# Program Plan and Findings: Four Column Layout

## Program (SSB) - EEE - Entrepreneurship (BSBA) - 473

**Program Mission Statement:** This plan relates to the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA) at Oklahoma State University's Spears School of Business (SB). The BSBA includes majors in accounting, economics, entrepreneurship, finance, general business, international business, management, management information systems, and marketing.

Oklahoma State University's Spears School of Business exists to prepare people to make a difference in the world by teaching essential interpersonal skills alongside a high-quality business education backed by impactful research and outreach.

## Program Information

### 2019 - 2020

**Program Information**
**Assessment Coordinator's Name:** Carol Johnson
**Assessment Coordinator's E-mail Address:** carol.johnson@okstate.edu
**Number of Students Enrolled in the Program:** 4472
**Total Number of Students Graduated:** 1277
**Were university assessment funds used by the department/program for assessment activities?:** Yes
**If yes, describe how funds were used and the contribution the funds had on the assessment process:** $5,762.65 was spent on stipends for business communications instructors to score the written communications assessments.
**Number of Student Graduates from Stillwater Campus:**
**Number of Student Graduates from Tulsa Campus:**

## Annual Executive Summaries

### 2019 - 2020

**Program Assessment Coordinator:** Carol Johnson
**Plan Review and Approval**
**Date Current Plan Was Reviewed and Approved:** 08/01/2018
**Date of Future Plan Review and Approval:** 08/01/2023
**Summary of Assessment Findings**
**Describe overall assessment findings and faculty members' interpretation of the assessment results:** Ethical decision making is a complex and many-faceted concept. This

assessment examined:

- Student decisions about how likely they would be to carry out an unethical action in sixteen different vignettes. Overall, scores were the best they have been in the last four assessments (8 years) and were significantly better than were produced by business executives in the Longenecker et al. (2006) study.
- Student ability to identify stakeholders and recommend ethical actions with nine case scenarios. Overall, scores were lower than the previous assessment and lower than the 80% target. This is, however, the area in which scoring is most subjective.
- Measures of student ethicality based on the Detert et al. (2008) study. Scores were better than the previous assessment by about 7 percent and about the same as the assessment four years ago.
- Measures of moral disengagement or student ability to rationalize decisions. Most changes between the 2017 and 2019 assessments were fairly minor. Scores on student tendencies towards dehumanization, however, got significantly worse (.49 deterioration), while scores on the attribution of blame got significantly better (.51 improvement).
- There were no significant differences across locations/delivery modes; and there were not any consistent differences across majors.

Written communications
- Results of the 2019 assessment were slightly lower than the results from the 2017 assessment. Results from the 2017 assessment were quite better than the 2015 assessment. For the 2019 assessment, the instructor who scored most generously in 2017 had dropped out, and a new instructor who appeared to score much more conservatively was added. These changes in graders likely account for much of the difference.
- The goal that 75% of students should score at a 12 or higher was met overall and across all majors. The goals was missed slightly (73%) for Tulsa students; however, Tulsa had a very small sample (n=15).

Career competency
- A new assessment was administered this time which involved 20 multiple-choice questions (one on each of the 20 competencies) for each student and an essay question that focused on the competencies of self-awareness, situational adaptability, courage, and resilience.
- In general, students performed better at understanding the elements of the competencies than understanding the causes of problems with the competencies.
- Results on the essay questions suggested there is plenty of room for progress. However, the three career competency classes (BADM-2111, BADM-3111, and BADM-3113) are still in early development and many students have not even taken them yet.

## Dissemination of Findings
**Describe the individual(s) or committee responsible for reviewing and interpreting assessment data:** The results of each of the assessments are shared with the Core Curriculum and Assessment Committee.
**Describe the process for sharing and discussing assessment findings with program faculty:** The Core Curriculum and Assessment Committee includes a representative from each department, who is responsible for communicating the results to his/her respective department.

## Program Improvements Based on Assessment
**Based on data collected this year, what changes are being considered or planned for the program?:** Due to pandemic-related priorities, the Core Curriculum and Assessment Committee has not yet met to discuss this year's results but will do so in Fall 2020.
**Based on this year's findings, what (if any) changes are planned for the assessment process?:** None at this time.
**Describe the process for implementing these changes/planned program improvements:** N/A
**Program Improvements Made in the Last Year:** Course Improvements, Curriculum Improvements, Assessment Measure Improvements
**"Other" Improvements:**
**Goals for the Coming Year:** The AACSB has just passed a new set of standards that should impact assessment and potentially the learning goals in the Spears School of Business.
**Is this Summary Report Complete?:** Yes
**List all individuals associated with this report preparation:** Carol Johnson writes the report. Decisions are a function of the Core Curriculum and Assessment Committee.

| Outcomes | Assessment Methods | Findings | Use of Findings (Actions) |
|---|---|---|---|

**Ethical Decision Making -** This goal anticipates that students will be able to:
• Understand appropriate responses to common ethical issues in their discipline;
• Identify when an ethical dilemma may exist;
• Identify stakeholders and potential consequences to the stakeholders; and
• Recommend ethical responses.
**Outcome Status:** Active
**Planned Assessment Year:** 2017 - 2018, 2019 - 2020, 2021 - 2022, 2023 - 2024
**Start Date:**
**Archived Date:**
**Outcome Type:** Disposition
**Reason for Archival:**

**Capstone Assignment -** •  Students will evaluate 16 problematic ethics scenarios and evaluate the actions on a scale of 1-4 (very acceptable to never acceptable).
**\* Learning Outcome Goal/Benchmark:** •  Target for the 16 questions is to have improved performance over the previous test.

**Timeline for Assessment:** •  These assessments will be administered on an every-two-year cycle beginning in Fall, 2013, to students in the business capstone course, MGMT-4513, at all OSU locations (Stillwater, Tulsa, and Online).
**Other Assessment Type:**

**Reporting Period:** 2019 - 2020
**Conclusion:** 3 - Meets Program Expectations (Proficient)
In the first part of the exam, students reviewed the 16 questions listed in Table 1 and indicated whether they would find the action always acceptable (4), sometimes acceptable (3), rarely acceptable (2), or never acceptable (1).  Since each of the questions involved the student's propensity to undertake an action that is deemed unethical, lower scores are seen as corresponding to higher ethical behavior.  The proportions of students who gave each response are presented in Table 1, along with a mean score for the current assessment (2019) and a mean score for the assessments performed in 2017, 2015, and 2013.  The cases are listed in order of those considered most acceptable to least acceptable in the 2019 assessment.

In the Overall Score column for 2019, results are marked in blue if they are improvements by at least .05 from the previous assessment.  They are marked in red if they were worse by at least .05 compared to the previous assessment.  In total, scores improved on 9 of the 16 case scenarios (average of 0.11 improvement) and did not decline on any case scenario. The remaining seven cases were virtually unchanged.  This trajectory appears to be different from the previous assessment, when there was a decline on 10 cases and improvement on only 1 case.

Case 1—a bid rigging scenario (specifically price fixing)—appears to be of the greatest concern—consistent with prior years.  This case likely involves a serious violation of federal law, but is probably not recognized as such by most students.  After seeing steady declines on the scores for this case in the three prior assessments, we are at least beginning to see some movement in the opposite direction.

In the Longenecker et al. (2006) study, which examined the administration of these same vignettes to business executives over a 17-year period, the average score for the 16 cases was 2.69 in 1985 (using the same scale as used in our assessment), 2.49 in 1993, and 2.40 in 2001.  The average for Spears students was 1.88 in 2013, 1.83 in 2015,

**Use of Findings (Actions):** The meeting of the Core Curriculum and Assessment Committee has been delayed due to pandemic-related priorities.  The committee will meet in Fall 2020 to discuss the findings.  With respect to this particular learning goal, it's unlikely any significant changes will be suggested. (08/30/2020)

1.88 in 2017, and 1.81 in 2019. The score in 2019 is the best overall score to date for Spears students and is significantly better than the scores of the business executives.

See Table 1 – Results by Vignette in Document Repository - General - Ethical Decision Making - Write-up

Table 2 presents the same results broken down by location and delivery mode (online classes, Stillwater face-to-face classes, and Tulsa face-to-face classes). Scores do not vary significantly across locations; Stillwater and Online students have a mean overall score of 1.81, while Tulsa students have a mean overall score of 1.85. The Tulsa sample (n=15) is even smaller than in normal assessment activities, since assessment had to be canceled in one of the two Tulsa assessment sections due to a snow day.

See Table 2 - Results by Location in Document Repository - General - Ethical Decision Making - Write-up

Results based on major are presented in Table 3. If a student is a double major, that student's scores are reported with both majors. Average acceptability scores across all cases are as follows, listed from least to most concerning: International Business (1.61), Economics (1.69), General Business and MIS (both 1.71), Marketing (1.76), Accounting and Management (both 1.84), Entrepreneurship (1.92), and Finance (1.93). The greatest difference between high and low score for any one case is Case 6—concealing embarrassing facts in the financial reports, where EEE majors (2.50) found this action to be more acceptable by a difference of 1.25 than International Business majors (1.75).

See Table 3 – Vignette Results Based on Major - General - Ethical Decision Making-Write-up (07/16/2020)

**Number of Students Assessed:** 337
**Number of Successful Students:** 270
**How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?:** The test was administered to students in the capstone courses (MGMT-4513) in the Fall

| Outcomes | Assessment Methods | Findings | Use of Findings (Actions) |
|---|---|---|---|

2019 semester.  Students in on-campus courses in Stillwater and Tulsa took the exam in a proctored session in a computer lab during a regularly-scheduled class period.  Students in online sections took the exams in certified testing centers.  Unfortunately, one of the two scheduled Tulsa assessments had to be canceled due to a snow day; so the number of Tulsa observations is even smaller than usual.

**What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?:** Some improvement in outcomes was seen since the last assessment two years ago.

**Capstone Assignment -** Students will evaluate two randomly-selected scenarios from a set of 9, identify stakeholders in the process, and recommend appropriate actions.

**\* Learning Outcome**

**Goal/Benchmark:** 80% of students should be able to score 6 or higher (average of meets expectations) on the rubric applied to the case.

**Timeline for Assessment:** These assessments will be administered on an every-two-year cycle, beginning in Fall 2013, to students in the business capstone course, MGMT-4513, at all OSU locations (Stillwater, Tulsa, and Online).

**Other Assessment Type:**

**Reporting Period:** 2019 - 2020

**Conclusion:** 1 - Does Not Meet Program Expectations (Unacceptable)

In the second portion of this assessment, students were presented with two short cases that were randomly selected from a set of nine possible cases.  Students were asked to identify stakeholders (those who stood to be affected by the decisions) and to indicate whether the decision was appropriate and why.  On the stakeholder portion of the assessment, students received 1 point if they could identify one stakeholder, 2 points if they could identify multiple stakeholders but missed some obvious ones, and 3 points if they did a fairly comprehensive job of identifying stakeholders.  On the action scoring, they were assigned 1 point if their recommended action was deemed illegal or unethical or if the reasoning for their action was seriously flawed.  They were assigned 3 points if they made a fairly reasonable recommendation with fairly reasonable rationale.  They were assigned 2 points if they fell somewhere in between.

The mean scores for identifying stakeholders and recommending actions are presented in Table 4.  Distributions of scores are shown on the right-hand side of the table.  The last two cases listed (Gail and the Cereal Manufacturer) are instances where no unethical action was taking place.  Scoring the ethicality of the recommended action gets a bit more complex in these cases, since students may see an ethical action as unethical.  Consequently, these cases were separated from the others

**Use of Findings (Actions):** The meeting of the Core Curriculum and Assessment Committee has been delayed due to pandemic-related priorities.  The committee will meet in Fall 2020 to discuss the findings.  (08/30/2020)

in the table.

The cases that involved unethical actions taking place are listed from highest (best score) to lowest (worst) score with respect to the student's recommended action.  As has been seen in the past, students have a lot of difficulty with actions involving vendors (bidding situations and kickbacks).  This time, however, they had the most difficulty with a case (Hannah) that involved an employee accidentally getting access to a competitor's confidential marketing strategy information.  They did relatively well on the matter of reporting suspicious financial activity even when instructed by their boss not to do so.  Likewise, they were very averse to the notion of downloading vendor programs for personal use even when instructed to do so by a company vice president.

See Table 4 (Stakeholder and Action Identification by Case) in Related Documents - General - Ethical Decision Making - Write-up

Table 5 presents the mean scores on stakeholder and action identification by location.  There are not enough Tulsa observations to draw much meaning.  One of the Tulsa sections had to be canceled due to a snow day; and Tulsa sections are inherently quite small.  Since each student had a random draw of two of the nine available cases, there were only between two and four observations from Tulsa students for each of the cases.  Students in Stillwater sections had higher scores than students in online sections for four of the seven cases that involved actual unethical behavior.  So neither group seems to dominate the other; and the differences between average scores of the two groups are not practically significant.

See Table 5 (Stakeholder and Action Identification by Case and Location) in Related Documents - General - Ethical Decision Making - Write-up

Table 6 presents results by major for identifying stakeholders (Panel A) and recommending actions (Panel B).

Since each student had two cases out of nine possible cases, the number of any particular major that have any one case can be quite small. The overall averages at the bottom of each table are based on the 7 cases listed at the top of the table, since the last two cases are atypical. MIS majors have the highest average score for identifying stakeholders; and Finance majors have the highest average for recommending actions. But there is no consistent pattern within any major--or even in comparison to the last ethics assessment—that suggests that one major dominates the others in ethical decision making or consistently lags behind the others

See Table 6 - Panel A (Stakeholder Identification by Major) in Related Documents - General - Ethical Decision Making - Write-up

See Table 6 - Panel B (Prescribe Action by Major) in Related Documents - General - Ethical Decision Making - Write-up

The target for this portion of the assessment proposed that 80% of students should be able to score 4 or higher (average of meets expectations) on the rubric applied to the case (sum of stakeholder score and action score). For purposes of this analysis, student scores were based on the average of the two cases they randomly pulled. However, the two cases in which there were no ethical violations were deleted, as they tend to confound the data. Overall, 71% of students scored at 4 or higher. By location, 66% of Stillwater students scored at 4 or higher, along with 83% of Tulsa students and 73% of online students. So the 80% target was missed this time around.

Results in Table 7 indicate that the only major which met the 80% target was MIS (82%). The lowest rates of meeting expectations were in Management (66%), Marketing (67%) and Entrepreneurship (69%).

See Table 7 - Rate of Meeting Expectations by Major - in Related Documents - General - Ethical Decision Making - Write-up (07/19/2020)

| Outcomes | Assessment Methods | Findings | Use of Findings (Actions) |
|---|---|---|---|

**Number of Students Assessed:** 337
**Number of Successful Students:** 239
**How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?:** The test was administered to students in the capstone courses (MGMT-4513) in the Fall 2019 semester. Students in on-campus courses in Stillwater and Tulsa took the exam in a proctored session in a computer lab during a regularly-scheduled class period. Students in online sections took the exams in certified testing centers. Unfortunately, one of the two scheduled Tulsa assessments had to be canceled due to a snow day; so the number of Tulsa observations is even smaller than usual.

**What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?:** Results fell short of target this year. However, results on other parts of the assessment were better than previous years and this portion is by far the most subjective. So it's a little difficult to tell whether student performance is worse or scoring is more severe.

**Related Documents:**
Ethics Write-Up - Fall 2019.docx

**Capstone Assignment -** Students will address eight questions intended to measure degree of ethicality.
**\* Learning Outcome**
**Goal/Benchmark:** No specific target. Serves to provide insight on the degree of ethicality of students.
**Timeline for Assessment:** These assessments will be administered on an every-two-year cycle, beginning in Fall 2013, to students in the business capstone course, MGMT-4513, at all OSU locations (Stillwater, Tulsa, Online).
**Other Assessment Type:**

**Reporting Period:** 2019 - 2020
**Conclusion:** 3 - Meets Program Expectations (Proficient)
In this part of the assessment, students were administered the assessment of unethicality that was utilized in Detert et al. (Detert, James R.; Trevino, Linda Klebe; and Sweitzer, Vicki L (2008). Moral disengagement in ethical decision making: A study of antecedents and outcomes. Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 93, No. 2, pp. 374-391). Students were asked how likely they were to engage in each of the following eight behaviors on a 7-point scale, ranging from 0 (not at all likely) to 6 (highly likely).

- You work in a fast-food restaurant in downtown Stillwater. It's against policy to eat food without paying for it. You came straight from classes and are therefore hungry. Your supervisor isn't around, so you make something for yourself and eat it without paying.
- You work as an office assistant for a department at Oklahoma State University. You're alone in the office making copies and realize you're out of copy paper at home. You therefore slip a ream of paper into your

**Use of Findings (Actions):** The meeting of the Core Curriculum and Assessment Committee has been delayed due to pandemic-related priorities. The committee will meet in Fall 2020 to discuss the findings. (08/30/2020)

backpack.

- You're preparing for the final exam in a class where the professor uses the same exam in both sections. Some of your friends somehow get a copy of the exam after the first section. They are now trying to memorize the right answers. You don't look at the exam, but just ask them what topics you should focus your studying on.

- You've waited in line for 10 minutes to buy a coffee and muffin at Starbucks. When you're a couple of blocks away, you realize that the clerk gave you change for $20 rather than for the $10 you gave him. You savor your coffee, muffin, and free $10.

- You get the final exam back from your professor and you notice that he's marked correct three answers that you got wrong. Revealing his error would mean the difference between an A and a B. You say nothing.

- Your accounting course requires you to purchase a software package that sells for $50. Your friend, who is also in the class, has already bought the software and offers to lend it to you. You take it and load it onto your computer.

- Your boss at your summer job asks you to get confidential information about a competitor's product. You therefore pose as a student doing a research project on the competitor's company and ask for the information.

- You are assigned a team project in one of your courses. Your team waits until the last minute to begin working. Several team members suggest using an old project out of their fraternity/sorority files. You go along with this plan.

Scores on the 8 questions were averaged for each student to develop the measure of "unethicality." In the Detert et al. (2008) study, the average score for freshmen students in business and education at a large public research university in the Northeast was 3.30 on a scale of 0-6. Table 12 presents scores for the Spears assessment of seniors overall and by location/delivery mode. The overall average score of 1.69 is about 49% lower than the scores in the Detert study. The highest mean score is 1.73 for Stillwater students, and the lowest score is 1.63 for Tulsa students. All scores are quite a bit lower (suggesting less

"unethicality") than the Detert scores. The average of 1.69 for this cycle is almost 7% lower than the average of 1.82 in the 2017 assessment but very similar to 1.66 in the 2015 assessment.

See Table 8 - Unethicality Measure - Overall and By Location - in Related Documents - General - Ethical Decision Making - Write Up

Unethicality scores by major are presented in Table 9. Scores range from a high (more unethical) of 2.22 for Economics majors to 1.56 (less unethical) for entrepreneurship majors; but all appear to be significantly lower than the 3.30 average in the Detert study.

See Table 9 - Unethicality Measure - By Major - in Related Documents - General - Ethical Decision Making - Write Up (07/19/2020)

**Number of Students Assessed:** 337
**Number of Successful Students:** 303
**How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?:** The test was administered to students in the capstone courses (MGMT-4513) in the Fall 2019 semester. Students in on-campus courses in Stillwater and Tulsa took the exam in a proctored session in a computer lab during a regularly-scheduled class period. Students in online sections took the exams in certified testing centers. Unfortunately, one of the two scheduled Tulsa assessments had to be canceled due to a snow day; so the number of Tulsa observations is even smaller than usual.
**What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?:** Students perform better than their peers at other institutions
**Related Documents:**
[Ethics Write-Up - Fall 2019.docx]

**Capstone Assignment -** Students will evaluate 24 questions intended to measure their propensity to various forms of moral disengagement or rationalizations.

**Reporting Period:** 2019 - 2020
**Conclusion:** 2 - Meets Minimum Program Expectations (Developing)
Detert et al. (2008) cites research by Bandura (Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the preparation of

**Use of Findings (Actions):** The meeting of the Core Curriculum and Assessment Committee has been delayed due to pandemic-related priorities. The committee

| | **\* Learning Outcome Goal/Benchmark:** No benchmark. This particular portion of the assessment is intended to help us understand how students may justify particular actions. Understanding rationalizations can help in closing the loop on ethical decision making.<br>**Timeline for Assessment:** These assessments will be administered on an every-two-year cycle, beginning in Fall 2013, to students in the business capstone course, MGMT-4513, at all OSU locations (Stillwater, Tulsa, and Online).<br>**Other Assessment Type:** | inhumanities. Personal and Social Psychology Review (3), pp. 193-209), which develops the idea of moral disengagement as a method for switching off the self-monitoring of our conduct, thereby enabling us to engage in acts that we might otherwise view as unacceptable. These "switching-off" behaviors are often referred to as "rationalizations" in the fraud literature. Detert et al. (2008) adapt measures of moral disengagement from prior research and measure forms of moral disengagement by asking students to rate the extent to which they agree with the following statements on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Our assessment used these same questions and averaged the responses within each set to develop measures of the eight forms of moral disengagement. | will meet in Fall 2020 to discuss the findings. This particular part of the assessment is used to provide insight on student rationalization processes, so it is unlikely any particular actions will be taken. (08/30/2020) |

- Moral Justification
  - o It is all right to fight to protect your friends.
  - o It's okay to steal to take care of your family's needs.
  - o It's okay to attack someone who threatens your family's honor.

- Euphemistic Labeling
  - o Sharing test questions is just a way of helping your friends.
  - o Talking about people behind their backs is just part of the game.
  - o Looking at a friend's homework without their permission is just borrowing it.

- Advantageous Comparison
  - o Damaging some property is no big deal when you consider that others are beating up people.
  - o Stealing some money is not too serious compared to those who steal a lot of money.
  - o Compared to other illegal things people do, taking some things from a store without paying for them is not very serious.

- Displacement of Responsibility

o        If people are living under bad conditions, they cannot be blamed for behaving aggressively.

o        If someone is pressured into doing something, they shouldn't be blamed for it.

o        People cannot be blamed for misbehaving if their friends pressured them to do it.

•        Diffusion of Responsibility

o        A member of a group or team should not be blamed for the trouble the team has caused.

o        If a group decides to do something harmful, it is unfair to blame any one member of the group for it.

o        You can't blame a person who plays only a small part in the harm caused by a group.

•        Distorting Consequences

o        People don't mind being teased because it shows interest in them.

o        Teasing someone does not really hurt them.

o        Insults don't really hurt anyone.

•        Attribution of Blame

o        If someone leaves something lying around, it's their fault if it gets stolen.

o        People who are mistreated have usually done things to deserve it.

o        People are not at fault for misbehaving at work if their managers mistreat them.

•        Dehumanization

o        Some people deserve to be treated like animals.

o        It is okay to treat badly someone who behaved like a "worm."

o        Someone who is obnoxious does not deserve to be treated like a human being.

Results for Spears Business students, both overall and by delivery mode, appear in Table 10.  It appears that the forms of moral disengagement in which students are most likely to engage are moral justification and diffusion of responsibility.  Moral justification involves recasting harm

to others in a way that makes it seem morally justified.  In a business setting, this form of disengagement might lead one to defend maintaining investments in a country that practices apartheid because doing otherwise might lead to higher unemployment among minorities.  Diffusion of responsibility allows someone to feel that they are not personally responsible for a decision if a group was involved in making the decision.

Most changes between the 2017 and 2019 assessment were fairly minor.  Scores on dehumanization, however, got significantly worse (+.49) with the most recent assessment, while scores on attribution of blame got significantly better (-.51).

See Table 10 - Moral Disengagement Overall and by Location - in Related Documents - General - Ethical Decision Making - Write-up

Table 11 presents the moral disengagement data on the basis of student major.  The blue shading identifies the major that scored lowest (best) on a particular form of moral disengagement; and pink shading represents the major that scored highest (worst).  There doesn't appear to be any correspondence between which majors did better or worse in 2019 vs. 2017.  In the 2019 results, ECON majors scored worst on 4 of the 8 forms of disengagement whereas FIN majors scored worst on 3 of the 8 forms of disengagement, and EEE majors scored best on 6 of them.

See Table 11 - Moral Disengagement by Major - in Related Documents - General - Ethical Decision Making - Write-up (07/19/2020)

**Number of Students Assessed:** 337
**Number of Successful Students:** 270
**How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?:** The test was administered to students in the capstone courses (MGMT-4513) in the Fall 2019 semester.  Students in on-campus courses in Stillwater and Tulsa took the exam in a proctored session in a computer lab during a regularly-scheduled class period.  Students in online sections took the exams in certified

| Outcomes | Assessment Methods | Findings | Use of Findings (Actions) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | testing centers.  Unfortunately, one of the two scheduled Tulsa assessments had to be canceled due to a snow day; so the number of Tulsa observations is even smaller than usual.<br>**What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?:** Results are stable with prior periods.<br>**Related Documents:**<br>[Ethics Write-Up - Fall 2019.docx](#) | |
| **Written Communication -** This goal anticipates that students will be able to produce effective, written, business communications that:<br>•　　Are written in a business-like fashion that is appropriate to the audience;<br>•　　Are well-organized and concise; and<br>•　　Use correct grammar, spelling, and mechanics.<br>**Outcome Status:** Active<br>**Planned Assessment Year:** 2017 - 2018, 2019 - 2020, 2021 - 2022, 2023 - 2024<br>**Start Date:**<br>**Archived Date:**<br>**Outcome Type:** Skills<br>**Reason for Archival:** | **Course Exam(s) -** • The preceding abilities will be assessed using a writing prompt in a lab setting in which students are provided with some graphics that represent test results.  Students will be asked to write a letter that is no more than 1-1/2 pages long to their supervisor.  The letter should explain the test results to the supervisor.  This testing approach should ensure that students are using their own words and their own work.<br>•　　This test will be administered on an every-two-year cycle beginning in Fall, 2013, to students in the business capstone course, MGMT-4513, at all OSU locations (Stillwater, Tulsa, and Online).<br>•　　For on-campus students in Stillwater and Tulsa, the exam will be administered during a regularly-scheduled class period; and the score will make up a small component of the student's grade. Online students will schedule a test time at a certified testing center.<br>•　　A sample rubric is provided in the related documents.<br>**\* Learning Outcome** | **Reporting Period:** 2019 - 2020<br>**Conclusion:** 2 - Meets Minimum Program Expectations (Developing)<br>Goals:  For each individual skill (content, organization, style & mechanics, and format & appearance), the average score for students should be a 3 or higher.  With respect to the total score, 75% of students should score a 12 or higher.<br><br>Table 1 provides scores overall and on a case-by-case basis. Although students seemed to have more trouble with the QPhone case than with the other two cases, the overall percent who scored at a 12 or higher was 89% (same as for the last assessment in Fall 2015).  This score exceeded the target of 75% across each case.  In addition, students averaged above a 3.0 for each case and each criterion.<br><br>See Table 1 in Related Documents - Written Communications Write-up<br><br>Table 2 presents results by location.  The highest scores were in Online, and the lowest scores were with the Stillwater students (opposite of the last assessment).  The Tulsa students fell slightly below the 75% target, but one section was missing due to a technology glitch.  All criterion averages exceeded the 3.0 target at every location.<br><br>See Table 2 in Related Documents - Written Communications Write-up<br><br>The following table presents results by major.  If a student is a double major, his/her results are included with both | **Use of Findings (Actions):** The meeting of the Core Curriculum and Assessment Committee has been delayed due to pandemic-related priorities.  The committee will meet in Fall 2020 to discuss the findings.  (08/30/2020) |

**Goal/Benchmark:** •          For each individual skill (content, organization, style & mechanics, and format & appearance), the average score for students should be a 3 or higher.

•          With respect to the total score, 75% of students should score a 12 or higher.

**Timeline for Assessment:** Assessments are to occur in Fall 2019 and every two years thereafter

**Other Assessment Type:**

**Related Documents:**

Rubric - Written Communications in SLO-05.docx

majors.  International Business and Accounting majors had the highest proportion of students scoring at or above a 12 overall (100% and 95%, respectively); General Business majors had the lowest proportion (76%).  However, every major had at least 75% of its students who scored at a 12 or higher.

See Table 3 in Related Documents - Written Communications Write-up

The artifacts were scored by three Business Communications instructors.  Each of the graders was randomly assigned a third of the cases from each of the three prompts.  One of the graders appeared to score more generously than the other two; but all three produced averages in excess of three for each case and component.

Results of the 2019 assessment were slightly lower than results from the 2017 assessment.  Results from the 2017 assessment were quite a better than the 2013 assessment and about the same as the 2015 assessment.  For the 2019 assessment, the instructor who scored most generously in 2017 had dropped out, and a new instructor who appeared to score much more conservatively was added.  These changes in may account for much of the difference. (07/29/2020)

**Number of Students Assessed:** 390

**Number of Successful Students:** 347

**How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?:** •          The preceding abilities were assessed using a writing prompt in a lab setting in which students were provided with some graphics that represented test results.  Students were asked to write an email that was 400-600 words in length to their supervisor.  The email was to explain the test results to the supervisor and make a recommendation.  Three different writing prompts were used for this assignment, and students were randomly assigned one of the three prompts.

•          This test was administered in Fall, 2019, to students in the business capstone course (MGMT-4513) at

all OSU locations (Stillwater, Tulsa, and Online).  Testing had to be canceled for one of the Tulsa sections because of a snow day; so the number of Tulsa students in the assessment is very small (n=15).

•    For on-campus students in Stillwater and Tulsa, the exam was administered during a regularly-scheduled class period; and the score made up a small component of the student's grade.  Online students were required to schedule a test time at a certified testing center.

•    A sample rubric for the scoring appears at the end of this write-up.  The artifacts were scored by four Business Communications instructors.

**What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?:** The artifacts were scored by three Business Communications instructors.  Each of the graders was randomly assigned a third of the cases from each of the three prompts.  One of the graders appeared to score more generously than the other two; but all three produced averages in excess of three for each case and component.

Results of the 2019 assessment were slightly lower than results from the 2017 assessment.  Results from the 2017 assessment were quite a better than the 2015 assessment.  For the 2019 assessment, the instructor who scored most generously in 2017 had dropped out, and a new instructor who appeared to score much more conservatively was added.  These changes in graders likely account for much of the difference.

**Related Documents:**

[Written Communications Write-Up - Fall 2019.docx](#)

---

**Career Competencies -** With the development of the new core curriculum, this outcome has been redefined from "interpersonal skills" to "career competencies" and focuses on key Korn Ferry competencies as determined by a collaboration of external parties, faculty, and Eastin Center personnel.  There has been

**Course Exam(s) -** Assessment method:  The following four competencies were tested under other learning goals as follows:

•    Objectives 2 (business insight) and 10 (financial acumen) are primarily addressed in assessment of the student's knowledge of business

**Reporting Period:** 2019 - 2020
**Conclusion:** 2 - Meets Minimum Program Expectations (Developing)
Multiple-Choice Assessment:
Table 1 presents results by competency, question type, and location.  There were three possible questions for each competency (Type A, B, or C), and each student had a random draw of one of those three questions for each competency.

**Use of Findings (Actions):** Results have been delayed by pandemic-related priorities.  Results will be shared with the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies and with the Director of the Eastin Center.  In addition, results will be discussed extensively with the Core Curriculum/Assessment

| Outcomes | Assessment Methods | Findings | Use of Findings (Actions) |
|---|---|---|---|

some back-and-forth on the competencies to be included; and the current set anticipates that students will demonstrate career competencies in the following areas:

1. Ensures accountability--Holds self and others accountable to meet commitments.
2. Business insight – Applies knowledge of business and the marketplace to advance the organization's goals.
3. Collaborates--Builds partnerships and works collaboratively with others to meet shared objectives.
4. Communicates effectively--Develops and delivers multi-mode communications that convey a clear understanding of the unique needs of different audiences.
5. Manages complexity--Makes sense of complex, high quantity, and sometimes contradictory information to effectively solve problems.
6. Courage--Steps up to address difficult issues, saying what needs to be said.
7. Customer Focus – Builds strong customer relationships and delivers customer-centric solutions.
8. Decision quality--Makes good and timely decisions that keep the organization moving forward.
9. Values differences--Recognizes the value that different perspectives and cultures bring to an organization.
10. Financial acumen – Interprets and applies understanding of key financial indicators to make better business decisions.

fundamentals.
• Objective 5 (manages complexity) is partially addressed in the problem-solving assessment.
• Objective 19 (tech savvy) is addressed as part of our technology assessment.

Additionally, students were assessed via two approaches:
• Each student took a 20-question multiple-choice test with each question covering a different competency. For each competency, the student had a random draw from one of three questions about the competency. The questions dealt with issues that revolved around recognizing the competency or its components or understanding the causes of problems with the competency.
• In addition, each student had a random draw of one of three short essay questions in which they addressed what they would do or had done in a particular scenario. The three scenarios addressed:

While it was intended that all tests be conducted in a proctored scenario, the occurrence of the COVID-19 pandemic necessitated that for Spring 2020, we move some of the testing to unproctored situations.

**\* Learning Outcome Goal/Benchmark:** Spring 2020 was the first administration of this assessment tool. Goals have not yet

• Questions labeled "A" presented students with some behaviors that individuals exhibited (e.g., following through on commitments and making sure their employees do the same) and asked them to identify the competency with which those behaviors were associated (e.g., ensures accountability).
• Questions labeled "B" presented students with a competency (e.g., business insight) and asked them to identify behaviors that were elements of that competency (e.g., knowing how businesses work).
• Questions labeled "C" presented students with a competency (e.g., collaboration) and asked students to identify factors that might cause poor performance in that competency (e.g., not being forthcoming with information).

Overall, students performed best on the Type A and B questions (79% and 77% correct, respectively) and had their lowest performance on the Type C questions (64% correct). So they seem to do better at recognizing the elements that comprise a competency than they do at recognizing the causes of poor performance in a competency.

[See Table 1 of Related Documents - Career Competencies Write-up - 2020].

Table 2 presents overall results by competency and location. The three competencies on which students scored the highest were global perspective (91%), self-development (89%), and being resilient (88%). The lowest scores were on managing complexity (46%) and persuasion, interpersonal savvy, and courage (all 60%). Total scores were highest among Tulsa students (mean=78%, n=30) and lowest among online students (mean=72%, n=265).

[See Table 2 of Related Documents - Career Competencies Write-up - 2020].

Table 3 presents results by competency and primary major. HTM only had one student in the capstone course at this point, so their average is meaningless. The highest scores

Committee. (08/29/2020)

| Outcomes | Assessment Methods | Findings | Use of Findings (Actions) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11. Global perspective – Takes a broad view when approaching issues, using a global lens.<br>12. Interpersonal savvy--Relates openly and comfortably with diverse groups of people.<br>13. Builds networks--Effectively builds formal and informal relationship networks inside and outside the organization.<br>14. Persuades – Uses compelling arguments to gain the support and commitment of others.<br>15. Is resilient--Rebounds from setbacks and adversity when facing difficult situations.<br>16. Demonstrates self-awareness--Uses a combination of feedback and reflection to gain productive insight into personal strengths and weaknesses.<br>17. Engages in self-development--Actively seeks new ways to grow and be challenged using both formal and informal development channels.<br>18. Is situationally adaptable--Adapts approach and demeanor in real time to match the shifting demands of different situations.<br>19. Is tech savvy--Anticipates and adopts innovations in business-building digital and technology applications.<br>20. Instills trust--Gains the confidence and trust of others through honesty, integrity, and authenticity.<br>**Outcome Status:** Active<br>**Planned Assessment Year:** 2019 - 2020, 2021 - 2022, 2022 - 2023<br>**Start Date:**<br>**Archived Date:** | been set yet other than continuous improvement.<br>**Timeline for Assessment:**<br>Assessments will begin in Spring 2020 and will take place at least every two years thereafter.<br>**Other Assessment Type:** | overall were in International Business (77%) and in Accounting and Finance (both 76%). Ignoring the HTM result, the lowest scores were in Entrepreneurship (69%) and General Business (71%), followed by Management, MIS, and Marketing (all 72%).<br><br>[See Table 3 of Related Documents - Career Competencies Write-up - 2020].<br><br>Short-Answer Assessment<br>The preceding questions dealt with the career competencies by testing in the lower half of Bloom's taxonomy, i.e., remembering, understanding, and some application. The short-answer assessment is actually more meaningful, in that it asks students to operate at the upper-end of Bloom's taxonomy, i.e., applying, analyzing, evaluating, and some creating. In this portion of the assessment, each student randomly drew one of three possible short-answer questions.<br><br>The first question was intended to test student self-awareness. The question was:<br><br>o        Scenario 1: Describe a time when you recognized a bias or stereotype you had towards others and what you did about it.<br><br>Eastin Center personnel scored this question on a scale of (1) poor; (2) satisfactory, or (3) great. Results are presented by location and overall in Table 4a. Overall, 25% of students who drew this question scored satisfactory or great. There were not significant scoring differences across locations.<br><br>[See Table 4a of Related Documents - Career Competencies Write-up - 2020].<br><br>Results by major are presented in Table 4b. For the majors for which there is a sample size greater than 15, results range from high to low as Finance (1.38), Accounting (1.30), Management (1.26), and Marketing (1.20). | |

| Outcomes | Assessment Methods | Findings | Use of Findings (Actions) |
|---|---|---|---|

**Outcome Type:** Skills
**Reason for Archival:**

[See Table 4b of Related Documents - Career Competencies Write-up - 2020].

The second question was intended to test student situational adaptability.  The question was:

o        Scenario 2:  You're a training and development specialist at an oil and gas company. You've been assigned to provide training to employees on how to create and set performance goals. Half of your training events will be conducted at the corporate office for the human resources, accounting, finance, engineering and legal teams, while the other half of the training events will be conducted in the field locations for employees working in production, maintenance, and health and safety. If you're presenting the same content to both locations, does how you deliver the content need to change? If yes, how so? Be specific.

Eastin Center personnel also scored this question on a three-point scale.  Results are presented by location and overall in Table 5a.  Overall, 76% of students scored at satisfactory or great.  Scoring for Online and Stillwater students was higher than scoring for Tulsa; but again, Tulsa is a very small sample.

[See Table 5a of Related Documents - Career Competencies Write-up - 2020].

Results by major are presented in Table 5b.  For the majors for which there is a sample size greater than 15, results range from high to low as Accounting (2.00), Marketing (1.92), and Management (1.88).

[See Table 5b of Related Documents - Career Competencies Write-up - 2020].

The third question was intended to test both courage and resilience.  The question was:

o        Scenario 3:  You're a business analyst and support the engineering department at your company. They include

you in important staff and project meetings and overall make you feel as part of the team. You have a good relationship with the vice president (Bob) over the engineering group but have only been working with him for about 3 months. You've seen Bob get frustrated and demean an employee during a meeting before, but never experienced it directly --until today. At the staff meeting with 8 total participants, you provided an update on some research that you did for a project that you're working on for them. There was a miscommunication and you did not look into a specific issue on which Bob thought you were going to provide an update. Upset that you're not prepared with all of the information, Bob verbally attacks you in front of the group and says that you dropped the ball and threatens to call your boss. There is still an hour left in the meeting.  What are you going to do?

Table 6a presents results for courage overall and by location.  Overall, 38% of students scored as satisfactory or great.  There were not very significant differences between locations.

[See Table 6a of Related Documents - Career Competencies Write-up - 2020].

Results by major are presented in Table 6b.  For the majors for which there is a sample size greater than 15, results range from high to low as Accounting (1.71), MIS (1.62), Finance (1.57), Marketing (1.44), and Management (1.43).

[See Table 6b of Related Documents - Career Competencies Write-up - 2020].

Table 7a presents results for resilience overall and by location.  Overall, 54% of students scored as satisfactory or great.  There were not very significant differences between locations.

[See Table 7a of Related Documents - Career Competencies Write-up - 2020].

Results by major are presented in Table 7b. For the majors for which there is a sample size greater than 15, results range from high to low as Finance (1.74), Management (1.68), MIS (1.67), Marketing (1.64), and Accounting (1.59).

[See Table 7b of Related Documents - Career Competencies Write-up - 2020].

Overall, on the basis of their essay responses, students scored highest on situational adaptability (1.94), then resilience (1.64), courage (1.51), and lowest on self-awareness (1.31). These results are different from the results on the multiple-choice section of the assessment, in which they scored highest on resilience (88%), then self awareness (84%), situational adaptability (74%), and courage (60%). A caveat is that with respect to the essay scoring, different individuals scored the different scenarios, with the exception of courage and resilience, which were both scored by the same person.

Additional Analyses
An all-subsets regression was run to attempt to determine the role of GPA, ACT, and performance in BADM-2111, BADM-3111, and BADM-3113 on student scores.

Dependent variables in the regressions were:
- Total_Score – Student score on the multiple-choice part of the assessment.
- Self_Aware – Student score on the self-awareness essay question.
- Sit_Adapt – Student score on the situational adaptability essay question.
- Courage – Student score on the courage essay question.
- Resilience – Student score on the resiliency essay question.

Independent variables in the regressions were:
- Grad_Ret_GPA – Student's graduate retention GPA
- OSU_GPA – Student's GPA in courses taken at

| Outcomes | Assessment Methods | Findings | Use of Findings (Actions) |
|---|---|---|---|

OSU
- ACT – Student's ACT score
- BADM2111 – Student's grade in BADM-2111, where A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, and everything else, including not having taken the class, = 0
- BADM3111 – Same as above for BADM-3111
- BADM3113 – Same as above for BADM-3113
- ClassesTaken – Total number of career competency classes taken (counting BADM-2111, 3111, and 3113), ranges from 0-3

The model that produced the highest adjusted $R^2$ included the following independent variables: Grad_Ret_GPA; ACT; BADM3111; and BADM3113. When a regression was isolated to these four independent variables, the coefficients on all independent variables other than BADM3111 were positive and significant. The coefficient on BADM3111 was negative and only marginally significant (p=.07).

Four ordinal logistic models were also run, in which the scores on the four essay questions (Self_Aware, Sit_Adapt, Courage, and Resilience) served as the dependent variables, and the independent variables were the same seven previously listed. The models with Self Awareness and Situational Adaptability were not significant. The model with Courage was borderline, with OSU GPA and the number of classes taken being marginally significant as positive predictors of courage. However, the model with Resilience as the dependent variable was highly significant (p=.0007) with positive predictors being OSU GPA (p=.0022) and the number of career competency classes taken (p=.045).
 (08/29/2020)
**Number of Students Assessed:** 529
**Number of Successful Students:** 423
**How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?:** All students in the Spring 2020 sections of the capstone course, MGMT-4513.
**What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?:** It is still early days for the career

| Outcomes | Assessment Methods | Findings | Use of Findings (Actions) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | competency courses in the revised core curriculum.  Of the 529 students who tested, 17% had not taken BADM-2111, 43% had not taken BADM-3111, and 14% had not taken BADM-3113.  In addition, of those students who had taken these courses, most were taken in the earliest semesters of the classes, when instructors were still refining coverage and pedagogies.  These factors make the outcomes difficult to interpret.<br>**Related Documents:**<br>Career Competencies Write-up - 2020.docx | |