

2012-2013 Annual Program Assessment Report

Please submit report to your department chair or program coordinator, the Associate Dean of your College and the assessment office by Monday, September 30, 2013. You may submit a separate report for each program which conducted assessment activities.

College: COBAE

Department: Finance, Management, Marketing, Systems & Operations Management

Program: All undergraduate programs in Business

Assessment liaison: Glen Whitman

1. Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s). Provide a brief overview of this year's assessment plan and process.

This academic year, we implemented our new staggered assessment cycle (approved by the faculty in May 2012). We performed assessment (that is, data collection) for SLO Group 1, while performing program review on SLO Group 2.

Departments with courses in the upper-division core (MKT 304, SOM 306, MGT 360, BUS 302) were responsible for constructing embedded instruments to assess SLO Group 1. With the assistance of their department chairs, instructors collected the data and then forwarded them to the Assessment Director (AD).

In addition to the four SLOs in Group 1, this report includes data for two SLOs that are in Group 2: Global Context, because a miscommunication caused one department to collect data even though it was unneeded; and Key Business Concepts, because this data is automatically collected in BUS 302L every year.

Meanwhile, the SLOs in Group 2 went through the program review process. The AD forwarded the previous year's data to the Dean, Associate Dean, and faculty at large. The AD made preliminary recommendations to the Administrative Council and Department Chairs. The Department Chairs crafted unit-level ("triage") responses, and sent further recommendations to the

Curriculum Review & Policy Committee (CRPC). Based on the recommendations of the AD and Department Chairs, as well as other factors, the CRPC crafted program-level responses.

2. **Assessment Buy-In.** Describe how your chair and faculty were involved in assessment related activities. Did department meetings include discussion of student learning assessment in a manner that included the department faculty as a whole?

For assessment, instructors and Department Chairs cooperated to create assessment instruments, sometimes with the help of a departmental committee. For program review, Department Chairs handled unit-level responses, again with the consultation of departmental faculty. The CRPC, which has representatives from across the COBAE faculty, handled program-level responses. In addition, the AD led a discussion during a Faculty Meeting about the demands of both assessment and program review.

3. **Student Learning Outcome Assessment Project.** Answer items a-f for each SLO assessed this year. If you assessed an additional SLO, copy and paste items a-f below, BEFORE you answer them here, to provide additional reporting space.

3a. Which Student Learning Outcome was measured this year?

Written and Oral Communication Skills

3b. Does this learning outcome align with one or more of the university's Big 5 Competencies? (Delete any which do not apply)

- Oral Communication
- Written Communication

3c. Does this learning outcome align with University's commitment to supporting diversity through the cultivation and exchange of a wide variety of ideas and points of view? In what ways did the assessed SLO incorporate diverse perspectives related to race, ethnic/cultural identity/cultural orientations, religion, sexual orientation, gender/gender identity, disability, socio-economic status, veteran status, national origin, age, language, and employment rank?

This SLO is unrelated to the university's commitment to diversity, except insofar as our instructors always seek to make sure their assignments and activities respect that commitment.

3d. What direct and/or indirect instrument(s) were used to measure this SLO?

BUS 302 (spring): Students' writing skills were assessed with a business ethics case that students wrote individually during one class period. The rubric used to evaluate students' ethics cases specified three elements specific to writing: the case analysis must be clearly written, well organized, and free of grammar and spelling mistakes. Business students' oral presentation skills were assessed with a formal case presentation. Students worked in teams to develop and present a Power Point presentation. Each student had to present a portion of the team presentation and was graded individually on performance. Students were provided with a *Presentation Evaluation Form*, which indicated how the total points were allocated among five categories: introduction, platform skills, use of visual aids, clear communication, and handling of questions and answers.

MKT 304 (fall and spring): Students' writing skills were assessed using an executive summary of a strategic marketing plan. (Although the marketing plan was a group project, the executive summary was an individual assignment.) The rubric used to evaluate writing in the executive summary included the following elements: purpose/main point, audience, organization, evidence, sentence style, correctness, and document design.

MGT 360: Students' writing skills were assessed using the writing (not content) portion of case analyses. The rubric used to evaluate writing specified a 4-point scale based on grammar, punctuation, organization, flow, and style.

3e. Describe the assessment design methodology: For example, was this SLO assessed longitudinally (same students at different points) or was a cross-sectional comparison used (Comparing freshmen with seniors)? If so, describe the assessment points used.

Assessment was performed using cross-sectional samples, which provide a snapshot of the student population at one point in time.

BUS 302: For writing, the work of 378 students in 11 class sections was assessed. For oral presentation, the work of 380 students in 11 class sections was assessed.

MKT 304: Random sampling was used to select the work of 127 students, from 5 lecture-hall sections over two semesters, to be assessed.

MGT 360: All instructors of MGT 360 sections were asked to perform assessment; 3 instructors did so. Two instructors used two cases studies, while the third instructor used one case study. The work 387 students across 3 instructors' sections was assessed.

3f. Assessment Results & Analysis of this SLO: Provide a summary of how the results were analyzed and highlight findings from the collected evidence.

BUS 302: 48% of students' writing was deemed very good, 37% good enough, and 15% not good enough. Additionally, 62% of students' oral presentations were deemed very good, 34% good enough, and 5% not good enough.

MKT 304: 75% of students' writing was deemed very good, 25% good enough, and 0% not good enough.

MGT 360: When all sections were combined into a single sample, 41% of students' writing was deemed very good, 56% good enough, and 3% not good enough. To construct these numbers, it was necessary to weight the samples of two instructors half as much as the third, because both of these instructors provided data from two case studies instead of one. Here is the disaggregated data:

Instructor	Very Good	Good Enough	Not Good Enough
1a	35%	62%	3%
1b	50%	50%	0%
2a	23%	76%	1%
2b	51%	48%	1%
3	49%	41%	10%

Also, it should be noted that instructor #3 used a 6-point scale instead of a 4-point scale, which (despite having been converted to a 4-point scale for comparison) might explain the difference in "not good enough" ratings.

ANALYSIS: COBAE sets a standard of at least 85% of students with good enough or very good performance for this learning goal. The results above indicate this goal is probably being met with respect to written communication, with successful results ranging from 0% to 15%. Last year's results were not as favorable, but those results included data from SOM 306, a course that was deemed inappropriate for assessing this goal. Now SOM 306 has been replaced by MGT 360, where writing is emphasized, and the results look better. With respect to oral communication, the goal is being met with 95% of students successful.

3g. Use of Assessment Results of this SLO: Describe how assessment results were used to improve student learning. Were assessment results from previous years or from this year used to make program changes in this reporting year? (Possible

changes include: changes to course content/topics covered, changes to course sequence, additions/deletions of courses in program, changes in pedagogy, changes to student advisement, changes to student support services, revisions to program SLOs, new or revised assessment instruments, other academic programmatic changes, and changes to the assessment plan.)

In previous years, MKT 304 had evaluated writing skills using a team assignment. Based on concerns that team products were inappropriate for evaluating individuals, this year MKT 304 used an individual assignment.

In previous years, writing skills had been evaluated in SOM 306. The SOM chair and instructors believed this didn't make sense because SOM 306 was not a writing-intensive course. Meanwhile, the MGT department had developed a new writing assignment and rubric for MGT 360 as part of a comprehensive course review. The faculty decided to reassign responsibility for assessing this SLO from SOM 306 to MGT 360.

3a. Which Student Learning Outcome was measured this year?

Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving (including Information Technology)

3b. Does this learning outcome align with one or more of the university's Big 5 Competencies? (Delete any which do not apply)

- Critical Thinking
- Information Literacy

3c. Does this learning outcome align with University's commitment to supporting diversity through the cultivation and exchange of a wide variety of ideas and points of view? In what ways did the assessed SLO incorporate diverse perspectives related to race, ethnic/cultural identity/cultural orientations, religion, sexual orientation, gender/gender identity, disability, socio-economic status, veteran status, national origin, age, language, and employment rank?

This SLO is unrelated to the university's commitment to diversity, except insofar as our instructors always seek to make sure their assignments and activities respect that commitment.

3d. What direct and/or indirect instrument(s) were used to measure this SLO?

FIN 303 (fall and spring): Multiple-choice exam questions were used to assess students' knowledge of investment decisions, financing decisions, and the use of financial data. All questions require students to have strong problem-solving skills.

MKT 304 (fall and spring): Students' critical thinking skills were assessed using an executive summary of a strategic marketing plan. (Although the marketing plan was a group project, the executive summary was an individual assignment.) The rubric used to evaluate critical thinking in the executive summary included the following components: purpose; key problem, question, or issue; point of view; information; concepts; assumptions, interpretations/inferences; and implications, consequences, and recommendations.

SOM 306 (spring): Individual instructors used different instruments, but in all cases, students' critical thinking and problem-solving skills were assessed based on their ability to analyze operations management questions. Specifically, within the graded assignment (case analysis, computer project, or exam questions), students were deemed to have good problem-solving skills if they could define the decision problem, select appropriate operations management concepts and/or models, and use software to perform their analysis.

BUS 497 (spring): Each instructor chose the most comprehensive analysis paper assigned to their students in their section. The papers randomly chosen for inclusion in the sample were evaluated according to a common rubric with the following components: internal analysis, external analysis, integration, alternative strategies, recommendation, and significance. (Each of these components included sub-components as well.)

3e. Describe the assessment design methodology: For example, was this SLO assessed longitudinally (same students at different points) or was a cross-sectional comparison used (Comparing freshmen with seniors)? If so, describe the assessment points used.

Assessment was performed using cross-sectional samples, which provide a snapshot of the student population at one point in time.

FIN 303: In fall (spring), the work of 322 (298) students in 2 (2) large class sections was assessed.

MKT 304: Random sampling was used to select the work of 127 students, from 5 lecture-hall sections over two semesters, to be assessed.

SOM 306: The work of 547 students, from the sections of 4 different instructors, was assessed.

BUS 497: The work of 40 students, randomly selected from 10 different class sections, was assessed.

3f. Assessment Results & Analysis of this SLO: Provide a summary of how the results were analyzed and highlight findings from the collected evidence.

FIN 303: In fall (spring), 83% (88%) of students correctly answered questions related to investment decisions; 72% (74%) correctly answered questions covering financing decisions; and 74% (81%) correctly answered questions covering use of financial data.

MKT 304: 41% of students' critical thinking was deemed very good, 59% good enough, and 0% not good enough.

SOM 306: 28% of students' work when analyzing operations problems was deemed very good, 53% good enough, and 19% not good enough.

BUS 497: 17.5% of students' critical thinking on a written assignment was deemed very good, 35% good enough, and 47.5% not good enough.

ANALYSIS: COBAE sets a standard of at least 70% of students with good enough or very good performance for this learning goal. In 300-level upper-division courses, the results above indicate that the standard is probably being met (with 72% to 100% of students successful across the three measures). However, the results from BUS 497 give cause for concern, with only 52.5% of students successful. Students' skills may deteriorate between 300-level and 400-level, or more likely, the graders may hold 400-level students to a higher standard. Also, since the assessed work was randomly selected from various assignments in different sections, it's possible that the common rubric is not appropriate for some of those assignments (i.e., the rubric may ask for things the assignment doesn't require). Further investigation is needed.

3g. Use of Assessment Results of this SLO: Describe how assessment results were used to improve student learning. Were assessment results from previous years or from this year used to make program changes in this reporting year? (Possible changes include: changes to course content/topics covered, changes to course sequence, additions/deletions of courses in program, changes in pedagogy, changes to student advisement, changes to student support services, revisions to program SLOs, new or revised assessment instruments, other academic programmatic changes, and changes to the assessment plan.)

This SLO is a new SLO resulting from the merger of three old SLOs: critical thinking, problem solving, and information technology skills. The first two were combined because it faculty did not perceive any important difference between the two. The third was added because it was determined that IT skills were being taught primarily in conjunction with problem-solving tasks, rather than as an independent skill set.

In previous years, MKT 304 had evaluated critical thinking and problem solving using a team assignment. Based on concerns that team products were inappropriate for evaluating individuals, this year MKT 304 used an individual assignment. Also in previous years, BUS

302 had been used to evaluate critical thinking, but the instrument used was a team assignment. In the merger of critical thinking and problem solving SLOs, BUS 302 was relieved of its assessment responsibility in this area.

In previous years, BUS 497 had not been used systematically for assessment. Starting this year, BUS 497 began assessing this SLO.

3a. Which Student Learning Outcome was measured this year?

Ethics & Social Responsibility

3b. Does this learning outcome align with one or more of the university's Big 5 Competencies? (Delete any which do not apply)

3c. Does this learning outcome align with University's commitment to supporting diversity through the cultivation and exchange of a wide variety of ideas and points of view? In what ways did the assessed SLO incorporate diverse perspectives related to race, ethnic/cultural identity/cultural orientations, religion, sexual orientation, gender/gender identity, disability, socio-economic status, veteran status, national origin, age, language, and employment rank?

Although this SLO might be construed to include concerns about diversity, none of instruments used to assess it specifically addressed diversity issues.

3d. What direct and/or indirect instrument(s) were used to measure this SLO?

BUS 302 (spring): Students' knowledge of ethics was assessed with a business ethics case that students wrote individually during one class period. The rubric used to evaluate students' ethics cases contains five elements specific to ethics: identify the ethical issues, identify and explain two ethical theories used to evaluate conduct, identify stakeholders, identify solutions, and recommend policy.

FIN 303 (fall and spring): Multiple-choice exam questions covered students' knowledge of financial ethics and regulatory requirements.

MGT 360 (spring): Multiple-choice questions covered students' knowledge of ethical theories and ethics within organizations. The same questions were used in both this class and MGT 497.

BUS 497 (spring): Multiple-choice questions covered students' knowledge of ethical theories and ethics within organizations. The same questions were used in both this class and MGT 360.

3e. Describe the assessment design methodology: For example, was this SLO assessed longitudinally (same students at different points) or was a cross-sectional comparison used (Comparing freshmen with seniors)? If so, describe the assessment points used.

Assessment was performed using cross-sectional samples, which provide a snapshot of the student population at one point in time.

BUS 302: The work of 378 students in 11 class sections was assessed.

FIN 303: In fall (spring), the work of 322 (298) students in 2 (2) large class sections was assessed.

MGT 360: The work of 653 students in the classes of 5 different instructors was assessed.

BUS 497: The work of 348 students in 15 class sections was assessed.

3f. Assessment Results & Analysis of this SLO: Provide a summary of how the results were analyzed and highlight findings from the collected evidence.

BUS 302: 57% of students' understanding of ethics based on their written case analysis was deemed very good, 21% good enough, and 22% unacceptable.

FIN 303: In fall (spring), 82% (85%) of students correctly answered questions covering financial ethics and regulatory requirements.

MGT 360: 25% of students' knowledge of ethics and corporate responsibility was deemed very good, 45% good enough, and 30% not good enough. However, only two of the five instructors actually taught this topic during the course. Looking at just those two instructors' 204 students, 53% were deemed very good, 40% good enough, and 7% not good enough. Looking at the 449 students whose instructors did not cover this material, 12% were deemed very good, 48% good enough, and 40% not good enough.

BUS 497: 26% of students' knowledge of ethics and corporate responsibility was deemed very good, 30% good enough, and 44% not good enough.

ANALYSIS: COBAE sets a standard of at least 70% of students with good enough or very good performance for this learning goal. The results above indicate the standard is probably not being met. The proportion of successful students exceeded the standard in FIN 303

and BUS 302 (82%/85% and 78%). However, performance in MGT 360 and BUS 497 was substantially worse, with only 70% and 56% successful, respectively.

The poor performance in MGT 360 and BUS 497 is most likely attributable to the fact that ethics and social responsibility were not taught in most sections of these courses. The standard was easily met (93% successful) in MGT 360 sections where the topic was taught.

Furthermore, some or all BUS 497 instructors did not let the students' scores on the ethics-related questions affect their course grades. Without that incentive, students may not have taken the questions seriously. The instructors in question did not let the scores affect final grades because they were uncomfortable grading students on material not covered in class.

All the explanations point in one direction: We need to think about where and when this topic is taught in the curriculum, with special attention to reinforcement.

3g. Use of Assessment Results of this SLO: Describe how assessment results were used to improve student learning. Were assessment results from previous years or from this year used to make program changes in this reporting year? (Possible changes include: changes to course content/topics covered, changes to course sequence, additions/deletions of courses in program, changes in pedagogy, changes to student advisement, changes to student support services, revisions to program SLOs, new or revised assessment instruments, other academic programmatic changes, and changes to the assessment plan.)

In previous years, this SLO was evaluated using BUS 302, FIN 303, and MGT 360 (although there was a one-year lapse for MGT 360). This year, we also assigned responsibility to BUS 497, which is run by the MGT department. Doing so gives us a means of tracking progress over time, by comparing snapshots at two different points in the academic program.

3a. Which Student Learning Outcome was measured this year?

Global Context of Business

3b. Does this learning outcome align with one or more of the university's Big 5 Competencies? (Delete any which do not apply)

3c. Does this learning outcome align with University's commitment to supporting diversity through the cultivation and exchange of a wide variety of ideas and points of view? In what ways did the assessed SLO incorporate diverse perspectives

related to race, ethnic/cultural identity/cultural orientations, religion, sexual orientation, gender/gender identity, disability, socio-economic status, veteran status, national origin, age, language, and employment rank?

Although this SLO might be construed to include concerns about diversity, the instrument used to assess it did not specifically address diversity issues.

3d. What direct and/or indirect instrument(s) were used to measure this SLO?

Assessment was performed using a cross-sectional samples, which provide a snapshot of the student population at one point in time.

FIN 303 (fall and spring): Multiple-choice exam questions were used to assess students' knowledge of portfolio diversification, investment decisions, and financing decisions in a global context.

3e. Describe the assessment design methodology: For example, was this SLO assessed longitudinally (same students at different points) or was a cross-sectional comparison used (Comparing freshmen with seniors)? If so, describe the assessment points used.

FIN 303: In fall (spring), the work of 322 (298) students in 2 (2) large class sections was assessed.

3f. Assessment Results & Analysis of this SLO: Provide a summary of how the results were analyzed and highlight findings from the collected evidence.

FIN 303: In fall (spring), 82% (77%) of students correctly answered questions related to global context.

ANALYSIS: COBAE sets a standard of at least 70% of students with good enough or very good performance for this learning goal. The results above indicate the standard is being met (77% to 82% of students successful).

3g. Use of Assessment Results of this SLO: Describe how assessment results were used to improve student learning. Were assessment results from previous years or from this year used to make program changes in this reporting year? (Possible changes include: changes to course content/topics covered, changes to course sequence, additions/deletions of courses in program, changes in pedagogy, changes to student advisement, changes to student support services, revisions to program SLOs, new or revised assessment instruments, other academic programmatic changes, and changes to the assessment plan.)

In years prior to 2011-12, we did not have systematic embedded assessment of this SLO. In 2011-12, global context was assessed in a handful of courses to help determine where to rest ongoing responsibility for assessing this goal. It has tentatively been decided to have FIN 303 and SOM 306 continue assessing it, given that representatives of both departments have said the SLO fit nicely within their respective courses.

3. **Student Learning Outcome Assessment Project.** Answer items a-f for each SLO assessed this year. If you assessed an additional SLO, copy and paste items a-f below, BEFORE you answer them here, to provide additional reporting space.

3a. Which Student Learning Outcome was measured this year?

Key Business Concepts

3b. Does this learning outcome align with one or more of the university's Big 5 Competencies? (Delete any which do not apply)

3c. Does this learning outcome align with University's commitment to supporting diversity through the cultivation and exchange of a wide variety of ideas and points of view? In what ways did the assessed SLO incorporate diverse perspectives related to race, ethnic/cultural identity/cultural orientations, religion, sexual orientation, gender/gender identity, disability, socio-economic status, veteran status, national origin, age, language, and employment rank?

This SLO is unrelated to the university's commitment to diversity, except insofar as our instructors always seek to make sure their assignments and activities respect that commitment.

3d. What direct and/or indirect instrument(s) were used to measure this SLO?

BUS 302L (fall and spring): Students take a multiple-choice exam in each of the six lower-division core (LDC) business subjects: financial and managerial accounting; business law; micro and macroeconomics; and statistics. Students must score a minimum of 50% on each exam to pass BUS 302L and they have three opportunities to take each exam.

The "Key Business Concepts" SLO is part of our SLO Group 2, which was not scheduled for assessment this academic year. However, the BUS 302L exams take place every year, irrespective of the assessment schedule, and so the results are reported here.

3e. Describe the assessment design methodology: For example, was this SLO assessed longitudinally (same students at different points) or was a cross-sectional comparison used (Comparing freshmen with seniors)? If so, describe the assessment points used.

BUS 302L (fall and spring): The highest score on each LDC exam for all 768 (659) enrolled students was collected in fall (spring). Some enrolled students did not take some of the exams. “Inclusive” failure rates count such students as having failed any exam they did not take; “exclusive” failure rates exclude these students from the sample for any exam they did not take. This cross-sectional data constitutes a whole population rather than a sample, inasmuch as it captures every student who enrolled in BUS 302 in 2012-13, and every undergraduate business student must take this course at some point.

3f. Assessment Results & Analysis of this SLO: Provide a summary of how the results were analyzed and highlight findings from the collected evidence.

BUS 302L: The inclusive failure rate on the six tests ranged from 4.5% (8.5%) in business law to 13.2% (17.0%) in statistics in fall (spring). The inclusive failure rate counts students who did not take a given exam, despite being enrolled in BUS 302L, as having failed that exam. For the exclusive failure rate, which excludes students who didn’t take a given exam from the sample, the failure rates were lower: from 2.1% (3.5%) in business law to 10.3% (11.4%) in statistics in fall (spring).

ANALYSIS: In BUS 302L, a minimum of 85% of students must successfully pass each LDC exam to meet the College standard. It appears this goal is being met. Exclusive failure rates always showed the goal being met in both semesters for all subjects (with pass rates of ranging from 88.6% to 97.9%). Inclusive failure rates showed the goal being met for every subject (with pass rates from 85.0% to 91.5%) with the exception of statistics in the fall (83%).

3g. Use of Assessment Results of this SLO: Describe how assessment results were used to improve student learning. Were assessment results from previous years or from this year used to make program changes in this reporting year? (Possible changes include: changes to course content/topics covered, changes to course sequence, additions/deletions of courses in program, changes in pedagogy, changes to student advisement, changes to student support services, revisions to program SLOs, new or revised assessment instruments, other academic programmatic changes, and changes to the assessment plan.)

Last year, there was a spike in inclusive failure rates in the spring, which we suspected was an anomaly associated with a high number of students enrolling but failing to take the LDC exams. This year, the inclusive failure rates dropped back down, supporting our belief that

there was an anomaly. Interesting, this year there was a spike in exclusive failure rates, but it wasn't large enough to cause success rates to fall below our benchmark.

4. Assessment of Previous Changes: Present documentation that demonstrates how the previous changes in the program resulted in improved student learning.

5. Changes to SLOs? Please attach an updated course alignment matrix if any changes were made. (Refer to the Curriculum Alignment Matrix Template, http://www.csun.edu/assessment/forms_guides.html.)

We changed both the SLOs and the schedule for assessing them. The revised alignment matrix is included in the attached 5-Year Plan.

6. Assessment Plan: Evaluate the effectiveness of your 5 year assessment plan. How well did it inform and guide your assessment work this academic year? What process is used to develop/update the 5 year assessment plan? Please attach an updated 5 year assessment plan for 2013-2018. (Refer to Five Year Planning Template, plan B or C, http://www.csun.edu/assessment/forms_guides.html.)

The updated 5-Year Plan is attached. This plan reflects the new staggered assessment schedule, which was implemented this year. Thus far, we believe the staggered plan is working well. Because program review proceeded too slowly in previous years, we have adopted a Closing-the-Loop Process Form to guide the process.

7. Has someone in your program completed, submitted or published a manuscript which uses or describes assessment activities in your program? Please provide citation or discuss.

No.

8. Other information, assessment or reflective activities or processes not captured above.

None.