CLO 1: Demonstrate effective writing about management in APA format.

CLO 2: Demonstrate an understanding of methods of managing in a dynamic, global environment.

CLO 3: Demonstrate an understanding of how principles of management are applied to organizations.

CLO 4: Demonstrate and understanding of areas of management: (e.g. leadership, entrepreneurship, human resource management, or operations).

### CLO 1: Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Scale: 2 = Advanced, 1 = Progressing, 0 = Beginning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard = 1**

**Findings:**

Students showed significant trouble with the Genre and Discipline and Syntax and Mechanics. In the Genre and Discipline dimension, students had difficulty properly conforming to accepted business writing practices. The results indicate students had difficulty delivering concise, yet thorough analysis in proper professional manner. Students also had difficulty with grammar and basic syntax. The average total score of 4.4 out of a possible 10.0 suggests students had limited written communication skills at the start of the course.
Students showed improvements across all dimensions except Source and Evidence. The improvement in Genre and Disciplinary and Syntax and Mechanics was expected as students gained experience writing for the unique nature of specific assignment. Students also received feedback from Current Events Reports #1 - #7 and five similar peer-reviewed reports. The average score is a 52% improvement from the average score of Current Events Report #1. All students, with the exception of Student #3, showed improvement from their previous score.

The assessment results indicate formative learning in written communication skills. In particular, students were able to develop the ability to deliver the short concise analyses that are required for most business communications. As shown by the initial low scores in Genre and Disciplinary, students had not developed that profession-specific skill. Students also showed a marked improvement in their Syntax and Mechanics. Because of the unique nature of the assignment, students were forced to carefully scrutinize each and every word used in their reports. This level of detail likely forced them to pay closer attention to the syntax and structure of their sentences.

The initial high scores in Source and Evidence is likely attributed to the mandatory workshop on international newswire services that was conducted by the UHWO library staff. However, the lack of improvement in that dimension suggests students were content to use just one source of information as opposed to seeking multiple sources for triangulation of evidence. A greater emphasis on triangulation of sources should be made in the future. While the assessment demonstrates improvements in writing skills over the course, one possible weakness is the nature of the assignment. It is very likely students had never experienced a writing assignment like the Current Events Reports. While the reports are very similar in structure to the executive summaries and executive memos used in the business world, they are stylistically opposed to most academic writing. As a result, the improvement in scores could be attributed to students gaining experience with an unfamiliar assignment and tailoring their writing to the desires of the instructor.

Another possible challenge in this assignment is that each student faces different writing challenges based on their selected country and the current political environment of that country. Students writing about politically stable countries are limited in choices of events, while those writing about unstable countries have a constant stream of different incidences. While geopolitical forces are beyond control of the course, future courses may consider requiring all students to write about the same event to provide a common frame of reference for writing development.
Findings:

Thirty-three students enrolled in the MGT301 (Principles of Management) course completed a 20 question multiple choice test (proctored, in-class) focusing on the topic of global management. Subsequent to the in-class dialogue focusing on the topic of global management, the same 20 question multiple choice test (proctored-in-class) was administered to and completed by 30 students. Of the 28 out of 30 students that completed the pre and post-test, 86% scored better on the post-test than the initial pre-test administered (24 students); 10% scored the same on the post-test and post-test (3 students) and 4% scored better on the pre-test than the post-test (1 student). The pre-test identified areas of student knowledge and deficiency on the topic of global management, which provided insight regarding targeting areas of focus and concepts requiring reinforcement to improve student knowledge and learning.

Perhaps further discussion and thought should be given to administering a pre-test/post-test evaluation process at the beginning and end of the business division level and/or the business management program to monitor student progress and learning across a pre-defined timeframe. If the pre-test/post-test
evaluation process takes place careful thought should be given to ensure that the tests measure what they are intended to measure over time.

**CLO 3: Organizations**

**Findings:**

The pretest revealed a low level of understanding for each principle. If the UHWO current standard of 62.5% (passing grade for a D) is applied to the pretest assessment, then students demonstrated an insufficient understanding of PLANNING. If the more common standard of 72.5% (passing grade of a C) is applied to the pretest assessment, then students demonstrated an insufficient understanding of PLANNING, ORGANIZING, and CONTROLLING. The posttest showed significant improvement across all each of the principles of management. Students demonstrated a sufficient understanding of all principles according to both the UHWO and the more common standard.

To confirm that students made a statistically significant improvement in their understanding of the principles of management, a paired t-test was conducted using SPSS software. After restricting the data to only those who completed both assessments, the analysis showed that average improvement in students’ scores was 4.1 points (n = 16, p < 0.001).
CLO 4: Areas of Management

Standard: 62.5%

Findings:

Of the 13 out of 28 students that completed both the pre-assessment and post-assessment, 53.84% scored better on the post-assessment than the initial pre-assessment administered (7 students); 30.76% scored the same on the post-assessment and post-assessment (4 students) and 15.38% scored better on the pre-assessment than the post-assessment (2 students).
Findings:

Taken as a whole, the chapter quizzes provided a comprehensive overview of the principles of management and basic business operations specific to the application of starting one’s own business. Chapter quizzes provided the only objective and comprehensive assessment of individual students learning. In addition, two-sample t-tests were conducted for each chapter quiz and for the total class average across all three terms. Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance was used to test for homogeneity of variance across compared samples. The lowest chapter quiz mean average was 7.0 (Chapter 4, Fall 2015). As expected, the four students who elected not to take chapter quizzes in Fall 2015 lowered the mean averages for all chapter quizzes during that term.

The class average for Fall 2015 was significantly less than Fall 2016 (-1.12, p < 0.001) and Summer 2015 (-1.32, p < 0.001). Several chapter quiz scores for Fall 2015 were also significantly less, at varying levels of significance, than other terms. There were no significant differences for any chapter quizzes or the class average between the Summer 2016 and Fall 2016 terms.
The mean average for all scores of 83% indicates students obtained knowledge specific to the areas of management: entrepreneurship. When these scores are compared to the current UH West O'ahu passing threshold of 63%, the evidence strongly suggests learning is occurring at an acceptable level. Unfortunately, because Summer 2015 was a compressed term of only 6 weeks, it is questionable to compare it to Fall 2015 and Fall 2016. According to the t-test analysis between Fall 2015 and Fall 2016, students performed significantly better (p < 0.1) during the Fall 2016 semester on half of the chapter quizzes. Overall, they averaged 1.12 more points (p < 0.001) during Fall 2016. Although not indicated in the above assessment, the average final grades for Fall 2015 and Fall 2016 were 78.4% and 84.5%, respectively.

The head-to-head comparison between the two Fall semesters seems to suggest the teaching and learning improved during Fall 2016. However, both semesters had the same instructor, the same assignments, same materials, and same video presentations. The only difference was Fall 2015 included one additional chapter (Chapter 14: Choosing the Right Location and Layout), but it is doubtful that the extra chapter could account for such a difference in semester grades. Therefore, it is likely that the difference came from a source other than the course materials or the instructor.

The data seems to suggest that the difference in chapter quiz scores was due to the students. Four students did not pass the course in Fall 2015, while all students passed in Fall 2016. When the final grades for the non-passing students are excluded from the analysis, the average final grade for Fall 2015 changes to 84.64%, almost identical to the grade for Fall 2016.

The four non-passing students bring up two interesting points. First, the instructor could be blamed for either not inspiring those students or not having those students withdraw from the course. In Fall 2016, all students at risk of failing withdrew from the course. The second point is that Fall 2016 saw expanded use of academic intervention strategies by the Office of Student Services. It is possible that counseling services included the recommendation to withdraw from the course.

It is suggested that a more aggressive intervention plan be adopted to identify at-risk students. While the decision to remain in the course is up to the student, the option of withdrawing from the class should be recommended for students who are unlikely to pass. Doing so would allow them to focus time and energy on other classes.

In terms of recommendations for future assessments, it would be good to find a way to assess the course across modes of delivery.