2009 Assessment**

| Course objective   | Assessment and Performance |           |      |         |      |       |      |       |      |               |      |
|--|----------------------------|-----------|------|---------|------|-------|------|-------|------|---------------|------|
|  | ICEs                       | Homeworks |      | Quizzes |      | Exam1 |      | Exam2 |      | Exam3 (final) |      |
|  |                            | HW        | PR   | Quiz    | PR   | #     | PR   | #     | PR   | #             | PR   |
| Review of basic microeconomic and math concepts  | √                          |           |      |         |      |       |      |       |      |               |      |
| Discussion of supply and demand, the market mechanism, equilibrium, comparative statics, demand and supply elasticity  | √                          | RQ1       | 0.71 | Quiz1   | 0.63 | 14    | 0.50 |       |      | 26            | 0.50 |
| Consumer Theory  |                            |           |      |         |      |       |      |       |      |               |      |
| Discussion of consumer preferences, indifference curve analysis, utility functions, the budget constraint, consumer choice and utility maximization                            | √                          | RQ2       | 0.83 | Quiz2   | 0.59 | 18    |      |       |      |               |      |
| Derivation of the individual demand curve, income and substitution effects, market demand, revenue and elasticity  | √                          | RQ3       | 0.69 |         |      | 19    |      |       |      |               |      |
| Producer Theory  |                            |           |      |         |      |       |      |       |      |               |      |
| Discussion of the production function, short-run production, long-run (variable inputs) production, returns-to- scale  | √                          | RQ4       | 0.50 | Quiz3   | 0.33 |       |      | 12    | 0.50 |               |      |
| Cost types, short-run cost characteristics, long-run cost, cost-minimizing input choice, derivation of long-run cost, scale economies  | √                          | RQ5       | 0.50 |         |      |       |      | 13    |      |               |      |
| Derivation of the firm supply curve under perfect competition—perfectly competitive markets, rule-of-thumb for profit maximization, output choice in the short and long run    | √                          | RQ6       | 1.00 | Quiz4   | 0.23 |       |      | 15    |      |               |      |
| Discussion of government policy and welfare economics—measuring consumer and producer welfare, role and effects of government policies in market economics (with applications) | √                          | RQ7       | 0.67 |         |      |       |      | 10    |      |               |      |
| Discussion of imperfectly  |                            |           |      |         |      |       |      |       |      |               |      |

|  |   |      |      |       |      |  |  |  |  |    |  |
|--|---|------|------|-------|------|--|--|--|--|----|--|
| <b>competitive markets</b>   |   |      |      |       |      |  |  |  |  |    |  |
| Monopoly—characteristics, profit maximization by a monopolist, rule-of-thumb for pricing, social cost, special cases, regulation                                     | √ | RQ8  | 0.82 | Quiz5 | 0.47 |  |  |  |  | 16 |  |
| Market power, measuring market power, different types of price discrimination, other pricing schemes   | √ | RQ9  | 0.90 |       |      |  |  |  |  | 9  |  |
| Monopolistic competition and Oligopoly—characteristics, pricing, strategic behavior, Nash equilibrium, Cournot model, Bertrand model and implications for efficiency | √ | RQ10 | 0.88 |       |      |  |  |  |  | 6  |  |
| Discussion of factor/input markets—characteristics, competitive individual and market demand for labor, labor supply in a work-leisure model                         | √ |      |      |       |      |  |  |  |  | 3  |  |

*Notes:*

**ICEs**—In-class exercise—often completed in groups of 2 or 3 students and involving problem solving; followed by a discussion of solution with the whole class

**RQ**—Review Question—this is a chapter review homework often with 2 or 3 questions that require lengthy problem solving or workouts

**PR**—Performance—for homeworks and quizzes, figure shows the ratio of students with a score of 60% or above; for exams, figure shows the ratio of students with a score of 70% or above

**Quizzes**—completed in class individually, often done at the conclusion of every 2 chapters

**#**—under exams, # shows the number of questions included in the exam covering or pertaining to a particular course objective

## BBA – Finance

### Learning Goal – Improve student abilities in communication

**Measure:** Faculty used a rubric to evaluate oral presentations skills of Finance majors in terms of organization, delivery, content/knowledge and visuals for two presentations. (FINC 438 Financial Decision Making)

|                    | Spring 2009 |      |
|--------------------|-------------|------|
|                    | Score       | %    |
| Average            | 7.67        | 96%  |
| Minimum            | 6.50        | 81%  |
| Maximum            | 8.00        | 100% |
| Standard deviation | 0.36        | 4.4% |
| n                  | 46          |      |

*\*Scale: 2 = poor, 4 = needs improvement, 6 = acceptable, 8 = very good*

## BBA – Management

**Learning Goal** – Enhance collaborative endeavors and cross cultural understanding

**Measure:** Team Diagnostic – Self assessment of class assigned teams and self using a standard rubric (MGNT 421 Leadership and Motivation, spring 2009 in Roanoke)

| Category                  | Average Scores |       |
|---------------------------|----------------|-------|
|                           | Individual     | Group |
| Flexibility               | 4.27           | 4.00  |
| Collaboration             | 4.18           | 4.18  |
| Productivity & Efficiency | 3.90           | 3.90  |
| Planning                  | 4.18           | 3.72  |
| Operations Stability      | 4.18           | 3.36  |
| Communication             | 3.54           | 4.09  |
| Cohesiveness              | 3.36           | 4.09  |
| Learning/Feedback         | 4.63           | 4.27  |
| Overall                   | 4.03           | 3.95  |
| n                         | 7              | 7     |

*Scale: 1= Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree.*

**Measure:** Results of Leadership Diagnostic . . . (MGNT 421, spring 2009, in Roanoke).

| Element     | Pre-test Scores* | Post-test Scores* |
|-------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Planning    | 24.67            | 23.38             |
| Leading     | 25.89            | 26.88             |
| Organizing  | 24.11            | 25.00             |
| Controlling | 26.33            | 26.13             |
| Total       | 101.00           | 101.38            |
|             | (n=12)           | (n=9)             |

*Scores are based on a 30-point scale.*

## **BBA – Marketing**

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| UG Learning Goal: | Demonstrate analytical skills needed to solve problems and make decisions based on available information |
| Course:           | MKTG 446 – Marketing Research  |
| Faculty:          | Angela Stanton   |
| Date:             | Spring 2009  |

## **Assessment Plan**

### Assessment Assignment

- Students were provided with data from a recently conducted marketing research study and provided with a brief background narrative. The students were then asked to answer specific questions based on their review of and reflection on the data. The assignment is attached.

### Data Gathered

- The assessment was evaluated based on the following 3 criteria:
  - Ability to identify the managerial problem
  - Distinguish the key findings from the data/information provided
  - Reach a logical conclusion based on the findings

The rubric used to measure each criterion is attached. This rubric is similar to one used by others in the COBE for analytical reasoning but was modified to reflect the nature of the MKTG 446 course.

### Assessment Evaluation

- The assessment was evaluated analytically (evaluating students' levels of performance for each criterion). 80% of students should meet or exceed expectations on each of the individual criteria.

## **Results**

### What were the empirical results as compared to the standards?

- Identify the managerial problem: 14.55% exceeded expectations, 1.82% met expectations, 83.64% fell below expectations
- Distinguish the key findings: 16.36% exceeded expectations, 49.09% met expectations, 34.55% fell below expectations
- Reach logical conclusions: 14.55% exceeded expectations, 47.27% met expectations, 38.18% fell below expectations

What changes are needed to improve student learning?

- More time needs to be spent on problem identification and definition. This topic is covered very early in the semester and clearly needs to be reinforced throughout.
- While the percentage of students who fell below expectations for identifying the study's key findings and reaching logical conclusions was far less than the percentage who fell below expectations in being able to identify the managerial problem, this area can still be vastly improved. More class time needs to be spent on how to identify what is important (as opposed to what is not as important) and reaching conclusions from data – possibly additional assignments would help in this area.

When should these changes be implemented?

- Fall 2009

What changes should be made to the method(s) of assessment used?

- The assessment was conducted as part of the course final examination. The overall length of the exam may not have provided students with enough time to complete the assessment activity thoroughly with sufficient attention to detail. The length of the final may need to be reexamined in order to provide sufficient time to process the information or this activity may need to be conducted separately from the final exam.

Analytical Assessment - Marketing Research (MKTG 446) - Spring 2009

|                                   |        |        |        |
|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| <b><u>Student Counts</u></b>      |        |        |        |
| Exceeds Expectations              | 8      | 9      | 8      |
| Meets Expectations                | 1      | 27     | 26     |
| Falls Below Expectations          | 46     | 19     | 21     |
|                                   |        |        |        |
| <b><u>Student Percentages</u></b> |        |        |        |
| Exceeds Expectations              | 14.55% | 16.36% | 14.55% |
| Meets Expectations                | 1.82%  | 49.09% | 47.27% |
| Falls Below Expectations          | 83.64% | 34.55% | 38.18% |