**2015-2016 Annual Program Assessment Report**

Please submit report to your department chair or program coordinator, the Associate Dean of your College, and to [james.solomon@csun.edu](mailto:james.solomon@csun.edu), Director of the Office of Assessment and Program Review, by September 30, 2016. You may, but are not required to, submit a separate report for each program, including graduate degree programs, which conducted assessment activities, or you may combine programs in a single report. Please identify your department/program in the file name for your report.

**College: David Nazarian College of Business and Economics**

**Departments: Accounting and Information Systems; Business Law; Finance, Financial Planning, and Insurance; Management; Marketing; Systems and Operations Management**

**Program: All undergraduate programs in Business**

**Assessment liaison: Barbara Gross, Nazarian College Assurance of Learning Director**

1. **Please check off whichever is applicable:**

**A. \_\_\_\_x\_\_\_\_ Measured student work.**

**B. \_\_\_\_x\_\_\_\_ Analyzed results of measurement.**

**C. \_\_\_\_x\_\_\_\_ Applied results of analysis to program review/curriculum/review/revision.**

1. **Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s).** On a separate sheet,provide a brief overview of this year’s assessment activities, including:

* an explanation for why your department chose the assessment activities (measurement, analysis, and/or application) that it enacted
* if your department implemented assessment **option A**, identify which program SLOs were assessed (please identify the SLOs in full), in which classes and/or contexts, what assessment instruments were used and the methodology employed, the resulting scores, and the relation between this year’s measure of student work and that of past years: (include as an appendix any and all relevant materials that you wish to include)
* if your department implemented assessment **option B**, identify what conclusions were drawn from the analysis of measured results, what changes to the program were planned in response, and the relation between this year’s analyses and past and future assessment activities
* if your department implemented **option C**, identify the program modifications that were adopted, and the relation between program modifications and past and future assessment activities
* in what way(s) your assessment activities may reflect the university’s commitment to diversity in all its dimensions but especially with respect to underrepresented groups
* any other assessment-related information you wish to include, including SLO revision (especially to ensure continuing alignment between program course offerings and both program and university student learning outcomes), and/or the creation and modification of new assessment instruments

**3. Preview of planned assessment activities for next year.** Include a brief description and explanation of how next year’s assessment will contribute to a continuous program of ongoing assessment.

**2. Overview of 2015-16 Assessment Projects:**

* **Explanation for why the David Nazarian College undergraduate business programs chose the assessment activities (measurement, analysis, and/or application) that it enacted**

In May 2012 the faculty of the David Nazarian College of Business and Economics approved a staggered assessment/assurance of learning cycle. The 7 SLOs for undergraduate degree programs in business were divided into 2 groups, SLO Group 1 and SLO Group 2. In alternating years, the Nazarian College performs assessment (i.e., measures student work and analyzes the results) for either SLO Group 1 or for SLO Group 2. During the same year, the College applies the results of the previous year’s analysis for the other SLO group to program review/curriculum review/revision. This is referred to as “closing-the-loop” activity.

In 2015-16, the Nazarian College measured and analyzed student work pertaining to the following 4 SLOs, which comprise SLO Group 2:

* + - SLO 4: Our students understand the global context of modern business.
    - SLO 5: Our students understand the cross-functional nature of business problems.
    - SLO 6: Our students understand and apply key business concepts.
    - SLO 7: Our students can work effectively in teams.

At the same time, the College used the results from the 2014-15 assessment of SLO Group 1 to perform program/ curriculum review (closing-the-loop activity). The 3 SLOs in SLO Group 1 are:

* + - SLO 1: Our students have strong written and oral communication skills.
    - SLO 2: Our students have strong problem-solving and critical thinking skills, including the application of information technology.
    - SLO 3: Our students understand ethics and social responsibility.
* **If implemented assessment option A, identify which program SLOs were assessed (please identify the SLOs in full), in which classes and/or contexts, what assessment instruments were used and the methodology employed, the resulting scores, and the relation between this year’s measure of student work and that of past years: (include as an appendix any and all relevant materials that you wish to include).**

In 2015-16, the College measured and analyzed student work pertaining to the following 4 SLOs which comprise SLO Group 2:

* + - SLO 4: Our students understand the global context of modern business.
    - SLO 5: Our students understand the cross-functional nature of business problems.
    - SLO 6: Our students understand and apply key business concepts.
    - SLO 7: Our students can work effectively in teams.

Measurement of each SLO is described in the following pages.

* + **SLO 4: Our students understand the global context of modern business.**

Students’ understanding of the global context of modern business was assessed in 2015-16 through direct course embedded measures, specifically multiple choice examination questions in FIN 303 (Financial Management) and SOM 306 (Operations Management). These 2 courses are part of the upper division core curriculum for students in all business majors. Supplementing these direct embedded measures, SLO 4 was also assessed through a direct non-embedded measure, a subtest within the standardized CSU-BAT (Business Assessment Test), which is administered through California State University, Long Beach and used by several business schools in the 23-campus California State University (CSU) system. Finally, direct measures of SLO 4 were supplemented by an indirect measure. At the end of each academic year, graduating seniors from the Nazarian College are asked to respond to an exit survey, which since 2014-15 has contained questions pertaining to each of the College’s undergraduate business learning goals.

**Direct Course Embedded Measures in FIN 303 and SOM 306:**

Assessment of SLO 4 through course embedded measures occurred primarily during the Spring 2016 semester. Multiple choice examination questions in FIN 303 tested students’ understanding of portfolio diversification, investment decisions, and financial decisions in a global context (questions were developed by individual instructors for use in assessment). Multiple choice examination questions in SOM 306 tested students’ understanding of the global implications of systems and operations management (5 standard questions were developed and approved by the Systems and Operations Management Department for use in assessment). Each student’s individual understanding was assessed as being very good, good enough, or not good enough based on the number of questions correctly answered.

In FIN 303, the work of students in 6 course sections (1 section in Fall 2015 and 5 sections in Spring 2016) taught by 5 different instructors was assessed (n=652). The number of examination questions answered correctly determined students’ performance. For example, an individual instructor who asked 8 examination questions to assess SLO 4 defined as very good the performance of those students who correctly answered 7 or 8 questions, defined as good enough the performance of students who correctly answered 4 to 6 questions, and defined as not good enough the performance of students who correctly answered 0 to 3 questions. Another instructor who asked 4 questions defined as very good the performance of students who correctly answered 4 questions, defined as good enough the performance of students who correctly answered 2 or 3 questions, and defined as not good enough the performance of students who correctly answered 0 or 1 question. Altogether, 32.8% of students’ work was deemed very good, 55.2% was deemed good enough, and 12.0% was deemed not good enough. These results are shown in tabular form in Table 1.

In SOM 306, the work of students in 6 course sections taught by 4 different instructors was assessed (n=802). This represented all students enrolled in SOM 306 in the Spring 2016 semester. The performance of students who correctly answered all 5 questions was deemed very good, the performance of students who correctly answered 3 or 4 questions was deemed good enough, and the performance of students who correctly answered 0 to 2 questions was deemed not good enough. Altogether, 20.8% of students’ work was deemed very good, 59.6% was deemed good enough, and 19.6% was deemed not good enough. These results are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: “Global Context of Business” Assessed in FIN 303 and SOM 306**

**(Direct, Course Embedded Measures)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very Good | Good Enough | Not Good Enough |
| FIN 303 (n=652) | 32.8% | 55.2% | 12.0% |
| SOM 306 (n=802) | 20.8% | 59.6% | 19.6% |

Overall, the 2015-16 assessment scores for “global context of business” as assessed with course embedded measures were comparable with those recorded when this SLO was last assessed in 2013-14. Scores in FIN 303 for 2015-16 were somewhat higher than were FIN 303 scores in 2013-14. Scores in FIN 303 for 2013-14 were 15% very good, 76% good enough, and 9% not good enough (n=322 in 2 class sections). Scores in SOM 306 for 2015-16 were somewhat lower than were SOM 306 scores in 2013-14. Scores in SOM 306 for 2013-14 were 29% very good, 60% good enough, and 11% not good enough (n=570 in 6 class sections).

The Nazarian College sets a standard of at least 70% of students with very good and good enough performance on course embedded measures of SLO 4. This benchmark was met when SLO 4 was measured in FIN 303 and SOM 306 in 2015-16, as 88.0% and 80.4% of students, respectively, performed at a level deemed very good or good enough.

**Direct Non-Embedded Supplemental Measure through the CSU-BAT:**

Students’ understanding of the global context of modern business was also assessed through a supplemental non-embedded measure, a subtest (5 questions) within the standardized 90-question CSU-BAT (Business Assessment Test), which is administered through California State University, Long Beach, and used by several business schools in the California State University (CSU) system. The examination was required in 2015-16 of all students enrolled in BUS 497 (Capstone) in the Nazarian College, and provided direct non-embedded measures of students’ understanding of business concepts, including the global context of business. Although not a course embedded measure, completion of the CSU-BAT was required in order for students to earn course credit for BUS 497.

The CSU-BAT was administered in a laboratory setting outside of class time, and students were informed that they would receive an Incomplete for BUS 497 if they did not complete the exam. (Students who received an Incomplete were offered opportunities to complete the exam and clear their Incomplete when the CSU-BAT was administered in subsequent semesters.) To incentivize conscientious student effort, students whose overall scores on the CSU-BAT were in the top 50% of all CSUN BUS 497 students taking the exam received extra credit in their BUS 497 course. The requirement and the extra credit were explained through BUS 497 syllabi, and reminders were emailed to students through the Associate Dean’s Office and announced by BUS 497 professors.

As shown in Table 2, Nazarian College BUS 497 students’ average (mean) scores on the 5-question global subtest of the CSU-BAT were 67.9% in Fall 2015 (n=551) and 69.3% in Spring 2016 (n=703). These scores were comparable with the averages for all business schools administering the CSU-BAT during the Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 semesters. For Fall 2015, CSUN’s average (67.9%) was slightly lower than the overall average of the 8 participating business schools (69.4%). For Spring 2016, CSUN’s average (69.3%) was slightly higher than the overall average of the 9 participating business schools (67.3%). CSUN rankings among participating business schools were 7th of 8 and 5th of 9 business schools in Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, respectively. Sample sizes for individual business schools administering the CSU-BAT were made available for Spring 2016, and so CSUN rankings among schools with large sample sizes (n>100), and the range of scores for schools with large sample sizes (n>100), are shown for Spring 2016.

**Table 2: “Global Context of Business” Assessed through the CSU-BAT (Business Assessment Test)**

**(Direct, Non-Embedded Supplemental Measure)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Average Score for CSUN Nazarian College  CSUN Rank (among total number of schools administering the CSU-BAT) | Average Score and Range of scores for  all schools administering the CSU-BAT |
| Fall 2015 | CSUN Average = 67.9% (n=551)  CSUN Rank = 7th of 8 | Average all = 69.4% (8 schools, n=NA)  Range = 62.1%-75.2% |
| Spring 2016 | CSUN Average 69.3% (n=703)  CSUN Rank = 5th of 9  CSUN Rank for schools with n>100 = 3rd of 6 | Average all = 67.3% (9 schools, n=2,452)  Range = 38.6%-79.4%  Range for schools with n>100 =  38.6%-71.3% |

The CSU-BAT results for 2015-16 are not directly comparable with results from prior years as the CSU-BAT exam questions were revised and the overall range of scores for all business schools utilizing the CSU-BAT is now higher than in previous years. Further, CSUN did not require the CSU-BAT of all BUS 497 students until Spring 2014. However, a comparison of ranking is possible. Comparing the results for 2013-14, the last time SLO 4 was assessed, CSUN’s ranking in Spring 2013 (based on a pilot and voluntary sample of n=92 BUS 497 students) was 1st out of 9 business schools. CSUN’s average score in Spring 2013 was 43.0% and the range of scores among business schools administering the CSU-BAT was 27.1%-43.0%. CSUN’s ranking in Spring 2014 was 4th out of 7 business schools. Spring 2014 was the first semester that the CSU-BAT was mandatory for all CSUN BUS 497 students (n=559). CSUN’s average score in Spring 2014 was 47.2% and the range of scores among business schools administering the CSU-BAT was 42.1%-57.7%.

**Indirect Measure through Exit Survey:**

Finally, the direct measures of SLO 4 discussed above were supplemented by an indirect measure to assess students’ perceptions of their learning. At the end of each academic year, graduating seniors from the Nazarian College are asked to respond to an exit survey, which since 2014-15 has contained questions pertaining to each of the Nazarian College’s undergraduate business learning goals. Pertaining to SLO 4, graduating seniors were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement, “I have gained a thorough understanding of the global context of modern business.” Responses are shown in Table 3 for academic years 2014-15 (n=520) and 2015-16 (n=521), indicating a relatively high level of student satisfaction or confidence with learning relevant to SLO 4. Caution should be used in interpreting this measure, as it is a measure of student perception, not a direct measure of learning.

**Table 3: “Global Context of Business” Assessed through Exit Survey**

**(Supplemental Indirect Measure)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exit Survey Question: “I have gained a thorough understanding of the global context of modern business. | | | | | | | |
|  | Strongly Agree | Agree | TOTAL\*  Strongly Agree + Agree | Neither Agree nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | TOTAL\*  Do Not Agree/  Disagree + Strongly Disagree |
| 2015 (n=520) | 42.5% | 42.3% | 84.8% | 11.7% | 2.3% | 1.2% | 15.2%/ 3.5% |
| 2016 (n=521) | 39.5% | 47.2% | 86.8% | 9.6% | 2.3% | 1.3% | 13.2%/ 3.6% |

\*Totals may be off by 0.1% due to rounding

* + - **SLO 5: Our students understand the cross-functional nature of business problems.**

Students’ understanding of the cross-functional nature of business problems was assessed in 2015-16 through a direct course embedded measure in BUS 497A, Capstone-Strategic Management. This course is part of the upper division core curriculum for students in all business majors, and requires completion of the lower division business core and other upper division core classes as prerequisites. Additionally, this direct embedded measure of SLO 5 was supplemented by an indirect measure. At the end of each academic year, graduating seniors from the Nazarian College are asked to respond to an exit survey, which since 2014-15 has contained questions pertaining to each of the College’s undergraduate business learning goals.

**Direct Course Embedded Measures in BUS 497A:**

Written case assignments were collected from 5 course sections of BUS 497A taught by 2 instructors in Spring 2016. Students were asked to upload their work to the university’s newly developed Electronic Assessment System (EAS). A total of 139 papers were uploaded from which the EAS system selected a sample (n=100). Student work was assessed independently by 2 assessors employed to read and rate all 100 student papers using a standardized rubric created by the College’s Curriculum Management and Policy Committee (CMAP). The rubric was first used in 2013-14, the last time SLO 5 was assessed. The rubric calls for student work to be assessed as being very good, good enough, or not good enough on 3 dimensions: “cross-functional perspective” (assessing whether the student identifies relevant cross-functional information needed to analyze a comprehensive business problem), “information integration” (assessing whether the student integrates information from multiple functional perspectives), and “holistic solutions” (assessing whether the student recommends a holistic solution that recognizes the impact of decisions across functional areas). An assessment of “very good” corresponds to a numeric rating of 3, an assessment of “good enough” corresponds to a numeric rating of 2, and an assessment of “not good enough” corresponds to a numeric rating of 1. Summed scores across all 3 dimensions, therefore, might range from 3 to 9 for each assessor.

Papers were flagged for a 3rd reading when summed scores differed by a total of 3 or more. For example, if a student’s paper received a summed score of 9 from one assessor and a summed score of 6 from the other assessor, it was flagged and submitted to a 3rd assessor. A total of 19 papers were thus flagged, 15 with summed differences of 3 and 4 with summed differences of 4. Finally, the ratings of the 2 (n=81) or 3 (n=19) assessors were averaged across each dimension to arrive at the final ratings.

On each dimension, an average score of 3 was deemed to be very good, an average score of 1.50 and higher was deemed to be good enough, and an average score less than 1.50 was deemed to be not good enough. To derive an overall composite score for each student, ratings were averaged across all 3 dimensions and the same numeric criteria were applied.

On the dimension, “cross-functional perspective,” 15.0% of students’ work was deemed very good, 81.0% was deemed good enough, and 4.0% was deemed not good enough. On the dimension “information integration,” 7.0% of students’ work was deemed very good, 84.0% was deemed good enough, and 9.0% was deemed not good enough. On the dimension “holistic solutions,” 4.0% of students’ work was deemed very good, 65.0% was deemed good enough, and 31.0% was deemed not good enough. Overall results were 2.0% very good, 84.0% good enough, and 14.0% not good enough. These results are shown in tabular form in Table 4.

**Table 4: “Cross Functional Nature of Business” Assessed in BUS 497A**

**(Direct, Course Embedded Measures)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rubric Dimension  (n=100) | Very Good | Good Enough | Not Good Enough |
| Cross-Functional Perspective | 15% | 81% | 4% |
| Information Integration | 7% | 84% | 9% |
| Holistic Solutions | 4% | 65% | 31% |
| Overall Assessment | 2% | 84% | 14% |

The Nazarian College sets a standard of at least 70% of students with very good and good enough performance on course embedded measures of SLO 5. This benchmark was met in 2015-16 for 2 of the 3 dimensions. For the dimension “cross-functional perspective,” 96% of students performed at a level deemed very good or good enough. For the dimension “information integration,” 91% of students performed at a level deemed very good or good enough. However, for the dimension, “holistic solutions,” only 69% of students’ work was deemed very good or good enough. It is not clear whether the higher percentage of work deemed not good enough on the dimension “holistic solutions,” was due to deficient skills and learning or because the assignments collected for assessment from BUS 497A were not well aligned to the rubric and the holistic solutions dimension of SLO 5. The benchmark was met for the overall assessment of SLO 5 with 86% of students’ work deemed very good or good enough.

As compared with results from 2013-14, the last time SLO 5 was measured (n=60 randomly selected papers from 18 BUS 497A course sections), some differences are apparent. The overall assessment results for SLO 5 in 2013-14 were 60% very good, 35% good enough, and 5% not good enough. On the dimension, “cross-functional perspective,” 65.0% of students’ work was deemed very good, 31.7% was deemed good enough, and 3.3% was deemed not good enough. On the dimension “information integration,” 58.3% of students’ work was deemed very good, 36.7% was deemed good enough, and 5.0% was deemed not good enough. On the dimension “holistic solutions,” 43.3% of students’ work was deemed very good, 46.7% was deemed good enough, and 10.0% was deemed not good enough. Thus, while the combined percentages deemed very good and good enough were comparable between 2013-14 and 2015-16, far higher percentages in 2013-14 were judged to be very good. Also, a greater number of papers in 2015-16 were judged to be not good enough on the dimension “holistic solutions” (31% in 2015-16 versus 10% in 2013-14).

One possible explanation for these differences is that the 100 BUS 497A papers assessed in 2015-16 were pulled from only 5 course sections taught by 2 instructors, as compared with smaller samples from a wider range of BUS 497A course sections and instructors in 2013-14. Perhaps the assignments given in 2015-16 were not as well aligned with the dimensions measured for SLO 5, especially the dimension “holistic solutions.” Another contributing factor might be that the assessment of SLO 5 in 2013-14 was conducted by only 1 assessor, a teaching instructor, as compared with 2 (and sometimes 3) outside assessors in 2015-16. It is possible that the assessors in 2015-16 applied the rubric criteria more strictly.

**Indirect Measure through Exit Survey:**

The direct embedded measure of SLO 5 discussed above was supplemented by an indirect measure to assess students’ perceptions of their learning. At the end of each academic year, graduating seniors from the Nazarian College are asked to respond to an exit survey, which since 2014-15 has contained questions pertaining to each of the Nazarian College’s undergraduate business learning goals. Pertaining to SLO 5, graduating seniors were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement, “I have gained a strong understanding of the cross-functional nature of business problems (i.e., how different subjects such as marketing, finance, and business law interact with each other).” Responses are shown in Table 5 below for academic years 2014-15 and 2015-16, indicating a high level of student satisfaction or confidence with learning relevant to this goal. Caution should be used in interpreting this measure, as it is a measure of student perception, not a direct measure of learning.

**Table 5: “Cross Functional Nature of Business” Assessed through Exit Survey**

**(Supplemental Indirect Measure)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exit Survey Question: “I have gained a strong understanding of the cross-functional nature of business problems (i.e., how different subjects such as marketing, finance, and business law interact with each other).” | | | | | | | |
|  | Strongly Agree | Agree | TOTAL\*  Strongly Agree + Agree | Neither Agree nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | TOTAL\*  Do Not Agree/  Disagree + Strongly Disagree |
| 2015 (n=522) | 53.4% | 38.9% | 92.3% | 5.6% | 1.1% | 1.0% | 7.7%/ 2.1% |
| 2016 (n=521) | 53.0% | 40.7% | 93.7% | 4.2% | 1.2% | 1.0% | 6.3%/ 2.1% |

\*Totals may be off by 0.1% due to rounding

* + - **SLO 6: Our students understand and apply key business concepts.**

Students’ understanding and application of key business concepts was assessed in 2015-16 through three direct assessment methods supplemented by indirect measures.

1. SLO 6 was assessed through direct course embedded measures in BUS 302L (the Gateway Experience Lab) where students were required to complete multiple choice examinations in each of the 6 lower division core (LDC) business subjects: business law, financial accounting, management accounting, macroeconomics, microeconomics, and statistics. These examinations were administered in the Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 semesters.
2. SLO 6 was assessed through direct course embedded measures in upper division core (UDC) classes required of all business majors: FIN 303 (Financial Management) for knowledge of key finance concepts, MKT 304 (Introduction to Marketing Management) for knowledge of key marketing concepts, SOM 306 (Operations Management) for knowledge of key systems and operations management concepts, and MGT 360 (Management and Organizational Behavior) for knowledge of key management concepts. Data were collected primarily in the Spring 2016 semester, with the exception of MKT 304 (all course sections) and one section of FIN 303, which collected assessment data in Fall 2015.
3. SLO 6 was assessed through 9 subtests within the standardized CSU-BAT (Business Assessment Test). This examination was administered in both the Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 semesters to all students enrolled in BUS 497 (Capstone). The direct non-embedded measures provided by the CSU-BAT are supplemental to the course embedded measures described above. Subtests of the CSU-BAT cover accounting, business law, economics, finance, management, management information systems, marketing, statistics, and supply chain management. The CSU-BAT also includes a subtest for global (discussed under SLO 4) and ethics (assessed by the Nazarian College as part of SLO Group 1).
4. SLO 6 was assessed through supplemental indirect measures. At the end of each academic year, graduating seniors from the Nazarian College are asked to respond to an exit survey, which since 2014-15 has contained questions pertaining to each of the College’s undergraduate business learning goals. Graduating seniors were asked to indicate their perceptions regarding their own learning of accounting, business law, economics, finance, management, marketing, and systems and operations management.

**Direct Embedded Measures in BUS 302L, the Lower Division Business Core:**

BUS 302L (the Gateway Experience Lab) is required of all undergraduate business majors for the purpose of testing students’ knowledge and retention of concepts covered in 6 key lower division business core classes. The lower division core (LDC) examinations cover business law, financial accounting, management accounting, microeconomics, macroeconomics, and statistics.

The highest score earned on each LDC examination for each student enrolled in BUS 302L in Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 was recorded and used for assessment. (Students who initially fail an examination may repeat that exam.) Thus, assessment data captured the entire population of students enrolled in BUS 302L in the Fall 2015 (n=975) and Spring 2016 (n=901) semesters.

Some students enrolled in BUS 302L elect not to attempt one or more examinations during the course of the semester, thus failing those exams. To reflect this, assessment used two measures for failure rates, “inclusive failure rates” and “exclusive failure rates.” Inclusive failure rates include students who did not attempt an exam as having failed that examination. “Exclusive failure rates” exclude the same students from the sample for any examination they did not attempt. Thus, reported inclusive failure rates are always higher than reported exclusive failure rates.

For the Fall 2015 and Spring 2015 semesters, the passing rates were highest (and the failure rates lowest) for examinations in business law, followed by microeconomics, macroeconomics, financial accounting, management accounting, and statistics. The inclusive failure rates ranged from a low of 7.6% and 7.3% for business law in Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, respectively, to a high of 17.1% and 20.5% for statistics in Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, respectively. The exclusive failure rates ranged from a low of 3.2% and 3.9% for business law in Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, respectively, to a high of 11.9% and 16.6% for statistics in Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, respectively. For most exams, passing rates were slightly lower (failure rates slightly higher) in the Spring 2016 versus Fall 2015 semester. The inclusive and exclusive failure and passing rates for each of the six LDC exams for the Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 semesters are shown in tabular form in Table 6.

**Table 6: “Key Business Concepts” Assessed in BUS 302L, LDC Exams**

**(Direct, Course Embedded Measures)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | “Inclusive Passing/Failure Rates” =  Including Students Who Did NOT Attempt Exam | | | | “Exclusive Passing/Failure Rates” =  Excluding Students Who Did NOT Attempt Exam | | | |
|  | Inclusive Passing Rate | | Inclusive Failure Rate | | Exclusive Passing Rate | | Exclusive Failure Rate | |
|  | Fall 2015  (n=975 ) | Spring 2016  (n=901) | Fall 2015  (n=975) | Spring 2016  (n=901) | Fall 2015 | Spring 2016 | Fall 2015 | Spring 2016 |
| Business Law | 92.4% | 92.7% | 7.6% | 7.3% | 96.8%  (n=931) | 96.1%  (n=869) | 3.2%  (n=931) | 3.9%  (n=869) |
| Microeconomics | 89.1% | 87.8% | 10.9% | 12.2% | 93.4%  (n=930) | 91.3%  (n=866) | 6.6%  (n=930) | 8.7%  (n=866) |
| Macroeconomics | 88.7% | 88.8% | 11.3% | 11.2% | 93.6%  (n=924) | 92.7%  (n=863) | 6.4%  (n=924) | 7.3%  (n=863) |
| Financial Accounting | 88.5% | 86.0% | 11.5% | 14.0% | 93.4%  (n=924) | 90.1%  (n=860) | 6.6%  (n=924) | 9.9%  (n=860) |
| Management Accounting | 86.0% | 85.6% | 14.0% | 14.4% | 91.2%  (n=919) | 90.0%  (n=857) | 8.8%  (n=919) | 10.0%  (n=857) |
| Statistics | 82.9% | 79.5% | 17.1% | 20.5% | 88.1%  (n=917) | 83.4%  (n=859) | 11.9%  (n=917) | 16.6%  (n=859) |

The Nazarian College sets a standard of at least 85% of students passing (no more than 15% failing) each LDC examination each semester. This benchmark was met in 2015-16 for all examinations other than statistics. The inclusive failure rates for statistics were higher than 15% in both the Fall 2015 (17.1%) and Spring 2016 (20.5%) semesters. The exclusive failure rate for statistics was greater than 15% in the Spring 2016 semester (16.6%).

Overall, the 2015-16 assessment scores for “key business concepts” as assessed with the BUS 302L LDC exams are slightly lower than in recent years, including when SLO 6 was last assessed in 2013-14. Inclusive passing and failure rates for each of the LDC examinations since Fall 2013 are shown in Table 7. Passing rates have held relatively steady with minor fluctuations for LDC examinations covering business law, microeconomics, and macroeconomics. Passing rates have generally declined for financial accounting and to a lesser degree for management accounting. Passing rates have declined for statistics and have fallen short of the college benchmark of 85% each semester except Spring 2015. Additionally, inclusive failure rates for management accounting have hovered near 15% since Fall 2014. LDC examinations were recently revised to include new questions, and this may account for some of the recent differences.

A similar comparison is provided in Table 8 for passing and failure rates excluding those students who did not attempt a specific LDC exam. By definition, as compared with inclusive rates, exclusive failure rates are lower (and passing rates higher) because students who did not attempt an exam were not included as having failed the exam. When excluding these students from the sample, the Nazarian College benchmark of a passing rate of at least 85% on each exam was met for all examinations in all semesters except statistics in Spring 2016 (83.4% passing rate, 16.6% failing rate).

**Table 7: “Key Business Concepts” Assessed in BUS 302L, LDC Exams 2013-14 to 2015-16**

**Inclusive (Including Students Who Did NOT Attempt an Exam) Passing and Failure Rates**

**(Direct, Course Embedded Measures)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Business Law | | Micro-  economics | | Macro-economics | | Financial Accounting | | Management Accounting | | Statistics | |
| Semester | Passed | Failed | Passed | Failed | Passed | Failed | Passed | Failed | Passed | Failed | Passed | Failed |
| Fall 2013  (n=797) | 92.2% | 7.8% | 88.7% | 11.3% | 88.3% | 11.7% | 89.1% | 10.9% | 86.2% | 13.8% | 84.9% | 15.1% |
| Spring 2014  (n=724) | 93.9% | 6.1% | 87.4% | 12.6% | 90.8% | 9.2% | 88.1% | 11.9% | 87.3% | 12.7% | 84.1% | 15.9% |
| Fall 2014  (n=961) | 93.6% | 6.4% | 89.2% | 10.8% | 90.2% | 9.8% | 89.4% | 10.6% | 85.7% | 14.3% | 83.6% | 16.4% |
| Spring 2015  (n=807) | 94.4% | 5.6% | 90.5% | 9.5% | 90.7% | 9.3% | 88.1% | 11.9% | 85.6% | 14.4% | 85.5% | 14.5% |
| Fall 2015  (n=975) | 92.4% | 7.6% | 89.1% | 10.9% | 88.7% | 11.3% | 88.5% | 11.5% | 86.0% | 14.0% | 82.9% | 17.1% |
| Spring 2016  (n=901) | 92.7% | 7.3% | 87.8% | 12.2% | 88.8% | 11.2% | 86.0% | 14.0% | 85.6% | 14.4% | 79.5% | 20.5% |

**Table 8: “Key Business Concepts” Assessed in BUS 302L, LDC Exams 2013-14 to 2015-16**

**Exclusive (Excluding Students Who Did NOT Attempt an Exam) Passing and Failure Rates**

**(Direct, Course Embedded Measures)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Business Law | | Micro-  economics | | Macro-economics | | Financial Accounting | | Management Accounting | | Statistics | |
| Semester | Passed | Failed | Passed | Failed | Passed | Failed | Passed | Failed | Passed | Failed | Passed | Failed |
| Fall 2013 | 96.3%n=763 | 3.7% | 92.9%  n=761 | 7.1% | 93.2%n=755 | 6.8% | 93.9%  n=756 | 6.1% | 91.4%  n=752 | 8.6% | 90.0%  n=752 | 10.0% |
| Spring 2014 | 97.3%n=699 | 2.7% | 91.3%  n=693 | 8.7% | 94.5%n=695 | 5.5% | 91.9%  n=694 | 8.1% | 91.5%  n=691 | 8.5% | 87.6%  n=695 | 12.4% |
| Fall 2014 | 97.1%  n=927 | 2.9% | 93.0%  n=922 | 7.0% | 94.2%n=920 | 5.8% | 93.5%n=919 | 6.5% | 90.2%  n=914 | 9.8% | 88.1%  n=911 | 11.9% |
| Spring 2015 | 97.7%  n=780 | 2.3% | 94.0%  n=777 | 6.0% | 94.2%n=777 | 5.8% | 91.6%n=776 | 8.4% | 89.4%  n=773 | 10.6% | 89.0%  n=775 | 11.0% |
| Fall 2015 | 96.8%  n=931 | 3.2% | 93.4%  n=930 | 6.6% | 93.6%n=924 | 6.4% | 93.4%n=924 | 6.6% | 91.2%  n=919 | 8.8% | 88.1%  n=917 | 11.9% |
| Spring 2016 | 96.1%  n=869 | 3.9% | 91.3%  n=866 | 8.7% | 92.7%n=863 | 7.3% | 90.1%n=860 | 9.9% | 90.0%  n=857 | 10.0% | 83.4%  n=859 | 16.6% |

**Direct Course Embedded Measures in Upper Division Core (FIN 303, MKT 304, SOM 306, MGT 360):**

Students’ understanding and application of key business concepts was also assessed in 2015-16 in the upper division core classes, FIN 303, MKT 304, SOM 306, and MGT 360. These courses are required of all students in all business majors.

In FIN 303, the work of students in 6 course sections taught by 5 different instructors (n=634) was used to assess students’ understanding and application of key finance concepts. Multiple choice examination questions developed by individual instructors tested key concepts pertaining to financing and investment analysis and decisions. The number of examination questions answered correctly determined students’ performance. For example, an individual instructor who asked 10 examination questions for assessment defined as very good the performance of students who correctly answered 9 or 10 questions, defined as good enough the performance of students who correctly answered 5 to 8 questions, and defined as not good enough the performance of students who correctly answered 0 to 4 questions. Altogether, 30.8% of students’ work was deemed very good, 54.3% was deemed good enough, and 15.0% was deemed not good enough. These results are shown in tabular form in Table 9.

In MKT 304, the work of students in 6 course sections taught by 5 different instructors (n=912) was used to assess students’ understanding and application of key marketing concepts. Multiple choice examination questions in MKT 304 tested students’ understanding of market segmentation, targeting, positioning, the marketing mix, product/service, pricing, distribution, promotion, branding, consumer behavior, marketing research, product life cycle, product development, product adoption, and marketing strategy. Assessment used 30 standard exam questions (2 questions for each concept) developed and approved by the Marketing Department. The performance of students who correctly answered 26 to 30 questions was deemed very good, the performance of students who correctly answered 18 to 25 questions was deemed good enough, and the performance of students who correctly answered 0 to 17 questions was deemed not good enough. Altogether, 23.6% of students’ work was deemed very good, 64.3% was deemed good enough, and 12.2% was deemed not good enough. These results are shown in Table 9.

In SOM 306, the work of students in 6 course sections taught by 4 different instructors (n=802) was used to assess students’ understanding and application of key systems and operations management concepts. This represents all students enrolled in SOM 306 in the Spring 2016 semester. Multiple choice examination questions in SOM 306 tested students’ understanding of key systems and operations management concepts (10 standard questions developed and approved by the Systems and Operations Management Department). The performance of students who correctly answered 9 or 10 questions was deemed very good, the performance of students who correctly answered 5 to 8 questions was deemed good enough, and the performance of students who correctly answered 0 to 4 questions was deemed not good enough. Altogether, 12.2% of students’ work was deemed very good, 62.2% was deemed good enough, and 25.6% was deemed not good enough. These results are shown in Table 9.

In MGT 360, the work of students in 1 course section (n=134) was used to assess students’ understanding and application of key management concepts. The data collection effort in 2015-16 served as a pilot. In future semesters, assessment of key management concepts will be expanded to multiple course sections. Multiple choice examination questions in MGT 360 tested students’ understanding of concepts pertaining to planning, organizing, leading, and controlling; motivation; and individual differences (10 standard questions developed and approved by the Management Department). The performance of students who correctly answered 8 to 10 questions was deemed very good, the performance of students who correctly answered 6 or 7 questions was deemed good enough, and the performance of students who correctly answered 0 to 5 questions was deemed not good enough. Altogether, 25.4% of students’ work was deemed very good, 56.7% was deemed good enough, and 17.9% was deemed not good enough. These results are shown in Table 9.

**Table 9: “Key Business Concepts” Assessed in Upper Division Core Classes: FIN 303, MKT 304, SOM 306, and MGT 360**

**(Direct, Course Embedded Measures)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very Good | Good Enough | Not Good Enough |
| FIN 303 (n=634) | 30.8% | 54.3% | 15.0% |
| MKT 304 (n=912) | 23.6% | 64.3% | 12.2% |
| SOM 306 (n=802) | 12.2% | 62.2% | 25.6% |
| MGT 360 (n=134) | 25.4% | 56.7% | 17.9% |

Overall, the 2015-16 assessment scores for “key business concepts” as assessed with course embedded measures in the upper division core classes were comparable with those recorded when SLO 6 was last assessed in 2013-14. Scores in FIN 303 for 2013-14 were 30% very good, 57% good enough, and 13% not good enough (n=322 in 2 class sections). Scores in MKT 304 for 2013-14 were 21% very good, 62% good enough, and 17% not good enough (n=475 in 6 class sections). Scores in SOM 306 for 2013-14 were somewhat higher than for 2015-16, at 20% very good, 64% good enough, and 16% not good enough (n=570 in 6 class sections). The academic year 2015-16 was the first year that SLO 6 was assessed in MGT 360 so no comparison data are available for MGT 360.

The Nazarian College sets a standard of at least 70% of students with very good and good enough performance on course embedded measures of SLO 6. This benchmark was met for 2015-16 when SLO 6 was measured in FIN 303 (85.1% very good and good enough), MKT 304 (87.9% very good and good enough), SOM 306 (74.4% very good and good enough), and MGT 360 (82.1% very good and good enough).

Beyond the summary statistics reported above, MKT 304 reported detailed assessment results for 2013-14 and 2015-16. These results show overall improvement in students’ understanding and application of key marketing concepts. The Marketing Department set a benchmark that at least 70% of students should answer questions correctly in each of the 15 marketing content categories tested. In 2013-14, this benchmark was met for 9 of the 15 content categories and not met for the other 6 categories. The 6 content categories for which the benchmark was not met were identified as areas for improvement. In 2015-16, the 70% benchmark was met for 11 of the 15 content categories and not met for the other 4 categories. Improvement was evidenced in the areas of product/service, distribution, marketing research, and product development. Content areas showing average scores of less than 70% in 2015-16 were targeting, pricing, product life cycle, and marketing strategy, with average scores ranging from 60.4% to 67.7%. Average scores increased in a majority of content categories. These results are shown in Table 10.

**Table 10: Detailed Results: “Key Business Concepts” (Marketing) Assessed in MKT 304**

**(Direct, Course Embedded Measures)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Marketing Content Categories | 2013-14 Average Scores  (n=475 in 6 class sections) | 2015-16 Average Scores  (n=912 in 6 class sections) |
| Market segmentation  Targeting  Positioning  The Marketing Mix  Product Service  Pricing  Distribution  Promotion  Branding  Consumer Behavior  Marketing Research  Produce Life Cycle  Product Development  Product Adoption  Marketing Strategy | 89%  67%  88%  72%  53%  77%  69%  74%  76%  84%  41%  83%  53%  72%  57% | 96.0%  67.7%  71.1%  73.6%  88.2%  63.4%  82.6%  72.5%  72.6%  82.1%  84.6%  60.4%  77.2%  73.4%  63.2% |

**Direct, Non-Embedded Measures through the CSU-BAT Standardized Test:**

Supplemental to the direct course embedded measures discussed above, SLO 6 was assessed through subtests within the standardized 90-question CSU-BAT (Business Assessment Test), which is administered through California State University, Long Beach, and used by several business schools in the California State University (CSU) system. The examination was required in 2015-16 of all students enrolled in BUS 497 (Capstone), and provided direct non-embedded measures of students’ understanding and application of key business concepts. Although not a course embedded measure, completion of the CSU-BAT was required in order for students to earn course credit for BUS 497.

The CSU-BAT was administered in a laboratory setting outside of class time, and students were informed that they would receive an Incomplete for BUS 497 if they did not complete the exam. (Students who received an Incomplete were offered opportunities to complete the exam and clear their Incomplete when the CSU-BAT was administered in subsequent semesters.) To incentivize conscientious student effort, students whose overall scores on the CSU-BAT were in the top 50% of all CSUN BUS 497 students taking the exam received extra credit in their BUS 497 course. The requirement and the extra credit were explained through BUS 497 syllabi, and reminders were emailed to students through the Associate Dean’s Office and announced by BUS 497 professors.

SLO 6 was assessed through results for 9 subtests of the CSU-BAT covering accounting, business law, economics, finance, management, management information systems, marketing, statistics, and supply chain management. (Additional subtests of the CSU-BAT cover global, discussed under SLO 4, and ethics, assessed by the Nazarian College as part of SLO Group 1.)

Table 11 shows average scores for each CSU-BAT subtest for Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, along with CSUN rankings and the ranges of scores among all business schools administering the CSU-BAT. Sample sizes for individual schools were made available for Spring 2016, and so CSUN’s ranking among schools with large sample sizes (n>100), and the range of scores for schools with large sample sizes (n>100), are shown for Spring 2016.

Results indicate performance for students in the Nazarian College comparable to or exceeding those of students at other CSUs who utilize the CSU-BAT. For Fall 2015, CSUN scored higher than average among the business schools utilizing the CSU-BAT for all subtests except management information systems and marketing. CSUN’s average scores ranked 1st for accounting and business law; and 2nd for economics, finance, management, statistics, and supply chain management. CSUN rankings were lower for management information systems (6th) and marketing (7th), but still only slightly below the average of all participating business schools. For Spring 2016, CSUN scored higher than the average for all subtests except management and management information systems. CSUN’s average scores ranked 1st for business law, 2nd for statistics, 3rd for marketing and supply chain management, 4th for economics, and 5th for accounting and finance. CSUN rankings were lower for management (6th) and management information systems (6th), but still only slightly below the average of all participating business schools. Thus, the averages and rankings shifted somewhat among subtests over the two semesters, but the overall results were comparable.

Spring 2016 was the first semester that CSUN administered the online CSU-BAT rather than the paper/pencil/SCANTRON version of the exam. The introduction of the online format does not appear to have affected exam scores.

**Table 11: “Key Business Concepts” Assessed through the CSU-BAT Standardized Exam**

**(Direct, Non-Embedded Supplemental Measures)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CSU-BAT Subtest | Fall 2015 | | Spring 2016 | |
| Average Score for CSUN Nazarian College (n=551)  CSUN Rank (among 8 schools administering the CSU-BAT) \* | Average Score and Range of scores for all business schools administering the  CSU-BAT  (8 schools, n=NA)\* | Average Score for CSUN Nazarian College (n=703)  CSUN Rank (among 9 schools administering the CSU-BAT) \* | Average Score and Range of scores for all schools administering the  CSU-BAT  (9 schools, n=2,452)\*\* |
| Accounting  (10 questions) | CSUN Average = 68.0%  CSUN Rank = 1st of 8 | Average all = 64.4%  Range = 54.7%-68.0% | CSUN Average = 62.0%  CSUN Rank = 5th of 9  CSUN Rank for schools with n>100 = 3rd of 6 | Average all = 59.8%  Range = 39.8%-67.6%  Range for schools with n>100 = 39.8%-63.6% |
| Business Law  (5 questions) | CSUN Average = 46.7%  CSUN Rank =1st of 4\* | Average all = 44.9%\*  Range = 36.1%-46.7%\* | CSUN Average = 49.3%  CSUN Rank = 1st of 8\*\*  CSUN Rank for schools with n>100 = 1st of 5 | Average all = 40.7%\*\*  Range = 31.6%-49.3%\*\*  Range for schools with n>100 = 31.6%-49.3% |
| Economics  (10 questions) | CSUN Average = 54.8%  CSUN Rank = 2nd of 8 | Average all = 51.5%  Range = 39.8%-55.6% | CSUN Average = 52.5%  CSUN Rank = 4th of 9  CSUN Rank for schools with n>100 = 2nd of 6 | Average all = 49.8%  Range = 40.5%-56.0%  Range for schools with n>100 = 40.5%-56.0% |
| Finance  (10 questions) | CSUN Average = 53.8%  CSUN Rank = 2nd of 8 | Average all = 49.4%  Range = 42.4%-54.7% | CSUN Average = 64.9%  CSUN Rank = 5th of 9  CSUN Rank for schools with n>100 = 3rd of 6 | Average all = 61.3%  Range = 43.6%-72.3%  Range for schools with n>100 = 43.6%-68.0% |
| Management  (10 questions) | CSUN Average = 54.2%  CSUN Rank = 2nd of 8 | Average all = 53.7%  Range = 48.2%-58.9% | CSUN Average = 53.0%  CSUN Rank = 6th of 9  CSUN Rank for schools with n>100 = 3rd of 6 | Average all = 55.0%  Range = 50.2%-63.5%  Range for schools with n>100 = 50.2%-58.9% |
| Management Information Systems  (10 questions) | CSUN Average = 42.8%  CSUN Rank = 6th of 8 | Average all = 43.1%  Range = 37.7%-44.8% | CSUN Average = 40.2%  CSUN Rank = 6th of 9  CSUN Rank for schools with n>100 = 4th of 6 | Average all = 43.0%  Range = 33.4%-60.0%  Range for schools with n>100 = 39.2%-42.9% |
| Marketing  (10 questions) | CSUN Average = 61.3%  CSUN Rank = 7th of 8 | Average all = 63.5%  Range = 58.8%-68.5% | CSUN Average = 65.2%  CSUN Rank = 3rd of 9  CSUN Rank for schools with n>100 = 2nd of 6 | Average all = 61.6%  Range = 41.9%-67.1%  Range for schools with n>100 = 41.9%-67.1% |

**Table 11: “Key Business Concepts” Assessed through the CSU-BAT Standardized Exam (Continued)**

**(Direct, Non-Embedded Supplemental Measures)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CSU-BAT Subtest | Fall 2015 | | Spring 2016 | |
| Average Score for CSUN Nazarian College (n=551)  CSUN Rank (among 8 schools administering the CSU-BAT) \* | Average Score and Range of scores for all business schools administering the  CSU-BAT  (8 schools, n=NA)\* | Average Score for CSUN Nazarian College (n=703)  CSUN Rank (among 9 schools administering the CSU-BAT) \* | Average Score and Range of scores for all schools administering the  CSU-BAT  (9 schools, n=2,452)\*\* |
| Statistics  (10 questions) | CSUN Average = 48.9%  CSUN Rank = 2nd of 8 | Average all = 47.5%  Range = 41.2%-49.9% | CSUN Average = 51.2%  CSUN Rank = 2nd of 9  CSUN Rank for schools with n>100 = 2nd of 6 | Average all = 47.7%  Range = 40.4%-52.7%  Range for schools with n>100 = 40.4%-52.7% |
| Supply Chain Management  (5 questions) | CSUN Average = 58.4%  CSUN Rank = 2nd of 4\* | Average all = 58.0%\*  Range = 52.3%-62.9%\* | CSUN Average = 58.2%  CSUN Rank = 3rd of 8\*\*  CSUN Rank for schools with n>100 = 3rd of 5 | Average all = 54.1%\*\*  Range = 47.0%-61.5%\*\*  Range for schools with n>100 = 47.0%-61.5% |

\* In Fall 2015, only 4 schools administered the business law and supply chain management subtests; 8 schools administered all other subtests.

\*\* In Spring 2016, only 8 schools administered the business law and supply chain management subtests; 9 schools administered all other subtests.

The CSU-BAT results for 2015-16 are not directly comparable with results from prior years as the CSU-BAT exam questions were revised and scores for all participating business schools differ in range from previous years. Further, CSUN did not require the CSU-BAT of all BUS 497 students until Spring 2014. However, a comparison of ranking is possible. Comparing the results for 2013-14, the last time SLO 6 was assessed, CSUN rankings in Spring 2013 (based on a voluntary sample of n=92 BUS 497 students) were 1st among 9 participating schools for accounting, business law, and finance; 2nd for statistics and supply chain management; 4th for management information systems; and 5th for economics, management, and marketing. Based on this limited and self-selected sample, average scores exceeded the averages for all business schools administering the CSU-BAT for 5 subtests (all subtests except economics, management, management information systems, and marketing). For Spring 2014 (n=559, the first semester that the CSU-BAT was made mandatory for all BUS 497 students), CSUN ranked 2nd among 7 participating schools for business law, economics, marketing, statistics, and supply chain management; 3rd for accounting and finance; and 4th for management and management information systems. For the Spring 2014 semester, CSUN average scores exceeded the averages for all 9 subtests. Thus, the Nazarian College has a history of strong performance on the CSU-BAT relative to other participating business schools.

**Indirect Measures through Exit Survey:**

The direct measures for SLO 6 discussed above were supplemented by indirect measures to assess students’ perceptions of their learning. At the end of each academic year, graduating seniors from the Nazarian College are asked to respond to an exit survey, which since 2014-15 has contained questions pertaining to each of the Nazarian College’s undergraduate business learning goals. Pertaining to SLO 6, graduating seniors were asked in 7 separate questions to indicate their level of agreement with the following statement, “I have gained a thorough understanding of, and ability to apply, important concepts from ....” the 7 functional areas of accounting, business law, economics, finance, management, marketing, and systems and operations management. Responses are shown in Table 12 for academic years 2014-15 and 2015-16, indicating a relatively high level of student satisfaction or confidence with learning relevant to SLO 6. Student satisfaction or confidence with learning is generally highest for management, marketing, and business law; and slightly lower for the more quantitative subjects, accounting, economics, finance, and systems and operations management. Caution should be used in interpreting these measures, as they are measures of student perception, not direct measures of learning.

**Table 12: “Key Business Concepts” Assessed through Exit Survey**

**(Supplemental Indirect Measures)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly Agree | Agree | TOTAL\*  Strongly Agree + Agree | Neither Agree nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | TOTAL\*  Do Not Agree/  Disagree + Strongly Disagree |
| Exit Survey Question: “I have gained a thorough understanding of, and ability to apply, important concepts from Accounting. | | | | | | | |
| 2015 (n=521) | 35.1% | 43.0% | 78.1% | 16.1% | 3.8% | 1.9% | 21.8%/ 5.7% |
| 2016 (n=521) | 34.7% | 42.2% | 77.0% | 16.7% | 5.0% | 1.3% | 23.0%/ 6.3% |
| Exit Survey Question: “I have gained a thorough understanding of, and ability to apply, important concepts from Business Law. | | | | | | | |
| 2015 (n=522) | 43.5% | 42.3% | 85.8% | 10.5% | 2.7% | 1.0% | 14.2%/ 3.7% |
| 2016 (n=521) | 40.7% | 45.7% | 86.4% | 11.1% | 2.1% | 0.4% | 13.6%/ 2.5% |
| Exit Survey Question: “I have gained a thorough understanding of, and ability to apply, important concepts from Economics. | | | | | | | |
| 2015 (n=520) | 30.6% | 47.9% | 78.5% | 15.4% | 3.5% | 2.7% | 21.5%/ 6.2% |
| 2016 (n=521) | 27.1% | 44.3% | 71.4% | 21.5% | 5.4% | 1.7% | 28.6%/ 7.1% |
| Exit Survey Question: “I have gained a thorough understanding of, and ability to apply, important concepts from Finance. | | | | | | | |
| 2015 (n=520) | 35.6% | 42.9% | 78.5% | 13.5% | 5.0% | 3.1% | 21.5%/ 8.1% |
| 2016 (n=521) | 31.3% | 40.9% | 72.2% | 17.5% | 7.7% | 2.7% | 27.8%/ 10.4% |
| Exit Survey Question: “I have gained a thorough understanding of, and ability to apply, important concepts from Management. | | | | | | | |
| 2015 (n=518) | 51.4% | 38.2% | 89.6% | 7.9% | 1.3% | 1.2% | 10.4%/ 2.5% |
| 2016 (n=521) | 53.9% | 34.9% | 88.9% | 8.3% | 2.1% | 0.8% | 11.1%/ 2.9% |

**Table 12: “Key Business Concepts” Assessed through Exit Survey (Continued)**

**(Supplemental Indirect Measures)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exit Survey Question: “I have gained a thorough understanding of, and ability to apply, important concepts from Marketing. | | | | | | | |
| 2015 (n=522) | 46.2% | 42.3% | 88.5% | 8.8% | 1.5% | 1.2% | 11.5%/ 2.7% |
| 2016 (n=521) | 45.9% | 41.8% | 87.7% | 10.2% | 1.5% | 0.6% | 12.3%/ 2.1% |
| Exit Survey Question: “I have gained a thorough understanding of, and ability to apply, important concepts from Systems and Operations Management. | | | | | | | |
| 2015 (n=523) | 31.4% | 40.5% | 71.9% | 17.2% | 7.5% | 3.4% | 28.1%/ 10.9% |
| 2016 (n=521) | 25.3% | 41.5% | 66.8% | 22.3% | 6.7% | 4.2% | 33.2%/ 10.9% |

\*Totals may be off by 0.1% due to rounding.

* + - **SLO 7: Our students can work effectively in teams.**

Students’ ability to work effectively in teams was assessed in 2015-16 through direct course embedded measures; specifically peer evaluations of teammates by students enrolled in BUS 302 (the Gateway Experience) and BUS 497A (Capstone-Strategic Management). These 2 courses are part of the upper division core curriculum for students in all business majors. Additionally, these direct measures of SLO 7 were supplemented by an indirect measure. At the end of each academic year, graduating seniors from the Nazarian College are asked to respond to an exit survey, which since 2014-15 has contained questions pertaining to each of the College’s undergraduate business learning goals.

**Direct Embedded Measures in BUS 302 and BUS 497A:**

All BUS 302 course sections create teams comprised of 5 to 7 students who work together for an entire semester to complete multiple case analysis projects. After completing their final projects in the Spring 2016 semester, BUS 302 students completed peer evaluations of their teammates using a standardized rubric created by the College’s Curriculum Management and Policy Committee (CMAP). The rubric calls for members of student teams to assess their teammates on 4 dimensions, “contribution to meetings and task completion,” “facilitation,” “constructive team climate,” and “response to conflict.” The 2015-16 academic year was the second assessment cycle during which this rubric was used. After its first use in 2013-14, the rubric was streamlined at the recommendation of the BUS 302 instructors. The 2 dimensions “contribution to meetings” and “task completion” were combined into 1 dimension, and instructions and explanations provided to students for each dimension were abbreviated.

To encourage candor, peer evaluations were completed anonymously and students were informed that the results of the evaluations would not affect team members’ grades. Although evaluation forms were collected from all Spring 2016 BUS 302 class sections, not all were usable as some students did not follow instructions. Usable data were obtained from 17 of 20 course sections taught by 7 instructors (n=442). (Whereas the evaluation forms collected by some instructors were 100% usable, other instructors collected only a few usable forms. This highlights the necessity for instructors to review the rubric instructions with their students.)

Teamwork assessment scores for each student were derived by averaging the numeric ratings on each rubric dimension assigned by each member of that student’s team. Overall scores were derived by averaging the ratings across dimensions. Self-evaluations were excluded. For each dimension, a numeric rating of 3 indicated that a teammate’s performance was judged to be very good on that dimension, a numeric rating of 2 indicated that a teammate’s performance was judged to be good enough, and a numeric rating of 1 indicated a teammate’s performance was judged to be not good enough. Because students tend to be quite generous in rating their peers and the BUS 302 teams were large, rather strict criteria were applied when assigning the cutoff points to represent average scores that qualified as very good, good enough, and not good enough. Only students averaging at least 2.85 on a dimension were deemed to be very good on that dimension, students averaging 1.85 to 2.84 were deemed to be good enough, and students averaging 1.84 or less were deemed to be not good enough. This allowed the assessments provided by students who were more discriminating to have a strong influence on the ratings. The same criteria were applied for the overall scores for each student.

On the dimension “contribution to meetings and task completion,” the performance of 51.6% of students was deemed very good, the performance of 42.3% was deemed good enough, and the performance of 6.1% was deemed not good enough. On the dimension “facilitation,” the performance of 45.0% of students was deemed very good, the performance of 50.2% was deemed good enough, and the performance of 4.8% was deemed not good enough. On the dimension “constructive team climate,” the performance of 54.3% of students was deemed very good, the performance of 43.0% was deemed good enough, and the performance of 2.7% was deemed not good enough. On the dimension, “response to conflict,” the performance of 48.0% of students was deemed very good, the performance of 47.5% was deemed good enough, and the performance of 4.5% was deemed not good enough. Finally, overall scores were 50.7% very good, 46.4% good enough, and 2.9% not good enough. These results are shown in tabular form in Table 13.

In BUS 497A, some instructors assign the Business Strategy Game (BSG), an online simulation that involves multiple rounds of competition among teams of 3 or 4 students. At the end of the simulation, students in 6 course sections (3 sections in Fall 2015 and 3 sections in Spring 2016) taught by 1 instructor completed peer evaluations of their teammates using an online instrument available for purchase as part of the BSG (n=181). Peer evaluations were completed anonymously. (Although some other BUS 497 instructors assigned the Business Strategy Game in 2015-16, because of monetary cost, only 1 assigned the BSG peer evaluation. In total, 20 sections of BUS 497 were taught in Fall 2015 and 21 sections were taught in Spring 2016.)

The BSG peer evaluation instrument calls for each student to assess team members on 3 dimensions: “co-manager meetings” (assessed by answering 3 multiple choice questions about each team member’s attendance, promptness, and preparation for meetings); “effectiveness in helping run the company” (assessed by answering 4 multiple choice questions about each team member’s analytic, strategic, and decision-making contributions); and “effectiveness as a member of the company’s management team” (assessed by answering 5 multiple choice questions about each team member’s enthusiasm and commitment, cooperation, leadership, share of workload, and overall performance). The BSG assigns points to each response option associated with each multiple choice question, and these were averaged for each student across relevant questions to obtain a score for each of the 3 dimensions. The wording of the response options and the accompanying scores were used to derive scores to indicate performance that was very good, good enough, and not good enough. Scores were further averaged to derive an overall rating for each student. Because students tend to be quite generous in rating their peers, rather strict criteria were applied when assigning the cutoff points to represent average scores that qualified as very good, good enough, and not good enough.

On the dimension “co-manager meetings,” the performance of 72.4% of students was deemed very good, the performance of 18.2% was deemed good enough, and the performance of 9.4% was deemed not good enough. On the dimension “effectiveness in helping run the company,” the performance of 43.6% of students was deemed very good, the performance of 54.1% was deemed good enough, and the performance of 2.2% was deemed not good enough. On the dimension “effectiveness as a member of the company’s management team,” the performance of 43.6% of students was deemed very good, the performance of 45.9% was deemed good enough, and the performance of 10.5% was deemed not good enough. Finally, overall scores were 76.8% very good, 13.3% good enough, and 9.9% not good enough. These results are shown in tabular form in Table 13.

**Table 13: “Work Effectively in Teams” Assessed in Upper Division Core Classes, BUS 302 and BUS 497A**

**(Direct, Course Embedded Measures)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course | Rubric Dimension | Very Good | Good Enough | Not Good Enough |
| BUS 302 (n=442) | Contribution to Meetings and Task Completion | 51.6% | 42.3% | 6.1% |
|  | Facilitation | 45.0% | 50.2% | 4.8% |
|  | Constructive Team Climate | 54.3% | 43.0% | 2.7% |
|  | Response to Conflict | 48.0% | 47.5% | 4.5% |
|  | Overall Assessment of Effective Teamwork in BUS 302 | 50.7% | 46.4% | 2.9% |
| BUS 497A (n=181) | Co-Manager Meetings | 72.4% | 18.2% | 9.4% |
|  | Effectiveness in Helping Run the Company | 43.6% | 54.1% | 2.2% |
|  | Effectiveness as a Member of the Company’s Management Team | 43.6% | 45.9% | 10.5% |
|  | Overall Assessment of Effective Teamwork in BUS 497 | 76.8% | 13.3% | 9.9% |

The 2015-16 assessment scores for “work effectively in teams” as assessed with course embedded measures in BUS 302 and BUS 497A were comparable to those recorded when SLO 7 was last assessed in 2013-14. Overall scores in BUS 302 in 2013-14 were 78% very good, 17% good enough, and 5% not good enough (n=78, 1 team randomly chosen from each of 14 class sections). It should be noted that for BUS 302, stricter criteria were used in 2015-16 than in 2013-14 for determining scores that qualified as very good, good enough, and not good enough. Scores in BUS 497A in 2013-14 were 85% very good, 14% good enough, and 2% not good enough (n=132 from 6 of 22 class sections). The same criteria were used in 2013-14 and in 2015-16 for determining scores that qualified as very good, good enough, and not good enough.

The Nazarian College sets a standard of at least 70% of students with very good and good enough performance on course embedded measures of SLO 7. This benchmark was met in 2015-16 in both BUS 302 and BUS 497A, as the teamwork of 97.1% and 90.1% of students, respectively, was judged to be very good or good enough. Further, the benchmark was exceeded on every rubric dimension for both BUS 302 and BUS 497A.

**Indirect Measure through Exit Survey:**

The direct embedded measures for SLO 7 discussed above were supplemented by an indirect measure to assess students’ perceptions of their learning. At the end of each academic year, graduating seniors from the Nazarian College are asked to respond to an exit survey, which since 2014-15 has contained questions pertaining to each of the Nazarian College’s undergraduate business learning goals. Pertaining to SLO 7, graduating seniors were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the following statement, “I have developed the ability to work effectively in teams.” Responses are shown in Table 14 for academic years 2014-15 and 2015-16, indicating a high level of student satisfaction or confidence with learning relevant to SLO 7. Caution should be used in interpreting this measure, as it is a measure of student perception, not a direct measure of learning.

**Table 14: “Work Effectively in Teams” Assessed through Exit Survey**

**(Supplemental Indirect Measure)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exit Survey Question: “I have developed the ability to work effectively in teams.’ | | | | | | | |
|  | Strongly Agree | Agree | TOTAL\*  Strongly Agree + Agree | Neither Agree nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | TOTAL\*  Do Not Agree/  Disagree + Strongly Disagree |
| 2015 (n=519) | 55.7% | 34.1% | 89.8% | 7.7% | 1.2% | 1.3% | 10.2%/ 2.5% |
| 2016 (n=521) | 56.4% | 35.3% | 91.7% | 6.1% | 0.6% | 1.5% | 3.3%/ 2.1% |

\*Totals may be off by 0.1% due to rounding

* **If implemented assessment option B, identify what conclusions were drawn from the analysis of measured results, what changes to the program were planned in response, and the relation between this year’s analyses and past and future assessment activities.**
  + **SLO 4: Our students understand the global context of modern business.**

The David Nazarian College of Business and Economics sets a standard of at least 70% of students with very good and good enough performance on course embedded measures of SLO 4 in upper division business core courses. This benchmark was met for 2015-16 when SLO 4 was assessed in the two upper division core courses selected for assessment of SLO 4, FIN 303 and SOM 306. For FIN 303, 88.0% of students performed at a level deemed very good or good enough. For SOM 306, 80.4% of students performed at a level deemed very good or good enough. These percentages are comparable with those recorded during the last assessment of SLO 4 in 2013-14.

Students’ understanding of the global context of modern business was also assessed through a supplemental non-embedded measure, a subtest (5 questions) within the standardized 90-question CSU-BAT (Business Assessment Test) required of BUS 497 students. Although no specific benchmark has been set, it is instructive to compare results with other business schools who administer the CSU-BAT. For the Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 semesters, Nazarian College students’ average (mean) scores on the global subtest of the CSU-BAT were comparable with the averages for other business schools. CSUN’s average was slightly lower than the average of all business schools administering the CSU-BAT in Fall 2015 and slightly higher than the same comparative average in Spring 2016.

Responses to the annual exit survey of graduating seniors (an indirect measure) indicate a relatively high level of student satisfaction or confidence with learning relevant to SLO 4.

* + - **SLO 5: Our students understand the cross-functional nature of business problems.**

The Nazarian College sets a standard of at least 70% of students with very good and good enough performance on course embedded measures of SLO 5. This benchmark was met in 2015-16 for the overall assessment (86% very good and good enough) and for 2 of the 3 individual dimensions measured. For the dimension “cross-functional perspective,” 96% of students performed at a level deemed very good or good enough. For the dimension “information integration,” 91% of students performed at a level deemed very good or good enough. However, for the dimension, “holistic solutions,” only 69% of students’ work was deemed very good or good enough, and 31% was deemed not good enough. It is not clear whether the higher percentage of work deemed not good enough on the holistic solutions dimension was due to deficient skills and learning or because the assignments collected for assessment from BUS 497A were not well aligned to the rubric and the holistic solutions dimension of SLO 5.

As compared with results from 2013-14, the last time SLO 5 was measured, some differences are apparent. While the combined percentages deemed very good and good enough were comparable between 2013-14 and 2015-16, far higher percentages in 2013-14 were judged to be very good. Also, a greater number of papers in 2015-16 were judged to be not good enough on the dimension “holistic solutions” (31% in 2015-16 versus 10% in 2013-14).

One possible explanation for these differences is that the 100 BUS 497A papers assessed in 2015-16 were pulled from only 5 course sections taught by 2 instructors, as compared with smaller samples from a wider range of BUS 497A course sections in 2013-14. Perhaps the assignments given in 2015-16 were not as well aligned with the dimensions measured for SLO 5, especially the dimension “holistic solutions.” Another contributing factor might be that the assessment of SLO 5 in 2013-14 was conducted by only 1 assessor, a teaching instructor, as compared with 2 (and sometimes 3) outside assessors in 2015-16. It is possible that the assessors in 2015-16 applied the rubric criteria more strictly.

Responses to the annual exit survey of graduating seniors (an indirect measure) indicate a high level of student satisfaction or confidence with learning relevant to SLO 5.

* + - **SLO 6: Our students understand and apply key business concepts.**

For the BUS 302L lower division core (LDC) examinations, the Nazarian College sets a standard of at least 85% of students passing (no more than 15% failing) each semester. This benchmark was met in 2015-16 for all examinations other than statistics. The inclusive failure rates for the statistics exam were higher than 15% in both the Fall 2015 semester (17.1%) and the Spring 2016 semester (20.5%). The exclusive failure rate for the statistics exam was greater than 15% in the Spring 2016 semester (16.6%). Additionally, inclusive failure rates for the management accounting exam have hovered near 15% since Fall 2014.

Overall, the 2015-16 assessment scores for “key business concepts” as assessed with the BUS 302L LDC exams were lower than in recent years, including when SLO 6 was last assessed in 2013-14. Passing rates have held relatively steady with minor fluctuations for LDC examinations covering business law, microeconomics, and macroeconomics. Passing rates for LDC examinations have generally declined for financial accounting and to a lesser degree for management accounting. Passing rates have declined for statistics and have fallen short of the Nazarian College benchmark of 85%.

After examining the 2013-14 results for the BUS 302L statistics exam, an analysis was conducted to determine if passing and failure rates differed between transfer students and students who entered CSUN as freshmen. Additionally, analysis was conducted of results from students who entered CSUN as freshmen to determine if passing and failure rates differed between those who completed MATH 140 and those who completed SOM 120, and if passing and failure rates differed between those who completed MATH 140 online versus in a traditional classroom setting. No meaningful differences were found between transfer students and those who entered CSUN as freshmen, or between those who took the online versus traditional MATH 140. Passing rates were found to be somewhat higher among students who took SOM 120 versus MATH 140.

For course embedded measures in upper division core courses (FIN 303, MKT 304, SOM 306, and MGT 360), the Nazarian College sets a standard of at least 70% of students with very good and good enough performance. This benchmark was met in 2015-16. Results for FIN 303 were 85.1% very good and good enough. Results for MKT 304 were 87.9% very good and good enough. Results for SOM 306 were 74.4% very good and good enough. Results for MGT 360 were 82.1% very good and good enough. The percentages for FIN 303 and MKT 304 are comparable with those recorded during the last assessment of SLO 6 in 2013-14, and scores for MKT 304 showed improvement. SLO 6 was assessed for the first time in MGT 360 in 2015-16, so no comparative data are available. The percentages for SOM 306 were somewhat lower in 2015-16 than in 2013-14 (74% very good and good enough in 2015-16 versus 84% in 2013-14). The 2015-16 results for SOM 306 exceed the 70% benchmark, but the Systems and Operations Management Department has already suggested that SOM 306 instructors will examine the causes for the lower scores, take proactive measures, and monitor future assessment results.

Supplemental to the direct course embedded measures discussed above, SLO 6 was assessed in 2015-16 through 9 subtests within the standardized CSU-BAT (Business Assessment Test) required of BUS 497 students. These 9 subtests cover accounting, business law, economics, finance, management, management information systems, marketing, statistics, and supply chain management. Although no specific benchmark has been set, it is instructive to compare results with other business schools that administer the CSU-BAT. For both the Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 semesters, Nazarian College students’ average (mean) scores on most subtests were comparable to or exceeded the averages for other business schools.

For Fall 2015, CSUN scored higher than average among all the business schools utilizing the CSU-BAT on all subtests except management information systems and marketing. CSUN’s average scores ranked 1st for accounting and business law; and 2nd for economics, finance, management, statistics, and supply chain management. CSUN’s average scores ranked lower for management information systems (6th) and marketing (7th), but were only slightly below the average of all participating business schools. For Spring 2016, CSUN scored higher than the average among all business schools utilizing the CSU-BAT on all subtests except management and management information systems. CSUN’s average scores ranked 1st for business law, 2nd for statistics, 3rd for marketing and supply chain management, 4th for economics, and 5th for accounting and finance. CSUN’s average scores ranked lower for management (6th) and management information systems (6th), but were only slightly below the average of all the participating business schools.

The CSU-BAT results for 2015-16 are not directly comparable with results from prior years as the CSU-BAT exam questions were revised and scores for all participating business schools differ in range from previous years. Further, CSUN did not require the CSU-BAT of all BUS 497 students until Spring 2014. However, a comparison of ranking shows the Nazarian College to have a history of strong performance on the CSU-BAT relative to other participating business schools.

Spring 2016 was the first semester that CSUN administered the online CSU-BAT rather than the paper/pencil/SCANTRON version of the exam. The introduction of the online format does not appear to have affected exam scores. Further, CSUN’s comparative rankings and relative scores have remained stable over several consecutive semesters. Given the stability and robustness of CSU-BAT results, the Nazarian College intends in the future to collect CSU-BAT data only during years when SLO 6 is formally assessed (every other year according to the College’s staggered assessment cycle).

It should be noted that while performance on the BUS 302L statistics exam has fallen short of the benchmark (see discussion above), performance on the statistics subtest of the CSU-BAT has been strong when compared with other business schools administering the CSU-BAT. CSUN’s ranking on the statistics subtest of the CSU-BAT was 2nd among all participating business schools during all semesters that the exam has been administered at CSUN (Spring 2013, Spring 2014, Fall 2015, and Spring 2016).

Finally, responses to the annual exit survey of graduating seniors (an indirect measure) indicate a high level of student satisfaction or confidence with learning relevant to SLO 6, with differences some across functional areas. Student satisfaction or confidence with learning was generally highest for management, marketing, and business law; and slightly lower for the more quantitative subjects, accounting, economics, finance, and systems and operations management.

* + - **SLO 7: Our students can work effectively in teams.**

The Nazarian College sets a standard of at least 70% of students with very good and good enough performance on course embedded measures of SLO 7. This benchmark was met in 2015-16 in both BUS 302 and BUS 497A, as the performance of 97.1% and 90.1% of students, respectively, was judged by their teammates to be very good or good enough. Further, the benchmark was exceeded on every rubric dimension for both BUS 302 and BUS 497A.

Responses to the annual exit survey of graduating seniors (an indirect measure) indicate a high level of student satisfaction or confidence with learning relevant to SLO 7.

* **If implemented option C, identify the program modifications that were adopted, and the relation between program modifications and past and future assessment activities**

In 2015-16, the David Nazarian College of Business and Economics used the results from 2014-15 assessment of SLO Group 1 to perform program/curriculum review (closing-the-loop activity). The 3 SLOs in SLO Group 1 are:

* SLO 1: Our students have strong written and oral communication skills.
* SLO 2: Our students have strong problem-solving and critical thinking skills, including the application of information technology.
* SLO 3: Our students understand ethics and social responsibility.

The 2014-15 assessment results were examined first by the departments and units from which assessment data were collected, and then by the Assurance of Learning and Accreditation Committee (AoL Committee). These parties forwarded recommendations relevant to both the assessment process and the undergraduate curriculum to the Assurance of Learning Director for presentation to the Curriculum Management and Planning Committee (CMAP). Subsequently, CMAP examined the 2014-15 assessment results and the input of these groups and developed recommendations to address areas of concern. These were summarized in a memorandum from the Assurance of Learning Director and CMAP to Dean Kenneth Lord for discussion with responsible parties, primarily the coordinators of BUS 302 and BUS 497A. Dean Lord’s initial conversations with the coordinators were held in May 2016, and follow up conversations are to be held in early Fall 2016. CMAP has asked to review the responses and implementation plans during the Fall 2016 semester, at its October or November meeting.

* **SLO 1: Our students have strong written and oral communication skills.**

CMAP offered several suggestions regarding oral communication. These included providing instructional videos on the BUS 302 website and encouraging students to review them, increasing the emphasis on instruction and grading of oral communication in BUS 302, and making greater use of practice presentations and peer feedback prior to graded presentations. Additionally, it was suggested that requiring BUS 302 students to make brief presentations via video could both simplify the logistics of oral communication assessment and provide students with valuable oral communication experience.

CMAP also offered suggestions regarding written communication. These included providing BUS 302 and BUS 497 students with exemplars and a rubric to demonstrate effective and ineffective writing, encouraging students to use the Learning Resource Center, building student confidence, and offering workshops.

In August 2016 the College implemented a new procedure to proactively contact and provide direction to students who have attempted but not passed the UDWPE. Such students receive notification from the Associate Dean that ability to register for 400-level courses is contingent upon first passing the UDWPE, and appropriate resources are suggested depending on the number of times a student has attempted the exam. Students who have failed the exam once are encouraged to utilize the services of the Learning Resource Center (LRC). Students who have failed the exam twice are encouraged to utilize the LRC and/or register for ENG 90. Students who have failed the exam three times are encouraged to utilize the LRC and/or register for ENG 90 or ENG 90P. Students who have failed the exam four or more times are encouraged to register for ENG 90 or ENG 90P.

* **SLO 2: Our students have strong problem-solving and critical thinking skills, including the application of information technology.**

CMAP suggested that BUS 497A assignments be modified to fit the expectations of the assessment rubric. Specific suggestions included collecting assignments closer to the end of the semester after students have had more training and feedback, and requiring a common assignment across all BUS 497A sections with instructions that the 2 measured dimensions (“identify business problems and key assumptions” and “clearly justified solution”) are important criteria for grading.

Further, CMAP suggested that problem-solving and critical thinking might be emphasized in other courses in the curriculum, and that it might be assessed in both BUS 302 and BUS 497A. To foster the important capability, “identify business problems and key assumptions,” CMAP suggested that faculty consider developing a 1-unit course to focus on this skill.

The rubric dimension “use of analytical skills” was not assessed in 2014-15. This dimension focuses on spreadsheet mechanics and report data, and no assignment in BUS 497A allows for such assessment. CMAP recommended that consideration be given to where this dimension can be assessed.

* + **SLO 3: Our students understand ethics and social responsibility.**

CMAP recommended that the College should ensure that ethics remains a major focus of BUS 302. Specific suggestions included allocating more class time to analyzing cases involving ethics, and giving particular emphasis to using ethical frameworks to justify a course of action. To improve assessment, it was suggested that identical case analysis instructions be provided across course sections and in alignment with the assessment rubric, and these should be provided both verbally and in writing.

* **In what way(s) the assessment activities may reflect the university’s commitment to diversity in all its dimensions but especially with respect to underrepresented groups.**

SLO 4 and SLO 7 most directly reflect the university’s commitment to diversity. SLO 4, “our students understand the global context of modern business,” recognizes the diversity inherent in global markets and workplaces. SLO 7, “our students can work effectively in teams,” is achieved through student experiences working with teammates from diverse backgrounds.

While SLO 5, “our students understand the cross-functional nature of business problems,” and SLO 6, “our students understand and apply key business concepts,” are less directly related to the university’s commitment to diversity, both take into account the role that diversity plays in management, marketing, business law, and other business disciplines.

Finally, Nazarian College instructors treat the work of all students with respect and seek to ensure that course assignments and activities respect the university’s commitment to diversity.

* **Any other assessment-related information you wish to include, including SLO revision (especially to ensure continuing alignment between program course offerings and both program and university student learning outcomes), and/or the creation and modification of new assessment instruments.**

Not applicable.

**3. Preview of Planned Assessment Activity for Next Year - Include a brief description and explanation of how next year’s assessment will contribute to a continuous program of ongoing assessment.**

The David Nazarian College of Business and Economics will continue to perform assessment and closing-the-loop activitiy according to our staggered assessment/assurance of learning cycle. In 2016-17, the College will perform assessment (measure student work and analyze the results) for SLO Group 1, while applying the results of the 2015-16 assessment of SLO Group 2 to program review/curriculum review/revision (i.e., closing-the-loop activity).

In 2016-17, the College will measure and analyze student work pertaining to the following 3 SLOs, which comprise SLO Group 1:

* SLO 1: Our students have strong written and oral communication skills.
* SLO 2: Our students have strong problem-solving and critical thinking skills, including the application of information technology.
* SLO 3: Our students understand ethics and social responsibility.

At the same time, the College will use the results from our 2015-16 assessment of SLO Group 2, which was discussed in the beginning sections of this report, to perform program/curriculum review (closing-the-loop activity).