

University of South Florida St. Petersburg

Digital USFSP

Academic Learning Compacts

Academic Learning Compacts & Supplemental
Documents

2017

Academic Learning Compact : Global [Effective 2017]

University of South Florida St. Petersburg.

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



ACADEMIC LEARNING COMPACTS (ALCs)

Global Business - AY2017-18

ALCs for the 'Global Business' Discipline

Course: GEB 3373

Reported by: Dr. Hemant Merchant / Global Business
September 12, 2018

Graduates of this program should be able to:

1. demonstrate understanding of core international business (IB) concepts and main IB theories;
2. apply the above-mentioned understanding by mapping it to at least one recent real-life situation;
3. relate the above-mentioned knowledge to the strategic and operational dimensions of organizations who operate (or intend to operate) in a 'international' context.

Objective	Criteria for success	Means of assessment	Findings	Remarks
#1: Students will demonstrate an understanding of core international business (IB) concepts and main IB theories.	GEB 3373: At least 75% of students will correctly answer at least 80 questions on exam-1. (Note: Exam-1 comprised of questions that mostly deal with IB concepts and theories.)	Percent of students earning at least 80% on exam-1.	60% of the class (15/25 students) earned 80% or higher on GEB 3373 exam-1 (Fall, 2017). Note: 2 students earned 79 points. Including these students above, raised the percentage to 68%.	Objective #1 was not achieved. There is a notable improvement in the results over Fall-2016: In Fall 2016, only 16% of the class achieved a score higher than 80% on exam-1.
#2: Students will apply the abovementioned understanding by mapping any one concept to a real-life situation.	GEB 3373: At least 75% of students will achieve a score of 85 or higher on Library research project. (Note: This project requires students to identify, assess, summarize, and discuss how their chosen IB concept applies in real-life.)	Percentage of students earning at least 85% on their Library research project.	This project was suspended in favor of including 'application' questions in the exams.	N/A
#3: Students will relate the abovementioned knowledge to the strategic and operational dimensions of organizations who operate (or intend to operate) in a 'international' context	GEB 3373: At least 75% of students will correctly answer at least 80 questions on exam-3. (Note: Exam-3 comprised of questions that mostly deal with firm-level aspects of International	Percent of students earning at least 80% on exam-3.	80% of the class (20/25 students) earned 80% or higher on GEB 3373 exam-3 (Fall, 2017).	Objective #3 was achieved.

	business.)			
--	------------	--	--	--

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.

MEASURE: 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: Spring 2018

OUTCOME: Twenty six essays/assignments were evaluated using our new 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.	26.92%	53.85%	19.23%
Student uses content/material learned in the course.	11.54%	73.08%	15.38%
Student employs logical reasoning.	26.92%	50.00%	23.08%
Grammar/Mechanics			
Document is grammatically correct.	26.92%	53.85%	19.23%
Sentence structure is sound.	38.46%	42.31%	19.23%
Student writes efficiently (without redundancy).	42.31%	34.62%	23.08%
Appearance and Organization			
Document is formatted appropriately	19.23%	61.54%	19.23%
Paragraphs are used appropriately to delineate concepts.	7.69%	69.23%	23.08%

Sentences are connected so that thoughts flow seamlessly together.	46.15%	30.77%	23.08%
Topics are introduced and concluded.	11.54%	69.23%	19.23%
Document Integrity			
Student uses his or her own words.	3.85%	76.92%	19.23%
Student references and cites work properly.	n/a	n/a	n/a

Students scored poorly (greater than 38% did not meet expectations) on 3 traits: sentence structure is sound, student writes efficiently, and sentences are connected so that thoughts flow seamlessly together. Conversely, students scored well (less than 12% did not meet expectations) on 4 traits: student uses content/material learned in course, paragraphs are use appropriately to delineate concepts, topics are introduced and concluded, and student uses his or her own words. One trait could not be measured since it was not a required part of the assignment.

This was first time that we used the rubric to score written communication in the College and the rubric was not provided to students when they were given and completing the assignment. Thus, 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 in the Fall 2018 semester and in the process they will be provided with the rubric along with the assignment.

The consultant/external reviewer also noted that we may want to (1) provide the students some flexibility in meeting the rubric criteria by using the term report versus essay in the instructions, and (2) provide more guidance for the assessor if they are outside of the discipline area. This would make it easier for him/her to score some of the traits.

ACTION TAKEN: As described above this was the first time using our new analytic (versus our old holistic) written communication rubric. The above assessments will be used as a benchmark for future assessment activities. We will measure written communication using our new rubric again in Fall 2018.

Critical Thinking Skills:

Learning Goal 2: Students will have critical thinking skills.

Objective 1: Students will develop solutions to business problems..

MEASURE: Students were given a writing assignment in Dr. Marlin's GEB 4890 class. The assignment was scored using a critical thinking rubric.

DATE ADMINISTERED: Spring 2018

OUTCOMES: Twenty six essays/assignments were evaluated using our new 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.	3.85%	69.23%	26.92%
Student is able to identify the root cause of the problem.	7.69%	65.38%	26.92%
Student is able to completely define the problem.	15.38%	61.54%	23.08%
Student is able to accurately define the problem.	19.23%	61.54%	19.23%
Problem Analysis and Solution Generation			
Student breaks down problem into its component parts.	15.38%	65.38%	19.23%
Student uses appropriate tools and techniques to analyze relevant data.	26.92%	57.69%	15.38%
Student uses supporting information.	26.92%	57.69%	15.38%
Student identifies alternative viable solutions.	11.54%	61.54%	26.92%
Student evaluates alternative viable solutions.	26.92%	50.00%	23.08%
Problem Solution			
Solution is optimal.	34.62%	50.00%	15.38%
Solution is appropriately documented.	38.64%	46.15%	15.38%
Solution is appropriately defended.	38.64%	46.15%	15.38%
Student considers limitations of solution.	38.64%	50.00%	11.54%

Students scored poorly (greater than 34% did not meet expectations) on all the four traits associated with problem solution. The assignment asked about choice of international strategy but many students discussed competitive/business-level strategy or international entry mode instead. This suggest that the assignment needs some clarification. Areas where students scored well (less than 12% did not meet expectations) included: student recognizes business

needs to be met/problem to be solved, student is able to identify the root cause of the problem, and student identifies alternative viable solutions.

This was first time that we used the rubric to score critical thinking in the College and the rubric was not provided to students when they were given and completing the assignment. Thus, 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 in the Fall 2018 semester and in the process they will be provided with the rubric along with the assignment.

ACTION TAKEN: As described above this was the first time using our new analytic (versus our old holistic) critical thinking rubric. The above assessments will be used as a benchmark for future assessment activities. We will measure critical thinking using our new rubric again in Fall 2018.