

**BBA Learning Assurance Committee
Minutes of December 2, 2004**

The minutes of November 4th meeting of the BBA Learning Assurance Committee were approved.

In attendance on December 2, 2004 were Glenn Albright, Al Booke, Ajay Das, Dorothy Dologite, Debra Dookeran, Elsie Gottlieb, Matthew Johnson, Hedda Nadler-Hurvich, Ed Rogoff, David Rosenberg, Steven Schnaars, Judy Tse, and Phyllis Zadra.

Hedda Nadler-Hurvich was introduced. She is the business consultant to the committee. Ms. Nadler-Hurvich is Professor Ann Brandwein's sister and a graduate of Baruch. She currently has a public relations firm in Manhattan (Mount & Nadler) that represents firms in financial services areas. She has experience in advertising, direct marketing, online advertising and is very familiar with financial services companies. Ms. Nadler-Hurvich is an employer and works with employees in many different companies. She also volunteers as a mentor to our MBA program.

Phyllis Zadra thanked Ms. Nadler for volunteering to work with the BBA committee and bringing her perspective as an employer to the group.

The members of the committee had completed a number of assignments and those were shared. (That information is also posted on the Bb site.) Drafts of the learning goals of the majors were distributed along with the refined definitions of the seven goals.

It was agreed that the committee would look at the seven overall BBA goals first. There was a discussion of what should be included in the oral communication goal and how it would be assessed. It was pointed out that we need to understand at what level our students begin (with regard to oral communication). It also was agreed that it is essential that we need to define oral communication and determine a standard that will be assessed at the end of the BBA program. If students do not meet the standard, they will not be held accountable in our pilot assessment program. We are looking for data that will inform us about our current curriculum.

It was agreed that we will find out where there are opportunities for oral communication within the curriculum as it currently is structured. It was suggested that there are some courses may need to be revised so as to increase the number of opportunities for public presentations and oral discussion.

The committee discussed how to determine good oral communication. Issues regarding stuttering and accents were considered. We clarified what would be meant by students meeting the standard. Matt Johnson explained that we would want an easy kind of check off with only two or three choices "met the standard, exceeded the standard, did not meet the standard". It was suggested that by using neutral evaluators rather than the instructor, there is a more objective look at performance.

In the end, we are looking to find our oral communication performance baseline level (as observed in BPL 5100) in spring 2005. After we determine a baseline we will need to consider if the curriculum needs fixing, where and how.

It was agreed that Prof. Schnaars would revise oral communication and put it into checklist form.

The Committee continued looking at the description of written communication drafted by Prof. Rogoff. There was a lengthy discussion of errors and responsibility regarding writing. There was a discussion about accents and if that detracts from communication effectiveness. It was generally agreed that the end product (either written or oral) must be understandable. Prof. Albright informed the committee about making writing opportunities in his large psychology course.

Prof. Rosenberg led the conversation on ethical decision-making. It was agreed to determine where these issues are discussed in the curriculum. The committee felt that ethics is covered in many courses but that students had various interpretations of what constitute ethical choices. The committee agreed that students could not be assessed on ethical choices, but rather if they were aware of the ethical dilemmas. The option of embedding an ethical question in each of the finals of the major capstone courses was suggested as a possible way to assess this goal. It was suggested that we measure the number of times students are exposed to ethical problem/questions in their courses.

The next committee meeting was set. It was agreed that we would invite some of the communication consultants from the Schwartz Communication Institute to join us at the next meeting.