

Spring 2004 Embedded Assessment Report

Table of Contents

Introduction	Page 1
Tables of Program Learning Goals	Page 2 - 4
Table of Course Assignments	Page 4
Business 301 Results	Page 5 - 7
Business Law 308 Results	Page 8
Finance 303 Results	Page 9 - 10
Management 360 Results	Page 11 - 12
Marketing 304 Results	Page 12 - 13
Systems and Operations 307 Results	Page 13 - 14
Accounting 351 Communications Results	Page 15 - 16
Business Law 508 Results	Page 17

Introduction

This report shows how the College is directly assessing the learning goals of three degree programs –the B.S. in Business Administration, the B.S. in Accountancy, and the Master of Business Administration- in the spring 2004 semester. The B.S. in Information Systems has developed learning goals for its degree program and will begin collecting course embedded measures in the spring 2005 semester.

Program learning goals are directly assessed with embedded measures in eight different courses where students have an opportunity to demonstrate proficiency in the learning goals. The linkage between program learning goals and embedded measures in specific courses is shown in Tables 1, 2, and 3 for the B.S. in Business Administration (BSBA), the B.S. in Accountancy, and the Master of Business Administration (MBA) respectively.

For example, Table 1 indicates that FIN 303 (Financial Management), MKT 304 (Introduction to Marketing Management), and SOM 307 (Data Analysis and Modeling) are courses where data is collected to measure students' problem solving skills (i.e., general learning goal 2). The material in these three courses provides students with an opportunity to improve their problem solving skills and their performance is measured with exams or class projects.

The Gateway course (BUS 301) provides students with important lessons in building teams and working cooperatively (i.e., general learning goal 6 in Table 1). However, the Gateway course is not currently collecting data on teamwork activities so the "courses" column is left blank. The College is committed to expanding our embedded assessment program to cover each of the program learning goals extensively. This report documents our efforts during the spring 2004 semester.

Table 4 indicates the type of assignments that faculty selected to measure student achievement in the learning goals. For example, BUS 301, FIN 303, and MGT 360 (Organizational Theory) instructors all used multiple choice exam questions to assess how well students were meeting the course learning goals. Alternatively, MKT 304 instructors used a marketing plan to assess student performance in the course learning goals.

Table 1. Linkage between BSBA Program Learning Goals and Course Embedded Measures

	BSBA Degree Learning Goals	Courses with Corresponding Embedded Measures
General Learning Goals	1. Our graduates have strong written and oral communication skills.	BUS 301, MKT 304, and SOM 307
	2. Our graduates have strong problem solving skills.	FIN 303, MKT 304, and SOM 307
	3. Our graduates have strong critical thinking skills.	BUS 301, BLAW 308, and MKT 304
	4. Our graduates have an understanding of ethics and social responsibility.	BLAW 308, FIN 303, and MGT 360.
	5. Our graduates have strong information technology skills.	
	6. Our graduates can work effectively in teams.	
Management Specific Learning Goals	1. Our graduates understand the global context of business.	MGT 360
	2. Our graduates understand the cross-functional and interdisciplinary nature of business problems.	BUS 301
	3. Our graduates understand the principles and applications of investment and financial decision-making.	FIN 303
	4. Our graduates understand marketing management's role in a firm's business strategy.	MKT 304
	5. Our graduates understand basic concepts in management and organizational behavior and can apply these concepts to the management of people and resources in an organization.	MGT 360

Table 2. Linkage between B.S. in Accountancy Program Learning Goals and Course Embedded Measures

	B.S. in Accountancy Degree Learning Goals	Courses with Corresponding Embedded Measures
General Learning Goals	1. Each student shall be able to recognize and analyze ethical problems in practical accounting situations and to select and defend a course of action.	
	2. Each student shall be able to effectively communicate complex accounting concepts both orally and in writing.	ACCT 351 (COM)*
	3. Each student shall be able to apply critical thinking skills when analyzing and solving problems.	ACCT 351
Accounting Specific Learning Goals	1. Each student shall have a conceptual understanding of accounting for:	
	• External financial reporting	ACCT 351
	• Managerial applications	
	• Tax planning and preparation	
	• The attest function	
	2. Each student shall be able to apply their conceptual understanding to both structured and unstructured problems in:	
	• External financial reporting	ACCT 351
	• Managerial accounting	
	• Tax planning and preparation	
	• Auditing	
	3. Each student shall be able to research accounting literature for both structured and unstructured problems in:	
	• External financial reporting	ACCT 351
	• Tax planning and preparation	
	• Auditing	
	4. Each student shall have the necessary knowledge and skills required to sit for a certifying examination (CPA, CMA, or CFM).	

Note: * indicates the course used embedded measures during the spring 2004 semester. Otherwise, the course will use embedded measures during the fall 2004 semester.

Table 3. Linkage between MBA Program Learning Goals and Course Embedded Measures

	MBA Degree Learning Goals	Courses with Corresponding Embedded Measures
General Learning Goals	1. Have skills appropriate for senior management professionals, including:	
	• Analytical thinking	BLAW 508
	• Clear communication	
	• Effective teamwork	
	• Global perspective	
	• Ethical practices	BLAW 508
Management Specific Learning Goals	2. Integrate theory and practice	
	3. Understand the interdisciplinary relationships in the firm and its environment	BLAW 508

Table 4. Types of Assignments used to Cover Learning Goals

Assignments	Courses with Embedded Measures
Multiple choice exam questions	BUS 301, FIN 303, MGT 360
Essay exam questions	BLAW 308, BLAW 508, SOM 307
Course project	MKT 304
Case analysis	ACCT 351 (COM), BUS 301
Formal presentation	BUS 301

Business 301, Gateway Experience

Business 301 is our "Gateway" course that prepares students for upper-division coursework. It is a required course for all business and accounting majors and must be taken prior to, or concurrently with, the student's first upper-division business core classes. BUS 301 reviews and tests students' knowledge of the lower-division business core (financial and managerial accounting, micro and macroeconomics, business law, and statistics) by integrating and applying concepts from these courses to solve business problems. While the course does not introduce new material from the lower-division business core, it is designed to develop the ability of our students to apply these disciplines in a complex business environment. Students also learn to work in teams, to analyze business cases, to make class presentations, and to write short business memorandums and letters.

Table 5 shows course learning goals, alignment with program learning goals, skills, knowledge, and abilities (SKA), and student performance on various course assignments in BUS 301. This data was collected from ten sections containing 277 students enrolled in BUS 301 during the spring 2004 semester.

Table 5. Embedded Measures for BUS 301

Course Learning Goals	Linkage to Program Learning Goals	SKA	Not Good Enough	Good Enough	Very Good
Oral Communication	-Effective Communication	Intro, platform skills, visual aids, clear comm., handling Q&A	5.8%	35.0%	59.2%
Written Communication	-Effective Communication	Focus & audience, organization & flow, clarity & correctness of style, and presentation	8.3%	44.4%	47.3%
Review and Integrate the Lower-division Core	-Critical thinking -Apply cross-functional and discipline-based knowledge	Understand & apply the top 10 concepts from 6 lower-division core classes	1.8%	48.7%	49.5%

The scale in Table 6 was used to classify student performance on each learning goal. The oral communication measure is derived from a formal case presentation in the class. Students work in teams to develop and present a Power Point presentation. Each student must present a portion of the team presentation and is graded individually on her performance. Students are provided with a *Presentation Evaluation Form*, which indicates how the total points are allocated to the various skills, knowledge, and abilities that are required for a formal presentation. This form (among others used in the Gateway course) is extremely important because it helps students understand exactly what is required to meet the course learning goals (e.g., to be a good presenter).

By examining the total points for the presentation, we see that only 5.8% of the students fall into the category "not good enough." Without information on the allocation of these total points, we cannot determine which SKA are driving the poor performance of these students. However, a substantial number of Gateway students are successful in making formal, oral presentations as

59.2% fall into the category of “very good” while 35% are deemed “good enough.” These results may indicate that our students have largely mastered the skills required for formal oral presentations. Alternatively, working in teams may bolster the individual performance of weaker students who receive help from team members to create the Power Point slides (worth 30 points out of 100).

Table 6. Scale for All Measures in Table 5

Performance on SKA	Outcome
Less than 70%	Not good enough
More than 70% but less than 85%	Good enough
85% or more	Very good

The written communication measure in Table 5 comes from an individual writing grade on the case analysis. Each team submits five business cases that are designed to review and integrate the top ten concepts from the lower-division core. The teams receive a content grade and a writing grade for each case. The content grade is the same for all individual team members but the writing grade is specific to the principal writer for a particular case. Students are provided with a *Case Write Up Evaluation Form With Point Allocations*, which indicates how the total points are allocated to the various skills, knowledge, and abilities that are required for a writing assignment.

By examining the total points for the writing grade, we see that 8.3% of the students fall into the category “not good enough.” Without further information we cannot determine which SKA are driving the poor performance of these students. However, we can say that a substantial number of students are successful in creating clearly written case analysis as 47.3% fall into the category of “very good” while 44.4% are deemed “good enough.” These results may indicate that our students have largely mastered the skills required for producing clear written assignments. Alternatively, working in teams may hide the performance of weaker students. A principal author receives written work from team members and then assembles and edits their team’s answers to case questions. The Gateway instructors recognize that this is a problem and are working to create individual writing assignments that do not involve the work of other team members.

The learning goal entitled “review and integrate the lower-division core” comes from the content grade on the case analysis. Student performance in Table 5 is determined by the average content grade on the five cases. By examining the total points for the content grade, we see that only 1.8% of the students fall into the category “not good enough.” Without further information we cannot determine which SKA are driving the poor performance of these students. However, we can say that a substantial number of students are successful in producing good case analysis as 49.5% fall into the category of “very good” while 48.7% are deemed “good enough.” These results may indicate that our students have largely mastered the skills required for good case analysis. Alternatively, working in teams could hide the performance of weaker students.

The Gateway course requires students to take a multiple choice exam in each of the six lower-division core business subjects: financial accounting, managerial accounting, business law, microeconomics, macroeconomics, and statistics. Students must pass each of the six exams with a minimum score of 9 out of 16 correct answers. If students do not achieve the minimum required score on their first attempt, they are given two additional opportunities to pass each exam. The purpose of the LDC exams is to demonstrate minimal proficiency in all LDC areas. The exam results from all 589 students enrolled in BUS 301 during the spring 2004 semester are summarized in Table 7. The scale for the LDC exams is shown in Table 8.

Table 7. Lower-division Exam Results

Lower-division Exam	Not Good Enough	Good Enough	Very Good	Mean score
Financial Accounting	9.0%	59.1%	31.9%	10.6
Managerial Accounting	10.4%	62.3%	27.3%	10.4
Business Law	2.6%	48.0%	49.4%	11.5
Microeconomics	6.0%	59.4%	34.5%	10.9
Macroeconomics	7.1%	58.6%	34.3%	10.8
Statistics	12.3%	65.0%	22.6%	10.2

Table 8. Scale for the LDC Exams

Performance on LDC	Outcome
Below 9	Not good enough
9 to 11	Good enough
Above 11	Very good

The scores in Table 7 represent the *highest* exam score achieved by any given student on a particular exam. As mentioned previously, each student had three opportunities to take each of the six LDC exams. The mean scores are similar across the LDC exams –between 10.2 in statistics and 11.5 in business law. However, there are some noteworthy differences when viewing the three performance categories. The findings suggest that students have largely mastered the topics covered in business law. Only 2.6% of the students earn scores that are “not good enough” while 49.4% are “very good.” By contrast, 12.3% of students do not pass the statistics exam after three takes and are categorized as “not good enough.” And only 22.6% are deemed “very good” in statistics. This suggests that students are having a difficult time with this subject area. Improvement strategies will be investigated to determine interventions that can improve the performance of these students. Examples of possible intervention strategies are altering topic coverage in the lower-division statistics course and providing additional review materials to Gateway students.

Business Law 308, Business Law II

This course is required of all students in the Business Law option. The course learning goals, their linkage to the program learning goals, the SKA and the results of embedded measures obtained from 149 students in two sections of BLAW 308 are summarized in Table 9.

Table 9. Embedded Measures for BLAW 308

Course Learning Goal	Linkage to Program Learning Goals	Skills, Knowledge, and Abilities	Not Good Enough	Good Enough	Very Good
Agency	-Critical thinking	When an agency has been formed	29%	20%	51%
Partnership	-Analytical thinking	When a partner has the authority to bind the partnership in contract	12%	16%	72%
Corporations	-Ethics	When the corporate veil can be pierced	33%	28%	39%

The instrument used to produce the data are essay exam questions. The data in the last three columns of Table 9 are the percentages of students who fell into each performance category. Students were deemed “very good” if their score on a particular exam question was in the A or B range. Alternatively, students who scored in the C range were deemed “good enough,” while those who scored in the D or F range were deemed “not good enough.”

The findings indicate that most students understand “when a partner has the authority to bind the partnership in contract” as 72% of the students fell into the category “very good;” 16% fell into the category “good enough;” and only 12% were “not good enough.”

The results indicate that students are having some difficulties with two learning goals -- “agency” and “corporations.” Roughly one-third of the students fell into the “not good enough” category on these two goals. The concepts surrounding agency are introduced at the beginning of the course, when students’ analytical skills and legal reasoning are not as well developed as they are later in the course. “When the corporate veil can be pierced,” the SKA associated with the learning goal of “corporations” is simply a difficult idea. It requires the use of analysis, judgment, and policy in a way that students find difficult.

The Business Law Department plans to review and discuss these findings during the fall 2004 semester. There is some concern that students’ performance will decline in the fall 2004 semester as students begin taking BLAW 308 in large, lecture hall classes. The department has collected data which suggests that student grades decline by a full grade point when comparing large, lecture hall sections with smaller, more traditionally-sized sections.

Finance 303, Financial Management

This course is required of all students in the BSBA program. The course learning goals, their linkage to the program learning goals, the SKA and the results of embedded measures obtained from 557 students in seven sections of Finance 303 are summarized in Table 10.

Table 10. Embedded Measures for FIN 303

Course Learning Goal	Linkage to Program Learning Goals	SKA	Not Good Enough	Good Enough	Very Good
Investment Decisions	-Financial theories -Analytical Skills -Reflective thinking	Time value of money concept			88%
		Risk and return concept		83%	
		Financial calculation			88%
Financing Decisions	-Financial theories -Analytical Skills -Reflective thinking	Financial Markets and Institutions		76%	
		Capital Structure	66%		
Using Financial Data	-Financial theories -Analytical Skills -Reflective thinking	Financial Statements		81%	
Financial Ethics and Regulatory Requirements	-Ethical and legal responsibilities in organizations and society	Ethics			87%
		Regulatory Requirements			91%

The instrument used to produce the data is the final examination. One or more multiple choice questions on the final exam covered every skill, knowledge, and ability that is associated with a particular learning goal. The percentage of correct answers on each question covering a given learning goal was computed. The scale in Table 11 was used to classify student performance on each SKA.

Table 11. Scale for All Measures in Table 10

Performance on SKA	Outcome
Less than 70%	Not good enough
More than 70% but less than 85%	Good enough
85% or more	Very good

The results represent the average percentage of correct answers on the questions covering each SKA associated with a particular learning goal. For example, on average, 76% of the students correctly answered the questions on “financial markets and institutions” and 66% of the students correctly answered the questions on “capital structure,” the other SKA associated with the course learning goal of being able to make “financing decisions.”

Note that it is possible to compute a weighted average score for all SKA associated with a particular learning goal, using different weights for each SKA that depend on its relative importance. The result would be an overall average score for the learning goal. For example, assuming that “financial markets and institutions” and “capital structure” are equally weighted in terms of their relative importance in being required to achieve the learning goal of making “financing decisions,” the average score for this learning goal is 71%, putting student achievement on this learning goal into the “good enough” category.

Embedded measures are extremely helpful in flagging areas where a course is successful in helping students achieve the learning goals, and in highlighting problem areas where students are having difficulty. For example, only 66% of the students correctly answered the questions on “capital structure,” one of the two SKA associated with the learning goal of making “financing decisions.” This is the only SKA where student performance fell into the “not good enough” category. Depending on the relative importance of this knowledge, overall performance on the learning goal may be compromised. These results will be used by the Finance Department to uncover underlying causes and take appropriate corrective action, which may involve changes in pedagogy (e.g., new assignments or use of the Socratic Method) or in the course (e.g., devote more time to covering the topic or cover it earlier in the course).

Management 360, Organizational Theory

The course learning goals and the skills, knowledge and abilities required to achieve the learning goals for Management 360 are shown in Table 12.

Table 12. Embedded Measures for MGT 360

Course Learning Goal	Skills, Knowledge, and Abilities	Not Good Enough	Good Enough	Very Good
Understands the varied roles and competencies required of managers	Knowledge of role of top managers			96%
	Components of planning and administration		84%	
Mean				90%
Understands environmental forces and how they influence today's organizations	Strategies of Multinational firms			90%
	Competitive strategies			96%
Mean				93%
Understands major political, legal, and cultural influences that affect managing in a global economy	Free trade laws			98%
	Protectionism			94%
Mean				96%
Understands the forces/approaches influencing ethical judgments and conduct within organizations	Environmental policy		73%	
	Ethical decisions		88%	
Mean			81%	
Understands the basic elements and the major behavior concepts/theories of the four functions of management: planning organizing, leading and controlling	Organizational behavior		86%	
	Knowledge of group dynamics			96%
Mean				91%

The embedded measures were derived from multiple choice questions on the final examination. The questions were grouped according to the learning goals covered by the question. To answer each question correctly, students must have certain skills, knowledge, and abilities, as shown in column two above. The percentages of correct answers on the questions corresponding to each SKA are also given in Table 12. Finally, the percentage of correct answers is averaged over the SKA that comprise each learning goal. The results are grouped into the performance categories shown in Table 13 below.

Table 13. Scale for All Measures in Table 12

Performance on SKA	Outcome
Less than 70%	Not good enough
More than 70% but less than 90%	Good enough
90% or more	Very good

From Table 12, it appears that the students in this course are either “good enough” or “very good” in achieving the course learning goals. However, these results represent a sample of only 49 students in one section of this course. A larger sample size will be selected next spring across several sections of the course. The Management Department is also currently working on refining the learning goals for this course. The revised learning goals and the results from a larger sample should provide a more comprehensive picture of student performance.

Marketing 304, Introduction to Marketing Management

The source of embedded measures for the learning goals of this course was the marketing plan. A marketing plan or a significant portion of a marketing plan is a common assignment to all 304 classes. Each instructor develops their own grading rubric but the rubrics have common elements of evaluation for a key set of marketing principles and their application, as well as common elements to evaluate writing, critical thinking, and problem solving. Each learning goal score is a sum of the composite SKA evaluated for having met a professional standard of performance or in need of improvement before the professional standard is met (thus a "0" or "1" is assigned for each SKA for each learning goal -- the sum of the "1's" assigned for each SKA is the score for that learning goal.

The learning goals each have a different number of SKA: Marketing Principles and Application = 16 possible points (SKA); Writing and Communication Skills = 7 possible points, Critical Thinking = 12 possible points; and Problem Solving = 8 possible points. These points are used to establish performance categories as shown in Table 14. The SKA related to each of the four learning goals are not reported here but are available upon request.

Table 14. Scale for All Measures in Table 15

Course Learning Goal	Not Good Enough	Good Enough	Very Good
Marketing Principles and Application	below 12	12 - 14	15 - 16
Writing and Communication Skills	below 4	4 - 5	6 - 7
Critical Thinking	below 7	7 - 9	10 - 12
Problem Solving	below 4	4 - 6	7 - 8

Below are the performance scores on the learning goals. Each performance score is the percentage of student reports falling into each performance category for each learning goal. The 30 reports were produced by 15 student groups of three to four students each and 15 individual students. There were six sections of the course offered in the spring 2004 semester. The analysis sample contains five randomly selected marketing plans from each of the six MKT 304 sections. The typical section is a lecture hall class of 150 students.

Table 15. Embedded Measures for MKT 304

Course Learning Goal	Linkage to Program Learning Goals	Not Good Enough	Good Enough	Very Good
Marketing Principles and Application	Knowledge of the functional areas of business	0%	27%	73%
Writing and Communication Skills	Effective communication	0%	3%	97%
Critical Thinking	Critical thinking	0%	50%	50%
Problem Solving	Problem solving	60%	30%	10%

From this data we are most interested in the Problem Solving scores that show 60% of our students' plans are "not good enough." In looking at disaggregated SKA scores from this learning goal, it is clear that students had a very difficult time calculating the breakeven volume. The key project was a marketing plan for a new YMCA in an underserved area (Pacoima). The client detail on pricing and cost was not clear. These findings have been shared with the 304 faculty and strategies for improving these elements of the course have been developed. Namely, faculty will supply clear assumptions on price and cost when students are working on client based projects.

Systems and Operations Management 307, Data Analysis and Modeling

This course is an elective course for several options in the BSBA. The course learning goals, their linkage to program learning goals, the SKA, and the results of embedded measures obtained from 238 students in five sections of SOM 307 are shown in Table 16.

Table 16. Embedded Measures for SOM 307

Course Learning Goals	Linkage to Program Learning Goals	SKA	Not Good Enough	Good Enough	Very Good
Students should be able to statistically analyze data to support decision-making in organizations	Statistical Analysis	Define the statistical problem	10%	19%	71%
		Select the appropriate method of analysis	20%	36%	44%
Students should be able to interpret and explain the results of their analysis to management	Effective Communication	Explain results in a non-technical manner	22%	13%	65%

The instrument used to produce the embedded measures is the final examination. The 307 instructors used a common essay question that covered the three skills, knowledge, and abilities listed in Table 16. The data in columns four through six are the percentages of students who fell into each SKA performance category. To be classified in a given performance category, a student's score on the portion of the question associated with a particular SKA must fall within the intervals shown in Table 17.

Table 17. Scale for All Measures in Table 16

Performance on SKA	Outcome
0 – 1 point	Not good enough
1.5 – 2.5 points	Good enough
3 points	Very good

The results indicate that students are having some difficulty explaining statistical results in a non-technical manner. Roughly 22% of the students were deemed “not good enough.” These students either did not answer the question “explain results” or their explanations contained major errors. However, 65% were deemed “very good” and 13% were “good enough.” Students who fell into the “good enough” category did not elaborate beyond “reject the null hypothesis” or “do not reject the null hypothesis.”

The findings also indicate that only 44% of the students were deemed “very good” with respect to their ability to “select the appropriate method of analysis.” The remaining 56% of the students had difficulties selecting the appropriate table –Z or t; distinguishing between “reject the null hypothesis if the sample statistic is greater than the critical value” and “reject the null hypothesis if the p-value is less than alpha;” and computation of the critical value or p-value. This could jeopardize the success of our students in meeting the learning goal associated with the ability to “statistically analyze data to support decision-making in organizations.”

Offsetting this result somewhat is the finding that 71% of the students were “very good” and 19% were “good enough” on the second ability associated with this learning goal --“define the statistical problem.” Common mistakes when defining the statistical problem involved (1) confusion over one-tail versus two-tail alternatives and (2) mislabeled H_0 and H_1 , due to switching the null and the alternative hypotheses. A few students were unable to write down the null and the alternative hypotheses.

ACCOUNTING 351 COM, Communications for Accountants

This two-unit course is required for the B.S. in Accountancy. Students must concurrently enroll into ACCT 351 (Intermediate Financial Accounting II). The two courses share common assignments so it is possible to assess multiple student skills (e.g., critical thinking, research skills, and written communication) in a single assignment. The 351 COM course learning goal is to develop a business style of writing letters, memos, and reports based on accounting situations.

The course embedded measures consist of (1) scores from a pre and post diagnostic exam that measures students' ability to properly apply conventions of English and organize information; and (2) scores from two writing assignments (i.e., pre and post assessment) in response to the assigned ACCT 351 cases.

The diagnostic exam comprises 50 sentences where students correct errors by inserting or deleting proper punctuation, capitalization, number style, abbreviations, plural and possessive forms, spelling, compound words, and grammar usage. In addition, two groups of five sentences each are organized for good paragraph flow. There are 60 possible points.

The pre diagnostic exam is given in the prior semester (i.e., fall 2003) in ACCT 350. Students who scored below 40 points were assigned the *Gregg Worksheets* that accompany the *Gregg Reference Manual*. Rules for the conventions of English are presented with 24 worksheets containing practice sentences. Answer keys are available in the Oviatt Library. Student worksheets were checked for completion during week 5 of the 351 COM course.

The post diagnostic exam is identical to the pre diagnostic exam and is given in 351 COM during week 12 of the spring 2004 semester. The pre and post diagnostic exam scores are not included in the students' final course grade.

There are also two written documents that are evaluated (i.e., pre and post assessment). The pre assessment does not count towards the students' grade the first time that it is graded. However, students consider the pre grade, feedback, and comments and write a revision of the pre assessment writing assignment, which counts 5%. The post assessment writing assignment counts 10%.

The pre assessment writing assignment is a diagnostic letter. Students are asked to write a business letter advising a client about making an investment decision based on the financial statements. Students are asked to discuss the financial statements in terms of reliance and reliability. Students are also told that very little credit will be given for quoting definitions or repeating the information provided in the facts. The client is not a sophisticated businessperson and, therefore, students are asked to communicate in terms that will be easily understood. Students are also provided with information about the format used to write a business letter.

The post assessment writing assignment is from Case C7-10 in the 351 accounting text. Students are asked that their case analysis is prepared in a one to two page memo and to present the required journal entry in an appendix.

The two written assignments –diagnostic letter and case analysis – are evaluated using the *Business Communication Evaluation Form for Written Documents*. Students are given this form prior to the assignments so they understand the skills, knowledge, and abilities that are required for excellent written assignments. Holistic grading is used based on the qualities listed in the evaluation form for the four categories of business writing—(1) audience, (2) organization, (3) clarity, and (4) presentation. A grade of 0 - 4 was given representing the letter grades A through F.

Table 18 shows the average scores for the pre (diagnostic letter) and post (case analysis) writing assessments; and the average pre and post diagnostic exams scores for 135 students enrolled in four sections of ACCT 351 COM during the spring 2004 semester.

Table 18. Embedded Measures for ACCT 351 COM

Section	12399	12400	12398	12401
Pre Writing Assessment	1.59	1.64	1.78	1.62
Post Writing Assessment	1.71	2.63	2.48	2.45
<i>% of students who score below 2.0 on the post writing</i>	26%	0%	9%	5%
Pre Diagnostic Exam	31.3	36.0	33.3	33.5
Post Diagnostic Exam	35.0	39.2	38.5	36.4
<i>% of students who score below 40 on the post exam</i>	78%	52%	56%	70%
Sample Size	27	23	45	40

Section 12399 had six students who were repeating the course. It was a weak section as can be seen by the low average scores in column two of Table 18. Also, most students (i.e., 78%) in this section scored below 40 on the post diagnostic exam.

The 351 COM students may not be taking this exam seriously because the score does not affect their final course grade. The average pre and post diagnostic exam scores are all below 40 – which is the minimum satisfactory score. The pre exam scores range from 31.3 to 36.0 points (out of 60 possible points), while the post exam scores range from 35.0 to 39.2.

Since the diagnostic exam scores are not tied to the students' final course grade, a change was made to the course requirements. A score of 40 or above is required for passing the 351 COM course. Furthermore, all students will be assigned the *Gregg Worksheets* by the ACCT 350 instructor. After two tries on the post exam during weeks 5 and 12 of the semester, students scoring below 40 will receive an Incomplete in 351 COM. Students will have to retake the diagnostic exam until they pass.

Business Law 508, (MBA) Law in Business Environment

This is a foundation course for students in the evening MBA program. The course learning goals, their linkage to the program learning goals, the SKA and the results of embedded measures obtained from 57 students in two sections of BLAW 508 are summarized in Table 19.

Table 19. Embedded Measures for BLAW 508

Course Learning Goal	Linkage to Program Learning Goals	Skills, Knowledge, and Abilities	Not Good Enough	Good Enough	Very Good
Negligence	-Critical thinking -Analytical thinking -Ethics	When a duty is owed	16%	39%	46%
Trespass	-Critical thinking -Analytical thinking	Existence of intent	19%	33%	47%
Unilateral contracts		Offer and acceptance	11%	15%	75%
Contracts		Whether an agreement is formed	4%	29%	67%

The instrument used to produce the data are essay questions from the first midterm. The data in the last three columns of Table 19 are the percentages of students who fell into each performance category. Students were deemed “very good” if their score on a particular exam question was in the A or B range. Alternatively, students who scored in the C range were deemed “good enough,” while those who scored in the D or F range were deemed “not good enough.”

The findings indicate that most students perform well in meeting the two learning goals – “unilateral contracts” and “contracts.” For example, 75% of the students fell into the “very good” category in their understanding “offer and acceptance” of a unilateral contract; and 67% fell into the “very good” category in their understanding of “whether an agreement is formed” in contracts.

The results indicate that students are having some difficulties with two learning goals -- “negligence” and “trespass.” More than 15% of the students fell into the “not good enough” category on these two goals. The business law department plans to review these findings during the fall 2004 semester.