



SLO Assessment Cycle for BUS 18

Business Law I

Assessment Initiated by: [Mike Gough](#) (8622) in ACCT

Outcomes:

Outcome 1: Statement

Demonstrate a knowledge of basic legal terminology and basic tort, constitutional, criminal, administrative and contract law.

Assessment Cycle Records:

Outcome 1: Assessment Planning Modified: [01/24/2011]

Assessment Strategy Used:

Quarter: Fall 2010

Assessors: Mike Gough, Sandra Spencer, Sandra Spencer

Assessment Tools: Exams

Sections being assessed: 03Y, 63z, 01, 02

Outcome 1: Reflect & Enhance Modified: [01/24/2011]

Number of people involved in Reflection and Enhancement: 2

Changes:

Fall 2010 was the first term we formally assessed this course. We determined as we analyzed the process that having fewer, more comprehensive outcomes would be an easier, more effective measure of student performance.

Methods:

A total of eight questions were selected to assess the attainment of this learning objective. All were multiple-choice questions and were administered on the final exam. These questions were further classified based on Bloom's taxonomy. Four questions addressed the lower levels of learning, namely, "comprehension". The remaining eight questions addressed a middle learning level -- "application".

The questions were directly related to classifying the law (substantive/procedural, public/private and criminal/civil), as well as more challenging application questions that involved the jury selection process and torts (defamation, negligence and strict liability).

Summary:

In two of the sections, overall, the students performed pretty well on the "Comprehension" questions covering the more basic concepts outlined above. On three of the four comprehension questions, the percentage of students who obtained the correct answer was approximately 84% - this was true of all sections that were analyzed.

In the other two sections, the results were a little more mixed, with students scoring as high as an average of 93% on one question, but as low as 15% on another comprehension problem. The overall comprehension rate ran at 60% which was lower than expected. We attribute some of the lack of success to the fact that the tort and general law issues are covered early in the course and there was likely a fall-off in comprehension late in the term.

It seems that thorough reviews during the term would be appropriate since these are important concepts and would likely help the students retain the information at the end of the course and beyond.

Overall, we would have to say it appears that the students met the standard of success in that the average score over the sections ran at greater than 70% and this quiz is seen as a low priority quiz (from the student's perspective because it offers few points as part of the course grade), so to that end, we believe the students grasp the crucial concepts - though we recognize there is room for improvement.

Enhancement (Part I):

As stated earlier, reviewing early course concepts will be done with a possibility of exams that include material from early in the term.

In terms of improvement, in addition to the suggestions referenced above, future assessments should perhaps use more than one tool

(final exam) or additional questions to assess a given learning level. This would help offset any anomalies and perhaps more clearly reflect the student's level of accomplishment.

We are looking forward to running this again with some updating of questions and a clearer approach to see how the classes fare in the current term. We then are planning on determining the best way to proceed at that point.

Enhancement (Part II):

At this point, we don't see a need for additional resources, just a better utilization of those available to us - perhaps greater coordination with the Tutorial Center since reading for content and interpretation is crucial for success in this course.

Outcome 2: Statement

Identify ethical issues in a business law context and evaluate factually simple contract issues using basic common law or UCC rules.

Outcome 2: Assessment Planning Modified: [01/24/2011]

Assessment Strategy Used:

Quarter: Fall 2010

Assessors: Mike Gough, Sandra Spencer, Sandra Spencer

Assessment Tools: Exams

Sections being assessed: 03Y, 62Z

Outcome 2: Reflect & Enhance Modified: [01/24/2011]

Number of people involved in Reflection and Enhancement: 2

Changes:

Fall 2010 was the first term we formally assessed this course. We determined as we analyzed the process that having fewer, more comprehensive outcomes would be an easier, more effective measure of student performance.

Methods:

A total of four questions were selected to assess the attainment of this learning objective. All were multiple-choice questions. In two sections, they were part of the final exam, in two other sections they were part of a late-term quiz. These questions were further classified based on Bloom's taxonomy. All four questions addressed the middle level of learning, namely, "application".

The questions were directly related to applying a number of contracts concepts to various scenarios. They covered the capacity of minors and their right to disaffirm contracts, fraud, contract formation and the Statutes of Fraud (SOF), the merchant's exception and debt settlement via "accord and satisfaction".

Summary:

Overall, the results were mixed here. On two questions (# 9 and 10), 82% and 79% of the students answered correctly. On the other two questions (# 7 and #8), 58% and 23% answered correctly.

One of the instructors believes the range was broad, because of a lack of some clarity in a few areas. In this area of contracts, the students may have been confused by the terminology particularly if they were not clear about what it means for something to "fall within/or outside of the SOF", and how the exceptions to the general rules affect the final determination as to whether or not a contract is formed. This suggests that more time should be spent explaining the terms and how the rules and exceptions are used (for example: the implications of the general UCC rules, the SOF, and the merchant's exception.)

Though students were advised that they needed to know each of the rules mentioned above, perhaps assigning additional problems requiring their use will further emphasize their importance.

In the other two sections, the results were very strong with an average score of nearly 90%. In those cases, it is assumed that since those sections had just completed the Contracts portion of the course, the concepts were fresh in the students' minds.

It also might indicate differences of focus between instructors, and that will be part of the discussion going forward.

Overall, among the four sections, it would appear that student success was met.

Enhancement (Part I):

As mentioned above, we plan on discussing focus of the course and how much time should be spent on major objectives.

We are hopeful that this exchange of ideas will improve all sections of the course and provide more clarity going forward.

Enhancement (Part II):

At this point, we don't see a need for additional resources, just a better utilization of those available to us - perhaps greater coordination with the Tutorial Center since reading for content and interpretation is crucial for success in this course.

[Number of Outcomes for BUS 18: 2]