

## UW Colleges Assessment Planning and Reporting Form 2004-2005

Email your reports to [SAC@uwc.edu](mailto:SAC@uwc.edu)

Department	Business and Economics
Assessment Coordinator(s)	John Houchens

NOTE: Please attach relevant supporting information used to complete the Report Summary Sheet.

### PART 1: Assessment of General Education Outcomes

#### Section 1: Identify the Proficiencies and Performance Indicators Assessed

- at the *Planning* stage, mark the performance indicators to be assessed in the left hand column below
- at the *Reporting* stage, report the numbers of students who did not meet, met, or exceeded expectations

Proficiency	Performance Indicators	# Do Not Meet	# Meet	# Exceed
<b>B. Quantitative Skills</b>	1. Solve quantitative and mathematical problems	107	245	238
	2. Interpret graphs, tables, and diagrams	91	405	322
<b>C. Communication Skills</b>	3. Demonstrate a large and varied vocabulary	87	395	495

#### Section 3: Use of Results

1. How did individual instructors report that they plan to use these results to improve the instructional process?

Instructors indicated that they will focus on poor results for specific questions and then put more emphasis on these areas during the next semester. This emphasis will be with regard to the specific disciplinary topic as well as the broader proficiency indicated. There is a great deal of interest on the part of many instructors in using these results to improve their teaching methods and ideologies and enhance the experience of the students.

Department members as a whole also noticed the very high rate of “success” on the instruments (very high percentages of “meets” or “exceeds”). Some thought this was a sign that the department has done a good job of assessment and that the students are indeed able to do what we claim they can do. Others thought that we were perhaps scoring our assessment instrument too low or too easy, resulting in inflated scores. Both approaches have merit and the reason for the significantly higher scores (compared to 2003-04) is probably somewhere in between. It was deemed that it is too early in the assessment activities to assume that our department has “figured it out,” so we agreed to reexamine the scoring mechanisms for the multiple-choice questions.

The department also made good use of its assessment budget. Our spring 2005 departmental meeting included a mini-workshop (1/2 day) covering assessment and SOTL. Dr. Carolyn Ottman from UW-Milwaukee led a discussion/workshop regarding the connection between assessment and SOTL. Specifically, the assessment (and SOTL) monies were spent on the speaker's honorarium, and on the speaker's and faculty members' lodging and mileage. Many department members remarked that the discussion cleared up some of the questions and issues they had regarding assessment.

2. What recommendations would you and/or the department assessment committee make to your department for continued improvement of the assessment process, proficiencies, performance indicators, assessment activity, rubric, and/or student performance in the discipline?

The following are some of the comments that instructors had:

- Increase number of questions, number of choices, incorporate quantitative but non-multiple-choice questions
- Add questions
- Clearer explanations regarding the need for assessment and how it differs from traditional grading
- Change questions annually
- Increase the number of possible answers to questions asked
- Incorporate different types of questions
- Review timing of assessment – earlier in the semester (the department currently tries to conduct all assessment on the final exam or near the end of the semester, to ensure consistency in timing)
- See correlation to actual grades

Some of these recommendations can easily be addressed by the DAC, the assessment committee members, and the department members in choosing the instrument used to conduct assessment activities. Generally, there is still some uncertainty on the part of department members as to the need and importance of assessment and how it differs from grading and other forms of evaluation.

3. After discussion of the results by the department, what course of action will the department take to improve student performance with respect to the assessed proficiency?

Continued discussion of the assessment process as well as results is important. We hope to have guest speakers at future department meetings that are knowledgeable and helpful in the area of assessment and “closing the loop.” As in the past, much of the time spent discussing assessment has consisted of different department members sharing their thoughts about assessment and its value and ways that they will try to improve their teaching methods, based on the results.

The main priority for 2005, as indicated in prior reports and comments from department members and the Senate Assessment Committee, was developing a set of discipline-specific proficiencies and rubrics to use in addition to the institutional ones. The department made significant strides in this area at the spring and August meetings, as described in Part 2.

Since the discipline-specific assessment activities seem to be well underway, the main focus of the department will now be on closing the loop. All department members have been presented with a wealth of data and results from past assessment and that in itself has

generated many good discussions and questions. But the time has come for serious discussion about how the data collected over the years and the assessment activities conducted to date can improve the students' learning.

The DAC and assessment committee will make this the priority of the department in its assessment discussion at the spring 2006 meeting. At that time, we will have data from fall 2005 to compare with the 2003-2004 data, since the same proficiencies (A1 and A3) are being assessed during the two periods. The department's attention to this matter has been somewhat lacking relative to the other pieces of assessment, and this needs to be rectified.

To complete this, we will devote significant time at the spring department meeting to discussion of using the results and closing the loop. The DAC will propose at minimum a 1/2-day session, to be funded with assessment budget monies. We may also decide to bring in an expert/guest speaker. The intention would be to have someone who is not an expert on assessment in general, but on closing the loop specifically, and not for a lecture or presentation, but for a hands-on workshop with active participation by department members. The discussion and activities will concentrate on both institutional and discipline-specific proficiencies and outcomes.

## PART 2: Assessment of Department-Specific Outcomes

### Section 1: Identify department-specific outcomes/performance indicators.

Outcomes/Performance Indicators
1. BUS - . . . a student will have the ability to construct and analyze a balance sheet.
2. ECO - . . . a student will understand graphical and algebraic representation of demand and supply concepts with appropriate application.

### Section 2: Attach the rubric/standards used to assess each outcome/performance indicator.

BUS – Student will be provided with a list of 10 basic accounts. The student is then to properly place each item on a balance sheet (10 points). If the balance sheet balances, the student is awarded 2 additional points. Scoring: 11-12 points exceeds expectations; 8-10 points meets expectations; 0-7 points fails to meet expectations.

ECO – Student will answer 6 multiple-choice questions. Scoring: 5-6 correct exceeds expectations; 3-4 correct meets expectations; 0-2 correct fails to meet expectations.

### Section 3: Assessment Results

No results at this time

### Section 5: Use of results

1. How did individual instructors report that they plan to use these results to improve the instructional process?

As with the institutional results, instructors seemed generally willing to view the data with an open mind and an interest in adapting teaching methods if necessary to improve the student's experience. There seems to be little confusion between discipline-specific and institutional assessment and the differences and importance of each. There is actually great interest among department members in assessing proficiencies specific to the disciplines. Many commented that this will give more meaningful and interesting results.

2. What recommendations would you and/or the department assessment committee make to your department for continued improvement of the assessment process, proficiencies, performance indicators, assessment activity, rubric, and/or student performance in the discipline?

The DAC and the assessment committee will share the results of the fall 2005 discipline-specific assessment with the department members at the spring departmental meeting. At that point, since this is our first attempt at discipline-specific assessment, we will discuss how the results can be used to improve teaching effectiveness, the appropriateness of the activities and rubrics, and whether discipline-specific assessment should be continued, refined, or possibly expanded to include additional proficiencies.

3. After discussion of the results by the department, what course of action will the department take to improve student performance with respect to the assessed proficiency?

The DAC and the assessment committee will likely investigate the possibility of changes to the assessed courses, texts used, offerings and timings of courses, and the like. We also hope to initiate further discussion among department members, separated by discipline, regarding individual teaching techniques and successes members have had teaching the respective concepts (balance sheet analysis and supply/demand analysis).

### **PART 3: Additional Assessment and Contributions**

Please ask for and include in the report information from Department members about any other assessment activities they have conducted, particularly in conjunction with grant-funded innovations. Also ask for and describe briefly any additional contributions to assessment such as publications, presentations, qualitative classroom innovations (such as Scholarship of Teaching and Learning activities), and other items relating to assessment that the department wishes to note.

No activity reported by department members.