

University of South Florida St. Petersburg

Digital USFSP

Academic Learning Compacts

Academic Learning Compacts & Supplemental
Documents

2018

Academic Learning Compact : Management BS [Effective 2018]

University of South Florida St. Petersburg.

Follow this and additional works at: https://digital.stpetersburg.usf.edu/institutional_research_acl



ACADEMIC LEARNING COMPACTS (ALCs)

Management

Academic Year 2018/19

Discipline Specific Knowledge:

Learning Goal: Students will have foundational and discipline-specific business knowledge.

Objective 1: Students will demonstrate focused knowledge of their chosen field of study.

Means of Assessment: Management Major Exit Exam

In May 2018 a decision was made to completely and comprehensively review the AOL process for the College. After this review, it was further decided to completely revamp our AOL process. To accomplish this, we sought assistance from an external AOL consultant to review our current assessment process and to help develop a more robust AOL process. At the recommendation of the AOL consultant we decided to develop an internal exit exam for each major to assess discipline specific knowledge. The exam for each major covers material from each of the required courses in the major (the common set of courses that is required for all students in the major). Permanent faculty who teach each required course in the major were asked to develop several multiple choice questions covering topics that reflect “essential knowledge” from these courses. After several iterations the questions from each course were combined together into an internal exit exam for the major. This exam was then pilot tested in multiple sections of GEB 4890 (capstone course) during the Spring 2019 and Summer 2019 semesters. The results of this pilot test are contained in this report.

Required courses in the major:

MAN 3240 Organizational Behavior Analysis

MAN 3301 Human Resource Management

MAN 4600 International Management

Administered: Spring 2019 and Summer 2019

Criteria for Success: At least 70% of students will be able to correctly answer each question.

Findings:

The results below are based on an assessment sample of 13 students. The table below shows the % of students who answered the question correctly and the class that the core class associated with the question.

Overall Students met the stated objective for 83% of the questions (20 out 24 questions) Students failed to meet the objective for the questions on job analysis (HR), legitimate power (OB), Conscientiousness (OB) and Low Context/High Context (Intl). Initially it appeared that students scored below the 70% mark on 5 questions, however one of the answers was coded incorrectly on question 16 (answer should have been marked individualism and collectivism) so that question actually was answered correctly by 95% of the students.

These topics were in the books, and should have been taught. However, adjuncts have been teaching many of these courses in 2018 and 2019 due to shortage in full time faculty available who can teach these courses, while also teaching the required courses in the MBA program. It is uncertain how thoroughly these topics were taught. Another issue is that the sample size was extremely low. For all 3

courses from the Spring of 2019 to the Summer of 2019, we only had 13 management majors respond- 2 in one course, 4 in another course and 7 in another course.

Dr. Chris Chen and Dr. Sharon Segrest reviewed the Management Major Results.

This table shows the exit exam results:

1	Job Analysis	27% *	HR
2	Recruiting	95%	HR
3	Personality	92%	HR
4	Training & Development & TO	79%	HR
5	Performance Appraisal	79%	HR
6	Agreeableness	74%	OB
7	Conscientiousness	65% *	OB
8	Trait Theory	82%	OB
9	Managers	95%	OB
10	Leadership	95%	OB
11	Legitimate Power*	19% *	OB
12	Rational Persuasion	74%	OB
13	Surface-level diversity	79%	OB
14	Withdrawal behavior	82%	OB
15	Low Context/high context	52% *	Intl
16	Individualism/Collectivism	95%	Intl
17	Uncertainty Avoidance	100%	Intl
18	Monochronic Schedule	74%	Intl
19	Culture	95%	Intl
20	FCPA	100%	Intl
21	Ethics	95%	Intl
22	Repatriation	95%	Intl
23	Third-country nationals	81%	Intl
24	Franchise	95%	Intl

Plan for Use of Findings:

Based on the findings above the faculty will include the following changes in the Human Resource Management, Organizational Behavior and International Management Courses to improve student learning in the areas of job analysis, types of power, the Big 5 Personality, and high and low context cultures organizations.

Specifically, in MAN 3301 Human Resource Management, the importance of job analysis needs to be emphasized and incorporated throughout the semester. Job analysis provides the basis for all human resource management functions and its utilities need to be discussed in all chapters. Although this question is a comprehension question, a management major student needs to realize the central role of job analysis. To increase understanding of this, job analysis needs to be highlighted in each chapter

lecture in order to show the linkage. We also need to facilitate more discussions around how job analysis is related to other key human resource functions in both the online and face-to-face classes.

In MAN 3240, Organizational Behavior, the key research findings related to the Big 5 Personality will be thoroughly discussed and emphasized by all instructors. The most important real-world application of research related to the Big 5 is that conscientiousness is related to performance across jobs. Therefore, conscientiousness can be used in the selection process with no legal ramifications. The point can be driven home via lecture, repeated review, putting the research takeaways on a study guide, showing a video and an article on the topic, and a writing assignment asking them to briefly discuss the research takeaways of the Big 5 Model. Following the use of these assignments students will be assessed using similar questions to determine if the emphasis on the topic area via specific assignments helps to improve student learning.

In MAN 3240, Organizational Behavior, the textbook distinguishes 5 types of power, including 3 types of formal power (coercive, legitimate, and reward), and 2 types of personal power (referent and expert). The wording for one of the multiple choices (D. organizational power), might be confusing. Organizational power is not a type of power in the textbook, however, students may confuse it with formal power. Therefore, we suggest changing the “organizational power” wording to “expert power” to further distinguish the 5 types of sub-powers. The goal is for students to recognize and distinguish the 5 subtypes. We will include more discussions of the subtypes in class/online discussions.

In MAN 4600, International Management, in addition to coverage of the topic of low context and high context cultures that is in the book, the instructors should show a video which is likely to be more memorable and relatable to students and thus help with them learning and remembering the topic. Also, students should be asked to briefly research the topic and write a few sentences about an example they found on the Internet about low and high context cultures. This could be added as an in-class participation in face-to-face classes or as a discussion board in online classes. Personally researching, reading and writing about an example should also be helpful with retention as it involves active learning. Another idea would be to have students do a role play demonstrating and high and low culture scenario.

Following the use of these assignments students will be assessed using similar questions to determine if emphasis on the topic area via specific assignments helps to improve student learning.

Communication Skills and Critical Thinking Skills were measured for Kate Tiedemann College of Business students in our required capstone course (GEB 4890) as follows:

Communication Skills:

Learning Goal: Students will be effective communicators.

Objective 1: Students will write professional documents.

Means of Assessment: Students will produce a written analysis of an assignment in selected sections of GEB 4890. The assignment was scored using a written communication rubric.

Administered: Fall 2018

Criteria for Success: At least 75% of students will meet or exceed expectations.

Findings: Thirty five essays/assignments were evaluated using our Written Communication Analytic Rubric which was developed as part of a revamping of the assurance of learning process in the College. As in past years we hired a consultant/external reviewer (English professor and head of our USFSP Student Success Center) to score the assignments. The rubric used addressed twelve traits spread across 4 categories: content, grammar/mechanics, appearance and organization, and document integrity. There were three levels of proficiency for each trait: does not meet expectations, meets expectations, and exceeds expectations.

The results of the scoring are as follows:

Learning Goal 1, Objective 1:

Student will write professional documents.

Analytic Rubric

Performance Dimensions	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Content			
Student completes assignment per instructions.	20.00%	74.29%	5.71%
Student uses content/material learned in the course.	5.71%	85.71%	8.57%
Student employs logical reasoning.	14.29%	74.29%	11.43%
Grammar/Mechanics			
Document is grammatically correct.	17.14%	74.29%	8.57%
Sentence structure is sound.	22.86%	68.57%	8.57%
Student writes efficiently (without redundancy).	25.71%	65.71%	8.57%
Appearance and Organization			
Document is formatted appropriately	11.43%	80.00%	8.57%
Paragraphs are used appropriately to delineate concepts.	5.71%	85.71%	8.57%

Sentences are connected so that thoughts flow seamlessly together.	22.86%	68.57%	8.57%
Topics are introduced and concluded.	2.86%	88.57%	8.57%
Document Integrity			
Student uses his or her own words.	2.86%	91.43%	5.71%
Student references and cites work properly.	2.86%	94.29%	2.86%

Upon review of the rubric results, students struggled with sentence structure and fluency and writing without redundancy. To some extent, word choice was an area of concern; whether this was due to students not proofreading their work or not knowing the meanings of words is unclear. Overall, most students demonstrated satisfactory writing based on the assignment criteria.

This was the second time that we used the rubric to score written communication in the College with this being the first time the rubric was provided to students prior to them completing the assignment. Providing students with the rubric appears to have resulted in better performance on the assignment. As an example, in the previous academic year students scored poorly (greater than 38% did not meet expectations) on 3 traits. In our current sample the highest percentage of students that did not meet expectations is under 26% resulting in students meeting or exceeding expectations on all but one trait – student writes efficiently (without redundancy). Finally, it is worth noting that with one exception (student employs logical reasoning) less than 10% of students exceeded expectations on any trait.

The above results will be used as a benchmark for future assessment activities in this area. More specifically, another sample of students will be assessed during the 2019/20 academic year.

Plan for Use of Findings: As described above this was the second time using our new analytic (versus our old holistic) written communication rubric and the first time the rubric was provided to students along with the assignment. The above assessments will be used as a benchmark for future assessment activities. We will continue to measure written communication using our new rubric again during the 2019/20 academic year.

Learning Goal: Students will be effective communicators.

Objective 2: Students will prepare and deliver high quality oral presentations.

Measure: Students will prepare and deliver a presentation as part of group project in selected sections of GEB 4890. Each student was separately scored on their presentation skills using an oral communication rubric.

Administered: Fall 2018 and Spring 2019

Criteria for Success: At least 75% of students will meet or exceed expectations.

Findings: A total of seventy nine students were evaluated using our new Oral Communication Analytic Rubric which was developed as part of a revamping of the assurance of learning process in the College. The rubric used addressed fifteen traits spread across six categories: structure, engagement, attitude, visual aids, presentation skills, and content. There were three levels of proficiency for each trait: does not meet expectations, meets expectations, and exceeds expectations.

The results of the scoring are as follows:

Learning Goal 1, Objective 2:

Student will prepare and deliver high quality oral presentations.

Analytic Rubric

Performance Dimensions	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Structure			
The presentation is well structured/designed.	0.00%	87.34%	12.66%
Engagement			
The presenter interacts appropriately with the audience.	0.00%	79.75%	20.25%
The presenter does not read off notes.	12.66%	63.29%	24.05%
Attitude			
The presenter is confident.	0.00%	75.95%	24.05%
The presenter uses proper gestures.	0.00%	87.34%	12.66%
The presenter is dressed appropriately.	10.13%	68.35%	21.52%
Visual Aids			
The presenter uses presentation tools appropriately.	0.00%	87.34%	12.66%
Presentation Skills			
The speech is conducted at the proper volume.	0.00%	74.68%	25.32%
The speech is conducted at an appropriate pace.	0.00%	77.22%	22.78%
The speech is easy to follow/understand.	0.00%	77.22%	22.78%
The presentation uses the allocated time properly.	1.27%	83.54%	15.19%
Content			
The presenter displays subject knowledge.	1.27%	78.48%	20.25%
Information presented is properly cited.	1.27%	86.08%	12.66%
Information presented is accurate.	1.27%	82.28%	16.46%
The presenter answers questions appropriately.	0.00%	84.81%	15.19%

Overall, students scored well meeting or exceeding expectations on all traits. The two areas where students scored the lowest (greater than 10% did not meet expectations) were the presenter does not read off notes and the presenter is dressed appropriately. Students met or exceeded expectations on all other scoring traits. Since this was first time that we used the rubric to score oral communication in the College, the above results will be used as a benchmark for future assessment activities in this area. More specifically, another sample of students will be assessed during the 2019/20 academic year.

Plan for Use of Findings: As described above this was the first time using our new analytic (versus our old holistic) oral communication rubric. The above assessments will be used as a benchmark for future assessment activities. We will measure oral communication using our new rubric again during the 2019/20 academic year.

Critical Thinking Skills:

Learning Goal: Students will have critical thinking skills.

Objective 1: Students will develop solutions to business problems.

Measure: Students were given a writing assignment in selected sections of GEB 4890. The assignment was scored using a critical thinking rubric.

Date Administered: Fall 2018

Findings: Thirty five essays/assignments were evaluated using our Critical Thinking Analytic Rubric which was developed as part of a revamping of the assurance of learning process in the College. The course professor scored the assignments. The rubric used addressed thirteen traits spread across 3 categories: problem identification, problem analysis and solution generation, and problem solution. There were three levels of proficiency for each trait: does not meet expectations, meets expectations, and exceeds expectations.

The results of the scoring are as follows:

Learning Goal 2, Objective 1:

Students will develop solutions to business problems.

Analytic Rubric

Performance Dimensions	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Problem Identification			
Student recognizes business needs to be met/problem to be solved.	2.86%	77.14%	17.14%
Student is able to identify the root cause of the problem.	2.86%	77.14%	17.14%
Student is able to completely define the problem.	2.86%	77.14%	17.14%
Student is able to accurately define the problem.	2.86%	77.14%	17.14%
Problem Analysis and Solution Generation			
Student breaks down problem into its component parts.	5.71%	71.43%	20.00%
Student uses appropriate tools and techniques to analyze relevant data.	8.57%	68.57%	20.00%
Student uses supporting information.	5.71%	71.43%	20.00%
Student identifies alternative viable solutions.	11.43%	60.00%	25.71%
Student evaluates alternative viable solutions.	14.29%	57.14%	25.71%

Problem Solution			
Solution is optimal.	25.71%	54.29%	17.14%
Solution is appropriately documented.	25.71%	54.29%	17.14%
Solution is appropriately defended.	25.71%	54.29%	17.14%
Student considers limitations of solution.	22.86%	57.14%	17.14%

This was the second time that we used the rubric to score critical thinking in the College with this being the first time the rubric was provided to students prior to them completing the assignment. Providing students with the rubric appears to have resulted in better performance on the assignment. As an example, in the previous academic year students scored poorly (greater than 34% did not meet expectations) on all the four traits associated with problem solution. In the current year that number fell to under 26%. This is probably still related to many students discussing competitive/business-level strategy or international entry mode instead of international strategy suggesting that the assignment needs further clarification. Overall, students scored well in all other areas meeting or exceeding our expectations. It should also be noted that 1 student assignment was removed from scoring due to plagiarism. The above results will be used as a benchmark for future assessment activities in this area. More specifically, another sample of students will be assessed during the 2019/20 academic year.

Plan for Use of Findings: As described above this was the second time using our new analytic (versus our old holistic) critical thinking rubric and the first time the rubric was provided to students along with the assignment. The above assessments will be used as a benchmark for future assessment activities. We will continue to measure critical thinking using our new rubric again during the 2019/20 academic year.