

BBA

(Target Performance: Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric)

RUBRICS EMPLOYED FOR ALL ASSESSMENTS ARE ENCLOSED AT THE END OF THIS DOCUMENT

Fall 2015

Goal 1: Effective Business Communication

1.1 Students will be proficient at locating, evaluating, and using information effectively

ASSESSED IN ECO 210/211

Criteria	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total	Avg Score	% performing at level 3 and above
Seeks information	4	35	265	7	311	2.88	87.46
Evaluates Information	5	94	204	8	311	2.68	68.17
Uses information	6	56	239	10	311	2.80	80.06
Sources information	5	80	219	7	311	2.72	72.67

BENCHMARKING: Objective 1.1 was last assessed in Fall 2012 using a 28-item test in ECO 210. The results of the assessment were as follows

Criteria	% performing at level 3 and above
Sources and Search Strategies	78.91
Academic, Trade, and Popular Information	67.64
Credibility of Information	63.4
APA citation and identifying plagiarism	79.8

Goal 1: Effective Business Communication

1.2 Students will develop clear, concise and well-organized written communication.

ASSESSED IN MGT 495

Criteria	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total	Avg Score	% performing at level 3 and above
Content	0	16	54	37	107	3.20	85.05
Organization	0	21	47	39	107	3.17	80.37
Tone	0	5	38	64	107	3.55	95.33
Mechanics*	2	7	7	13	29	3.07	68.97
References*	2	5	14	8	29	2.97	75.86
Format	0	4	38	65	107	3.57	96.26

* Mechanics and references were assessed in 1 out of 3 sections only

BENCHMARKING: Objective 1.2 was last assessed in Fall 2013 in MKT 350. The results of the assessment were as follows

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total	Avg Score	% performing at level 3 and above
Content	1	21	46	25	93	3.02	76.3
Organization	1	14	61	17	93	3.01	83.9
Tone	0	19	61	13	93	2.94	79.6
Mechanics	0	31	47	15	93	2.83	66.6
Format	3	26	52	12	93	2.78	68.8

Goal 2: Functional Business Knowledge

2.1 Students will apply disciplinary knowledge to solve problems.

N =123 (a total of 157 students took the Major Field Test given by ETS out of which 34 were ACC majors). Performance on each question is reported in terms of the percentage of students who answered the question correctly. 48.22% of Seidman business students answered the questions on problem solving correctly in comparison to 48.04% nationally. Since the scores are reported by item instead of by student, the performance of non- ACC Majors could not be separated from that of ACC majors.

Goal 2: Functional Business Knowledge

2.2 Students will demonstrate proficiency in the basic concepts and principles across the disciplines.

Scores for the Major Field Tests are reported on a scale of 120-200. The average score of non-ACC majors was 150.5, which was lower than the performance of ACC majors (average = 157.8) and comparable to the performance of students at our competitive institutions (average=150.9). In terms of specific discipline areas, the non-ACC majors performed either at par or better than the competitive group in accounting, economics, finance, marketing, legal & social environment, international business and information systems. The student performance was marginally below the competitive group in management and quantitative business analysis.

Goal 4: Ethics and Values (Non-ACC students)*4.1 Students will apply ethical theories and models to decision making.**4.2 Students will identify their own values and understand how value systems impact decision-making.***ASSESSED IN ECO 440**

Criteria	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total	Avg Score	% performing at level 3 or above
Values clarification	17	6	10	24	57	2.72	59.65
Identification of ethical issues	0	1	6	50	57	3.86	98.25
Stakeholder identification	0	0	0	57	57	4	100
Application of ethical theory/models	0	1	5	51	57	3.88	98.25
Personal Voice and Action	1	0	5	51	57	3.86	98.25

BENCHMARKING: Goal 4 was last assessed in Winter 2014 in MKT 365 (38 students), FIN330 (36 students) and ECO440 (38 students). The results of the assessment were as follows

Criteria	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total	Avg Score	Avg score ECO 440	% performing at level 3 or above
Values Clarification	13	10	35	54	112	3.16	2.26	79.50%
Identification of ethical issues	2	23	36	51	112	3.21	3.82	77.70%
Stakeholder Identification	1	19	30	62	112	3.37	3.94	82.10%
Application of ethical theory/models	7	29	43	33	112	2.91	3.11	67.90%
Personal voice and action	2	17	35	58	112	3.33	3.92	83.00%

Winter 2016

3. Informed Decision Making

3.1 SWOT (measured by traits 1, 2 & 5 in the rubric)

3.2 Global (measured by traits 3 & 4 in the rubric)

Criteria	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total	Average Score	% performing at level 3 or above
Assesses external environment	18	74	49	9	150	2.3	38.67
Assesses internal environment	14	50	58	28	150	2.7	57.33
Identification of various aspects of a firm's global strategy	29	47	40	34	150	2.5	49.33
Identification of cultural factors in international settings using a cultural framework	150				150	1.0	0.00
Develops strategic options	45	51	39	15	150	2.2	36.00

BENCHMARKING: Goal 3 is new. It was previously called business environment and was last assessed in Fall 2012 in MGT 495. The results of the assessment were as follows

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total	Avg Score	% performing at level 3 or above
Applies Models	0	13	25	12	50	2.98	74%
Assesses External Environment	0	5	30	15	50	3.2	90%
Assesses Internal Environment	0	13	21	16	50	3.06	74%
Develops Strategic Options	2	14	24	10	50	2.84	68%
Used Multiple Disciplines	0	17	20	13	50	2.92	66%

BBA LOCATING, EVALUATING AND USING INFORMATION RUBRIC

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Seeks Information	Consults an insufficient number of quality sources.	Gathers information from a limited range of sources; may rely too much on one kind of source	Gathers good information from a variety of sources; may have missed a few.	Gathers optimal information from a variety of quality electronic and print sources, including ABI Inform
Evaluates Information	Shows no evidence of understanding what information is useful or of good quality	Uses some quality sources, but uses too many that are poor or tangential.	Does a good job evaluating the quality and usefulness of sources.	Evaluates and selects only the best sources for usefulness and quality
Uses Information	Reaches conclusions that do not have enough support. Question or problem ineffectively resolved. Most necessary idea/points are missing	Conclusions could have been better supported. Question or problem minimally resolved. Some necessary ideas/points are missing.	Uses information to draw appropriate conclusions, answer a question, or solve a problem. Some minor ideas/points are missing.	Uses information effectively to draw appropriate conclusions, and optimally answer a question or solve a problem. All relevant ideas/points included.
Sources Information	Materials are clearly plagiarized, either intentionally or through ignorance.	Documentation is improperly constructed or absent body of paper and/or bibliography.	Documents with care (in body of paper and bibliography) although a few errors are noted.	All ideas, text and media are properly cited (in body of paper and bibliography), following a recognized style

BBA WRITTEN COMMUNICATION RUBRIC

Criteria	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Content	Paper does not identify thesis or purpose. Analysis vague or missing. Reader is confused or misinformed.	Some analysis of a thesis or purpose. Reader gains few insights.	Basic analysis of a thesis or purpose. Reader gains sufficient insight.	Thoughtful and insightful analysis of a clearly presented thesis or purpose. Reader gains good insight.
Organization	Little semblance of logical organization. Reader cannot identify reasoning.	Writing is not logical and ideas sometime fail to make sense. Reader needs to work to figure out meaning.	Ideas are, for the most part, arranged logically and linked. Reader can follow most of the reasoning.	Ideas arranged logically. Flow smoothly and are clearly linked. Reader can follow reasoning.
Tone	Tone is not professional. It is inappropriate for audience and purpose.	Tone is occasionally professional or occasionally appropriate for audience.	Tone is generally professional and mostly appropriate for audience.	Tone is consistently professional and appropriate for audience.
Mechanics	Errors are so numerous that they obscure meaning.	Writing has numerous errors and distracts the reader.	Occasional errors in writing, but they don't represent a major distraction.	Writing is free or almost free of errors.
References	References are not or mostly not presented.	Occasional and/or incomplete references are provided.	Complete references are generally present	Sources of presented evidence are clearly and fairly represented.
Format	No standardized format followed.	Format of document reflects incomplete knowledge of standard.	A recognized format is generally followed; a few mistakes.	A recognized format is correctly followed.

BBA ETHICS AND VALUE RUBRIC

Criteria	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Values Clarification	Lists values but unable to offer any thoughtful defense of why they are important.	Lists values but uses superficial reasoning to defend choices.	Articulates values; offers acceptable explanation of why they are important to business behavior.	Student can thoughtfully articulate and defend five or six values that should guide behavior in business.
Identification of Ethical Issues	Identification of ethical concerns is sparse or missing.	Identifies only some of the ethical concerns in a given problem/case. Omits a few major points.	Identifies most of the ethical concerns in a given problem/case. May omit a few minor points.	Completely and thoughtfully identifies all ethical concerns in a given problem/case.
Stakeholder Identification	Identification of stakeholder is sparse or missing.	Identifies only some of the stakeholder positions in a given problem/case. Omits a few major points.	Identifies most of the stakeholder positions in a given problem/case. May omit a few minor points.	Completely and thoughtfully identifies all stakeholder positions in a given problem/case.
Application of Ethical Theory/Models	Application of ethical decision-making models is sparse or missing.	Application of ethical decision-making models is superficial or incomplete.	Good application of consequentialist, deontological and virtue ethical decision making models; may miss some details or nuances.	Completely and thoughtfully applies consequentialist, deontological and virtue ethical decision models to problem.
Personal Voice and Action	Approach/plan about how to confront unethical behavior is unrealistic or missing.	Approach/plan how to confront unethical behavior fails to consider some important points or conditions.	Developed a plausible and defensible plan about how to confront unethical behavior in a given situation; missed some minor considerations.	Developed a compelling and thoughtful plan about how to confront unethical behavior in a given situation.

BBA Informed Decision Making Rubric

Criteria	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Assesses External Environment	Analysis is completely inadequate; several opportunities and threats missing from analysis	Considers some external factors in analysis but misses one or two major ones	Includes most relevant external factors in analysis but may miss a few minor ones	Analyzes the external environment clearly and completely by identifying all important opportunities and threats
Assesses Internal Environment	Analysis is completely inadequate; several strengths and weaknesses missing from analysis	Considers some internal factors in analysis but misses one or two major ones	Includes most relevant internal factors in analysis; may miss a few minor ones	Analyzes the internal environment clearly and completely by identifying all strengths and weaknesses
Identification of the various aspects of a firm's global strategy	No identification of aspects of a firm's global strategy	Identifies some of the aspects of a firm's global strategy but misses one or two major ones	Identifies most relevant aspects of a firm's global strategy; may miss a few minor ones	Clearly and accurately identifies all relevant aspects of a firm's global strategy
Identification of cultural factors in international settings using a cultural framework	No Identification of cultural factors	Identifies some surface cultural factors without utilizing a cultural framework	Identifies some relevant cultural factors utilizing a cultural framework	Identifies most relevant cultural factors utilizing a cultural framework
Develops Strategic Options	Development of strategic options missing, incorrect, or superficial	Attempts to develop strategic options but analysis is incomplete	Correctly develops appropriate number of strategic options	Insightfully develops appropriate number of strategic options