

# General Education Assessment Report

**SPRING 2016**

**BBG 231 (Business Law I)**

**Prepared by:** David Clough, Chair and Kathy Taylor

September 16, 2016

## **Introduction**

The General Education outcomes chosen for assessment include the following: **.2** Recognize ever-changing interpretations of history; **.5** Describe the impact of the past on subsequent events, including the present; and **.6** Examine the complex, dynamic and interrelated nature of change

### **Course outcomes that align with TAP outcomes:**

A rubric was used to assess outcomes using a typical 1 through 4 scoring (1 being not competent and 4 being highly competent—see appendix for rubric used). The rubric was only slightly adjusted from a rubric put together and previously used by SCSU for Historical Knowledge Competency Assessment; very little needed to be changed.

No previous assessment has taken place within the Legal Studies Department.

**Assessment committee members:** David Clough, Professor and Chair – Legal Studies; Eric Lanzieri, adjunct Business Law instructor; and Kathy Taylor, Assistant Professor, Legal Studies.

## **Assessment Methodology**

Professors Clough and Taylor jointly developed the assessment question with outcomes 2, 5, and 6 in mind. Professors Clough and Taylor incorporated the suggestions made by the General Education committee especially as it pertained to the inclusion of legal precedent and comparing the court's varying interpretation of equal protection embedded in the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment. The assessment question follows:

Jose Carcaño, a 27-year-old transgender employee of the University of X-Chapel Hill and a first-year law student enjoys living in the state of X. Jose has always found Chapel Hill, a liberal college town to be welcoming and supportive of his life. Recently, a more conservative wave has swept through Chapel Hill, resulting in the election of both a new Mayor and Governor of the state. Just three weeks after being inaugurated, Governor Mary Wallace signed a controversial bill into law. The bill blocks local governments from enacting laws that protects

LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender) people. Additionally, it requires transgender people to use bathrooms that match with their biological sex, even if doing so violates their gender identity.

Carcaño's birth certificate shows the biological sex as female though he identifies as male and has identified that way since he was a child growing up in south Texas. His friends, family and coworkers recognize him as a man. His therapist is concerned that "using the women's restroom, as required by the new law, could compromise his mental health, well-being and safety".

At the University in keeping with the law, Carcaño will now have to leave the campus and use a private bathroom. If he uses the women's restroom as the law requires, the suit said, "it would also force him to disclose to others the fact that he is transgender, which itself could lead to violence and harassment".

Carcaño, after taking Constitutional Law, is convinced that the new law is unconstitutional. He argues that by singling out LGBT people for disfavored treatment, the new law violates the most basic guarantees of equal treatment and the US constitution.

Questions:

1. Let's consider the claim of discrimination that North Carolina is discriminating against Carcano on the basis of his sexual identity. Does the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment provide protection to Carcano? Based on the legal arguments advanced in *Griswold v. Connecticut*, *Loving v. Virginia*, *Roe v. Wade* Explain your answer.
  2. Did the Supreme Court originally interpret the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment to include a right to privacy? How has the court's interpretation changed over the course of the last half-century? And why?
  3. Why might it have taken nearly 60 years for the Supreme Court to get to its current interpretation of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment?
  4. What might this suggest about the importance of looking at historical context of Supreme Court rulings?
- Out of 3 instructors, 2 participated in artifact collection, and all participated in the scoring and calibration session.

## Assessment Data

- The sample size included 22 artifacts from BBG 231; and sampling was randomized in Excel.
- The total sample size included 68 artifacts from BBG 231
- Scoring was conducted on September 9, 2016 at 9 a.m. in room E518. Once everyone was settled and directions were given, 3 random samples were calibrated. Once the three scorers individually read and scored the 3 random artifacts, the group shared scores, addressed any discrepancies, made an argument for specific scores, and reconciled the scores to reflect the group's best thinking and analysis.

- Approximately 40 minutes was spent calibrating the scoring to ensure rater reliability. If ever a question or discrepancy arose, it was discussed, compromises were made after a solid case was presented to make a score adjustment, everyone made note of such situations with scoring, and then we moved on to the scoring of the individual artifacts.

## Findings

- See appendix for raw data.

### BBG 231 DATA

	Outcome 2	Outcome 5	Outcome 6
<b>Average</b>	2.7	2.4	2.5
<b>Median</b>	3	3	3
<b>Mode</b>	2	2	2

## Mapping

### BOR TAP Outcomes

- 2 Recognize ever-changing interpretations of history.

#### Course Outcomes/BBG 231

- Compare and contrast significant laws and judicial opinions that have shaped history and are subject to constant re-interpretation from competing stakeholders in society.

- 5 **Describe the impact of the past on subsequent events, including the present.**

#### Course Outcomes/BBG 231

- **Describe many of the pertinent historical legal issues, laws, and court decisions impacting government, business, and society and how they provide continuing societal impact into the present.**

- 6 **Examine the complex, dynamic, and interrelated nature of change.**

#### Course Outcomes/BBG 231

- Examine the law as a catalyst to societal change and recognize when change is appropriate, the importance of being able to adapt to change as it occurs, and the importance of societal forces taking the lead in creating needed change.

## Conclusion

- The highest average within the assessment: 2.7 for BOR Outcome 2 in BBG 231.
- The highest mode within the assessment: 3 for Outcome 2,5, and 6.
- The lowest average: 2.4 for Outcome .5 in BBG 231
- The lowest mode:
- Averages that are middle of the road but need improvement:
  - Outcome 2 for BBG 231 @ 2.7
  - Outcome 5 for BBG 231 @ 2.4
  - Outcome 6 for BBG 231 @ 2.5
- Of particular interest for professional development in BBG 231 will be Outcomes 5 and 6 with less emphasis on 2.
- Basically, all of the competencies that were measured were minimally competent and competent. Therefore, all competencies need sustained focus.
- To accurately assess outcomes in BBG 231, all instructors must participate in the collection of artifacts as well as the scoring of artifacts.
- To ensure consistency across the collection of artifacts, the committee will develop a standardized process including instructions, questions, and directions to students.
- Continued focus and attention must be paid to moving students into the highly competent and competent areas. The committee may explore the adoption of common assignments aimed at developing competency in areas 2, 5, and 6.