

University of Dayton
School of Business Administration
Assurance of Learning Report for 2008-2009
April 8, 2010

This report covers the SBA's educational outcomes assessment activities for the academic year 2008-09. Following the schedule in the SBA Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan, the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration degree program (the "UG Program" in this report) was assessed based on data collected in this period. (The assessment of the Master of Business Administration (MBA) Program will be in the report for next year.)

The assessment utilized direct measures of student performance in order to ascertain whether learning outcome objectives were being met. Student performance was evaluated either by independent evaluators (those not teaching the courses where the measures are embedded) or by individual faculty teaching these courses using pre-determined, rubric-based measures in a manner consistent with AACSB guidelines. The Undergraduate Curriculum and Assurance of Learning Committee reviewed the evidence (including the report from the previous cycle), developed findings and recommendations for the program, and will monitor their implementation. Please see the SBA Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan document for complete details on measures and procedures.

UG Program Results Summary

The broad learning outcomes, specific objectives, measurement approach, target achievement levels, and findings for the UG Program are summarized in Table 1 with details of the results in the accompanying Exhibits. Note that two outcomes are inactive. Indeed, all current outcomes will be dropped formally effective Fall 2010 when the new learning outcomes recently approved by the SBA faculty take effect. A new assessment plan will be developed to measure those outcomes.

Overall, the results in Table 1 show that all targets were met except for one, which was very close. This indicates that students in the UG Program largely are achieving the desired learning outcomes. However, the results also indicate the need for action in a few areas:

- A recommendation for the next assessment cycle is to raise the achievement target for the measure of *Objective 1 (Knowledge of core concepts in business disciplines)* that pertains to sub-scores in individual disciplines. Currently, the target for the mean score in each area is one standard deviation below the mean for other institutions. This is to be raised to the mean for other institutions similar to the target for the overall score. In the absence of prior data, the target for each individual discipline (or sub-score) had been set initially to a lower standard than that for the overall score to avoid overreaction with changes in a particular discipline if the overall score met its target. Now, based on data from two cycles of data collection, alignment of the targets for the sub-scores and overall score is warranted.
- The target for *Objective 2 (Ability to identify and capitalize on business opportunities)* was only narrowly missed, at about the same level as in the previous cycle. Consequently, we will continue to monitor results for this objective for another cycle, if this measure is retained in the new assessment plan. At the same time, we will investigate refining the measure. For instance, it is based on relative performance on the capstone business simulation. Instead of using ranks for relative performance, we could use an index that better reflects the raw performance scores.

- The Eye Contact trait in the measure of *Objective 3a (Proficiency in oral communications)* was an item that was to be monitored based on the results from the previous cycle. In the current assessment, the score for this trait was much higher. While the score on all traits met the target levels, one trait in particular – Interest – was lower than in the previous cycle. However, the major action taken since the previous cycle was to improve the video recording quality as recommended by the independent evaluator. Improvement in the Eye Contact trait or a lower score on the Interest trait may be artifacts of the quality difference in video recording in the two cycles with a more accurate evaluation now being feasible. Consequently, we will examine data from the next cycle before drawing inferences about trends.
- Scores on all traits in the measures of *Objective 3b (Proficiency in written communications)* and *Objective 3c (Proficiency in research or information literacy skills)* met their targets. However, scores were significantly lower than in the prior cycle on the following items: organizes arguments in a logical manner, draws conclusions that are consistent with arguments and analysis, and uses acceptable style and grammar (all in the area of written communications) and framing the research question (in the area of research/information literacy.) The evaluators were the same in both cycles. Grades earned in the course where the evaluation was done are only slightly but not significantly lower (average course GPA of 2.75 versus 2.80) compared to the previous cycle so the performance and capability of students (with the subject matter of the course) in the two samples is similar. An interview with a course instructor suggests that the drop off from the previous cycle was not qualitatively discernible but identifies traits (such as those listed above) within writing and information literacy skills that could be stronger and should be tracked. We will examine data from the next cycle to monitor any trends in these skills to decide whether we need to involve those teaching the English classes.
- The focus for actions for improvement indicated by assessment in the previous cycle was on *Objective 3d (Proficiency in using technology to structure and retrieve data for decisions)*. Although the overall target on the measure for this objective was met, scores on three specific sub-traits dealing with the design of data tables, queries, and reports were very low with only 29%, 31%, and 21% of students, respectively, demonstrating proficiency with those skills in the previous cycle. The current assessment shows that the overall target has again been met and, following the improvement actions outlined in the previous report, the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency on the three sub-traits in question are 36%, 62%, and 66% of students, respectively. Thus, only one sub-trait related to the design of tables, while showing some improvement (from 29% to 36%), is still very weak. Further analyses have been conducted to understand this weakness. Refining the layout of the test (to investigate whether the result is an artifact of the test) but asking a similar question showed that 58% of students (35 out of 60) were able to successfully accomplish the task. Another investigation showed that 76% of students (22 out of 29) were successful when the question was more directive and framed in terms of the mechanics of what was to be accomplished rather than as the original “word problem.” The Course Director of MIS 301, where these skills are taught, will use these insights to coordinate actions to address this weakness.
- The results for the remaining objectives are satisfactory and indicate that no action is required. However, some changes to note from the previous cycle are that an independent evaluator was used for *Objective 6 (Recognition of ethical dilemmas and corporate social responsibility issues)* and the target used for *Objective 3e (Proficiency in teamwork)* reflects a higher standard as recommended in the report for the previous cycle.

Assurance of Learning Process Evaluation Summary

The SBA Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan calls for evaluation and adjustment of assessment procedures based in part on input by process participants such as the two Curriculum and Assurance of Learning Committees. As a result of this evaluation, the following will be undertaken:

- Target levels will be reviewed and adjusted (likely raised) for certain measures. In the absence of baseline data, the target achievement level for all learning outcomes was set at a uniform 70% of the sample achieving an acceptable score on each measure (or 60% for sub-scores.) The availability of data now supports altering target achievement levels. Thus, the target for *Objective 3e* was raised after the previous cycle and the target for sub-scores for *Objective 1* is to be raised now.
- Measurement procedures will be refined to incorporate greater use of independent evaluators and more relevant external benchmarks where possible, e.g., by pegging target levels on the ETS Field Test in Business to performance of peer schools, subject to budgetary considerations. Evaluation of student work for *Objective 6* was done by an independent evaluator instead of the previous practice of using the instructors of the course where the measure is embedded.

Table 1. Assurance of Learning Results: UG Program (2009)

Outcomes/Learning Goals	Learning Objectives*	Curriculum	Measurement Approach**	Satisfactory Level	Result	Status/Action
(1a) Mastery of the fundamental concepts of business in a global market place.	(1) Knowledge of core concepts in business disciplines [Knowledge, Comprehension]	All core courses except MGT 490	ETS Field Test in Business in MGT 490	Mean total score no lower than that of other institutions & mean score on sub-areas no lower than one standard deviation below other institutions	Met target (Exhibit 1)	Raise sub-area targets to mean score of other universities
(1b) Mastery of specialized knowledge in one or more areas of study.	(Specific to each major)					Not relevant for AACSB; may be assessed in future
(2) Ability to identify and capitalize on business opportunities.	(2) Ability to identify and capitalize on business opportunities [Application, Analysis, Synthesis]	MGT 490	Faculty evaluation of decisions and results based on MGT 490 business simulation group exercise	70% of groups have a rank of 3 or better	67% of groups met target (Exhibit 2)	Track results for another cycle to determine if action is required; investigate feasibility of refining measure
(3) Ability to effectively participate and/or provide leadership in solving complex business problems involving challenges such as, cross-functional issues, highly integrated systems, diverse work teams, and the broader issues of society.	(3a) Proficiency in oral communications [Application]	CMM modules	Independent evaluator evaluates recorded project presentations from MIS 301 using rubric from faculty	70% of students have a mean score of 2 or better and 60% score 2 or better on each trait	Met target (Exhibit 3)	No action required
	(3b) Proficiency in written communications [Application]	ENG courses	MGT 201 instructors evaluate research paper on common writing rubric	70% of students score 2 or better on each trait	Met target (Exhibit 4)	No action required but investigate / monitor as scores lower than previous year

Outcomes/Learning Goals	Learning Objectives*	Curriculum	Measurement Approach**	Satisfactory Level	Result	Status/Action
	(3c) Proficiency in research or information literacy skills [Application]	ENG courses	MGT 201 instructors evaluate research paper on common information literacy rubric	70% of students score 2 or better on each trait	Met target (Exhibit 5)	No action required but investigate / monitor as scores lower than previous year
	(3d) Proficiency in using technology to structure and retrieve data for decisions [Application]	BAI 103L MIS 301	Parts of hands-on database test in MIS 301 scored using common checklist	70% of students have a total score of 20 or better	Met total score target but weak in some areas (Exhibit 6)	Investigate item of greatest weakness to determine causes & remedy
	(3e) Proficiency in teamwork [Application]	MGT 301	MGT 490 business simulation team peer evaluations using rubric from faculty	80% of students have a mean score of 3.5 or better	Met target (Exhibit 7)	No action required
(4) Commitment to life-long learning to maintain professional competence.						Inactive: evaluation with direct measures difficult & tenuous link to curriculum
(5) Broadly educated with an integrated understanding of science, social science, and the humanities.		Gen Ed				Inactive: evaluation provided by CAS based on indirect measures only
(6) Personal qualities which embody integrity, the principle of servant leadership, ethical decision making, desire to grow spiritually, and the ability to balance one's work, family, and societal responsibility.	(6) Recognition of ethical dilemmas and corporate social responsibility issues [Analysis]	Gen Ed PHL 313 / REL 368 Various SBA core courses	Independent evaluator evaluates paper required for Walk the Talk in conjunction with MGT 490 using rubric from faculty	70% of students have a total score of 10 or better	Met target (Exhibit 8)	No action required

* Bloom's taxonomy categories in parentheses

** See SBA Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan for details of measures utilized

EXHIBIT 1: UG Objective 1 Results
Knowledge of core concepts in business disciplines

ETS Field Test: Business
Winter 2009
Sample size: 182 students

TOTAL TEST

Scaled Score Range	Number in Range	Percent Below
200	0	100
195-199	0	100
190-194	4	98
185-189	0	98
180-184	4	96
175-179	16	87
170-174	16	78
165-169	15	70
160-164	37	49
155-159	24	36
150-154	31	19
145-149	19	9
140-144	6	5
135-139	6	2
130-134	2	1
125-129	1	1
120-124	1	0
	Mean	Standard Deviation
UD Total Scaled Score	160	13
Other Institutions' Score/Target	151.6	7

SUBSCORES

Assessment Indicator Title	Mean Percent Correct	Other Institutions		
		Mean	Std Dev	Target
Accounting	54	49.8	6.9	42.9
Economics	56	47.4	7.0	40.4
Management	63	54.7	7.5	47.2
Quantitative Business Analysis	52	46.2	5.9	40.3
Finance	62	54.9	8.5	46.4
Marketing	62	52.0	6.8	45.2
Legal and Social Environment	56	46.1	6.1	40.0
Information Systems	61	58.0	5.2	52.8
International Issues	64	54.0	8.0	46.0

EXHIBIT 2: UG Objective 2 Results
Ability to identify and capitalize on business opportunities

MGT 490 Business Simulation Team Project: Students work in teams throughout the semester on their business simulation project. Teams can work toward a variety of goals (or metrics) which must include, at a minimum, cumulative profits and average stock price. Teams are evaluated based on their relative performance (rank relative to other teams) on the most heavily weighted metric of their choice.

Fall & Winter 2008-09
Sample: 66 teams

Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total Count in Metric	% Ranked 1-3 (Target 70%)
Metric								
Cumulative profit	3	3	2	1	1	3	13 (20%)	62%
Average stock price	3	2	2		1	2	10 (15%)	70%
Average Return on Sales	2	4	2	1	1	3	13 (20%)	62%
Average Return on Assets			2		1	1	4 (6%)	50%
Average Return on Equity			1				1 (2%)	100%
Average Market Share	6	3	2	3	1	1	16 (24%)	69%
Average Asset Turnover	2	2	3		1	1	9 (14%)	78%
Total in Rank	16 (24%)	14 (21%)	14 (21%)	5 (8%)	6 (9%)	11 (17%)		67%

**EXHIBIT 3: UG Objective 3a Results
Proficiency in oral communications**

MIS 301 Term Project Oral Presentation: Students present the results of their group term project that involves analysis, design, and development of a database-centered solution to support a business process for a real or hypothetical organization

**Winter 2009
Sample: 109 students**

Traits	Unacceptable (0)	Poor (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Good (3)	Excellent (4)	% Rated 2 or better (Target 60%)
Interest: Introduces material, creates interest & enthusiasm, projects energy & confidence	2 (2%)	23 (21%)	33 (30%)	26 (24%)	25 (23%)	77%
Eye Contact: Makes eye contact with audience, avoids reading & looking at screen	1 (1%)	19 (17%)	27 (25%)	43 (39%)	19 (17%)	82%
Speech: Speaks clearly and with appropriate volume, tone, pace	0 (0%)	8 (7%)	48 (44%)	42 (39%)	11 (10%)	93%
Mannerisms: Avoids distracting mannerisms & verbal pauses; appropriate gestures & posture	0 (0%)	9 (8%)	44 (40%)	45 (41%)	11 (10%)	92%
Visuals: Appropriate use of visual aids of good quality	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	11 (19%)	46 (78%)	100%
Range for Traits' Mean	0-0.99	1.00-1.99	2.00-2.99	3.00-4.00		
Mean Trait Score	0 (0%)	16 (15%)	51 (47%)	42 (39%)		

Mean Score of 2 or better: 85% (Target 70%)

**EXHIBIT 4: UG Objective 3b Results
Proficiency in written communications**

MGT 201 Term Paper – Written Communication: Students write a persuasive, position paper that shows the impact of a law or laws on the conduct of businesses

Winter 2009

Sample Size: 194 students

Traits	Unsatisfactory (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Good (3)	% Rated 2 or 3 (Target 70%)
Provides clear introduction and background	23 (12%)	88 (45%)	83 (43%)	88%
Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the discipline-related concepts and issues*	37 (19%)	97 (50%)	60 (31%)	81%
Uses internally consistent arguments	25 (13%)	83 (43%)	86 (44%)	87%
Organizes arguments in a logical manner	40 (21%)	70 (36%)	84 (43%)	79%
Applies law to facts appropriately*	55 (28%)	90 (46%)	49 (25%)	72%
Draws conclusions that are consistent with arguments and analysis	27 (14%)	87 (45%)	79 (41%)	86%
Uses acceptable style and grammar	37 (19%)	69 (36%)	88 (45%)	81%
Documents sources effectively	20 (10%)	82 (42%)	92 (47%)	90%

* These traits reflect substantive knowledge more than written communication skills

EXHIBIT 5: UG Objective 3c Results
Proficiency in research or information literacy skills

MGT 201 Term Paper – Information Literacy: Students demonstrate information literacy skills for a written position paper that shows the impact of a law or laws on the conduct of businesses.

Winter 2009

Sample Size: 194 students

Traits	Unsatisfactory (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Good (3)	% Rated 2 or 3 (Target 70%)
Framing the Research Question	45 (23%)	84 (43%)	65 (34%)	77%
Accessing Sources	46 (24%)	91 (47%)	57 (29%)	76%
Evaluating Sources and Content	32 (16%)	97 (50%)	65 (34%)	84%
Using Information for a Specific Purpose	35 (18%)	76 (40%)	81 (42%)	82%

EXHIBIT 6: UG Objective 3d Results
Proficiency in using technology to structure and retrieve data for decisions

MIS 301 Hands-on Database Test: Students apply to a new scenario their skills in creating and querying relational databases and organizing the results during a limited time, in-class exam

Fall & Winter 2008-09
Sample: 90 students

Traits	Yes (1)	No (0)
A. Data Tables & Relationships		
Creates table	90 (100%)	0 (0%)
With all fields	90 (100%)	0 (0%)
Appropriate primary key	85 (94%)	5 (6%)
All fields set to appropriate data types	88 (98%)	2 (2%)
All fields set to appropriate size	90 (100%)	0 (0%)
Creates relationships between tables on correct fields	32 (36%)	58 (64%)
Mean Sub-Total (out of 6)	5.23	
B. Forms		
Creates form and sub form	78 (87%)	12 (13%)
All appropriate fields	74 (82%)	16 (18%)
No repeated fields	86 (96%)	4 (4%)
Appropriate labels	86 (96%)	4 (4%)
Appropriate form headers	84 (93%)	6 (7%)
Appropriate form footers	87 (97%)	3 (3%)
Mean Sub-Total (out of 6)	5.50	
C. Queries		
Select correct fields	89 (99%)	1 (1%)
Display only relevant fields	78 (87%)	12 (13%)
Sort on multiple criteria	49 (54%)	41 (46%)
Perform multi-table query correctly	51 (57%)	39 (43%)
Select appropriate criteria for record selection	87 (97%)	3 (3%)
Make use of correct comparison operator in a query	84 (93%)	6 (7%)
Select records on multiple criteria (e.g. and/or)	63 (70%)	27(30%)
Select records on pattern match criteria (e.g. like a*)	56 (62%)	34 (38%)
Use parameter query function correctly	53 (59%)	37 (41%)
Perform calculation	75 (83%)	15 (17%)
Perform aggregate function correctly	54 (60%)	36 (40%)
Mean Sub-Total (out of 11)	8.21	
D. Reports		
Creates report	87 (97%)	3 (3%)
All appropriate fields	84 (93%)	6 (7%)
No repeated fields	82 (91%)	8 (9%)
Appropriate labels	59 (66%)	31 (34%)
Appropriate report headers	65 (72%)	25 (28%)
Appropriate report footers	67 (74%)	23 (26%)
Appropriate calculated fields	59 (66%)	31 (34%)
Mean Sub-Total (out of 7)	5.59	
Mean Total (out of 30)	24.58	

Total Score of 0-14: 3 (3.3%)
15-19: 6 (6.7%)
20-24: 31 (34.4%)
25-30: 50 (55.6%)

Total Score of 20 or better: 90% (Target 70%)

**EXHIBIT 7: UG Objective 3e Results
Proficiency in teamwork**

MGT 490 Team Peer Evaluation: Students work in teams throughout the semester on their business simulation project. Project results affect a significant percentage of the course grade.

**Winter 2009
Sample: 110 students**

Rating Scale:*	Unacceptable (1)	Poor (2)	Satisfactory (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)
Mean Rating Range:**	1.00-1.49	1.50-2.49	2.50-3.49	3.50-4.49	4.50-5.00
Attendance at group meetings	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	14 (13%)	21 (19%)	75 (68%)
Came to group meetings prepared to solve the requirements of the project	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	6 (5%)	40 (36%)	63 (57%)
Exerted individual effort in getting things done as needed	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	4 (4%)	36 (33%)	69 (63%)
Has made thoughtful contributions to our team's strategies	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	6 (5%)	40 (36%)	63 (57%)
Individual contribution to the team's overall success in preparing the assignments and presentation	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (6%)	38 (35%)	65 (59%)
Individual effort in getting things done as assigned	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	4 (4%)	39 (35%)	66 (60%)
Showed a willingness to listen to, and to consider, the ideas of others	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (5%)	24 (22%)	81 (74%)
Tried to lead, and not to dominate, the team's decision making	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	9 (8%)	46 (42%)	54 (49%)
Understood the contents of the assignments and cases	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	5 (5%)	34 (31%)	70 (64%)
Overall contribution of this person to the team's learning experience	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (7%)	27 (25%)	75 (68%)
Mean of traits above	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (5%)	35 (32%)	69 (63%)

Individual Mean Trait Score in Satisfactory range (2.50-3.49) or better: 100%
Individual Mean Trait Score of 3.5 or better: 95% (Target 80%)

* Rating scale (1-5) used by students to rate their team members

** Range for classifying mean rating earned by an individual student based on ratings by his/her peers

EXHIBIT 8: UG Objective 6 Results
Recognition of ethical dilemmas and corporate social responsibility issues

MGT 490 “Walk the Talk” Ethics/Social Responsibility Paper: Students typically attend a lunch meeting in a small group that includes an executive to discuss a short ethics/social responsibility case. They write a paper on the case.

Winter 2009
Sample: 100 students

Trait	Poor (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Good (3)
Correctly identifies the facts and ethical issues	1 (1%)	25 (25%)	74 (74%)
Extrapolates the consequences of action to other parties.	3 (3%)	31 (31%)	66 (66%)
Looks at transactions from the perspective of other parties, including corporate	3 (3%)	27 (27%)	70 (70%)
Generates insights in developing appropriate courses of action.	4 (4%)	38 (38%)	58 (58%)
Reflection reveals insights generated by the experience.	1 (1%)	35 (35%)	64 (64%)

Total Score

5: 0 (0%)
6: 1 (1%)
7: 2 (2%)
8: 0 (0%)
9: 2 (2%)
10: 18 (18%)
11: 6 (6%)
12: 2 (2%)
13: 9 (9%)
14: 5 (5%)
15: 55 (55%)

Total Score of 10 or better: 95% (Target 70%)