

**BBA Learning Assurance Committee
Minutes of February 27, 2007**

The minutes of the February 13, 2007 meeting of the BBA Learning Assurance Committee were approved with a friendly amendment to add a hyphen.

The meeting began at 12 noon. In attendance on February 27, 2007 were Bob Blau, Al Booke, Mike Carew, Mehmet Genc, Mikhail Gershovich, Matthew Johnson, Jimmy Jung, Karl Lang, Ed Rogoff, David Rosenberg, Steve Schnaars, Dennis Slavin, Vanessa Vacchiano, Ashok Vora, Judith Tse, and Phyllis Zadra.

Vanessa Vacchiano and Jimmy Jung reported on the reformatted writing and analytical assessment analyses. The revised report contains a break out of the transfer student information along with tables that describe the writing and analytical assessments in greater detail (by gender, ethnicity, and transfer source). The range of the scores was recalibrated. The range of average scores for the writing assessment is 4-12 and the range of average scores for analytical assessment is 3-9. When one looks at the means for each of the 4 components of the writing assessment (thesis/focus, support, organization and grammar/mechanics), it is clear that as a group our students hover around a 2.0. A more in depth analysis indicates that our native freshmen performed significantly better than our CUNY community college transfers. The latter group did not attain a 2.0 on any of the four dimensions of the writing assessment.

In the analytical assessment, the means for each of the three dimensions (identifies problems, finds causes, offers solutions) clustered in the 1.75-1.95 range (2.0 reflects meeting the standard). In this assessment there was a single statistical difference between native freshmen and CUNY community college students on the dimension of identifying problems. Once again the native Baruch students performed better.

The Committee discussed the results for some time. We wanted to ensure that we were not making inferences that could not be supported by the data. Although there was evidence to support the conclusion that CUNY community college students did not perform as well as native Baruch students in the writing assessment and on one dimension of the analytical assessment, the committee was very clear in wanting to communicate that the scores on both of these assessments indicate a lack of proficiency by all of our students. The Committee reiterated that these are baseline scores and that when the assessments are repeated in three years our goals are to have no more than 10% of our students scores in the category below expectations, and at least 15% of our students in the category above expectations. There was considerable discussion about how we may improve the performance of our Zicklin students. Members of the Committee spoke passionately about the current faculty reward system and how it serves as a disincentive to improve teaching and create innovative classroom assignments. The Committee recommended that Phyllis Zadra present the results to the P&B and raise the issue of increased rewards for faculty prepared to rework their courses with more

interactive assignments that require writing, analytical projects and faculty feedback. In addition, the issue of how large class size mitigates against providing feedback to students was raised.

The Committee continued its discussion of cases/prompts that had been submitted to assess the learning goal civic awareness and ethical decision-making. We looked at and discussed “Back Dating of Options” as written by Bob Blau. He recommended that the descriptive material (in small print on the case) not be included. He suggested that part of the assignment include a research component so that students learn how to become informed of the issues that surround back dating of options. We discussed “The Growing Use of Deceptive and Hardball Marketing Tactics to Reduce the Bargaining Power of Consumers” prompt by Steve Schnaars. The Committee felt that this was an issue that would be readily understood by our students. The Committee members themselves were divided in their opinions of whether such practices were ethically wrong. Finally, we looked at a Curem Pharmaceutical II a case that has been used by Larry Zicklin at Graduate Orientations. Ed Rogoff suggested that there are many pharmaceutical cases that might resonant with students, but perhaps this was not the best one since it was concerned with a remote region in Africa. The Committee agreed that it would be best to use a case/prompt that is relevant to our students’ lives.

The meeting was adjourned at 2PM. The next meeting was not set.