Academic Year: 2016-2017

Course Name/Catalog Number: BUS 103

General Education Component: First-Year Seminar

UULO(s) assessed this year:
- ☑ Intellectual Breadth/Life-long Learning
- ☑ Inquiry/Critical Thinking
- ☐ Communication
- ☐ Global/Multicultural Knowledge and Awareness
- ☐ Citizenship & Ethics

Other learning outcomes assessed this year: none

Process: Please provide a brief narrative of the assessment process for this course. Include a description of the type of student work assessed (e.g., research papers, exams, etc.), the number and roles of people involved in the process, any tools used for the assessment (e.g., checklists, rubrics, etc.), and how student learning was evaluated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Labels</th>
<th>Mean of Explanation</th>
<th>Mean of Evidence</th>
<th>Mean of Context / Assumptions</th>
<th>Mean of Position</th>
<th>Mean of Conclusion</th>
<th>Mean of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F 2014</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 2015</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>9.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 2015</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 2016</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>10.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 2016</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>8.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The assessment committee was comprised of:
  - Patrick Griffis – UNLV Business Librarian
  - John Watts – Teaching and Learning Librarian
  - Beth Gersten – Assistant Dean, Undergraduate Programs; BUS 103 Instructor
  - Karen Seale - BUS 103 Coordinator and Instructor
- The assessment took place February 24, 2017.
• Student papers from one assignment completed by four sections in the fall semester were submitted to the committee for assessment. Each assignment targeted critical thinking.
• The fall semester instructor was the same for each section.
• The assessment committee received the same written instructions given to students for the assignment. Ungraded student submissions for the corresponding assignment were identified only by NSHE number.
• Scoring was based on the critical thinking rubric circulated by Dr. Heavey. The rubric totaled twenty possible points resulting from a maximum of four points in five skill categories indicated in the following table. Each paper was scored by two different committee members.
• The means were reported by skills category and were totaled for each semester.
• Values of 0 and n/a were used.

Results: Please provide a brief summary of the results of your assessment process. Include both what you learned about your students’ achievement of the specified learning outcomes and what you learned about the assessment process itself, if applicable.
• The highest mean score fell in “Explanation”.
• The lowest mean score fell in “Influence of Context and Assumptions”.
• All five measures are lower than both Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 semesters.

Conclusions: Please describe how the results of this assessment process might be used to revise instruction in this course and/or refine the assessment process in future years.
• Additional information is needed to determine why scores significantly fell in Fall 2016. Perhaps First-Year Seminar instructors could discuss their assessment findings and anecdotal observations.

Appendices: Please attach any applicable assignment descriptions, rubrics, results tables, or graphic representations of results.