

BSBA AY 2015-2016 Assessment

Phase 1: Assessment Plan

Learning Outcome assessed:

BSBA Learning Outcome 3: Communication

Effectively communicate orally and in writing using various mediums across unique situations.

Assessment Method:

Group projects in BUS 308

Targeted performance, based on rubrics:

80% of the students should meet or exceed expectations on the rubric's criterion assessing this learning outcome.

Evaluation Process:

During the spring semester of 2016, 72 students from two sections of the core business course Systems in Organizations were put into multiple teams of three or four students and participated in three case studies and four simulations (the teams were assigned sequentially, not concurrently). Early in the semester, the students' knowledge and understanding was scaffolded with three case studies focused on three foundational course concepts: forecasting, inventory planning, and process analysis. The students were required to submit a case analysis for two of the three case studies (forecasting and inventory planning) and a write-up on each simulation after each of the four simulations was completed.

The write-ups were group projects, however, each student had the opportunity to improve their grade by submitting rewrites for each case analysis and simulation write-up.

Written communication was assessed using a writing rubric (see below). The rubric was used for both the case analyses as well as the four simulation write-ups.

For BSBA Learning Outcome #3, the student learning outcome for written communication was first found by averaging the score of the group write-ups from the first three simulation write-ups (the fourth write-up was excluded as there was a time crunch at the end of the semester and the write-up was not representative of students' work.) The average was formed from a student's work that spanned two different teams. By averaging a student's scores from two teams, an attempt was made to tease out individual learning outcomes. For example, if the top score of a student's written work exceeded expectations in one group, it might have been because a teammate had excellent writing skills. The student's written work in another team was looked at to try to tease out individual performance. If a student's average written assessment score is below expectations, even though it may have met or exceeded expectations on one assignment, it is deemed that the student has writing skills below expectations.

All of the students had the opportunity to turn in individual rewrites for each of the cases and simulation write-ups to improve their grades. If a student took advantage of this opportunity for the third simulation write-up, how the student’s written performance may have improved was also analyzed.

Rubric:

<p>■ 9.1.1 - Written Communications view longer description threshold: 8.0 pts</p>	<p>Exceeds Expectations: The purpose of the writing is clear and carries through the entire study. The study is cohesive, accurate, and persuasive, flowing logically from point to point and section to section. The reader is well prepared for each sentence in this thoroughly professional report that would not be significantly improved. 10.0 pts</p>	<p>Meets Expectations: The purpose of the writing is clear and carries through the entire study, which is cohesive and accurate. There are appropriate sections; however, there are instances in which the flow is interrupted between points or headings. The student could readily fix these problems with additional time and advice. 8.0 pts</p>	<p>Below Expectations: The purpose is stated, but the language is not clear or the study is organized in sections that are appropriate but they are mingled and mildly disjointed or the writing is hurried and partially inaccurate in one or two places. Problems can be remedied easily by an editor. 6.0 pts</p>	<p>Does Not Meet Expectations: The purpose is not stated or it does not drive the writing of the study. The report is disjointed and contains three and/or more inaccuracies. 4.0 pts</p>	<p>10.0 pts</p>
--	---	--	--	---	-----------------

Courses where learning outcome was assessed:

BUS 308 Systems in Organizations

Evaluator(s):

Stephen Morris

Phase 2: Results Assessment and Planned Action

Results:

The following results were found by using the average written communication scores on three group written assignments:

- 12.5% of the students (9/72) met or exceeded expectations on written communications.
- 87.5% of the students (63/72) were below expectations on written communications.

When the learning outcome from individual rewrites from simulation 3 is included in the results, the numbers change to the following (the improvement in student learning outcomes is a very good indicator of the efficacy of rewrites.) Fewer than half of the students actually turned in rewrites for the third simulation (30/72) as they were optional in the course. Several of the students had already met or exceeded expectations in their written work and were not included in the additional numbers, however, eight of 27 students (29.6%) who had been below expectations showed significant improvement in their written communication learning outcomes in their simulation #3 individual rewrite. When those eight students are included in the results, we have the following:

- 23.6% of the students (17/72) met or exceeded expectations on written communications.
- 76.4% of the students (55/72) were below expectations on written communications.

What did we learn about student learning?

The writing skills of business students needs to improve. Within BUS 308, course improvements would include requiring the students to rewrite the case analyses and simulation write-ups. There is ample evidence in educational research that demonstrates rewriting is perhaps the most salient aspect of developing and honing writing skills.

Suggested Action:

In the broader framework of the BSBA program, it is necessary to have rubrics that assess the writing skills of the students as they wend their way through the entire program. Cases may already be assigned in many courses, but faculty need to understand the importance of assessing writing skills in every core course on many of the assignments, as well as be trained on how to do so. These skills not only align with AACSB standards 9.1.1 – Written Communications, but also with the WSCUC core competency of Written Communication.

Closing the Loop:

This outcome is scheduled to be re-assessed in AY 17/18.

BUS 406 Content Rubric

Rubric for the Assessment of Oral Communication: Content

Indicators of Effective Content	Levels of Achievement			
	Beginning	Developing	Competent	Accomplished
Introduction: gains attention, connects to topic, establishes credibility	No attention getting strategy was evident. No clear or relevant connection to topic or speech purpose. No credibility was established.	Use of attention getting strategy, but did not seem to adequately capture audience attention and/ or lead to desired outcome. Credibility was implied.	Effective strategy to capture listeners' attention. Adequate introduction of the topic. Credibility was established by the speaker.	Creative attention getting strategy captures listeners' attention to introduce the topic. It is relevant to the topic and clearly gains the desired response from the audience. Credibility was established by speaker.
Thesis Statement: explicit, identifies topic, previews main points	No thesis statement. Main points are not clearly identified, audience unsure of the direction of the message.	Thesis is implied, although not explicitly stated. Topic is clearly identified, but main points are not clearly previewed.	Thesis statement identifies topic and lists/previews main points.	Speaker clearly stated a well formulated thesis statement during the speech introduction. Thesis statement identifies topic and lists/previews main points.
Connection to Audience: needs & interest, demonstrates understanding	Topic seems irrelevant to audience needs and interests. No attempt made to connect topic to audience.	Topic seems somewhat relevant to audience. Vague reference to audience needs and or interests. Identifies target audience.	Clearly stated the relevance of topic to audience needs and interests. Expresses an understanding of their target audience.	Connection of topic to audience needs and interests is stated with sophistication. Identifies and expresses a deep understanding of their target audience.
Subject Knowledge: depth of content, relevant support, clear explanation	Provides irrelevant or no support. Explanation of concepts is inaccurate or incomplete.	Provides some support for main points, but needed to elaborate further with explanations, examples, descriptions, etc. Support is relevant, but not timely.	Main points adequately substantiated with timely, relevant and sufficient support. Accurate explanation of key concepts.	Depth of content reflects thorough understanding of topic. Main points well supported with timely, relevant and sufficient support. Provided precise explanation of key concepts.
Organization: main points distinct from support, transitions, coherence	Lack of structure. Ideas are not coherent. No transitions. Difficult to identify introduction, body, and conclusion.	General structure/organization seems adequate. Difference between main points and supporting details is blurred. Logical flow, but no clear signposts for transitions.	Clear organizational pattern. Main points are distinct from supporting details. Smooth transitions differentiate key points.	Effective organization well suited to purpose. Main points are clearly distinct from supporting details. Graceful transitions create coherent progress toward conclusion.

BUS 406 Delivery Rubric

Rubric for the Assessment of Oral Communication: Delivery

Indicators of Effective Delivery	Levels of Achievement			
	Beginning	Developing	Competent	Accomplished
Eye Contact: establish rapport; expand zone of interaction	Reads speech from notes/manuscript. Avoids eye contact with audience.	Conspicuous use of speaker notes. Only occasional, sporadic glances at audience.	Eye contact establishes rapport with audience. Unobtrusive use of speaker notes. Scanning of audience to establish a zone of interaction.	Consistently uses eye contact to maintain rapport with audience. Inconspicuous use of speaker notes. Effective use of scanning to expand zone of interaction.
Movement: expressive, comfortable, enhances message	Body language is not supportive of the message, may contradict it. Gestures, facial expressions, and posture are stiff or distracting.	Body language is a minimal support of the verbal message. Gestures, facial expressions, and posture reflect speaker discomfort that occasionally interferes with the message.	Body language is an adequate support of the message. Movement and gestures clarify key points. Facial expressions and posture seem comfortable.	Gestures, facial expressions, and posture reinforce and enhance the verbal message. Body language is expressive, dynamic, natural and comfortable.
Voice: rate, pitch, volume and tone are natural and authentic	Fails to maintain audience interest and support the verbal message due to excessive monotone, inappropriate rate and volume. Pitch may be strained or flat.	Inconsistent use of voice to support message. Monotone passages interfere with audience interest. Rate may be too fast or slow; volume too high or low. Pitch is strained at times, too artificial or too nervous.	Tone fits verbal message, changing for emphasis at appropriate moments. Rate and volume allow audience to follow message. Pitch seems natural to speaker.	Tone is authentic and appropriate to topic. Rate, pitch and volume vary at key points to support the verbal message and keep audience interest. Voice is natural to the speaker and topic, talking with rather than at audience.
Fluency: pronunciation, enunciation, articulation are smooth; lack of fillers	Incoherent presentation due to many factors that undermine fluency including poor pronunciation. Long pauses interrupt flow of speech. Excessive use of vocalized fillers distracts audience.	Pronunciation is mostly correct yet enunciation and articulation are still tentative. Speaker recovers from awkward pauses and proceeds. Vocalized fillers are noticeable but not excessive.	Careful pronunciation supports coherence of presentation. Enunciation and articulation of words are mostly clear. Pauses were momentary and did not interrupt fluency of speech. Vocalized fillers are minimal and do not distract the audience.	Coherence of presentation strongly supported by correct pronunciation, confident enunciation and articulation. Pauses are purposeful and enhance fluency of speech. Virtually no vocalized fillers are noticeable.

This rubric is intended for use in the assessment of student achievement at the institutional level. It can also be used as a guide for development of rubrics to measure writing at the program, course and section levels. Please send your comments and suggestions about this rubric to Kurt Ewen, LET Co-chair kewen@valenciac.edu. For more information <http://valenciac.edu/learningevidence/>