### Program - School of Business (BSBA)

**Professional Proficiency**

- Students graduating with a degree in business administration will have acquired the necessary skills and knowledge to meet professional competencies as business professionals and global citizens.

Outcomes

- An understanding of the history and vocabulary unique to business disciplines.
- Knowledge of procedures, concepts, and technical business skills through practical application (forecasting, budgeting, financial statement analyses, business plans, strategic planning).
- The ability to read and interpret financial statements in the decision-making process.
- Effective team work and collaborative skills in a simulated business environment.

**Planned Assessment Years:**

- 2013 - 2014

**Start Date:**

- 09/01/2012

**Outcome Status:**

- Active

#### Means of Assessment & Criteria / Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Business Analysis</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Observation and Analysis

**Assessment Environment:**

The ETS Major Fields Exam was administered by faculty teaching Integrated Business Policy in the fall 2012 semester. Sample: SoB seniors in all sections of Integrated Business Policy.

**Criterion:**

The School of Business expected business administration students' mean percentile scores in the nine content areas on the ETS exam to increase or remain the same as Year 2011 national average which are as follows.

**Reporting Period:**

- 2012 - 2013

**Constituents:**

- Business Advisory Council
- Student Round Table
- Faculty of School of Business

The ETS Major Fields Test was administered by the faculty teaching Integrated Business Policy. School of Business Seniors in all sections of Integrated Business Policy (n=202)

**Assessment Area**

- Accounting
- Economics
- Management
- Quantitative Business Analysis
- Finance
- Marketing

**Reporting Period:**

- 2011 - 2012

**Constituents:**

- Business Advisory Council
- School of Business Faculty
- Student Round Table
## Outcomes

### Means of Assessment & Criteria / Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Mean Percent Correct</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>NOT MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>NOT MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Business Analysis</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Observation and Analysis

- **Observation Type:** Criteria Met
- **Reporting Period:** 2012 - 2013
- **Constituents:**
  - Business Advisory Council
  - School of Business Faculty
  - Student Round Table

### Action Plan & Follow-Up

- **02/17/2014** - We will also start a dialogue on program level assessment.
- **02/17/2014** - We would have a discussion in the department regarding comparative assessment between regular and intersession courses.
- **02/17/2014** - Add additional assessment methods, such as Student Surveys and/or Alumni Surveys, to comply with the requirements of University assessment committee.
- **02/17/2014** - The criteria is not met for this assessment method. We will use Curriculum mapping to see where coverage of the material covered in the ETS is lacking.

### 2. Assessment Method:

School of Business students complete internships at local and national businesses and organizations to obtain a meaningful work experience for the intern that includes exposure to a variety of operating functions within the organization. The employer/supervisor monitors and evaluates the intern on a regular basis and provides feedback to the student, and to the School of Business including a final written Internship evaluation of the intern's performance.

### Assessment Method Category:

Course Assessment (Direct)

### Criterion:

The School of Business revised the internship evaluation form to align the evaluation form with the SBuss learning goals in fall 2009. The employers/supervisors rated students job performance on a scale from 1 to 5, where 5 represents the highest rating for each category.

### Observation Type:

Criteria Met

### Reporting Period:

2011 - 2012

### Constituents:

- Business Advisory Council
- School of Business Faculty
- Student Round Table

The mean score under Professional Proficiency is 4.73.

### Observation Type:

Criteria Met

### Reporting Period:

2012 - 2013

### Constituents:

- Business Advisory Council
- School of Business Faculty
- Student Round Table

02/03/2014 - The mean score under Professional Proficiency is 4.73.
### Outcomes

#### Means of Assessment & Criteria / Tasks

The criterion is that School of Business students will score an average of 3.5 or better under the Professional Proficiency Category.

#### Observation and Analysis

**School of Business Faculty**

Internship evaluation forms are received for 77 students during Fall, Spring, and Summer. The mean score was 4.57 under the professional proficiency category.

**Observation Type:**

Criteria Met

**Reporting Period:**

2013 - 2014

**Constituents:**

Business Advisory Council

School of Business Faculty

Student Round Table

---

### Program - School of Business (BSBA) - Critical Thinking and Problem Solving

- Students graduating with a degree in business administration will demonstrate effective critical thinking and problem solving skills.
- Students will effectively evaluate and resolve business or other contemporary challenges using appropriate problem solving methodology demonstrating good decision-making skills and application of knowledge.
- Students will correctly apply analytical techniques to analyze and solve quantitative financial, managerial, and statistical problems.

#### Planned Assessment Years:

- 2012 - 2013
- 2014 - 2015

---

#### Assessment Method:

Faculty teaching each course agreed upon the quantitative questions for exams or other in-class activities to be used to measure students critical thinking and problem solving skills.

Multi-section courses used the same questions. A spreadsheet was developed by the assessment committee for faculty to record student responses (correct or incorrect) and to submit to the committee at the end of the spring semester.

**Assessment Method Category:**

Course Assessment (Direct)

**Criterion:**

70% of student would answer the questions correctly.

---

**Overall:** 70% of the questions were answered correctly.

**By Course level:**

- 200-level: 76% of the questions were answered correctly.
- 300-level: 62% of the questions were answered correctly.

---

**Observation Type:**

Criteria Met

**Reporting Period:**

2011 - 2012

**Constituents:**

Business Advisory Council

School of Business Faculty

Student Round Table

---

The following courses in the business core were selected by SoB faculty in the spring 2013 semester:

- ACCT 209
- ACCT 340
- ECON 201
- MGMT 351
- MRKT 330
- FIN 303

Sample: To get a representative sample from the spring 2013 student population for formative assessment purposes, 685 students in the business core courses at the 200- and 300-level participated (200-level = 221 and 300-level = 464). Method: Faculty teaching each course agreed upon the quantitative questions for exams or other in-class activities to be used to measure students critical thinking and problem solving skills. Multi-section

---

**Action Plan & Follow-Up**

02/17/2014 - Determine whether we are collecting enough information in our internship reports.

02/21/2014 - Add additional assessment methods, such as Student Surveys and/or Alumni Surveys, to comply with the requirements of University assessment committee.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Means of Assessment &amp; Criteria / Tasks</th>
<th>Observation and Analysis</th>
<th>Action Plan &amp; Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses used the same questions. A spreadsheet was developed by the assessment committee for faculty to record student responses (correct or incorrect) and to submit to the committee at the end of the spring semester. Expected Results: 70% of student would answer the questions correctly. Actual Results: Overall: 72.9% of the questions were answered correctly. By Course level: 200-level: 64.3% of the questions were answered correctly. 300-level: 77.7% of the questions were answered correctly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observation Type:**
Criteria Met

**Reporting Period:**
2013 - 2014

**Constituents:**
Business Advisory Council
Student Round Table
School of Business Faculty

The following courses in the business core were selected by School of Business Faculty in Spring 2012 Semester. ACCT 210, ACCT 340, ECON 202, ECON 219, MGMT 320.
Results: 76% of the questions were answered correctly.

**Observation Type:**
Criteria Met

**Reporting Period:**
2012 - 2013

**Constituents:**
School of Business Faculty
Business Advisory Council
Student Round Table

---

**2. Assessment Method:**
The course-embedded ETS exam is administered to all seniors in the MGMT 458 course in the fall and spring semesters to assess critical thinking and problem solving in the QBA section.

**Assessment Method Category:**
Standardized Test (Direct)

**Criterion:**
The School of Business expected business administration students' mean percentile scores in the QBA content areas on the ETS exam to increase or remain the same as Year 2011 national average which is 40.5.

The mean scores on ETS for QBA section is 42.0

**Observation Type:**
Criteria Met

**Reporting Period:**
2011 - 2012

**Constituents:**
Business Advisory Council
Student Round Table
School of business Faculty

02/03/2014 - The mean score for QBA section is 42.

**Observation Type:**
Criteria Met
Outcomes

Means of Assessment & Criteria / Tasks
Observation and Analysis
Action Plan & Follow-Up

1. Assessment Method:
The writing assessment will be conducted from Managerial Accounting class. Each paper is evaluated by the faculty in terms of writing using a writing rubric. The writing components were assessed based on four criteria including organization, focus, idea development, language, and spelling and grammar. The writing assessment is rated based on a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 represents the highest rating for each criteria.

Assessment Method Category:
Course Assessment (Direct)
Criterion:
70% of School of Business Students will score an average of 3.0 or better.

2. Assessment Method:
School of Business students complete internships at local and national businesses and organizations to obtain a meaningful work experience for the intern that includes exposure to a variety of operating functions within the organization. The employer/supervisor monitors and evaluates the intern on a regular basis and provides feedback to the student, and to the School of Business including a final

Observation Type:
Criteria Met
Reporting Period:
2012 - 2013
Constituents:
Business Advisory Council
Student Round Table
School of Business Faculty

The mean score on ETS for QBA section is 42.0

Observation Type:
Criteria Met
Reporting Period:
2013 - 2014
Constituents:
Business Advisory Council
School of Business Faculty
Student Round Table

02/17/2014 - Determine whether we are collecting enough information in our internship reports.

Program - School of Business (BSBA) - Communication - Students graduating with a degree in business administration will demonstrate competency in oral and written communication skills.

Writing: Students will create written business and professional documents in appropriate style and format.

Students will prepare in proper format and style the following documents:
An essay paper (one to two pages)
Business Memo
Term paper
Oral Communication: Students graduating with a degree in business administration will deliver an effective oral presentation on a business and/or professional topic.

02/21/2014 2:00 PM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Means of Assessment &amp; Criteria / Tasks</th>
<th>Observation and Analysis</th>
<th>Action Plan &amp; Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internship evaluation of the intern's performance.</td>
<td><strong>Assessment Method Category:</strong> Course Assessment (Direct)</td>
<td>The mean score under communication skills is 4.66.</td>
<td>02/17/2014 - Determine whether we are collecting enough information in our internship reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion:</strong> The School of Business revised the internship evaluation form to align the evaluation form with the SBus learning goals in fall 2009. The employers/supervisors rated students job performance on a scale from 1 to 5, where 5 represents the highest rating for each category. The criterion is that School of Business students will score an average of 3.5 or better under the Communication Category.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02/17/2014 - Determine whether we are collecting enough information in our internship reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observation Type:</strong> Criteria Met</td>
<td><strong>Reporting Period:</strong> 2011 - 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constituents:</strong> Business Advisory Council, Student Round Table, School of Business Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship evaluation forms are received for 77 students during Fall, Spring and Summer. The mean score was 4.49 under the Communications category.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3. Assessment Method: Faculty assess students oral presentations given in the MGMT 458 course. The presentations are recorded on DVDs by Communication majors, and they are evaluated in the next semester using the Oral communication rubric. The oral communication rubric evaluates individual students using the following criteria: Organization, Poise and Volume, Delivery, and Body Language on a scale from 1 to 4 (1 being a complete lack of skills and 4 indicating mastery of the skill). | **Assessment Method Category:** Course Assessment (Direct) | **Criterion:** 70% of students will score an average of 2.5 or better. | 02/17/2014 - Determine whether we are collecting enough information in our internship reports. |
| **Observation Type:** Criteria Met | **Reporting Period:** 2011 - 2012 | | |
| **Constituents:** Business Advisory Council, School of Business Faculty, Student Round Table | | | |
| 34 students from Integrated Business policy class were evaluated. 81% of students scored an average of 2.5 or better. | | | |

| 4. Assessment Method: Faculty assess students oral presentations given | | | |
| **Observation Type:** Criteria Met | **Reporting Period:** 2013 - 2014 | | |
| **Constituents:** School of Business Faculty, Business Advisory Council, Student Round Table | | | |
| 22 Students from Integrated Business Policy class were evaluated. 100% of students scored an average of 2.5 or better. | | | |

| **Observation Type:** Criteria Met | **Reporting Period:** 2013 - 2014 | | |
| **Constituents:** School of Business Faculty, Business Advisory Council, Student Round Table | | | |
| 22 Students from Integrated Business Policy class were evaluated. 100% of students scored an average of 2.5 or better. | | | |

34 students from Intergrated Business policy class were evaluated. 81% of students scored an average of 2.5 or better. | | | |

**Observation Type:** Criteria Met | **Reporting Period:** 2011 - 2012 | | |
<p>| <strong>Constituents:</strong> Business Advisory Council, School of Business Faculty, Student Round Table | | | |
| 22 Students from Integrated Business Policy class were evaluated. 100% of students scored an average of 2.5 or better. | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Means of Assessment &amp; Criteria / Tasks</th>
<th>Observation and Analysis</th>
<th>Action Plan &amp; Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in the MGMT 458 course. The presentations were recorded on DVDs last semester by Communication majors, and they are evaluated in the next semester using the Presentation Rubric. The presentation rubric evaluates each student using the following criteria: Organization, Subject Knowledge, Resources, and Presentation Process on a scale from 1 to 4 (1 being a complete lack of skills and 4 indicating mastery of the skill). <strong>Assessment Method Category:</strong> Course Assessment (Direct) <strong>Criterion:</strong> 70% of students will score 2.5 or better.</td>
<td><strong>Observation and Analysis</strong> average of 2.5 or better. <strong>Observation Type:</strong> Criteria Met <strong>Reporting Period:</strong> 2011 - 2012 <strong>Constituents:</strong> Business Advisory Council Student Round Table School of Business Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In Spring 2011: 61% of the students scored greater than or equal to 3.0 on the writing rubric with an average score of 3.11. <strong>Observation Type:</strong> Criteria Not Met <strong>Reporting Period:</strong> 2011 - 2012 <strong>Constituents:</strong> Business Advisory Council Student Round Table School of Business Faculty</td>
<td>Both writing and ethics assessments were conducted from a sample of students from two sections of FIN 303: Issues in Global Business Classes in a traditional classroom format in Fall 2012 and a distributed education format in Winter 2012. A total of 27 student's writing and ethics assignments were randomly chosen from both classes. Each paper was evaluated by three faculty in terms of writing and ethics using two different writing and ethics rubrics. The writing components were assessed based on four criteria including organization, focus, idea development, language, and spelling and grammar. Both writing and ethics assessments were rated based on a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 represents the highest rating for each criteria. <strong>Expected results:</strong> For spring 2011, faculty changed the expected results from 70% of School of Business students will score ≥ 2.5 for each rubric to 80% of School of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program - School of Business (BSBA) - Information Technology</td>
<td>Students will demonstrate proficiency in the use of computers and software to manage information with statistical analysis, spreadsheet, data base, and other appropriate applications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Means of Assessment &amp; Criteria / Tasks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Observation and Analysis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Action Plan &amp; Follow-Up</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>students will score greater than or equal to 3.0 for each rubric.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual Results: 48.15% of Students scored greater than or equal to 3.0. However, using the prior benchmark 70.37% of the students scored greater than or equal to 2.5 on the writing rubric.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation Type:</td>
<td>Criteria Not Met</td>
<td>Reporting Period:</td>
<td>2012 - 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituents:</td>
<td>Business Advisory Council, School of Business Faculty, Student Round Table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The mean score on Information Technology in ETS is 47.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Assessment Method:</strong></td>
<td>The course-embedded ETS exam is administered to all seniors in the MGMT 458 course in the spring semester to assess Information Technology.</td>
<td>Observation Type:</td>
<td>Criteria Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Method Category:</td>
<td>Standardized Test (Direct)</td>
<td>Reporting Period:</td>
<td>2011 - 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion:</td>
<td>The School of Business expected business administration students’ mean percentile scores in IS category on the ETS exam to increase or remain the same as Year 2011 national average for IS Category, which is 48.2.</td>
<td>Constituents:</td>
<td>Business Advisory Council, School of Business Faculty, Student Round Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The mean score on Information Technology in ETS is 49.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observation Type:</strong></td>
<td>Criteria Met</td>
<td>Reporting Period:</td>
<td>2012 - 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constituents:</strong></td>
<td>Business Advisory Council, School of Business Faculty, Student Round Table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The mean scores on the ETS for IS Category is 51.0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observation Type:</strong></td>
<td>Criteria Met</td>
<td>Reporting Period:</td>
<td>2013 - 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constituents:</strong></td>
<td>Business Advisory Council, School of Business Faculty, Student Round Table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02/17/2014 - Add additional assessment methods, such as Student Surveys and/or Alumni Surveys, to comply with the requirements of University assessment committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Means of Assessment &amp; Criteria / Tasks</td>
<td>Observation and Analysis</td>
<td>Action Plan &amp; Follow-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **1. Assessment Method:**  
School of Business students complete internships at local and national businesses and organizations to obtain a meaningful work experience for the intern that includes exposure to a variety of operating functions within the organization. The employer/ supervisor monitors and evaluates the intern on a regular basis and provides feedback to the student, and to the School of Business including a final written Internship evaluation of the intern's work.  
**Assessment Method Category:**  
Course Assessment (Direct)  
**Criterion:**  
The School of Business revised the internship evaluation form to align the evaluation form with the SBuss learning goals in fall 2009. The employers/supervisors rated students' job performance on a scale from 1 to 5, where 5 represents the highest rating for each category. The criterion is that School of Business students will score an average of 3.5 or better under the Information Technology Category.  
**Observation Type:**  
Criteria Met  
**Reporting Period:**  
2012 - 2013  
**Constituents:**  
Business Advisory Council  
Student Round Table  
School of Business Faculty  
The mean score under Information technology category is 4.74.  
**Observation Type:**  
Criteria Met  
**Reporting Period:**  
2012 - 2013  
**Constituents:**  
Business Advisory Council  
Student Round Table  
School of Business Faculty  
The mean score under Information technology category is 4.84.  
**Observation Type:**  
Criteria Met  
**Reporting Period:**  
2011 - 2012  
**Constituents:**  
Business Advisory Council  
Student Round Table  
School of Business Faculty  
Internship evaluation forms are received for 77 students during Fall, Spring and Summer. The mean score was 4.52 under the information technology category.  
**Observation Type:**  
Criteria Met  
**Reporting Period:**  
2013 - 2014  
**Constituents:**  
Business Advisory Council  
School of Business Faculty  
Student Round Table  
02/17/2014 - Determine whether we are collecting enough information in our internship reports. |

| Program - School of Business (BSBA) - Ethics -  
Students graduating with a degree in business administration will demonstrate an understanding of the legal environment and ethical standards of business and an awareness of the implications of their behavior and actions as a business professional. Students will apply an appropriate framework for examining ethical dilemmas and be able to (1) identify ethical issues and stakeholders, (2) evaluate alternative strategies and ethical perspectives, (3) determine a recommended course of action, and (4) communicate the findings to stakeholders.  
**Assessment Method:**  
School of Business students complete internships at local and national businesses and organizations to obtain a meaningful work experience for the intern that includes exposure to a variety of operating functions within the organization. The employer/supervisor monitors and evaluates the intern on a regular basis and provides feedback to the student, and to the School of Business including a final written Internship evaluation of the intern's work.  
**Observation Type:**  
Criteria Met  
**Reporting Period:**  
2012 - 2013  
**Constituents:**  
Business Advisory Council  
Student Round Table  
The mean score under Ethics category is 4.76.  
**Observation Type:**  
Criteria Met  
**Reporting Period:**  
2012 - 2013  
**Constituents:**  
Business Advisory Council  
Student Round Table  
The mean score under Ethics category is 4.76.  
**Observation Type:**  
Criteria Met  
**Reporting Period:**  
2012 - 2013  
**Constituents:**  
Business Advisory Council  
Student Round Table  
The mean score under Ethics category is 4.76.  
**Observation Type:**  
Criteria Met  
**Reporting Period:**  
2012 - 2013  
**Constituents:**  
Business Advisory Council  
Student Round Table  
The mean score under Ethics category is 4.76.  
**Observation Type:**  
Criteria Met  
**Reporting Period:**  
2012 - 2013  
**Constituents:**  
Business Advisory Council  
Student Round Table  
The mean score under Ethics category is 4.76. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Means of Assessment &amp; Criteria / Tasks</th>
<th>Observation and Analysis</th>
<th>Action Plan &amp; Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>School of Business including a final written Internship evaluation of the intern's performance. <strong>Assessment Method Category:</strong> Course Assessment (Direct) <strong>Criterion:</strong> The School of Business revised the internship evaluation form to align the evaluation form with the SBuss learning goals in fall 2009. The employers/supervisors rated students job performance on a scale from 1 to 5, where 5 represents the highest rating for each category. The criterion is that School of Business students will score an average of 3.5 or better under the Ethics Category.</td>
<td>School of Business Faculty The mean score under Ethics category is 4.95. <strong>Observation Type:</strong> Criteria Met <strong>Reporting Period:</strong> 2011 - 2012 <strong>Constituents:</strong> School of Business Faculty Business Advisory Council Student Round Table</td>
<td>Internship evaluation forms are received for 77 students during Fall, Spring and Summer. The mean score was 4.76 under Ethics category. <strong>Observation Type:</strong> Criteria Met <strong>Reporting Period:</strong> 2013 - 2014 <strong>Constituents:</strong> Business Advisory Council School of Business Faculty Student Round Table</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Assessment Method:** The ethics assessment will be conducted from a sample of students in FIN 303: Issues in Global Business Classes. Each paper was evaluated by a faculty in terms of ethics using ethics rubric. The ethics component includes ability to identify ethical issues, ability to identify stakeholders, ability to evaluate alternatives, and ability to formulate action plan. The ethics assessment is rated based on a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 represents the highest rating for each criteria. **Assessment Method Category:** Course Assessment (Direct) **Criterion:** 80% of School of Business Students will score an average of 3.0 or better. | Both writing and ethics assessments were conducted from a sample of students from two sections of FIN 303: Issues in Global Business Classes in a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Means of Assessment &amp; Criteria / Tasks</th>
<th>Observation and Analysis</th>
<th>Action Plan &amp; Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>traditional classroom format in Fall 2012 and a distributed education format in Winter 2012. A total of 27 student's writing and ethics assignments were randomly chosen from both classes. Each paper was evaluated by three faculty in terms of writing and ethics using two different writing and ethics rubrics. The ethics components include ability to identify ethical issues, ability to identify stakeholders, ability to evaluate alternatives, and ability to formulate action plan. Both writing and ethics assessments were rated based on a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 represents the highest rating for each criteria.</td>
<td>Expected results: For spring 2011, faculty changed the expected results from 70% of School of Business students will score greater than or equal to 2.5 for each rubric to 80% of School of Business students will score greater than or equal to 3.0 for each rubric. Actual Results: 51.85% of Students scored greater than or equal to 3.0. However, using the prior benchmark 74.07% of the students scored greater than or equal to 2.5 on the writing rubric.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Observation Type:</strong></td>
<td>Criteria Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting Period:</td>
<td>2012 - 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>