

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

Business Administration, BS

Division: School of Business, College of Business and Technology

Prepared by: Dr. Weiwen Liao

Date: July 7, 2023

Approved by: Dr. Mary Edith Stacy

Date: July 17, 2023

Northwestern Mission. Northwestern State University is a responsive, student-oriented institution committed to acquiring, creating, and disseminating knowledge through innovative teaching, research, and service. With its certificate, undergraduate, and graduate programs, Northwestern State University prepares its increasingly diverse student population to contribute to an inclusive global community with a steadfast dedication to improving our region, state, and nation.

College of Business and Technology Mission. The College of Business and Technology is dedicated to providing a high quality – market responsive business and technology education, preparing our diverse student population for successful careers and enriched lives in the public, private and nonprofit sectors, and enhancing our students' academic experiences through our research and scholarly activities.

School of Business Mission. The mission of the School of Business is to provide our diverse student population with innovative skills in business and technology to prepare them for successful careers and responsible citizenship roles to have a positive societal impact in the world of business. (Adopted 2017-2018 – mission wording was revised to include “our diverse population”; Adopted 2020-2021 – mission wording was revised to reflect societal impact)

Business Administration Program Mission Statement: The mission of the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration in the School of Business at Northwestern State is to prepare our diverse student population for careers as business professionals in public, private and nonprofit sectors, and/or for advancement into graduate programs. This purpose will be met by providing quality online and face-to-face business and technology instruction and academic support with high academic standards, superior teaching, quality research, significant service, and effective use of technology for the citizens of our region.

Purpose: To prepare students for careers as business professionals in the public, private and nonprofit sectors, and/or for advancement into graduate programs.

Methodology: The assessment process for the School of Business includes:

(1) The School of Business and Technology alternates the assessment of its SLO yearly. SLO's 1-4, which are shared among the programs is assessed during one assessment cycle. SLO 5, which is unique to each program is assessed during another assessment cycle. This approach allows for a complete program assessment every two years.

(2) A variety of assessment tools (quantitative, qualitative, direct and indirect) are used to collect data for analysis for each of the five Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

- (3) Data is collected and returned to the SLO Chairs.
- (4) Summary results are analyzed to determine if students have achieved or “met” the measurable outcomes. When necessary, proposed action steps are created by each SLO chairman in collaboration with the SLO committee members, faculty teaching core courses, and the program coordinator.
- (5) Following discussion and review by appropriate faculty, if needed, proposed recommended action steps, and recommended changes are implemented by the faculty responsible for teaching the courses tied to the SLO.
- (6) Individual meetings are held with faculty and staff as required (show cause).
- (7) In consultation with the staff and senior leadership, proposed changes to measurable outcomes, assessment tools for the next assessment period and, where needed, service changes will be recommended.
- (8) These proposed recommended action steps and recommended changes are implemented by the faculty responsible for teaching the courses tied to the SLO.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs):

Note: The School of Business measures SLO1 to SLO4 every other year so in AC 2022- 2023, SLO 5 was not measured. The SLO 5 results and analysis in this report are based on the AC 2021-2022 report. **SLO 1 to SLO 4 were measured during AC 2022-2023.**

SLO 1. Effective Communicators. Students should be able to:

Objective 1a: Produce professional quality business documents, (Only need

Objective 1b: Deliver professional quality oral presentations; and,

Objective 1c: Demonstrate communication skills in team settings.

Course Map:	Tied to course syllabus objectives.
BUAD 2200	Business Reports and Communication (Foundational Course)
MGT 4300	Strategic Management and Policies (Capstone Course)
MKTG 3230	Principles of Marketing (Foundational Course)

Measure 1a.1 (Direct – Exam; BUAD 2200 Objective Measures)

Details/Description: In BUAD 2200, a pre-test and post-test that includes an objective exam and a written emailed letter was developed to provide a comprehensive overview of the business communication requirements and contained such topics as: (1) Laying communication foundations, (2) Using the writing process, (3) Corresponding at work, (4) Reporting workplace data, and (5) Developing speaking and technology skills. This same test is given as a post-test at the end of the semester. Seventy five percent of the final score is from the objective part of the exam and twenty five percent is from the written document. The results of the two parts are totaled for a final post-test score. These scores are used to

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

evaluate the students' written communication skills. The scores are provided below.

Acceptable Target: At least 75% of the students must earn 70% or better on the posttest which included a written letter assignment.

Ideal Target: At least 85% of the students must earn 70% or better on the post-test which included a written letter assignment.

Implementation Plan (timeline): This measurement is completed each semester in BUAD 2200. The data would only be reported every other academic year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: School of Business faculty teaching BUAD 2200 are responsible for this measurement.

Finding: The acceptable target was **not** met.

Analysis: The table below shows the results for the 2020-2021 and 2022-2023 assessment cycles for Measure 1a.1. The acceptable target was not met in AC 2020-2021 and was not met in AC 2022-2023. While the table shows a 11% drop in the percentage of students earning a 70% or better on the post-test, this comparison is not a valid comparison as the 2020-2021 numbers included all students in BUAD 2200 while the 2022-2023 numbers included only the BUAD students.

Table 1: AC 2020-2021 through AC 2020-2021 Results

Measure 1a.1				
Academic Year	n (# of students)	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target	Actual Results
2020-2021 (All Students)	195	75%	85%	66%
2022-2023 (BUAD Only)	87	75%	85%	55%
Percentages indicate the percent of students scoring 70% or better on the measure.				

*SLOs 1-4 are measured every other assessment cycle

Data was not reported for the AC 2021-2022 as it was decided that data for this SLO would only be reported every two years.

AC 2020-2021: The acceptable target was not met. 195 students were given the BUAD 2200 objective measure (post-test). Of these students, 66% scored 70% or better on the post-test.

The number of students not participating in the pre-test post-test exams was larger in AC 2020-2021 than in past semesters. A total of 237 students were graded for the BUAD 2200 courses. Eighty-two percent (n=195) students took the final exam during AC 2020-2021; 18% (n=42) did not complete the final exam/post-test.

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

Based on the analysis of the AC 2020-2021 results, the faculty implemented the following changes in AC 2021-2022 and AC 2022-2023 to drive the cycle of improvement:

The instructors of the course attempted to lower the number of students not participating in the pre-test, post-test exams as the 18% non-participation rate was higher than the 10% range from past years. The instructors delivered information to the students at the beginning of each semester about the expectations for the students. Students were asked to indicate their understanding of the requirements for the course.

The instructors of the Business Communications course continued to meet regularly to examine scoring and grading issues and to review any issues with attendance and participation. Examples of short instructional videos were added to the course. Short chapter quizzes were offered after each chapter.

The faculty provided an additional comprehensive overview of the business communication requirements in both the face-to-face and online courses. To continue the strengthening of the course topics and assessment, the instructors collaborated to insure course consistency. Also, all students were directed to the Bossier Parish Community College-Open Campus (free online non-credit courses) to aid instruction in the grammar mechanics area.

Faculty members teaching BUAD 2200 continued to utilize a variety of pedagogical methods to assist students. Best practices included professors continuing to embed model examples of various business report documents into the course and voice-narrated videos. These videos provided step by step project/assignment directions for use by students.

These changes were an attempt to improve the student's ability to understand the communication process and therefore, become a better communicator.

AC 2022-2023: As a result of these changes, the acceptable target was not met. However, due to a change in the measurement, a direct comparison between AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 is not advisable. The AC 2020-2021 numbers included all students in BUAD2200 while the 2022-2023 numbers included only the BUAD students. While Accounting, Business Administration, and Computer Information Systems have shared the first four student learning outcome goals for many years, this change allows the faculty in each discipline to better analyze the results for their students and make changes to their degree plan which will then be reflected in their students' results.

In AC 2022-2023, 87 BUAD students were given the BUAD 2200 objective measure (post-test). Of these students, 62% scored 70% or better on the post-test.

Decision:

In 2022-2023, the target was not met. Based on the analysis of the AC 2022-2023 results, corrective action will be taken in AC 2023-2024. The faculty will implement the following changes in 2023-2024 to drive the cycle of improvement:

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

A larger discussion of reimagining the student learning outcomes and the Business Administration degree plan occurred in the AC 2022-2023 cycle. Additionally, a statewide discussion regarding transferability amongst all four-year and two-year institutions also occurred in the AC 2022-2023 cycle. As part of these discussions, the faculty planned to likely revise the curriculum to include COMM1010 – Oral Communication in addition to BUAD2200 – Business Reports and Communication.

In August 2023, the faculty will officially vote on this change. If approved, the change will then go to the university Curriculum Review Committee for consideration. If approved by that committee and signed off by the provost and president, the change would then become effective in the AC 2024-2025. While this change will not impact the results in AC 2023-2024, it could potentially start to affect the results in AC 2024 - 2025.

Measure 1a.2 (Direct – Student Artifact; MGT 4300 Written Document)

Details/Description: In MGT 4300, students are required to create a business letter addressing a business problem and deliver the letter as an attachment.

Acceptable Target: At least 75% of the students must earn 70% or better on the final business document.

Ideal Target: At least 85% of the students must earn 70% or better on the final business document.

Implementation Plan (timeline): This measure should be completed each semester as part of the School of Business Common Body Knowledge Exam (SoBUSKE).

Key/Responsible Personnel: The School of Business faculty teaching MGT 4300 are responsible for completing this measurement.

Finding: The idea target for AC 2022-2023 was met.

Analysis: The table below demonstrates the results of the findings for AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 for Measure 1a.2.

Table 2: AC 2020-2021 through AC 2022-2023 Results

Measure 1a.2				
Academic Year	n (# of students)	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target	Actual Results
2020-2021 (All Majors)	15	75%	85%	80%
2022-2023 (BUAD Only)	17	75%	85%	89%
Percentages indicate the percent of students scoring 70% or better on the measure.				

*SLOs 1-4 are measured every other assessment cycle.

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

Data was not reported for the AC 2021-2022 as it was decided that data for this SLO would only be reported every two years.

AC 2020-2021: The acceptable target was met. The ideal target was not met. During the Fall 2020 semester only 11 students from the MGT 4300 course returned the letter assessment as directed on the exam. Of those 11, 9 scored a 75% or above on the measurement. During the Spring 2021, 4 students from the CIS 4600 section completed the letter assessment as requested on the exam. Three of the four students that submitted the letter assessment scored over the acceptable 75% target (75% met the target). When both semesters are combined, the yearly target score is met. Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 results yield the following: a total of 15 students (n=15) submitted the letter assessment. Out of those 15 students, 12 scored 75% or higher for a total of 80% of the students meeting the acceptable target.

Based on the analysis of the AC 2020-2021 data, the following changes were made to drive the cycle of improvements in AC 2021-2022 and AC 2022-2023:

The faculty assigned this measure to the students earlier during the semester and separate it from the SoBUSKE to increase the participation on the letter assessment compared to the full SoBUSKE. The faculty teaching the MGT 4300 utilized peer learning and peer assessments to allow students to recognize different quality levels of writing in other students in such a way that it also helps them to improve their own writing. The faculty members also continued to urge students in their classes to submit the letter. Review materials for block-style letters and management content were added to the MGT 4300 class and students used the format for the letters.

AC 2022-2023: As a result of the above changes, the ideal target was met. However, due to a change in the measurement, a direct comparison between AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 is not advisable. The AC 2020-2021 numbers included all students who submitted a letter while the 2022-2023 numbers included only the BUAD students. While Accounting, Business Administration, and Computer Information Systems have shared the first four student learning outcome goals for many years, this change allows the faculty in each discipline to better analyze the results for their students and make changes to their degree plan which will then be reflected in their students' results.

During the Fall 2022 semester, 10 of 11 students completed the assessment and scored over the acceptable 75% target. In Spring 2023, 7 of 11 students from the MGT 4300 section completed the letter assessment as requested on the SOB Knowledge Exam. Six of the 7 students that submitted the letter assessment scored over the acceptable 75% target. Finally, combined results for the full AC 22-23 do show a positive outcome. When both semesters are combined, the yearly target score is met. Fall 2022 and Spring 2023 results yield the following: a total of 17 students (n=17) submitted the letter assessment. Out of those 17 students, 16 scored 75% or higher for a Fall 22 – Spring 23 total of 90% of the students meeting the acceptable target.

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

While the table shows a 9% increase in the percentage of students earning a 70% or better on the final business document, this comparison is not a valid comparison as the 2020-2021 numbers included all students while the 2022-2023 numbers included only the BUAD students.

Decision:

In AC 2022-2023 the acceptable target and the ideal target were met. Based on the analysis of the AC 2022-2023 results, the faculty will implement the following change in AC 2023-2024 to drive the cycle of improvement:

The faculty will add a practice assignment earlier in the year for the students to further enhance their success. The instructor attributes all the practice in earlier classes to the success of the students in the capstone class.

The change should help improve the participation rate on this measurement and help to improve the student's ability to successfully write a business letter and email. Changes to our instruction are designed to help students communicate in increasingly varied business environments as well as push the cycle of improvement forward.

Measure 1a.3 (Direct – Student Artifact; UNIV1000 Written Document)

This Measure has been removed by faculty vote.

Details/Description: In UNIV1000 (The University Experience), students are required to create a business letter addressing a business problem and deliver the letter as an email attachment.

Acceptable Target: At least 75% of the students must earn 70% or better on the final business document.

Ideal Target: At least 85% of the students must earn 70% or better on the final business document.

Implementation Plan (timeline): This written document is part of the SoBUSKE and will be given each semester.

Key/Responsible Personnel: School of Business Faculty Teaching UNIV1000 School of Business Freshman Interest Group (FIG).

Findings: The target was not measured.

Analysis: The table below shows the results of the findings for 2020-2021 for Measure 1a.3.

Table 3: AC 2020-2021 Results

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

Measure 1a.3				
Academic Year	n (# of students)	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target	Actual Results
2020-2021	52	75%	85%	0%
Percentages indicate the percent of students scoring 70% or better on the measure.				

*SLOs 1-4 are measured every other assessment cycle.

Data was not reported for the AC 2021-2022 as it was decided that data for this SLO would only be reported every two years.

In AC 2020-2021, the target was not met. Fifty-two students were enrolled in UNIV 1000 during the fall 2020 semester. These students were given the SoBUSKE exam; however, the instructor did not give the written letter assignment portion of the exam. Therefore, there was no data available for this measure and the resulting statistic is 0% passing. This course was not offered during the Spring semester. The acceptable and the ideal targets were not measurable because the data was not captured for AC 2020-21.

Based on the analysis of the AC 2020-2021 results as well as previous year results, the School of Business faculty determined that this measurement was not giving any useful information. The School of Business faculty determined this measurement would not be included in UNIV1000 any longer.

As a result of these changes, in AC 2022-2023, the target was not measured.

Decision:

In AC 2022-2023, the target was not measured. Based on the previous analysis of past year's results, the faculty will discontinue the use of this measurement going forward.

Measure 1a.4 (Direct – Student Artifact; BUAD 2200 Written Document)

Details/Description: In BUAD 2200 students are required to create a business letter addressing a business problem and deliver the letter as an email attachment.

Acceptable Target: At least 75% of the students must earn 70% or better on the final business document.

Ideal Target: At least 85% of the students must earn 70% or better on the final business document.

Implementation Plan (timeline): This assignment is given in BUAD 2200 each semester as part of the final exam.

Key/Responsible Personnel: The School of Business faculty teaching BUAD 2200 are responsible for this measure.

Findings: The acceptable target was not met. The Ideal target was not met.

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

Analysis: The table below shows the results for the 2020-2021 and 2022-2023 assessment cycles for Measure 1.a.4.

Table 4: AC 2020-2021 through AC 2022-2023 Results

Measure 1a.4				
Academic Year	n (# of students)	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target	Actual Results
2020-2021 (All Students)	180	75%	85%	68%
2022-2023 (BUAD Only)	86	75%	85%	57%
Percentages indicate the percent of students scoring 70% or better on the measure.				

*SLOs 1-4 are measured every other assessment cycle.

Data was not reported for the AC 2021-2022 as it was decided that data for this SLO would only be reported every two years.

AC 2020-2021: The acceptable target was not met. 180 of 237 enrolled students (76%) completed the BUAD 2200 written document measure during the BUAD 2200 (Business Reports and Communications) final exam. Twenty-four percent (n=57) of the enrolled students either did not take the final exam at all or chose not to complete the final letter assignment. It was found that only 68% of the students who completed the assessment (n=82), scored 70% or better on the written letter.

Based on the analysis of the AC 2020-2021 results, changes were made in AC2021-2022 and AC 2022-2023 to drive the cycle of improvements. The BUAD2200 faculty delivered more information about writing sales letters. The rubric for the assignment was discussed more thoroughly with the students before the assignment and an additional writing assignment was added. The instructors provided more opportunities for students to have one-on-one feedback on preliminary written documents prior to the final written document assignment.

AC 2022-2023: As a result of the above changes, the acceptable target was not met. However, due to a change in the measurement, a direct comparison between AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 is not advisable. The AC 2020-2021 numbers included all students who submitted a letter while the 2022-2023 numbers included only the BUAD students. While Accounting, Business Administration, and Computer Information Systems have shared the first four student learning outcome goals for many years, this change allows the faculty in each discipline to better analyze the results for their students and make changes to their degree plan which will then be reflected in their students' results.

In AC 2022-2023, 86 students submitted the business letter. Of these students, 57% scored 70% or better on the post-test. While the table shows a 11% decrease in the percentage of students earning a 70% or better on the business letter, this comparison is not a valid comparison as the 2020-2021 numbers included all students writing the letter while the 2022-2023 numbers included only the BUAD students writing the letter.

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

Decision:

In 2022-2023, the acceptable target was not met. Based on the analysis of the AC 2022-2023 results, corrective action will be taken in AC 2023-2024. The faculty will implement the following changes in 2023-2024 to drive the cycle of improvement:

A larger discussion of reimagining the student learning outcomes and the Business Administration degree plan occurred in the AC 2022-2023 cycle. Additionally, a statewide discussion regarding transferability amongst all four-year and two-year institutions also occurred in the AC 2022-2023 cycle. As part of these discussions, the faculty planned to likely revise the curriculum to include COMM1010 – Oral Communication in addition to BUAD2200 – Business Reports and Communication.

In August 2023, the faculty will officially vote on this change. If approved, the change will then go to the university Curriculum Review Committee for consideration. If approved by that committee and signed off by the provost and president, the change would then become effective in the AC 2024-2025. While this change will not impact the results in AC 2023-2024, it could potentially start to affect the results in AC 2024 - 2025.

Measure 1b (Direct – Student Artifact; BUAD 2200 Oral Presentation)

Details/Description: In BUAD 2200 (Business Reports and Communication), students are required to develop and deliver a 20 minute presentation about conducting business in a foreign country. This presentation is graded with a rubric shared with all students and the professors. Scores of all the raters are compared to provided a final grade.

Acceptable Target: : On the final class presentation, a minimum of 90% of students will score at least acceptable (70%).

Ideal Target: On the final class presentation, a minimum of 95% of students will score at least acceptable (70%).

Implementation Plan (timeline): This measurement is completed each semester in BUAD2200.

Key/Responsible Personnel: School of Business Faculty teaching BUAD 2200 are responsible for this measurement.

Findings: The ideal target was met.

Analysis: The table below presents the AC 2020-2021 and the AC 2022-2023 results for Measure 1b.

Table 4: AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 Results

Measure 1b				
Academic Year	n (# of students)	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target	Actual Results

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

2020-2021 (All Students)	184	90%	95%	94%
2021-2022 (BUAD Only)	81	90%	95%	97%
Percentages indicate the percent of students scoring 70% or better on the measure.				

*SLOs 1-4 are measured every other assessment cycle.

Data was not reported for the AC 2021-2022 as it was decided that data for this SLO would only be reported every two years.

AC 2020-2021: The acceptable target was met, and the ideal target was not met. 94% of the students (n=173) scored 70% or better on the final presentation. This rate was a slight (1%) decline over the results from AC 2018-2019. Unfortunately, 22% (n=64) of the enrolled students either did not complete the course or chose not to participate in the presentation environment. Those students received a zero on the assignment but were removed from the data analysis.

Based on the analysis of the 2020-2021 results, the faculty made the following changes in AC 2021-2022 and AC 2022-2023. The BUAD2200 instructors delivered information to the students about the expectations of the students. Students were asked to indicate their understanding that the final presentation was a mandatory requirement for the course. The faculty utilized the steward mentoring program and used best practices such as embedding additional examples of various business presentation documents into the course and voice-narrated videos.

AC 2022-2023: As a result of the above changes, the ideal target was met. However, due to a change in the measurement, a direct comparison between AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 is not advisable. The AC 2020-2021 numbers included all students who completed the oral presentation while the 2022-2023 numbers included only the BUAD students. While Accounting, Business Administration, and Computer Information Systems have shared the first four student learning outcome goals for many years, this change allows the faculty in each discipline to better analyze the results for their students and make changes to their degree plan which will then be reflected in their students' results.

In AC 2022-2023, 81 students completed the oral presentation. Of these students, 97% scored a 70% or higher. While the table shows a 3% increase in the percentage of students earning a 70% or better on the final class presentation, this comparison is not a valid comparison as the 2020-2021 numbers included all students writing the letter while the 2022-2023 numbers included only the BUAD students writing the letter.

Decision:

In 2022-2023, the acceptable target was not met. Based on the analysis of the AC 2022-2023 results, corrective action will be taken in AC 2023-2024. The faculty will implement the following changes in 2023-2024 to drive the cycle of improvement:

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

A larger discussion of reimagining the student learning outcomes and the Business Administration degree plan occurred in the AC 2022-2023 cycle. Additionally, a statewide discussion regarding transferability amongst all four-year and two-year institutions also occurred in the AC 2022-2023 cycle. As part of these discussions, the faculty planned to likely revise the curriculum to include COMM1010 – Oral Communication in addition to BUAD2200 – Business Reports and Communication.

In August 2023, the faculty will officially vote on this change. If approved, the change will then go to the university Curriculum Review Committee for consideration. If approved by that committee and signed off by the provost and president, the change would then become effective in the AC 2024-2025. While this change will not impact the results in AC 2023-2024, it could potentially start to affect the results in AC 2024 - 2025.

Measure 1c (Direct – Student Artifact; MKTG 3230 Team Presentation)

Details/Description: In MKTG 3230, students are divided into small groups (3 to 4 students) and are required to develop a marketing plan for a new product. In addition to developing a written report, the groups are required to orally present their reports. The presentations were evaluated as Exemplary, Good, Satisfactory, or Unacceptable.

Acceptable Target: At least 75% of the groups will earn an Exemplary or Good score on at least three of the four areas of the grading rubric.

Ideal Target: At least 85% of the groups will earn an Exemplary or Good score on at least three of the four areas of the grading rubric.

Implementation Plan (timeline): This measurement is completed each semester in MKTG 3230.

Key/Responsible Personnel: School of Business Faculty teaching MKTG 3230 are responsible for this measurement.

Findings: The acceptable target was met. The ideal target was not met.

Analysis: The table below shows the results for the 2020-2021 and 2022-2023 assessment cycles for Measure 1c.

Table 5: AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 Results

Measure 1c				
Academic Year*	n	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target	Actual Results**
2020-2021 (All Students)	16 (# of student teams)	75%	85%	94%
2022-2023 (BUAD Only)	70 (# of students)	75%	85%	84%

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

*SLOs 1-4 are measured every other assessment cycle.

**Percentages indicate the percent of students scoring 70% or better on the measure.

Data was not reported for the AC 2021-2022 as it was decided that data for this SLO would only be reported every two years.

AC 2020-2021: In AC 2020-2021, the acceptable target was met, and the ideal target was met. In Fall 2020, 10 out of 11 groups (90.9%) groups earned an Exemplary or Good score on at least three of the four areas of the grading rubric. In Spring 2021, 5 out of 5 groups (100%) made groups earned an Exemplary or Good score on at least three of the four areas of the grading rubric.

Overall, in AC 2020-2021, 15 out of 16 groups (93.75%) earned an Exemplary or Good score on at least three of the four areas of the grading rubric. The ideal target was met. Based on the analysis of the 2020-2021 results, the faculty made the following changes in AC 2021-2022 and AC 2022-2023. The MKTG3230 instructor included more one-on-one attention to students through emails, phone calls, and video chats encouraging students to participate in the presentation. The instructor developed a series of example video presentations to allow students to view and critique a presentation in the context of a class discussion. The instructor also emphasized the need for students to practice several times before they presented.

AC 2022-2023: As a result of these changes, in AC 2022-2023, the acceptable target was met, and the ideal target was not met. However, due to a change in the measurement, a direct comparison between AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 is not advisable. The AC 2020-2021 numbers included all teams who completed the marketing plans while the 2022-2023 numbers included only the BUAD students. While Accounting, Business Administration, and Computer Information Systems have shared the first four student learning outcome goals for many years, this change allows the faculty in each discipline to better analyze the results for their students and make changes to their degree plan which will then be reflected in their students' results.

10 of the 70 BUAD students did not participate in the group presentation, which brought the 2022-2023 BUAD major average down to 84% scoring better than a 70% on the presentation. While the table shows a 10% decrease in the percentage of students earning an exemplary or good score on at least three of the four areas of the grading rubric, this comparison is not a valid comparison as the 2020-2021 numbers included all teams completing the marketing plan while the 2022-2023 numbers included only the BUAD students completing the marketing plan.

Decision:

In AC 2022-2023 the acceptable target was met, and the ideal target was not met. Based on the analysis of the AC 2022-2023 results, the faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2023-2024 to drive the cycle of improvement.

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

Thus, the faculty member teaching the MKTG 3230 class will strengthen their efforts to ensure participation in the group presentation. The faculty member will utilize one-on-one contact to ensure students participate in the group presentation. Additionally, as students start taking COMM1010 and get to the MKTG3230 class, their oral presentation skillset will be enhanced and make them more likely to participate.

These changes will improve the faculty's ability to truly judge and improve the students' ability to demonstrate communication skills in team settings.

SLO 2. Integration of Knowledge across Business Disciplines. Students should be able to: **Demonstrate understanding of key concepts and theories in various functional areas of business.**

Course Map: Tied to course syllabus objectives.

BUAD 2120 Basic Business Statistics (Foundational Course)
CIS 4600 Advanced Systems Development (Capstone Course)
FIN 2150 Personal Finance (Foundational Course)
MGT 4300 Strategic Management and Policies (Capstone Course)
MKTG 3230 Principles of Marketing (Foundational Course)
UNIV 1000 The University Experience (Supporting Course)

A note on the School of Business Knowledge Exam (SoBUSKE):

Data for SLO2 measures 1a.2, 1a.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 4.3 are usually gathered through the NSU School of Business Knowledge Exam (SoBUSKE). This exam was administered for over ten years. However, as part of our plan at the end of AC 2016 - 2017, the exam was only partially administered in AC 2017-2018. During the 2017- 2018 academic cycle, an updated SoBUSKE was developed and implemented in Spring 2019. The results from the first official implementation of the test were in spring 2019.

SLO 2. Integration of Knowledge across Business Disciplines. Students should be able to: **Demonstrate understanding of key concepts and theories in various functional areas of business.**

Course Map: Tied to course syllabus objectives.

BUAD 2120 Basic Business Statistics (Foundational Course)
FIN 2150 Personal Finance (Foundational Course)
FIN 3090 Business Finance
MGT 4300 Strategic Management and Policies (Capstone Course)
MKTG 3230 Principles of Marketing (Foundational Course)

A note on the School of Business Knowledge Exam (SoBUSKE):

Data for SLO2 measures 1a.2, 1a.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 4.3 are usually gathered through the NSU School of Business Knowledge Exam (SoBUSKE). An updated SoBUSKE was developed and

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

implemented in Spring 2019. The results from the first official implementation of the test were in spring 2019.

Measure: 2.1. (Direct – Exam; Partial School of Business Knowledge Exam)

Details/Description: Portions of the School of Business Knowledge Exam (SoBUSKE) are given in the following classes: BUAD 2120 (Basic Business Statistics), FIN 2150 (Personal Finance), and MKTG 3230 (Principles of Marketing). These classes provide intermediate measurements for specific components of the School of Business Knowledge Exam.

Note: In accordance with the school of business' assessment plan, the SoBUSKE is given every other year. Therefore, testing data from AC 2019-2020 is typically the same data as from the 2018-2019 assessment cycle.

Acceptable Target: At least 75% of students will score higher than the ETS average in the knowledge area.

Ideal Target: At least 85% of students will score higher than the ETS average in the knowledge area.

Implementation Plan (timeline): These partial School of Business Knowledge Exams are given each semester the class is offered.

Key/Responsible Personnel: School of Business faculty teaching these courses are responsible for the measurement.

Findings: The ideal target was met.

Analysis: The national Education Testing Systems (ETS) Major Field Test (MFT) was taken in the spring of 2019 to be used as a national baseline norm over the course of the next 5 years examining the students' comprehensive knowledge of materials over each school of business content area. Additionally, every other year students are given the SoBUSKE, our internal exam, focusing on the specific discipline areas. We compare these results against corresponding discipline areas of the nationally normed ETS MFT in business.

The results of the 2019 Spring ETS exam and the SoBUSKE (AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023) are summarized in the table below. While the table shows an increase or a maintenance of the percentage of students scoring higher than the ETS mean, this comparison is not a valid comparison as the 2020-2021 numbers included all students completing the partial School of Business Knowledge exam while the 2022-2023 numbers included only the BUAD students completing the partial School of Business Knowledge exam.

Table 7: SLO 2 Summary

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

Subject	2019 ETS Mean % Correct (n=13)	AC 2020-2021 SoBUSKE Mean % Correct (All majors)	AC 2020-2021 Acceptable Target Met? (All majors)	AC 2022-2023 SoBUSKE Mean % Correct (BUAD Majors)	AC 2022-2023 Acceptable Target Met? (BUAD Majors)
Quantitative Business Analysis	28%	57% n=65	Yes, 98.2% scored better than the ETS' 28%.	56% n=32	Yes, 100% scored better than the ETS 28%.
Finance	44%	41% n=81 (Fall 20)	No, 49.3% scored better than the ETS' 44%	48% n=95	Yes, 86% scored better than the ETS 44%.
Marketing	45%	87% n=16 (Spring 21)	Yes, 100% scored better than the ETS' 45%	75% n=21	Yes, 95% scored better than the ETS 45%.

Data was not reported for the AC 2021-2022 as it was decided that data for this SLO would only be reported every two years.

Finding - BUAD 2120 Basic Business Statistics: The ideal target was met.

Analysis: Results from the ETS exam (2019) and SoBUSKE (AC 2020- 2021 and AC 2022-2023) are compared for business statistics in the table below. This table refers to Measure 2.1a.

Table 8: Measure 2.1a: Basic Business Statistics

Discipline	NSU ETS 2019	SoBUSKE AC 2020 - 2021 (All Majors)	SoBUSKE AC 2022-2023 (BUAD Only)
Statistics	28%	57%	56%

Percentages indicate the student mean percentage on the discipline area test. Data was collected in courses where the partial SoBUSKE was normally embedded as part of the course materials.

Note: The scores in the chart above are the unprocessed student mean scores. These are presented for easy interpretation of student trends.

AC 2020-2021: The ideal target was met. Sixty-five students took the portion of the SoBUSKE that relates to the area of statistics. Six of these students were removed from the sample because they responded to no questions. Following compilation of these scores, the SoBUSKE mean score in statistics was 57% while the NSU ETS MFT score was 28%. Based on a comparison of these results, 98.2% of the students scored above 28% on the SoBUSKE. Based on the analysis of the AC 2020-2021 results, the BUAD2120 faculty made the following changes in AC 2021-2022 and AC 2022-2023 to drive the cycle of improvement. They developed and implemented a strategic communication plan to emphasize specific learning resources available to students. They produced instructor-led videos that demonstrated

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

concepts and techniques taught in the course. They increased the focus on the hypothesis testing procedure theory in relation to decision-making. Finally, they created and disseminated a mapped-out flow chart depicting the decision process on the selection of specific inferential tests.

AC 2022-2023: As a result of the above changes, the ideal target was met. However, due to a change in the measurement, a direct comparison between AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 is not advisable. The AC 2020-2021 numbers included all students who completed the statistics portion of the partial knowledge exam while the 2022-2023 numbers included only the BUAD students. While Accounting, Business Administration, and Computer Information Systems have shared the first four student learning outcome goals for many years, this change allows the faculty in each discipline to better analyze the results for their students and make changes to their degree plan which will then be reflected in their students' results.

In AC 2022-2023, 32 BUAD students completed the SoBUSKE partial exam for statistics. Of these 32 students, 100% scored better than the ETS score of 28%.

Decision (BUAD only):

In AC 2022-2023, the ideal target was met. Based on the analysis of the AC 2022-2023 results, the BUAD2120 faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2023-2024 to drive the cycle of improvement.

While the percentage of students scoring higher than the ETS score was outstanding at 100%, the mean is slightly dropped from 57% in AC 2020-2021 to 56% in AC 2022-2023. Thus, this percentage could improve.

To improve this percentage, the BUAD2120 faculty will incorporate the use of Excel into the publisher application that they are currently using. The incorporation of Excel will allow students to practice utilizing Excel more which will reinforce many of the topics covered on the statistics exam. This incorporation will also allow faculty to focus more on the use of statistics to make decisions as opposed to the underlying statistical theories.

This change will improve the student's ability to understand key concepts and theories in statistics.

Finding - FIN 3090 Personal Finance: The ideal target was met.

Analysis (FIN only): Results from the past ETS exam (2019) and SoBUSKE (AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023) are compared below. This table refers to measure 2.1b covering finance.

Table 9: Measure 2.1b: Finance

Discipline	NSU ETS 2019	SoBUSKE AC 2020 -2021 (All Majors)	SoBUSKE AC 2022-2023 (BUAD Only)
Finance	28%	41%	48%

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

Percentages indicate the student mean percentage on the discipline area test. Data was collected in courses where the partial SoBUSKE was normally embedded as part of the course materials.

Note: The scores in the chart above are the unprocessed student mean scores. These are presented for easy interpretation of student trends.

Data was not reported for the AC 2021-2022 as it was decided that data for this SLO would only be reported every two years.

AC 2020-2021: The acceptable target was not met. Eighty-one students took the portion of the SoBUSKE that relates to the area of finance. Six of these students were from the sample because they responded to no questions. Following compilation of these scores, the SoBUSKE mean score in finance was 41% while the NSU ETS MFT score was 44%. Based on a comparison of these results, 49.3% of the students scored above 44% on the SoBUSKE.

Based on the analysis of the AC 2020-2021 results, the faculty determined that the partial knowledge exam needed to be given in FIN 3090 instead of FIN 2150. This change was due to students not covering many of the finance components until FIN 3090. Additionally, Accounting and Computer Information Systems students were not required to take FIN 2150, so the measurement was excluding two of the three disciplines.

AC2022-2023: As a result of the above changes, the ideal target was met. However, due to a change in the measurement, a direct comparison between AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 is not advisable. The AC 2020-2021 numbers included all students who completed the statistics portion of the partial knowledge exam while the 2022-2023 numbers included only the BUAD students. While Accounting, Business Administration, and Computer Information Systems have shared the first four student learning outcome goals for many years, this change allows the faculty in each discipline to better analyze the results for their students and make changes to their degree plan which will then be reflected in their students' results.

In AC 2022-2023, 95 BUAD students completed the SoBUSKE partial exam for statistics. Of these 86 students, 86% scored better than the ETS score of 44%.

Decision (FIN only):

In AC 2022-2023, the ideal target was met. Based on the analysis of the AC 2022-2023 results, the Finance faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2023-2024 to drive the cycle of improvement.

While a direct comparison between AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 is not advisable, it should be noted that had the faculty continued to analyze all majors in the results, the mean score would have increased as well as the percentage of students scoring higher than the ETS average. While the increase was not enough to meet the targets, this increase did represent progress towards the goals. Thus, the change in testing from FIN 2150 to FIN 3090 may have helped.

For the number specifically for BUAD students, it represents a baseline comparison number

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

to which future changes can be measured.

Additionally, the Finance faculty are reviewing the topics covered in FIN 3090 and FIN 4200 to ensure a distribution of topics between the two classes that could potentially enhance success in the Finance classes. The Finance faculty members put forth a lot of effort to ensure success in the classes, but realize students often struggle in classes with a lot of mathematical or computational thinking. This redistribution of topics could enhance the amount of time spent on topics covered by the finance partial knowledge exam. The Finance faculty will ensure that any topics covered in the finance partial knowledge exam remain in the FIN 3090 class.

This change will improve the student's ability to understand key concepts and theories in finance.

Finding - MKTG3230: The ideal target was met.

Analysis (MKTG only): Results from the ETS exam (2019), SoBUSKE (AC2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023) are compared for marketing in the table below. This table refers to measure 2.1c.

Table 10: Measure 2.1c: Marketing

Discipline	NSU ETS 2019	SoBUSKE AC 2020 -2021 (All Majors)	SoBUSKE AC 2022-2023 (BUAD Only)
Marketing	28%	87%	75%

Percentages indicate the student mean percentage on the discipline area test. Data was collected in courses where the partial SoBUSKE was normally embedded as part of the course materials.

Note: The scores in the chart above are the unprocessed student mean scores. These are presented for easy interpretation of student trends.

Data was not reported for the AC 2021-2022 as it was decided that data for this SLO would only be reported every two years.

AC 2020-2021: The ideal target was met. Sixteen students took the portion of the SoBUSKE that relates to the area of marketing. Following compilation of these scores, the SoBUSKE mean score in marketing was 87% while the NSU ETS MFT score was 45%. Based on a comparison of these results, 100% of the students scored above 45% on the SoBUSKE.

Based on the analysis of the AC 2020-2021 results, the MKTG3230 faculty member held multiple review sessions over core content in the class. The faculty member also researched and participated in in-class activities shown to engage larger class sizes.

AC 2022-2023: As a result of the above changes, in AC 2022-2023, the ideal target was met. However, due to a change in the measurement, a direct comparison between AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 is not advisable. The AC 2020-2021 numbers included all students who

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

completed the marketing portion of the partial knowledge exam while the 2022-2023 numbers included only the BUAD students. While Accounting, Business Administration, and Computer Information Systems have shared the first four student learning outcome goals for many years, this change allows the faculty in each discipline to better analyze the results for their students and make changes to their degree plan which will then be reflected in their students' results.

In AC 2022-2023, 21 BUAD students completed the SoBUSKE partial exam for marketing. Of those 21 students, 95% scored better than the ETS score of 45%.

Decision (MKTG only):

In AC 2022-2023, the acceptable target and the ideal target were met. Based on the analysis of the AC 2022-2023 results, the Finance faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2023-2024 to drive the cycle of improvement.

While the percentage of students scoring higher than the ETS score was outstanding at 95%, the mean percentage was at 75% which was lower than the AC 2020-2021 all-major mean of 87%. Thus, this percentage could improve. However, limited conclusion should be drawn from this percentage due to the low number of students in the sample size.

This change will improve the faculty's ability to judge and improve the students' ability to understand key concepts and theories in marketing.

Measure 2.2 (Direct – Exam; UNIV 1000 Complete School of Business Knowledge Exam)

Details/Description: The entire School of Business Knowledge exam (SoBUSKE) should be given in UNIV 1000 business classes. The following areas are covered in this exam: Accounting, Economics, Management, Quantitative (Statistics and Operations Management), Finance, Marketing, Legal, Information Systems, International Business, and Ethics.

NOTE: The CISPAC committee in coordination with last year's assessment results decided to remove all data collection from UNIV 1000. Entering freshmen are typically expected to have minimal business knowledge, and as expected, past results tended to show that. Therefore, this measure was removed from the assessment process with midpoint and senior-year measures taking priority.

Acceptable Target: At least 75% of students will score higher than the ETS average in the knowledge area.

Ideal Target: At least 85% of students will score higher than the ETS average in the knowledge area.

Implementation Plan (timeline): These partial School of Business Knowledge Exams are given each semester the class is offered.

Key/Responsible Personnel: School of Business faculty teaching these courses are

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

responsible for the measurement.

Findings: The target was not measured.

Analysis: The first set of data for this measure was gathered in UNIV 1000, a course for entering freshmen, in Fall 2020. The data from that semester is below.

Table 11: Measure 2.2: SoBUSKE and ETS Exam Results (Intermediate)

ETS Subject Area	2019 ETS Mean % Correct (n=13)	AC 2020-2021 SoBUSKE Results from UNIV 1000 (n=46)	Target met?
Accounting	41%	28%	No (8.7% scored higher than 41%)
Economics	30%	29%	No (28% score higher than 30%)
Management	52%	30%	No (6.5% scored higher than 52%)
Quantitative Business Analysis	28%	37%	Yes (80.4% scored higher than 28%)
Finance	44%	25%	No (10% scored higher than 44%)
Marketing	45%	32%	No (13% scored higher than 45%)
Legal and Social Environment	36%	45.% (Avg of 3 law classes)	No (73.9% scored higher than 36%)
Information Systems	47%	30%	No (17% scored higher than 47%)
International Issues	35%	24%	No (13% scored higher than 35%)
Ethics	N/A	35%	N/A

Data was not reported for the AC 2021-2022 as it was decided that data for this SLO would only be reported every two years.

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

AC 2020-2021: The target was not met. Forty-six students took the SoBUSKE exam in Fall 2020. These students did not fare well on the exam with only one area meeting the target. Faculty members believe this area was an anomaly.

Based on the analysis of the AC 2020-2021 results as well as previous year results, the School of Business faculty determined that this measurement was not giving any useful information. The School of Business faculty determined this measurement would not be included in UNIV1000 any longer.

AC 2022-2023: As a result of these changes, in AC 2022-2023, the target was not measured.

Decision:

In AC 2022-2023, the target was not measured. Based on the previous analysis of past year's results, the faculty will discontinue the use of this measurement going forward

Measure 2.3 (Direct - Student Artifact; MGT 4300 Complete School of Business Knowledge Exam)

Details/Description: The entire School of Business Knowledge exam (SoBUSKE) (<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/N8DNVXT>) should be given in MGT 4300. The following areas are covered in this exam: Accounting, Economics, Management, Quantitative (Statistics and Operations Management), Finance, Marketing, Legal, Information Systems, International Business, and Ethics.

Note: In accordance with the school of business' assessment plan, the SoBUSKE is given every other year. Therefore, testing data from AC 2019-2020 is typically the same data as from the 2018-2019 assessment cycle.

Acceptable Target: Average score on School of Business Knowledge exam should be higher in all areas of the exam than the ETS Mean Percentage.

Ideal Target: Average scores on School of Business Knowledge exam should be 10% higher in all areas of the exam than the ETS Mean Percentage.

Implementation Plan (timeline): The School of Business Knowledge exam is given each semester MGT 4300 is offered.

Key/Responsible Personnel: School of Business Faculty teach MGT 4300 is responsible for this measure.

Findings: The target was not met.

Analysis: The full SoBUSKE was administered in AC 2022-2023 in MGT 4300. These classes typically have many students who are nearing graduation. A breakdown of those students' average scores is shown and compared to the 2019 ETS exam results in the table below.

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

Table 12: Measure 2.3: SoBUSKE and ETS Exam Results

ETS Subject Area	2019 ETS Mean Percent Correct (n=13)	AC 2020-2021 SoBUSKE (All Majors n=75)	Target met?	AC 2022-2023 SoBUSKE Results (BUAD only n=9)	Target met?
Accounting	41%	35%	No	30%	No
Economics	30%	33%	Yes	30%	Yes
Management	52%	38%	No	38%	No
Quantitative Business Analysis	28%	38%	Yes	36%	Yes
Finance	44%	28%	No	39%	No
Marketing	45%	43%	No	62%	Yes
Legal and Social Environment	36%	50.5% (Avg of 3 law courses)	Yes	41%	Yes
Information Systems	47%	45%	No	47%	No
International Issues	35%	31%	No	33%	No
Ethics*	N/A	42%	N/A	47%	N/A

* The ETS exam does not have an ethics section. Therefore, the ethics scores as listed as N/A in the table above.

Note: The law section of the exam in AC 2020-2021 was measured across three separate law courses, each one tailored to meet the needs of the specific major (Information Systems, Accounting, or Business Administration). This change was intended to give students in each major customized law content more in line with their specific field of study. While the AC 2020-2021 average reported above is an average of all three, the instructors of each course can examine the results in each course or by each major and even more specific detail. If any individual law course did not meet the assessment results, corrective action may be implemented in that specific law course. However, in AC 2022-2023, the law results were

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

reported for each major in the specific law course specialized for that major.

AC 2020-2021: The acceptable target was not met. Only three of the nine categories had a mean on the SoBUSKE greater than the mean on the ETS. Those three areas were economics, quantitative business analysis, and legal and social environment. Given the decrease in scores, faculty members believed the COVID-19 pandemic and its resulting changes to higher education affected students and their performance on the exam.

Based on the analysis of the AC 2020-2021 results, the School of Business faculty members believed the results would rebound once faculty and students returned to a more normal classroom environment. Faculty members also emphasized material that was causing difficulties for students in their classes. As appropriate, additional assignments or practice were assigned.

AC 2022-2023: As a result of the above changes, in AC 2022-2023, the acceptable target was not met. However, due to a change in the measurement, a direct comparison between AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 is not advisable. The AC 2020-2021 numbers included all students who completed the knowledge exam while the 2022-2023 numbers included only the BUAD students. While Accounting, Business Administration, and Computer Information Systems have shared the first four student learning outcome goals for many years, this change allows the faculty in each discipline to better analyze the results for their students and make changes to their degree plan which will then be reflected in their students' results.

In AC 2022-2023, nine BUAD students completed the knowledge exam. The BUAD students scored higher than the ETS mean in four of the nine categories. Those categories were economics, quantitative business analysis, legal and social environment, and marketing. Students scored the same rate in one category (information systems). The remaining four categories where the mean was lower by more than a point were accounting, management, finance, and international issues.

Decision:

In AC 2022-2023, the acceptable target was not met. Based on the analysis of the AC 2022-2023 results, the School of Business faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2023-2024 to drive the cycle of improvement.

One issue that continues to affect the SoBUSKE is the lack of effort students give to the exam. While the MGT 4300 faculty member urges the students to attempt the exam and tries to encourage them to do well, given the presence of a large capstone project and the number of other assignments in the MGT 4300 class, students do not try at a high level on the exam as they do not believe it will affect their grade.

Given this lack of effort, the MGT 4300 member will reiterate the importance of measuring student learning and will continue to promote students giving their best effort on the exam.

This change will improve the faculty's ability to judge and improve the students' ability to understand key concepts and theories in various functional areas of business.

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

SLO 3. Critical Thinking. The objectives of SLO 3 Critical Thinking are that students should be able to:

- **Objective 3a: Demonstrate the ability to draw on knowledge and insights from a variety of disciplines when analyzing and formulating solutions to problems and opportunities.**
- **Objective 3b: Demonstrate the ability to generate and compare alternative solutions to business problems.**
- **Objective 3c: Demonstrate the ability to select feasible solutions to complex business problems.**

Course Map: Tied to course syllabus objectives.

FIN 3090	Business Finance (Foundational Course)
FIN 4200	Financial Policies and Practices (Foundational Course)
MGT 4300	Strategic Management and Policies (Foundational Course)
UNIV 1000	The University Experience (Supporting Course)

Measure 3.1 (Direct – Other; FIN 3090 Critical Thinking Essays)

Details/Description: After AC 2020-2021, the critical thinking quiz was discontinued. To access critical thinking skills, students are required to compose two two-page essays with references. The essay must analyze and critique a current topic in business finance. The topic must be clearly identified and analyzed, incorporating business and finance terminology. Sample topics include but are not limited to:

- Corporate social responsibility and good governance issues
- What determines interest rates, and what role do they play in financial markets and institutions in the global financial system.
- Concept of the cost of capital, how it is affected by the firm's capital structure, and the application of these concepts to capital budgeting, decision-making, and dividend policy.
- The impact of the Internet on working capital management.
- Various sources of financing working capital
- Risk and volatility.
- Asset management
- Financial performance.
- Hedge funds.
- Financial statement analysis.
- International finance.

Acceptable Target: The acceptable target is an average of 75% and 70% of the students achieving a 70% or greater.

Ideal Target: The ideal target is an average of 80% and 80% of the students achieving a 70%

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

or greater.

Implementation Plan (timeline): This measure is given each spring semester in the FIN 3090 class.

Key/Responsible Personnel: School of Business faculty teaching FIN 3090 are responsible for this measure.

Findings: The acceptable target was met for all disciplines. The ideal target was met for all disciplines.

Analysis: The table below provides the 2022-2023 assessment cycle results for Measure 3.1.

Table 13: AC 2022-2023 Results

Measure 3.1					
Assessment Cycle	n (# of students)	Average Score Acceptable Target	Average Score	Percentage Passing Acceptable Target	Percentage Passing
2020-2021 (All Majors)	45	75%	70%	70%	69%
2022-2023 (BUAD only)		75%	84.1%	70%	94%

Data was not reported for the AC 2021-2022 as it was decided that data for this SLO would only be reported every two years.

AC 2020-2021: The acceptable target was not met. 45 students took the critical thinking quiz and earned an average score of 70%. 69% of the students passed with a 70% or higher.

Based on the analysis of the AC 2020-2021 results, the faculty made the following changes in 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 to drive the cycle of improvement. The faculty decided to change from a quiz to a measurement based on essays related to analyzing and critiquing a current topic in business finance. Students had to write two two-page essays with references. To encourage more thoughtful discussion, the instructor used a more stringent grading system based on the quality of the submission and discussion.

AC 2022-2023: As a result of the above changes, in AC 2022-2023, the ideal target was met. However, due to a change in the measurement, a direct comparison between AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 is not advisable. The AC 2020-2021 numbers included all students who completed the quiz while the 2022-2023 numbers included only the BUAD students who completed the essays. While Accounting, Business Administration, and Computer Information Systems have shared the first four student learning outcome goals for many years, this change allows the faculty in each discipline to better analyze the results for their students and make

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

changes to their degree plan which will then be reflected in their students' results.

In AC 2022-2023, the BUAD students scored an average of 84.1% on the essays with 94% of the students passing the essays assignment with a 70% or higher score.

Decision:

In AC 2022-2023, the acceptable target was met, and the ideal target was met. Based on the analysis of the AC 2022-2023 results, the School of Business faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2023-2024 to drive the cycle of improvement.

First, the FIN 3090 faculty member will keep the change involving moving from a critical thinking quiz to essays. While the 2022-2023 results were for BUAD majors only, the results would have shown an increase for all majors if we had continued using that group.

The FIN 3090 faculty member will ensure topics in business finance are current and relate to future responsibilities of BUAD graduates.

These changes will improve the students' ability to think critically in the business environment.

Measure 3.2 (Direct – Other; FIN 4200 Comprehensive Project)

Details/Description: In AC 2022-2023, a comprehensive project was introduced to replace the business simulation game, which had been used since AC 2017-2018 and had become cost prohibitive. This course is required for BUAD majors.

Students were given the assignment to choose a company and analyze its financial statements, balance sheets, and stock information spanning five years. To complete this task, the students utilized a combination of a company report and a spreadsheet. Using Microsoft Excel, they input a range of data points necessary for the analysis. The following financial metrics were included in the spreadsheet:

- Stock Information: Stock price, EPS (Earnings Per Share), Shares Outstanding, Beta.
- Balance Sheet: Accounts Receivable, Inventory, Current Assets, Fixed Assets, Total Assets, Accounts Payable, Current Liabilities, Total Non-Current Liabilities, Total Liabilities, Total Stockholder Equity, Total Liabilities and Equity.
- Income Statement: Net Sales or Revenues, COGS (Cost of Goods Sold), Depreciation, Depletion, and Amortization, Operating Income (EBIT), Interest, Earnings Before Taxes, Income Taxes, Net Income (used to calculate Basic EPS).
- Using the financial data provided, various financial ratios and metrics were calculated to gain insights into the company's performance. The following categories of analysis were conducted:
- Profitability Analysis- Profitability ratios, such as Gross Profit Margin, Operating Profit Margin, and Net Profit Margin, were calculated to assess the company's ability to generate profits from its operations. Additionally, Return on Assets (ROA) and Return

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

on Equity (ROE) ratios were computed to evaluate the company's efficiency in utilizing its assets and equity to generate returns for shareholders.

- Market Performance Analysis- To gauge the company's market performance, metrics such as Price-to-Earnings (P/E) ratio and Earnings Per Share (EPS) were determined. These indicators provide insights into the company's valuation and attractiveness to investors.
- Productivity Analysis- Productivity ratios, including Asset Turnover and Inventory Turnover, were computed to assess how efficiently the company utilizes its assets and manages its inventory.
- Debt Management Analysis - Debt management ratios, such as Debt-to-Equity ratio and Interest Coverage ratio, were analyzed to evaluate the company's financial leverage and its ability to service its debt obligations.
- Liquidity Analysis - Liquidity ratios, including Current Ratio and Quick Ratio, were calculated to assess the company's short-term solvency and ability to meet its immediate financial obligations.
- Forecasting Analysis- Based on historical data and trends, forecasting ratios, such as Growth Rate and Earnings Per Share (EPS) Forecast, were determined to provide insights into the company's potential future performance.

Once the information for the past five years was inputted into the spreadsheet, students proceeded to calculate various ratios and metrics. By conducting these calculations, students gained insights into the company's financial performance and trends.

Based on the results derived from the spreadsheet analysis, students compiled a comprehensive report to articulate their findings. This report documented their observations, interpretations, and conclusions drawn from the calculated ratios and metrics. In addition, the report served as a platform for students to demonstrate their understanding of the company's financial health, evaluate its strengths and weaknesses, and provide recommendations or forecasts based on the data analyzed.

This project provided students with valuable hands-on experience in financial statement analysis and equipped them with the skills to effectively interpret and communicate complex financial information. By utilizing both the company report and spreadsheet analysis, students gained a holistic understanding of the selected company's financial position and performance over the specified period.

Acceptable Target: The acceptable target is an average of 75% and 70% of the students achieving a 70% or greater.

Ideal Target: The ideal target is an average of 80% and 80% of the students achieving a 70% or greater.

Implementation Plan (timeline): This measure is given each semester in the FIN 4200 class.

Key/Responsible Personnel: School of Business faculty teaching FIN 4200 are responsible for this measure.

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

Findings: The acceptable target was met. The ideal target was not met.

Analysis: The tables below provides the AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 assessment cycle results for Measure 3.2.

Table 14: AC 2020-21 and AC 2022-2023 Results

Measure 3.2					
Assessment Cycle	n (# of students)	Percent Profitable	Avg. ProfitPeriod 1	Avg. ProfitPeriod 8	
2020-2021 (All Majores)*	39	76%	2.66	16.8	
2022-2023 (BUAD Only)	81	Average Score Acceptable Target	Average Score	% Passing Acceptable Target	% Passing
		75%	77.7%	70%	71.6%

Note: In AC2020-2021, the measure used a business simulation game which has been replaced by the comprehensive project since AC2022-2023.

Data was not reported for the AC 2021-2022 as it was decided that data for this SLO would only be reported every two years.

AC2020-2021: The acceptable target was met, and the ideal target was met. Thirty-nine students participated in the game and 76% of the students were profitable. In the fall semester, three students performed better than the instructor for the first time.

Based on the analysis of the AC 2020-2021 results, the initial plan was for the FIN 4200 instructor faculty member to offer a wider variety of businesses in the simulation game. However, that faculty member retired, and a new faculty member decided to incorporate a comprehensive project involving data analysis in Excel and a comprehensive report of findings. In AC 2022-2023, a comprehensive project was introduced to replace the business simulation game, which had been used since AC 2017-2018 and had become cost prohibitive.

AC 2022-2023: As the result of the above changes, the acceptable target was met. The ideal target was not met. Due to the above change in the measurement, a direct comparison between AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 is not advisable. The AC 2020-2021 numbers were from the discontinued business simulation game and included all students in FIN4200 while the 2022-2023 numbers were from the comprehensive project and included only the BUAD students. While Accounting, Business Administration, and Computer Information Systems have shared the first four student learning outcome goals for many years, this change allows the faculty in each discipline to better analyze the results for their students and make changes to their degree plan which will then be reflected in their students' results.

In AC 2022-2023, 81 BUAD students participated the comprehensive project and scored an

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

average of 77.7%. 71.6% of these BUAD students achieved a 70% or greater.

Decision: Based on the 2022-2023 assessment cycle results, the project will continue to be used with hopes of improvement as we distance ourselves from the covid lockdowns and students acclimate themselves more to online learning. Also, a return to more in-class instruction and normalized student learning should improve scores in 2023-2024.

Measure 3.3 (Direct – Other; FIN 3090 Case Analysis)

Details/Description: Case studies link financial ideas to real events and real policies. Finance 3090 examines corporate financing, investment decisions, and related issues in financial strategy. The student must deal with the situation described in the case, in the role of the manager or decision maker facing the situation. By engaging in the case, students apply the concepts, techniques, and methods of the discipline and improve their ability to apply them. Students are required to identify the principal questions of the case and perform an analysis using the appropriate tools and knowledge to identify challenges and ambiguities in the case. Students learn the material more deeply when they are active generators rather than passive recipients of knowledge and retain more of the material as they apply the concepts and methods. Cases compel students to work on real world problems that are complicated and messy which require students to hone skills in identifying and using evidence; choosing which concepts, theories, and methods are relevant; and ignoring extraneous and irrelevant material. Case analysis develops skills in problem solving, quantitative and/or qualitative analytical tools, decision making in complex situations, and coping with ambiguities.

Acceptable Target: The acceptable target is an average of 75% and 70% of the students achieving a 70% or greater.

Ideal Target: The ideal target is an average of 80% and 80% of the students achieving a 70% or greater.

Implementation Plan (timeline): This assignment measure is given each semester in the FIN 3090 class.

Key/Responsible Personnel: School of Business faculty teaching FIN 3090 are responsible for this measure.

Findings: The ideal target was met.

Analysis: The table below provides the AC 2020-2021 and 2022-2023 assessment cycle results for Measure 3.3.

Table 15: AC 2020-2021, and AC 2022-2023 Results

Measure 3.3					
Assessment Cycle	n (# of students)	Average Score Acceptable Target	Average Score	% Passing Acceptable Target	% Passing
2020-2021	170	75%	75%	70%	82.4%

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

(All Majors)					
2022-2023 (BUAD Only)	56	75%	83%	70%	94.6%

Data was not reported for the AC 2021-2022 as it was decided that data for this SLO would only be reported every two years.

AC 2020-2021: The acceptable target was met. The ideal target was partially met. 170 students completed the FIN 3090 case analysis. Of those 170 students, 82.4% passed the case analysis with a 70% or higher score. The average score was 75%.

Based on the analysis of the AC 2020-2021 results, the faculty made the following changes in AC 2021-2022 and AC 2022-2023 to drive the cycle of improvement. Students were required to use Excel to analyze the data. The FIN 3090 faculty member believed that this new technology allowed students to better see the impact of company decision which led to improved ability to perform case analyses.

AC 2022-2023: As a result of these changes, in AC 2022-2023, the ideal target was met. However, due to a change in the measurement, a direct comparison between AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 is not advisable. The AC 2020-2021 numbers included all students who completed the case analysis while the 2022-2023 numbers included only the BUAD students. While Accounting, Business Administration, and Computer Information Systems have shared the first four student learning outcome goals for many years, this change allows the faculty in each discipline to better analyze the results for their students and make changes to their degree plan which will then be reflected in their students' results.

In AC 2022-2023, 56 BUAD students completed the case analysis. Of these students, 94.6% passed the case analysis with a 70% or higher score. The average score was an 83%.

Decision:

In AC 2022-2023, the ideal target was met. Based on the analysis of the AC 2022-2023 results, the faculty will implement the following changes in 2023-2024 to drive the cycle of improvement.

While the 2022-2023 results were for BUAD majors only, the results would have shown an increase for all majors if we had continued using that group.

As previously noted, the Finance faculty are reviewing the topics covered in FIN 3090 and FIN 4200 to ensure adequate distribution of topics between the two classes that could potentially enhance success in the Finance classes. This redistribution of topics will allow facilitate more in-depth coverage of topics introduced in FIN 3090 and delve more deeply into related topics. The Finance faculty will ensure that any topics covered in the case analysis remain in FIN 3090.

Additionally, the Finance faculty are assisting in MGT 4300 case analysis. With this additional assistance, students in MGT 4300 class will have a chance to review and enhance critical-thinking skills for problem-solving.

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

These changes will improve the students' ability to think critically in the business environment.

SLO 4. Global, Cultural, and Ethical Perspective. Students should be able to: Identify cultural/global challenges facing management in doing business in the international arena.

Course Map: Tied to course syllabus below.

ACCT 2000 Financial Accounting (Foundational Course)
 BUAD 2200 Business Reports and Communications (Foundational Course)
 BUAD 3270 International Business (Foundational Course)
 CIS 4600 Advanced Systems Development (Capstone Course)
 MGT 4300 Strategic Management and Policies (Capstone Course) UNIV 1000 The Student Experience (Supporting Course)

Measure 4.1. (Direct – Exam; BUAD 2200 – Country Report

Details/Description: Written document measure (BUAD 2200)

Acceptable Target: 70% of the students will score 70% or better.

Ideal Target: 90% of the students will score 70% or better.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Ongoing in BUAD 2200.

Key/Responsible Personnel: School of Business Faculty Teaching BUAD 2200.

Finding: The ideal target was met.

Analysis: Table 16 compares the 2020-2021 and 2022-2023 academic year results for Measure 4.1.

Table 16: AC 2020-2021 vs. AC 2022-2023 Comparison

Measure 4.1				
Academic Year	n (# of teams or # of students)	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target	*Actual Results
2020-2021(All Majors)	50	70%	90%	88%
2022-2023(BUAD Major Only)	81	70%	90%	98%

Note: *Percentages indicate the percent of teams/students scoring 70% or better on the measure.

Data was not reported for the AC 2021-2022 as it was decided that data for this SLO would only be reported every two years.

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

AC 2020-2021: The acceptable target was met. The ideal target was not met. During the 2020-2021 term 50 groups (n=237) completed the BUAD 2200 Country Report assignment and 88% of the teams (n=50), scored 70% or better. This score does indicate a drop of 8% from the 2018-2019 assessment cycle.

Based on the analysis of the AC 2020-2021 results the instructors of the Business Communications course made the following changes in AC2022-2023 to drive the cycle of improvement. Examples of short instructional videos were added to the course. A reading list of possible book sources was added earlier in the semester so that students can begin to read about cultural differences, social and business etiquette, political patterns, family life, etc. in foreign countries. New instructors of the course were assigned a course mentor during their first semester of teaching the course. To increase the participation rate students were asked to indicate their understanding of the requirements for the course and that the report project was mandatory for all students, including both the oral and written components. The assessment project was introduced earlier in the semester and students submitted portions of the assessment for review by BUAD2200 faculty members. To further aid students in their ability to demonstrate a basic awareness and understanding of cultural differences, we increased instruction in the areas of business and social etiquette in foreign countries. Areas such as social customs, political patterns, family life and the way these contexts are different from Americans were expanded.

AC 2022-2023: As a result of the above changes, the ideal target was met. However, due to a change in the measurement, a direct comparison between AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 is not advisable. The AC 2020-2021 numbers included all teams who completed the country report while the 2022-2023 numbers included only the BUAD students. While Accounting, Business Administration, and Computer Information Systems have shared the first four student learning outcome goals for many years, this change allows the faculty in each discipline to better analyze the results for their students and make changes to their degree plan which will then be reflected in their students' results.

In AC 2022-2023, 82 BUAD students participated in the written final report of the International Business Plan group project. The average grade of the 82 students for the written document was 80%. 98% of students scored 70% or better.

Unfortunately, based upon the new analysis there cannot be a comparison due to the change in reflecting each major present in the School of Business.

Decision:

In AC 2022-2023, the ideal target was met. Based on the results of the AC 2022-2023 and the new push to model the ULS system, the faculty will implement the following changes in 2023-2024 to drive the cycle of improvement:

(1) Instructors are to engage in full discussions in reimagining this SLO goal. These deliberations center around the ULS push to ensure that students are competent in critical

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

and creative problem solving, communication and cultural competency, adaptable resilience, and self-reflective awareness.

(2) Instructors are to implement the reimagined student learning outcome with the appropriate learning objectives and their respective outcomes that help fully align the course and the appropriate major's desired goals with the aforementioned and other identified core competencies.

(3) Instructors will then decide if the courses are satisfactory, need augmentation, or a complete redesign to incorporate these critical competencies that will help prepare our students for life and career success in business.

Measure 4.2 (Direct – Exam; BUAD 3270 International Business Plan)

Details/Description: Middle measure of student knowledge of cultural/global perspectives; a written document measure in BUAD 3270.

Acceptable Target: 70% of the students will score 70% or better.

Ideal Target: 90% of the students will score 70% or better.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Ongoing in BUAD 3270 class.

Key/Responsible Personnel: School of Business Faculty Teaching BUAD 3270.

Finding: The ideal target was met.

Analysis: Table 17 compares AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 academic year results for Measure 4.2.

Table 17: AC 2018-2019 vs. AC 2020-2021 Comparison

Measure 4.2					
Academic Year	n (# of students)	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target	*Actual Results	Mean
2020-2021(All Majors)	164	70%	90%	100%	89%
2022-2023(BUAD Major Only)	71	70%	90%	100%	93%

Note: * Percentages indicate the percent of students scoring 70% or better on the measure.

Data was not reported for the AC 2021-2022 as it was decided that data for this SLO would only be reported every two years.

AC 2020-2021: In AC 2020-2021, the ideal target was met. 164 students participated in the written final report of the International Business Plan group project. The average grade of the 164 students for the written document was 89%. 100% of students scored 70% or better.

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

Based on the analysis of the 2020-2021 results the faculty implemented the following changes to drive the cycle of improvement: Faculty members utilized a variety of pedagogical methods to assist students with their group International Business reports. Best practices include professors continued to provide coaching, to divide the project and provide feedback to strengthen the final submission, and to require the use of Microsoft Teams to facilitate collaboration and communication between the students as well as with the instructor. International business research databases and tools were introduced in class to enhance the quality research for the international business plan.

AC 2022-2023: As a result of the above changes, the ideal target was met. However, due to a change in the measurement, a direct comparison between AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 is not advisable. The AC 2020-2021 numbers included all students who completed the final report while the 2022-2023 numbers included only the BUAD students. While Accounting, Business Administration, and Computer Information Systems have shared the first four student learning outcome goals for many years, this change allows the faculty in each discipline to better analyze the results for their students and make changes to their degree plan which will then be reflected in their students' results.

In AC 2022-2023, the ideal target was met. 71 BUAD students participated in the written final report of the International Business Plan group project. The average grade of the 71 students for the written document was 93%. 100% of students scored 70% or better.

Unfortunately, based upon the new analysis there cannot be a comparison due to the change in reflecting each major present in the School of Business.

Decision:

In AC 2022-2023, the ideal target was met. Based on the results of the AC 2022-2023 and the new push to model the ULS system, the faculty will implement the following changes in 2023-2024 to drive the cycle of improvement:

- (1) Instructors are to engage in full discussions in reimagining this SLO goal. These deliberations center around the ULS push to ensure that students are competent in critical and creative problem solving, communication and cultural competency, adaptable resilience, and self-reflective awareness.
- (2) Instructors are to implement the reimagined student learning outcome with the appropriate learning objectives and their respective outcomes that help fully align the course and the appropriate major's desired goals with the aforementioned and other identified core competencies.
- (3) Instructors will then decide if the courses are satisfactory, need augmentation, or a complete redesign to incorporate these critical competencies that will help prepare our students for life and career success in business.
- (4) Additionally, instructors can work with BUAD 2200 to ensure that written report reinforcement of those concepts.

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

Measure 4.3 (Direct – Exam, Partial School of Business Knowledge Exam)

Details/Description: Partial School of Business Knowledge Exam Given in BUAD 3270

Acceptable Target: Resetting this year.

Ideal Target: Resetting this year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Ongoing in BUAD 3270 sections

Key/Responsible Personnel: School of Business Faculty Teaching BUAD 3270 Sections.

Findings: Findings will need to be determined next year. This is because this year was a baseline. The ETS test is no longer utilized to compare our students' results.

Analysis: Table 18 compares AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 academic year results for Measure 4.3.

Table 18: AC 2020-2021 vs. AC 2022-2023 Comparison

Measure 4.3				
Academic Year	n (# of students)	Acceptable Target (based on ETS data)	Ideal Target (based on ETS data)	Mean
2020-2021(All Majors)	88	35%	45%	49%
2022-2023(BUAD Major Only)	60	*n/a	*n/a	54%

Note: The unit measure was changed for the AC 2022-2023.

Data was not reported for the AC 2021-2022 as it was decided that data for this SLO would only be reported every two years.

AC 2020-2021: The average score for the year is 49%. The International Issues score on the ETS exam was 35% so that the acceptable and ideal targets were met. In reviewing the 3% loss from AC 2018-2019, some factors to explain this may be that the area experienced two hurricanes and two snowstorms with the resulting loss of water and electricity to the parish in addition to the global pandemic. However, we still met our goals.

Based on the analysis of the AC 2020-2021 results the instructors of the Business Communications course made the following changes to drive the cycle of improvement. Faculty members continued to monitor students' performances, and move to implement additional instructional materials, if needed. These changes improve the student's ability to be agile in the global business environment thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward. The AoL #4 Committee decided that the ETS measure was no longer a good data point for the organization; rather, the internal SoBUSKE exam would replace the ETS for the upcoming AC 2022-2023 for all majors.

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

AC 2022-2023: 60 BUAD students participated in the SoB Knowledge Exam. The average score was 54%. However, due to a change in the measurement, a direct comparison between AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 is not advisable. The AC 2020-2021 numbers included all students who completed the final report while the 2022-2023 numbers included only the BUAD students. While Accounting, Business Administration, and Computer Information Systems have shared the first four student learning outcome goals for many years, this change allows the faculty in each discipline to better analyze the results for their students and make changes to their degree plan which will then be reflected in their students' results.

Decision:

Based upon the new analysis there cannot be a true comparison due to the change in reflecting each major present in the School of Business and the resetting of the goals of this measure.

SLO 5. Business Administration. Students will demonstrate the ability to solve problems from an integrated multi-disciplinary business perspective.

Note: For SLO 5, the School of Business measures it every other year so in AC 2022-2023, SLO 5 is not measured. The SLO 5 results and analysis in this report are based on the AC 2021-2022 report.

Course Map: Tied to course syllabus objectives.

ACCT 2000 Financial Accounting (Foundational Course)

BUAD 2200 Business Reports and Communications (Foundational Course)

BUAD 2120 Basic Business Statistics (Foundational Course)

FIN 3090 Business Finance (Foundational Course)

MGT 3220 Organizations and Management (Foundational Course)

MKTG 3230 Principles of Marketing (Foundational Course)

MGT 3580 Operations Management (Foundational Course)

MGT 4300 Strategic Management and Policies (Capstone Course)

Measure 5.1 (Direct- Student Artifact; MGT 4300 Exam 1 - Business Case Study Written Document)

Details/Description: In AC 2016-2017, the Business Administration faculty in the School of Business developed the fifth students learning outcomes for business administration program (SLO 5 BUAD) and its Measure 5.1. Business administration students will solve problems from an integrated multi-disciplinary business perspective using a business case study written document as MGT 4300 Exam 1. The written document consists of Section 1 (Conceptual Framework) and Section 2 (Business Ratios). Students will complete an integrated multi-disciplinary business case analysis utilizing a conceptual framework model and business ratio formulation and analysis to identify a company's situation and position, company issues, and implications. Students will provide solutions to the identified business problems and submit a final case study report.

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

Acceptable Target: The acceptable target was established as 70% of the students will score 70 % or better on the business case study.

Ideal Target: The ideal target was established as 75% of the students will score 75% or better.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Ongoing in MGT 4300 in each semester and to be reported biannually since AC 2017-2018. AC 2017-2018 represents the baseline year for Measure 5.1.

Key/Responsible Personnel: The MGT 4300 faculty will be responsible for administering the exam, gathering, and analyzing results and providing actions, recommendations, and decisions.

Findings: The ideal target was met.

Analysis: In AC 2021-2022 the acceptable target was met. The ideal target was also met. The actual results increased from AC 2019-2020 to AC 2021-2022, by one percentage point in the acceptable target and four percentage points in the ideal target. See Table 19 below.

Table 19: AC 2019-2020 vs. AC 2021-2022 Comparison

Measure 5.1					
Assessment Cycle	n (#of students)	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target	Actual Results of Acceptable Target *	Actual Results of Ideal Target**
2019-2020	144	70%	75%	85%	82%
2021-2022	145	70%	75%	86%	86%
*Actual Results indicate percent of students scoring 70% or better on the measure.					
**Actual Results indicate percent of students scoring 75% or better on the measure.					

Note: For SLO 5, the School of Business measure it every other year so in AC 2020-2021, SLO 5 is not measured.

AC 2019-2020: The acceptable target was met. The ideal target was also met. The actual result was 85% of the students scored 70% or better and 82% of the students scored 75% or better.

AC 2021-2022: The acceptable target was met. The ideal target was also met. The actual result was 86% of the students scored 70% or better and 86% of the students scored 75% or better. In 2021-2022 the following changes were implemented to drive continuous improvement. Based on the analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty implemented the following changes to drive the cycle of improvement. A new case study and business analysis project were selected and implemented in fall 2021. Lectures, presentations, and videos were created and linked to the Excel Grading Rubric giving the students solid examples to prepare them for Exam 1. In Spring, 2022 An extra video and presentation was created by the Finance instructor to assist with the financial section of the exam, and she returned to the class three times to ensure that the students understood the concepts. There was a marked improvement in the scores. The faculty will continue to explore more resources to enhance the written side of the exam.

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

As a result of these changes, in AC 2021-2022, the acceptable target and the ideal target were met.

Decision.

In 2021-2022 the acceptable and the ideal targets were met. Based on the analysis of the 2021-2022 results the faculty will implement the following changes in 2022-2023 to drive the cycle of improvement. Since the case studies and business analysis documents will be changed annually, it is important to add more resources, such as videos, presentations, and other assignments to ensure student success. The faculty will add more resources to the curriculum to ensure continued success, including more resources to explain the Conceptual Framework Model. The faculty will analyze the papers to see what areas need more explanations and respond accordingly.

These changes will enhance the students' learning experience and improve the student's ability to solve problems from an integrated multi-disciplinary business perspective thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward.

Measure 5.2 (Direct-Student Artifact: MGT 3580 Final Exam)

Details/Description: In AC 2016-2017, Business Administration faculty in the School of Business developed the SLO 5 BUAD and its Measure 5.2. In MGT 3580 (Operations Management) students will complete an integrated multi-disciplinary comprehensive exam solving business problems across multiple disciplines using analytical tools (such as Excel) or models. Students will provide solutions to specific business problems and submit the results to the exam for evaluation. The exam is graded by the instructor of each MGT 3580 classes.

Acceptable Target: 70% of the students will score 80% or better in MGT3580 Final Exam.

Ideal Target: 85% of the students will score 80% or better.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Ongoing in MGT 3580 in each semester and to be reported biannually since AC 2017-2018. AC 2017-2018 represents the baseline year for Measure 5.2.

Key/Responsible Personnel: The MGT 3580 faculty is responsible for administering the exam, gathering, and analyzing results and providing actions, recommendations, and decisions.

Findings: The target was not met.

Analysis: In AC 2021-2022, the acceptable target was not met. Compared with AC 2019-2020, the result in AC 2021-2022 dropped by two percentage points. The drop can be mainly attributed to the lower result in fall 2021 at which time the final exam was moved from Moodle to McGraw-Hill Connect with new test questions requiring Excel calculation submission for each question. Comparing to AC 2019-2020, the result (22%) in fall 2021 was decreased by five percentage points, then increased by six percentage points in spring 2022, thus made the result (28%) in spring 2022 one percentage point higher than AC 2019-2020. See Table 20 below.

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

Table 20: AC 2019-2020 vs. AC 2020-2021 Comparison

Measure 5.2				
Assessment Cycle	Number of students	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target	Actual Results*
2019-2020	165	70%	85%	27%
2021-2022	155	70%	85%	25%
<i>Fall 2021</i>	77	70%	85%	22%
<i>Spring 2022</i>	78	70%	85%	28%

*Actual Results indicate the percentage of students scoring 80% or better in the MGT 3580 final exam.

Note: For SLO 5, the School of Business measure it every other year so that in AC 2020-2021, SLO 5 is not measured.

AC 2019-2020: The target was not met. The actual result was that 27% of the students scored 80% or better.

AC 2021-2022: The target was not met. The actual result was that 25% of the students scored 80% or better.

Based on the analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty implemented the following changes in 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement:

- (1) Tracking the grade of each question in the final exam, steps were taken to enhance the problem-solving skills of Line Balancing, QFD, Product Structure Tree, and Productivity. Actions included more classroom practices with Excel, reviewing the chapter assessments questions in the classroom and via recorded videos, adding course review classes to the class schedule before the midterm and final exams, and creating problem-solving skills review list with video links in Moodle, etc.
- (2) Since fall 2021, MGT 3580 final exam was set up and implemented through McGraw-Hill Connect to ensure academic integrity and required Excel submission for all questions. Each test question was either algo (which means that different students get different data series under the same question) or drawn from a pool of questions under the same problem-solving skill evaluation. Rubrics for grading were created and implemented at the same time.
- (3) Track students' performance more frequently and be agile to accommodate students' learning during the COVID-19 pandemic or other environmental changes in education. The instructor created Microsoft Team for all MGT 3580 sections and encouraged students to use team chat with the instructor to get homework help. The instructor also added an orientation video on online learning in course orientation module to help students transition to online learning. One instructor allowed students to request customizing all the due dates of the chapter assignments according to their individual schedules.

As a result of these changes, in AC 2021-2022, the target was not met. It cannot be concluded that students' performance in Measure 5.2 was poorer because the final exam was redesigned in FA21 with the new test. In fact, the SP22 actual result (28%) is six percent points higher than

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

FA21 (22%), which indicates an improvement in performance since the new final exam had been enacted.

Decision:

In 2021-2022, the target was not met. Based on the analysis of the 2021-2022 results, the faculty will implement the following changes in 2022-2023 to drive the cycle of improvement:

- (1) Deleting Moodle quizzes to avoid students' switching between two learning platforms for chapter assessments. The Moodle quiz questions can be assigned under Connect assignments.
- (2) Requiring Excel submission under Connect assignments to set up the Connect assignments using the same format as the Final Exam.
- (3) Setting up MGT 3580 midterm exam in Connect with the same format as the final exam.
- (4) Using Proctorio+ in proctoring exams for online students.
- (5) Inviting guest speakers from local businesses to the MGT 3580 classroom.

These changes will improve the students' ability to solve business problems across multiple disciplines using analytical tools (such as Excel) or models, enhance the academic integrity, and provide agility to accommodate students' learning thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward.

Comprehensive Summary of Key evidence of improvement based on the analysis of results.

The following reflects all the changes implemented to drive the continuous process of seeking improvement in AC 2022-2023. These changes are based on the knowledge gained through the analysis of the AC 2021-2022 results.

Data on the students learning outcomes was collected, analyzed, and reported for the BS in Business Administration. Instruments used included the complete and partial SoBUSKE, the ETS exam, written and oral projects from students as individuals and as teams, case studies, simulations, and other quizzes or exams.

In AC 2022-2023, SLO 1 to SLO 4 were measured. SLO 5 was not measured. The SLO 5 results and analysis in this report are based on the AC 2021-2022 results. Table 21 below indicates the SLOs results in AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023.

Table 21: Summary of SLOs in AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023

SLO Measure		Acceptable Target Met?		Ideal Target Met?	
		2020-2021	2022-2023	2020-2021	2022-2023
SLO#1	1a.1	No	No	No	No

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

	1a.2	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	1a.3	No	Discontinued	No	Discontinued
	1a.4	No	No	No	No
	1b	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	1c	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
SLO#2	2.1a	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	2.1b	No	Yes	No	Yes
	2.1c	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	2.2	No	Discontinued	No	Discontinued
	2.3	No	No	No	No
SLO#3	3.1	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	3.2	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	3.3	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
SLO#4	4.1	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	4.2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	4.3	Yes	n/a	Yes	n/a
SLO#5	5.1	Yes	Not measured	Yes	Not measured
	5.2	No	Not measured	No	Not measured

Compared to AC 2020-2021, both the number of measures in which we achieved the acceptable target and the number of measures in which we achieved the ideal target in AC 2022-2023 increased. In AC 2020-2021, 10 out of the 17 measures, i.e., 59% of the measures under SLO 1 to SLO 4 met the acceptable target. Of these, 7 measures, i.e., 41% of the 17 measures under SLO#1 to SLO#4 also met the ideal target. In AC 2022-2023, 11 out of 14 measures, i.e., 79% of the measures under SLO 1 to SLO 4 met the acceptable target. Of these, 9 measures, i.e., 64% of the measures under SLO 1 to SLO 4 met the ideal target. The number of measures which achieved the acceptable target was increased by 20 percentage points in AC 2022-2023.

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

The number of measures which achieved the ideal target was increased by 23 percentage points.

However, due to a change in the measurement, a direct one-on-one comparison between AC 2020-2021 and AC 2022-2023 measures is not advisable because the AC 2020-2021 numbers included all students while the 2022-2023 numbers included only the BUAD students. While Accounting, Business Administration, and Computer Information Systems have shared the first four student learning outcome goals for many years, this change allows the faculty in each discipline to better analyze the results for their students and make changes to their degree plan which will then be reflected in their students' results.

Five measures were taken for SLO#1 Effective Communication. Of these, three measures met the acceptable target with two also meeting the ideal target. Two measures did not meet the target. Key actions taken by our school and faculty to make continuous improvement in SLO#1 include lowering the number of non-participants in the SoBUSKE exams, BUAD 2200 letter assignment and MGT 3230 presentation, adding class discussions, instructional videos, review materials, one-on-one feedbacks, and a writing assignment to make our students understand the course requirements earlier and better in the classes. Our faculty collaborated to ensure course consistency. All students were directed to the Bossier Parish Community College-Open Campus (free online non-credit courses) to aid instruction in the grammar mechanics area.

Four measures were taken for SLO#2. Of these, three measures met the ideal target, and one measure did not meet the acceptable target. Key actions taken by our school and faculty to make continuous improvement in SLO#2 include implement of a strategic communication plan in BUAD 2120 to emphasize learning resources, new instructional videos, learning materials, or course reviews added in BUAD 2120, MKTG 3230, and MGT 4300 classes. The finance faculty also determined to give partial knowledge exam in FIN 3090 instead of FIN 2150 to improve student performance.

Three measures were taken for SLO#3. All of these met the acceptable targets while two also met the ideal targets. Key actions taken by our school and faculty to make continuous improvement in SLO#3 include replacing the quiz for business finance essays under Measure 3.1, replacing the business simulation game for a comprehensive project under Measure 3.2, and required use of Excel in FIN 3090 case analysis under Measure 3.3.

Three measures were taken for SLO#4. While one measure is not available because the target is still to be reset with AC 2022-2023 and AC 2023-2024 data, other two measures both met the ideal targets. Key actions taken by our school and faculty to drive the cycle of improvement include adding more instructional and research resources, attempting to increase the class participation and communication, and mentoring the new instructors.

For SLO 5, one measure met the acceptable and ideal targets while another did not meet either target. The Business Administration faculty have made key changes to improve their program and the associated student learning outcomes. Changes in MGT 4300 in a coverage of new case study and business analysis project, lectures, presentations, and videos, led to marked improvement in the scores. Changes in the MGT 3580 final exam led to a decline of 2% in the

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

actual results but we believe the new test enhanced the academic integrity and it will benefit the program and improve the student learning outcomes in the long-term. Changes to coverages of more Excel exercises, course review, and the new rubric in grading the Excel made the students' performance was improving in the new test. The faculty also added more accommodations for students to customize their learning schedule and have more access to communicate with the instructor and the class.

Plan of Action moving forward.

Based on analysis of the 2022-2023 results (SLO#1-4) and the 2020-2021 results (SLO#5), the School of Business has identified several strategies for improving learning outcomes.

The possible inclusion of COMM1010 (if approved by the School of Business Faculty and the University Curriculum Review Committee) could provide increased performances in multiple areas. Its inclusion would also allow other classes to adjust the topics covered in their classes, leading to increased performance in other areas.

One particular focus is the continuation of the creation of strategies to address non-participation and lack of effort in many of the activities. Some of the student learning outcome measurements are greatly affected by the lack of participation by students. While the faculty are trying to make decisions based on the available data, these decisions could be skewed due to the students who are not meaningfully participating.

Collaboration between faculty within the School of Business continues to be key. The faculty members will work with the BUAD2200 faculty members to create rubrics for the oral and written components of the FIN 3090, BUAD 3270, MKTG 3230 and MGT 4300 projects and case analyses. Additionally, for all changes in classes where multiple faculties teach the class, the faculty members will work together to ensure that the change is effective across all class sections.

The use of technology and external resources remain a constant need going forward. Faculty members will be incorporating the use of Excel for analysis in more classes and creating sections within the learning management system to highlighter external business research databases and tools.

Efforts remain in providing professional development and feedback to the faculty regarding student learning outcomes and quality teaching. The Lunch and Learn program in the School of Business remains a key area in which to accomplish this task. In 2022-2023, almost monthly events were held related to varying topics. In most of these events for 2022-2023, the topics were a specific student learning outcome, its measurements, and ways to affect these measurements. The discussion of the change in how we were measuring across the School of Business for each degree program and how to handle it for each measurement was also a key component of these luncheons. Finally, other topics were discussed, such as a presentation by Emily Perritt from Electronic and Continuing Education on the creation of accessible documents for use in class.

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

Faculty should remain interested in incorporating support for student learning outcomes due to a previous change in the merit sheet. In the 2020-2021 academic year, a new merit sheet was proposed and approved. The 2022-2023 academic year was the second year in which the faculty went through the evaluation process under this new merit sheet. This merit sheet includes an emphasis on key items that move the School of Business in the direction outlined by our mission statement and vision. One key area where faculty members can receive points is “Demonstration of the incorporation of the outcomes of the SoB’s assessment process of student learning expectations into the faculty member’s course or courses that highlight either a new design, delivery method, revision, and/or overall improvement for the degree program curricula.” Through the promotion of this area, the School of Business faculty hope to have more faculty members supporting the various student learning outcomes. We are also able to gather data about changes made in classes due to student learning outcomes even if those changes weren’t part of the original plan.

Additionally, three strategic initiatives are included in the merit sheet. Two of these initiatives could have a direct impact on student learning. One of the initiatives is for faculty to undertake a Quality Matters review for their classes. Another initiative relates to a push for inclusion of teaching and non-teaching activities related to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

For SLO 5, the Business Administration faculty are committed to continue enhancing the quality of their program. The successful changes made in the MGT 4300 courses will be kept and more resources will be added to ensure student success. For the second measurement, the faculty will move chapter assessments and the midterm exam to Connect platform, require more Excel exercises, adopt Proctorio+ and invite guest speakers. These actions will give students more accommodations to manage the learning process and enhance the problem-solving skills.

On the capstone project, the faculty will monitor how changes in the curriculum are affecting student performance on the final project. Faculty will also ensure user guides are incorporated throughout all portions of the curriculum.

One of the largest efforts that could affect the student learning outcome process is an effort undertaken called “Reimagining Our AOLs”. For AACSB accreditation purposes, we use assurance of learning instead of student learning outcome. Additionally, while the title emphasizes assurance of learning, the discussions are about learning so it naturally involves curriculum discussion as well. This process began in 2022-2023 and will continue in 2023-2024. Through this process, the faculty members in Accounting, Business Administration, and Computer Information Systems met multiple times to discuss the soft skills and knowledge-specific skills of the graduate in their area.

Faculty members used these lists of skills to form overall goals for the program. Either during Summer 2023 or at beginning of Fall 2023, faculty members will vote on these new goals. Then during 2023-2024, faculty members will continue meeting to refine specific objectives, measurements, and targets for these goals. Thus far, the good news is that the proposed goals align with the student learning outcome goals put forth by the University of Louisiana System.

As faculty members were asked to come into these discussions as if the previous goals and

Assessment Cycle 2022 – 2023

their supporting objectives and measurements did not exist, some of the goals will be changes from the goals that the School of Business has been using for several years. Once the goals, measurements, and objectives have been refined, discussions will occur with the appropriate personnel at the University about the change and the unit will move forward in implementing these changes. Another component of the discussion will be about skills or knowledge that did not get specifically measured in a student learning outcome but that the faculty members thought were important. The faculty members will analyze these skills and knowledge to ensure they are being taught in the curriculum as well.

In conclusion, the School of Business and its faculty strive to improve all aspects of student learning. New initiatives are constantly being introduced and evaluated based on their effectiveness. Measures of student learning outcomes are assessed each semester and compared to previous results to determine progress. The School of Business has a collegial environment and faculty often work together to ensure classes are blending and that appropriate and successful strategies are shared with other faculty members.