

2016-2017 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, Director of the Office of Academic Assessment and Program Review, by September 30, 2017. 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

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

Program: All Undergraduate Business Programs

Assessment liaison: Barbara Gross and Ray Calnan

1. Please check off whichever is applicable:

- A. Measured student work within program major/options.
- B. Analyzed results of measurement within program major/options.
- C. Applied results of analysis to program review/curriculum/review/revision major/options.
- D. Focused exclusively on the direct assessment measurement of General Education Basic Skills outcomes

2. 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 2016-17 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 academic years, the 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" activities.

In AY 2016-17, the Nazarian College measured and analyzed 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 used the results from the AY 2015-16 assessment of SLO Group 2 to perform program/ curriculum review (closing-the-loop activities). The 4 SLOs in SLO Group 2 are:

- 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.

- **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 2016-17, the College measured and analyzed 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.

Measurement of each SLO is described in the following pages.

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

Oral and written communication skills were assessed through direct course-embedded measures, assignments required of students in BUS 302, Gateway Experience, and in BUS 497A, Capstone-Strategic Management. These 2 required courses are part of the upper division core curriculum for students in all business majors. Assessment of SLO 1 occurred during the Spring 2017 semester.

Oral Communication

Direct Course-Embedded Measure in BUS 302:

Business students’ oral communication skills were assessed through a direct embedded measure, a formal case presentation assigned in BUS 302. Although students in BUS 302 analyzed and presented the assigned case in teams, each student was responsible for a portion of the oral presentation and was assessed on his or her individual work. Students’ oral communication was evaluated using a standardized common rubric created by the College’s Curriculum Management and Policy Committee (CMAP). The rubric was created specifically for assessment purposes, independent of grading, and was used for the first time in AY 2014-15 and for the second time in AY 2016-17. Each student’s individual oral presentation was assessed as being “very good,” “good enough,” or “not good enough” on 2 dimensions, “organization” and “delivery.”

The oral presentations of 231 students were assessed. These were students across 22 course sections of BUS 302 taught by 9 instructors. An outside assessor visited class sessions over a 3-week period in April and May 2017, when students were giving oral presentations. Individual student oral communication was assessed by the outside assessor and by the teaching instructor in each class section. Each assessor used the standardized rubric created by CMAP, and assessment scores assigned by the outside assessor and assessment scores assigned by the teaching instructors were calculated separately. Inter-rater reliability between the outside assessor and the teaching instructors was calculated by comparing scores assigned for each student.

Table 1 shows the percentages of students assessed by the outside assessor and by the teaching instructors as performing at levels deemed “very good,” “good enough,” and “not good enough” on the 2 dimensions of oral communication assessed. In general, students scored better on the dimension “organization” than on the dimension “delivery.”

**Table 1: Oral Communication Assessed in BUS 302
(Direct Course-Embedded Measure)**

	Very Good		Good Enough		Not Good Enough	
	Outside Assessors' Scores*	Teaching Professors' Scores*	Outside Assessors' Scores*	Teaching Professors' Scores*	Outside Assessors' Scores*	Teaching Professors' Scores*
Organization	33.3%	34.6%	56.7%	55.0%	10.0%	10.4%
Delivery	28.6%	28.6%	53.7%	52.8%	17.8%	18.6%

*Totals across dimensions may be off by 0.1% due to rounding

On the dimension “organization,” the outside assessor found 33.3% of the students’ work to be very good, 56.7% to be good enough, and 10.0% to be not good enough. Teaching instructors’ scores were similar, with 34.6% of the students’ work deemed very good, 55.0% good enough, and 10.4% not good enough. Inter-rater reliability was 90.0%.

On the dimension “delivery,” the outside assessor found 28.6% of the students’ work to be very good, 53.7% to be good enough, and 17.8% to be not good enough. Teaching instructors’ scores were similar, with 28.6% of the students’ work deemed very good, 52.8% good enough, and 18.6% not good enough. Inter-rater reliability was 91.3%.

Overall, the AY 2016-17 direct assessment scores for oral communication are comparable with those recorded when oral communication was last assessed in AY 2014-15. In AY 2014-15, teaching instructors (8 instructors teaching 18 course sections of BUS 302) assessed a sample of 235 students’ oral communication during their case presentations. On the dimension “organization,” teaching instructors rated the students’ performance as 32% very good, 60% good enough, and 7% not good enough. On the dimension “delivery,” teaching instructors rated the students’ performance as 29% very good, 49% good enough, and 22% not good enough.

As a pilot in AY 2014-15, an outside assessor assessed a convenience sample of 58 students from 5 course sections of BUS 302 taught by 3 instructors. On this smaller convenience sample, the outside assessor rated the students’ performance on the dimension “organization” as 16% very good, 79% good enough, and 5% not good enough. On the dimension “delivery,” the outside assessor rated the students’ performance as 22% very good, 64% good enough, and 14% not good enough. The scores of the outside assessor varied somewhat from the aggregated scores of the teaching instructors, with teaching instructors more frequently categorizing students’ performance as either “very good” or “not good enough,” and less frequently categorizing it as “good enough.” Because the teaching instructors and the outside assessor did not assess the same students in AY 2014-15, it is not known if these differences were due to different standards or to differences in the samples. The methodology used in AY 2016-17 represents an improvement because the outside assessor and the teaching instructors evaluated the same students and inter-rater reliability was calculated.

The David Nazarian College of Business and Economics sets a standard of at least 85% of students with “very good” and “good enough” performance for SLO 1, and no more than 15% “not good enough.” Assessment results from AY 2016-17 for the oral communication component of SLO 1 indicate that this goal is being met on the dimension “organization,” with 90.0% or 89.6% of students scoring very good and good enough as determined by the outside assessor and by the teaching instructors, respectively. The outside assessor and the teaching instructors, respectively, found 10.0% and 10.4% of students’ performance to be not good enough. However, assessment results suggest that performance falls short of the standard for the dimension “delivery.” The outside assessor classified 82.3% of students as scoring very good and good enough and 17.8% as scoring not good enough. Similarly, the

teaching instructors classified 81.4% of students as scoring very good and good enough and 18.6% as scoring not good enough.

Indirect Measure through Exit Survey:

The direct course-embedded measure of the oral communication component of SLO 1 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. Since AY 2014-15, the exit survey has contained questions pertaining to each of the Nazarian College’s undergraduate business learning goals. Pertaining to SLO 1, graduating seniors were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement, “I have developed strong oral communication and presentation skills.” Responses are shown in Table 2 for academic years 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17, indicating a relatively high level of student satisfaction or confidence with learning relevant to this component of SLO 1. However, caution should be used in interpreting this measure as it is a measure of student perception, not a direct measure of learning.

**Table 2: Oral Communication Assessed through Exit Survey
(Supplemental Indirect Measure)**

Exit Survey Question: “I have developed strong oral communication and presentation skills.							
	Strongly Agree	Agree	TOTAL* Strongly Agree + Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	TOTAL* Do Not Agree/ Disagree + Strongly Disagree
2017 (n=482)	48.3%	41.1%	89.4%	8.1%	1.0%	1.5%	10.6%/ 2.5
2016 (n=521)	48.9%	40.9%	89.8%	8.1%	1.2%	1.0%	10.2%/ 2.1%
2015 (n=522)	46.6%	42.5%	89.1%	7.9%	1.7%	1.3%	10.9%/ 3.0%

Written Communication

Business students’ written communication skills were assessed through direct embedded measures, written assignments required in BUS 302 and in BUS 497A. In BUS 302, students’ writing skills were assessed with a business ethics case that students wrote individually in the classroom during one class period. In BUS 497A, instructors who had required an individually written case analysis (prepared outside of class) were asked to submit their students’ work for use in assessment. These direct course-embedded measures were supplemented by student performance on the university’s Upper Division Writing Proficiency Examination (UDWPE), a direct non-embedded measure. This examination is required of all CSUN students and the Nazarian College of Business and Economics requires that students pass the examination prior to enrolling in 400-level courses.

Direct Course-Embedded Measure in BUS 302:

An individually written in-class business ethics case assignment in BUS 302 was used to assess written communication. The sample consisted of 100 papers randomly selected from 18 course sections taught by 7 instructors, with papers drawn proportionally from each course section. Written work was assessed independently by 2 outside assessors who were employed to read and rate all 100 papers using a standardized rubric created by the

College’s Curriculum Management and Policy Committee (CMAP). The rubric was created specifically for assessment purposes, independent of grading, and was used for the first time in AY 2014-15 and for the second time in AY 2016-17. Each student’s individual written work was assessed as being “very good,” “good enough,” or “not good enough” on the dimensions “purpose and organization” and “language.” 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 the 2 dimensions, therefore, can range from a possible 2 to 6 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 3 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 7 papers were thus flagged, all with summed differences of 3.

Finally, the ratings of the 2 assessors (n=93 papers) or 3 assessors (n=7 papers) were averaged across each dimension to arrive at summary ratings for each student. On each dimension, an average score of 3 was deemed to be “very good,” an average score of 1.7-2.9 was deemed to be “good enough,” and an average score of less than 1.7 was deemed to be “not good enough.” To derive the overall composite score for each student, ratings were averaged across all 3 dimensions and the same numeric criteria were applied.

It should be noted that the written communication rubric created by CMAP contains a third dimension, “document construction,” to assess formatting and citations. However, this dimension was not used for assessment of written communication through BUS 302 assignments. This is because the BUS 302 assignments were handwritten in class using blue/green books or notebook paper, so formatting was minimal and citation was not part of the assignment.

Results of this assessment are summarized in Table 3. On the dimension “purpose and organization,” 19% of the students’ work was deemed very good, 72% good enough, and 9% not good enough. On the dimension “language,” 15% of the students’ work was deemed very good, 82% good enough, and 3% not good enough. To derive an overall composite score for student performance on SLO 1, values assigned by the assessors to both dimensions were summed and averaged. Student work with an average score of 3 (very good) across both dimensions was categorized as “very good,” student work with an average score across both dimensions of 1.7-2.9 was categorized as “good enough,” and student work with an average score of less than 1.7 across both dimensions was categorized as “not good enough.” Thus, student work was held to a higher standard to be regarded as “very good” overall in that it had to be deemed very good on both dimensions. On the basis of these composite scores, 12% of the students’ work was deemed very good, 84% good enough, and 4% not good enough.

Table 3: Written Communication Assessed in BUS 302 (Direct Course-Embedded Measure)

n=100	Very Good	Good Enough	Not Good Enough
Purpose and Organization	19%	72%	9%
Language	15%	82%	3%
Overall	12%	84%	4%

SLO 1 was last assessed in BUS 302 in AY 2014-15, and the same rubric created by CMAP was used. That year the aggregate scores across the 2 relevant rubric dimensions were 26% very good, 66% good enough, and 8% not good enough (n=100 sampled from 20 class sections taught by 9 instructors). When the categories “very good” and “good enough” are combined, the results from AY 2016-17 show improvement over AY 2014-15. Results in AY 2014-15

were 92% very good or good enough and 8% not good enough. Results for AY 2016-17 are 96% very good or good enough and 4% not good enough.

The David Nazarian College of Business and Economics sets a standard of at least 85% of students with “very good” and “good enough” performance for SLO 1, and no more than 15% “not good enough.” Assessment results from AY 2016-17 indicate that this goal is being met for the written communication component of SLO 1 as measured in BUS 302. Overall scores for BUS 302 were 96% very good and good enough. BUS 302 students’ scores also met the standard for the 2 specific dimensions measured, “purpose and organization” and “language” (91% and 97%, respectively).

Direct Course-Embedded Measure in BUS 497A:

Also used for assessment of the written communication component of SLO 1, individually written case assignments were collected from 13 course sections of BUS 497A taught by 6 instructors in Spring 2017. Students were asked to upload their work to the university’s newly developed Electronic Assessment System (EAS). A total of 370 papers were uploaded from which the EAS system selected a random sample of n=100. However, due to a system error, only 98 papers were evaluated. Student work was assessed independently by 2 outside assessors employed to read and rate all 98 student papers using the standardized rubric created by the College’s Curriculum Management and Policy Committee (CMAP). The rubric was first used in AY 2014-15 and used for a second time in AY 2016-17. As explained in the discussion of written communication in BUS 302, the rubric calls for student work to be assessed as being “very good,” “good enough,” or “not good enough” on the 3 dimensions “purpose and organization,” “language,” and “document construction.” As contrasted with BUS 302, all 3 dimensions were used to assess BUS 497A papers. An assessment of “very good” on a dimension 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, can range from a possible 3 to 9 for each assessor.

Papers were flagged for a 3rd reading when summed scores differed by a total of 4 or more. For example, if a student’s paper received a summed score of 2 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 21 papers were thus flagged, all with summed differences of 4. Finally, the ratings of the 2 assessors (n=77 papers) or 3 assessors (n=21 papers) were averaged across each dimension to arrive at summary ratings for each student. On each dimension, an average score of 3 was deemed to be “very good,” an average score of 1.7-2.9 was deemed to be “good enough,” and an average score of less than 1.7 was deemed to be “not good enough.” To derive the overall composite score for each student, ratings were averaged across all 3 dimensions and the same numeric criteria were applied.

Results of this assessment are summarized in Table 4. On the dimension “purpose and organization,” 21.4% of the students’ work was deemed very good, 66.3% good enough, and 12.2% not good enough. On the dimension “language,” 8.2% of the students’ work was deemed very good, 77.6% good enough, and 14.3% not good enough. On the dimension “document construction,” 40.8% of the students’ work was deemed very good, 46.9% good enough, and 12.2% not good enough. To derive an overall composite score for student performance, values assigned by the assessors to the 3 dimensions were summed and averaged. Student work with an average score of 3 (very good) across all 3 dimensions was categorized as “very good,” student work with an average score across the 3 dimensions of 1.7-2.9 was categorized as “good enough,” and student work with an average score of less than 1.7 across the 3 dimensions was categorized as “not good enough.” Thus, student work was held to a higher standard to be regarded as “very good” overall in that it had to be deemed very good on all 3 dimensions. On the basis of these overall composite scores, 4.1% of the students’ work was deemed very good, 87.8% good enough, and 8.2% not good enough.

**Table 4: Written Communication Assessed in BUS 497A
(Direct Course-Embedded Measure)**

n=98	Very Good	Good Enough	Not Good Enough
Purpose and Organization	21.4%	66.3%	12.2%
Language	8.2%	77.6%	14.3%
Document Construction	40.8%	46.9%	12.2%
Overall	4.1%	87.8%	8.2%

SLO 1 was last assessed in BUS 497A in AY 2014-15, and the same rubric created by CMAP was used. That year the overall composite scores across the 3 rubric dimensions were 33% very good, 63% good enough, and 4% not good enough (n=100 sampled from 4 class sections taught by 3 instructors). When the categories “very good” and “good enough” are combined, the results from AY 2016-17 are slightly lower to those from AY 2014-15. Results in AY 2014-15 were 96% very good or good enough and 4% not good enough. Results for AY 2016-17 are 92% very good or good enough and 8% not good enough. It should be noted that AY 2016-17 assessment includes a more representative sample of student work, with papers collected from more instructors and more course sections.

The David Nazarian College of Business and Economics sets a standard of at least 85% of students with “very good” and “good enough” performance for SLO 1, and no more than 15% “not good enough.” Assessment results from AY 2016-17 indicate that this goal was met for the written communication component of SLO 1 as measured in BUS 497A. Overall scores for BUS 497A were 92% very good and good enough. BUS 497A students’ scores also met the standard for the 3 specific dimensions measured, “purpose and organization, (88%),” “language (86%),” and “document construction” (88%).

Direct Non-Embedded Measure through the Upper Division Writing Proficiency Examination (UDWPE)

The direct course-embedded measures from BUS 302 and BUS 497A used to assess written communication are supplemented by student performance on the Upper Division Writing Proficiency Examination (UDWPE), a direct non-embedded measure. Successful completion of this examination is required of all CSUN students prior to graduation, and the Nazarian College requires that students pass the examination prior to enrolling in 400-level courses. According to the university website which provides information to students regarding the UDWPE, students are allowed 120 minutes to read a text and write an essay responding to the topic of the text. The examination was modified in 2016-17 to include assessment of quantitative evidence along with writing. Students must respond to the quantitative evidence provided in the text and evaluate whether the text’s conclusions are supported by evidence. Finally, students must discuss in their essays what research strategies they would use to obtain additional information to evaluate the claims in the text. Two independent assessors score each essay and their scores are averaged. Essays with scores that diverge between passing and not passing are submitted to a 3rd reader for final determination.

In August 2016 the Nazarian College implemented a new procedure to proactively contact and provide direction to Nazarian College 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) which

offers workshops and individual assistance. 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 3 times are encouraged to utilize the LRC and/or register for ENG 90 or ENG 90P. Students who have failed the exam 4 or more times are encouraged to register for ENG 90 or ENG 90P.

Nazarian College UDWPE performance for the past 5 years is shown in Table 5. These summary statistics refer to the percentages of students who attempted and passed or did not pass the UDWPE during the relevant academic year. In cases where an individual student repeated the exam, only that student’s highest score is counted. Thus, for example, a student who did not pass the exam on the first attempt but did pass the exam on the second attempt is counted only once and as having passed the exam. Because a score of 8 is a passing score, scores lower than 8 are categorized as “not good enough,” scores of 8 and 9 are categorized as “good enough,” and scores of 10 and higher are categorized as “very good.” The highest possible score is 12.

Table 5: Written Communication Assessed the Upper Division Writing Proficiency Examination (Direct Non-Embedded Measure)

	Very Good (Score = 10-12)	Good Enough (Score = 8- 9)	Not Good Enough (Score = 0-6)
2016-17 Academic Year (n=2,021)	11.53%	73.78%	14.70%
2015-16 Academic Year (n=2,263)	10.25%	72.38%	17.37%
2014-15 Academic Year (n=1,947)	10.48%	78.07%	11.45%
2013-14 Academic Year (n=1,791)	13.01%	75.71%	11.28%
2012-13 Academic Year (n=952)	13.55%	75.63%	10.82%

*Totals may be off by 0.1% due to rounding

Indirect Measure through Exit Survey:

The direct measures of the written communication component of SLO 1 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. Since AY 2014-15 the exit survey has contained questions pertaining to each of the Nazarian College’s undergraduate business learning goals. Pertaining to the written communications component of SLO 1, graduating seniors were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement, “I have developed strong written communication skills.” Responses are shown in Table 6 for academic years 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17, indicating relatively high levels of student satisfaction or confidence with learning relevant to this component of SLO 1. However, caution should be used in interpreting this measure as it is a measure of student perception, not a direct measure of learning.

**Table 6: Written Communication Assessed through Exit Survey
(Supplemental Indirect Measure)**

Exit Survey Question: "I have developed strong written communication skills."							
	Strongly Agree	Agree	TOTAL* Strongly Agree + Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	TOTAL* Do Not Agree/ Disagree + Strongly Disagree
2017 (n=482)	46.9%	41.9%	88.8%	9.3%	0.4%	1.5%	11.2%/1.9
2016 (n=521)	46.1%	43.4%	89.4%	8.3%	1.3%	1.0%	10.6%/2.3%
2015 (n=522)	45.4%	43.1%	88.5%	8.2%	1.7%	1.5%	11.5%/3.2%

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

Students’ problem-solving and critical thinking skills were assessed through direct embedded measures in 3 courses: FIN 303, Financial Management; SOM 306, Operations Management; and BUS 497A, Capstone-Strategic Management. These courses are part of the upper division core curriculum for students in all business majors.

Direct Course Embedded Measures in FIN 303 and SOM 306:

In FIN 303, multiple choice examination questions were used to assess students’ problem-solving and critical thinking with regard to investment decisions, financing decisions, and the use of financial data. The work of students taking FIN 303 in 6 sections over the Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 semesters (n= 956) was assessed. The number of questions answered correctly determined each student’s performance as “very good,” “good enough,” or “not good enough.” Altogether, 25.3% of students’ work was deemed very good, 56.4% good enough, and 18.3% not good enough. These results are shown in tabular form in Table 7.

In SOM 306, instructors assigned case analyses to assess students’ performance in solving operations management problems. The work of all students taking SOM 306 in Spring 2017 (n=856) was assessed. There were 8 course sections taught by 5 instructors. Students were deemed to demonstrate good problem-solving and critical thinking skills if they could define the decision problem, select appropriate operations management concepts and/or models, and use software to perform analysis. Students scoring 90-100% on the measures were deemed “very good,” those scoring 60-89% “good enough,” and those scoring less than 60% “not good enough.” Altogether, 43.2% of students’ work was deemed very good, 43.6% good enough, and 13.2% not good enough. These results are shown in tabular form in Table 7.

Table 7: Problem-Solving and Critical Thinking Measured in FIN 303 and SOM 306 (Direct Course-Embedded Measures)

	Very Good	Good Enough	Not Good Enough
FIN 303 (n=956)	25.3%	56.4%	18.3%
SOM 306 (n=856)	43.2%	43.6%	13.2%

*Totals may be off by 0.1% due to rounding

As compared with results from AY 2014-15, the last time SLO 2 was assessed, some improvement is shown. The assessment results using measures collected in AY 2014-15 in SOM 306 were 25% very good, 62% good enough, and 13% not good enough. Thus, a higher percentage of student work was deemed to be very good in AY 2016-17 versus AY 2014-15. The results from FIN 303 AY 2016-17 showed similar results to those in AY 2014-15 with results of 27% very good, 54% good enough, and 19% not good enough. This shows a slight improvement in the “not good enough” performance. The David Nazarian College of Business and Economics sets a standard of at least 70% of students with “very good” and “good enough” performance for SLO 2, and no more than 30% “not good enough.” Assessment results from AY 2016-17 indicate that this goal was met when SLO 2 was assessed in FIN 303 and SOM 306 as 81.7% and 86.8% of student work in these two classes, respectively, was categorized as very good and good enough.

Direct Course Embedded Measure in BUS 497A:

In BUS 497A, the same case assignments used to assess written communication (see SLO 1, n=98 from 13 course sections taught by 6 instructors) were used to assess SLO 2, problem-solving and critical thinking. As explained in the discussion of SLO 1, students were asked to upload their work to the university's newly developed Electronic Assessment System (EAS). A total of 370 papers were uploaded from which the EAS system selected a random sample (n=100). However, due to a system error, only 98 papers were reviewed. Student work was assessed independently by 2 outside assessors employed to read and rate all 98 student papers using the standardized rubric created by the College's Curriculum Management and Policy Committee (CMAP).

The CMAP-created rubric was first used in AY 2014-15, and was used for the second time in AY 2016-17. The rubric calls for student work to be assessed as being "very good," "good enough," or "not good enough" on the 3 dimensions "identify business problems and key assumptions," "use of analytical skills," and "clearly justified solution." An assessment of "very good" on any dimension 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, can range from a possible 3 to 9 for each assessor. Papers were flagged for a 3rd reading when summed scores differed by a total of 4 or more. For example, if a student's paper received a summed score of 2 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 21 papers were thus flagged, all with summed differences of 4. Finally, the ratings of the 2 assessors (n=77 papers) or 3 assessors (n=21 papers) were averaged across each dimension to arrive at the summary ratings for each student.

It should be noted that the Nazarian College's operationalization of the dimension "use of analytical skills" was revised after AY 2014-15 to eliminate a prior focus on spreadsheet mechanics, formulas, and report data. The prior focus rendered the dimension "use of analytical skills" to be unusable in AY 2014-15 because its requirements did not fit the BUS 497A assignment. With this revision, assessors were able to apply all 3 rubric dimensions in AY 2016-17 whereas only 2 rubric dimensions were applied in AY 2014-15.

Results of the critical thinking and problem solving assessment from BUS 497A are summarized in Table 8. On the dimension "identify business problems and key assumptions," 11.2% of the students' work was deemed very good, 70.4% good enough, and 18.4% not good enough. On the dimension "use of analytical skills," 17.3% of the students' work was deemed very good, 67.3% good enough, and 15.3% not good enough. On the dimension "clearly justified solution," 8.2% of the students' work was deemed very good, 51.0% good enough, and 40.8% not good enough. To derive an overall composite score for student performance, values assigned by the assessors to the three dimensions were summed and averaged. Student work with an average score of 3 (very good) across all 3 dimensions was categorized as "very good," student work with an average score across the 3 dimensions of 1.7-2.9 was categorized as "good enough," and student work with an average score of less than 1.7 across the 3 dimensions was categorized as "not good enough." Thus, student work was held to a higher standard to be regarded as "very good" overall in that it had to be deemed very good on all 3 dimensions. On the basis of these overall composite scores, 4.1% of the students' work was deemed very good, 79.6% good enough, and 16.3% not good enough.

It is not clear whether the relatively high percentage of work deemed not good enough, especially on the dimension "Use of Analytical Skills," was due to deficient skills and learning or because the assignments collected for assessment were not well aligned to the rubric and the SLO.

**Table 8: Problem-Solving and Critical Thinking Measured in BUS 497A
(Direct Course-Embedded Measure)**

n=98	Very Good	Good Enough	Not Good Enough
Identify Business Problems and Key Assumptions	11.2%	70.4%	18.4%
Use of analytical skills	17.3%	67.3%	15.3%
Clearly Justified Solution	8.2%	51.0%	40.8%

The David Nazarian College of Business and Economics sets a standard of at least 70% of students with “very good” and “good enough” performance for SLO 2, and no more than 30% “not good enough.” Assessment results from AY 2016-17 indicate that this goal was met for SLO 2 as measured in BUS 497A. Overall scores for BUS 497A were 83.7% very good and good enough. BUS 497A students’ scores also met the standard for the 3 specific dimensions measured, “identify business problems and key assumptions” (81.6%), “use of analytical skills (84.7%),” but did not meet the dimension of “clearly justified solution” (59.2%). This may be the result of the instructions or assessment tool used, rather than a lack of skills obtained by students. Further analysis will be conducted to help establish the potential reason for this score.

Indirect Measure through Exit Survey:

The direct course-embedded measures of SLO 2 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. Since AY 2014-15 the exit survey has contained questions pertaining to each of the Nazarian College’s undergraduate business learning goals. Pertaining to SLO 2, graduating seniors were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statements, “I have developed strong problem-solving and critical thinking skills,” and “I have learned to use information technology to solve business problems.” Responses are shown in Table 9 for academic years 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17. Results indicate a relatively high level of student satisfaction or confidence with learning relevant to problem-solving and critical thinking in general. However, less satisfaction or confidence is indicated with learning to use information technology to solve business problems. Open-ended responses on the exit survey also indicate concern among some students about learning information technology tools such as Excel. Caution should be used in interpreting this measure as it is a measure of student perception, not a direct measure of learning.

**Table 9: Problem-Solving and Critical Thinking Assessed through Exit Survey
(Supplemental Indirect Measure)**

Exit Survey Question: "I have developed strong problem-solving and critical thinking skills.							
	Strongly Agree	Agree	TOTAL* Strongly Agree + Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	TOTAL* Do Not Agree/ Disagree + Strongly Disagree
2017 (n=482)	49.8%	39.4%	89.2%	8.5%	0.6%	1.7%	10.8%/ 2.3
2016 (n=521)	45.7%	45.7%	91.4%	6.7%	1.0%	1.0%	8.6%/ 1.9%
2015 (n=521)	45.9%	42.6%	88.5%	8.1%	2.1%	1.3%	11.5%/ 3.4%
Exit Survey Question: "I have learned to use information technology to solve business problems.							
2017 (n=482)	40.9%	39.0%	79.9%	12.0%	5.2%	2.9%	20.1%/ 8.1
2016 (n=521)	34.2%	44.9%	79.1%	15.0%	3.6%	2.3%	20.9%/ 6.0%
2015 (n=523)	38.4%	40.0%	78.4%	14.9%	4.8%	1.9%	21.6%/ 6.7%

*Totals may be off by 0.1% due to rounding

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

Students’ understanding of ethics and social responsibility was assessed through direct embedded measures in BUS 302, Gateway Experience, and in FIN 303, Financial Management. These 2 courses are part of the upper division core curriculum for students in all business majors. SLO 3 was also assessed through a supplemental non-embedded measure, a sub-test within the standardized CSU-BAT (Business Assessment Test), which is administered through California State University, Long Beach for business schools in the California State University system. The Nazarian College requires it of BUS 497 students every other year.

Direct Course Embedded Measure in FIN 303:

In FIN 303, multiple choice examination questions were used to assess students’ knowledge of financial ethics and regulatory requirements. The work of students taking FIN 303 in 5 sections, each taught by a different instructor, was assessed (n= 793). The number of questions answered correctly determined students’ performance. Altogether, 46.4% of students’ work was deemed very good, 41.0% good enough, and 12.6% not good enough. These results are shown in tabular form in Table 8.

Table 8: Ethics and Social Responsibility Measured in FIN 303

	Very Good	Good Enough	Not Good Enough
FIN 303 (n=793)	46.4%	41.0%	12.6%

*Totals may be off by 0.1% due to rounding

As compared with results from AY 2014-15, the last time SLO 3 was assessed, results indicate that performance has decreased. The assessment results using measures collected in AY 2014-15 in FIN 303 were 60% very good, 32% good enough, and 8% not good enough. Thus, a lower percentage of student work was deemed to be “very good” in AY 2016-17 versus AY 2014-15. The David Nazarian College of Business and Economics sets a standard of at least 70% of students with “very good” and “good enough” performance for SLO 3, and no more than 30% “not good enough.” Assessment results from AY 2016-17 indicate that this goal was met when SLO 2 was assessed in FIN 303 as 87.4% of student work was categorized as very good and good enough.

Direct Course-Embedded Measure in BUS 302:

In BUS 302, the same business ethics case used to assess written communication was also used to assess ethics and social responsibility (see SLO 1, n=100 randomly selected from 18 course sections taught by 7 instructors, with papers drawn proportionally from each course section). Student work was assessed independently by 2 outside assessors who were employed to read and rate all 100 papers using a standardized rubric created by the College’s Curriculum Management and Policy Committee (CMAP). The rubric was used for the first time in AY 2014-15 and for the second time in AY 2016-17. Individual student work was assessed as being “very good,” “good enough,” or “not good enough” on 3 dimensions: “identify ethical dilemma and major analytical frameworks,” “identify interests and develop alternative strategies using ethics/social responsibility,” and “use ethics/social responsibility to justify course of action.” 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, can 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 30 papers were thus flagged, 19 with summed differences of

3, 9 with summed difference of 4, and 1 each with summed differences of 5 and 6. Finally, the ratings of the 2 assessors (n=70 papers) or 3 assessors (n=30 papers) were averaged across each dimension to arrive at the summary ratings for each student.

On each dimension, an average score of 3 was deemed to be “very good,” an average score of 1.7-2.9 was deemed to be “good enough,” and an average score of less than 1.7 was deemed to be “not good enough.” To derive the overall composite score for each student, ratings were averaged across all 3 dimensions and the same numeric criteria were applied.

Results of this assessment are summarized in Table 9. On the dimension “identify ethical dilemma and major analytical frameworks,” 21% of the students’ work was deemed very good, 67% good enough, and 12% not good enough. On the dimension “identify interests and develop alternative strategies using ethical/social responsibility,” 13% of the students’ work was deemed very good, 81% good enough, and 6% not good enough. On the dimension “use ethical/social responsibility to justify course of action,” 14% of the students’ work was deemed very good, 61% good enough, and 25% not good enough. To derive an overall composite score for student performance on SLO 3, values assigned by the assessors to all 3 dimensions were summed and averaged. Student work with an average score of 3 (very good) across all 3 dimensions was categorized as “very good,” student work with an average score across the 3 dimensions of 1.7-2.9 was categorized as “good enough,” and student work with an average score of less than 1.7 across all 3 dimensions was categorized as “not good enough.” Thus, student work was held to a higher standard to be regarded as “very good” overall in that it had to be deemed very good on all 3 dimensions. On the basis of these composite scores, 8% of the students’ work was deemed very good, 82% good enough, and 10% not good enough.

Table 9: Ethics and Social Responsibility Assessed in BUS 302 (Direct Course-Embedded Measure)

n=100	Very Good	Good Enough	Not Good Enough
Identify Ethical Dilemmas and Major Analytical Frameworks	21%	67%	12%
Identify Interests and Develop Alternative Strategies using Ethical/Social Responsibility	13%	81%	6%
Use Ethics/Social Responsibility to Justify Course of Action	14%	61%	25%
Overall	8%	82%	10%

SLO 3 was last assessed in BUS 302 in AY 2014-15, and the same CMAP-created rubric was used. That year the aggregate scores across the 3 rubric dimensions were 13% very good, 59% good enough, and 28% not good enough (n=100 sampled from 20 class sections taught by 9 instructors). When the categories “very good” and “good enough” are combined, the results from AY 2016-17 show improvement over AY 2014-15. Results in AY 2014-15 were 72% very good or good enough and 28% not good enough. Results for AY 2016-17 are 90% very good or good enough and 10% not good enough. Notably, assessment results for AY 2016-17 show improvement for the dimension “use ethics/social responsibility to justify course of action.” Although this remains the dimension where the highest percentage of student work is categorized as “not good enough,” 25% of student work was categorized as not good enough in AY 2016-17 versus 29% in AY 2014-15.

The Nazarian College sets a standard of at least 70% of students with very good and good enough performance on this learning goal. This standard was met when SLO 3 was measured in BUS 302, with 90% of students performing at a level deemed very good or good enough overall (composite score). In general, students showed stronger performance on the dimensions “identify ethical dilemma and major analytical frameworks” (88% very good and good enough) and “identify interests and develop alternative strategies using ethics/social responsibility” (94% very good and good enough). Performance relative to the dimension “use ethics/social responsibility to justify course of action” was somewhat weaker (75% very good and good enough), but still met the standard and showed improvement over AY 2014-15 (71% very good and good enough).

Direct Non-Embedded Measure through the CSU-BAT Standardized Test:

Supplemental to the direct course-embedded measures discussed above, SLO 3 was assessed through a 5-question subtest within the standardized 90-question CSU-BAT (Business Assessment Test), which is administered through California State University, Long Beach. The CSU-BAT was last administered by the Nazarian College in the 2015-16 academic year as it is used primarily to assess SLO 6 (“Our students understand and apply key business concepts”) which is part of SLO Group 1. The CSU-BAT was required in AY 2015-16 of all students enrolled in BUS 497, Capstone. A full description of the CSU-BAT administration was provided in the 2015-2016 Annual Program Assessment Report for undergraduate business programs.

Overall scores on the Ethics subtest of the CSU-BAT were 88.4% in Fall 2015 (n=551) and 88.9% in Spring 2016 (n=703). These scores are comparable with those recorded in past administrations of the CSU-BAT and are slightly above the average when compared with other CSU campuses that administered the CSU-BAT in AY 2015-16. The average score among the 8 participating schools in Fall 2015 was 88.3% (range=78.9%-94.4%) and the average score among the 9 participating schools in Spring 2016 was 85.1% (range=73.8%-92.6%). Nazarian College students’ scores ranked 6th of the 8 participating schools in Spring 2015, but ranked 2nd of the 9 participating schools in Spring 2016.

Indirect Measure through Exit Survey:

The direct measures of SLO 3 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. Since AY 2014-15, the exit survey has contained questions pertaining to each of the Nazarian College’s undergraduate business learning goals. Pertaining to SLO 3, graduating seniors were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement, “I have gained a thorough understanding of ethics and social responsibility.” Responses are shown in Table 10 for academic years 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17, indicating a high level of student satisfaction or confidence with learning relevant to SLO 3. However, caution should be used in interpreting this measure as it is a measure of student perception, not a direct measure of learning.

**Table 10: Ethics and Social Responsibility Assessed through Exit Survey
(Supplemental Indirect Measure)**

Exit Survey Question: "I have gained a thorough understanding of ethics and social responsibility."							
	Strongly Agree	Agree	TOTAL* Strongly Agree + Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	TOTAL* Do Not Agree/ Disagree + Strongly Disagree
2017 (n=482)	60.2%	30.5%	90.7%	6.6%	1.2%	1.5%	9.3%/2.7
2016 (n=521)	60.3%	34.0%	94.2%	4.2%	1.0%	0.6%	5.8 %/ 1.5%
2015 (n=522)	56.1%	34.9%	91.0%	6.1%	1.7%	1.2%	9.0%/2.9%

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

The David Nazarian College of Business and Economics sets a standard of at least 85% of students with “very good” and “good enough” performance for SLO 1, and no more than 15% “not good enough.”

In the area of oral communication, the results reported in the previous section indicate that this goal is being met on the dimension “organization,” with 90.0% or 89.6% of students scoring very good and good enough as determined by the outside assessor and by the teaching instructors, respectively. The outside assessor and the teaching instructors, respectively, found 10.0% and 10.4% of students’ performance to be not good enough. This is comparable to the findings on the dimension of “organization” when oral communication was last assessed in AY 2014-15.

Assessment results suggest that performance falls short of the standard for the dimension “delivery.” The outside assessor classified 82.3% of students as scoring very good and good enough and 17.8% as scoring not good enough. Similarly, the teaching instructors classified 81.4% of students as scoring very good and good enough and 18.6% as scoring not good enough. These results are slightly improved over those recorded in AY 2014-15 by teaching instructors who found, in the aggregate, that 78% of students performed at a level deemed very good or good enough and 22% of students’ performed at a level deemed not good enough. While the improvement is encouraging, the results suggest that the David Nazarian College of Business and Economics must continue to focus on improving students’ oral communication skills on the dimension of “delivery.”

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 the oral communication component of SLO 1.

In the area of written communication, the results reported in the previous section indicate that students in both BUS 302 and BUS 497A are meeting this goal. Overall scores for BUS 302 were 96% very good and good enough. BUS 302 students’ scores also met the standard for the 2 specific dimensions measured, “purpose and organization” and “language” (91% and 97%, respectively). Overall scores for BUS 497A were 92% very good and good enough. BUS 497A students’ scores also met the standard for the 3 specific dimensions measured, “purpose and organization, (88%),” “language (86%),” and “document construction” (88%).

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 the written communication component of SLO 1.

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

The Nazarian College sets a standard of at least 70% of students with very good and good enough performance on this learning goal. This benchmark was met when SLO 2 was measured in FIN 303 and SOM 306, as 81.7% and 86.8% of students, respectively, performed at a level deemed very good or good enough. In SOM 306, considerable improvement was shown as 43.2% of students performed at a level categorized as “very good” versus 24.6% in AY 2014-15. The standard was met on only two dimensions measured in BUS 497A. On the dimension “identify business problems and assumptions,” 81.6% of students’ work was deemed very good or good enough. On the

dimension “use of analytical skills, 84.7% of students’ work was deemed very good or good enough. However, on the dimension “clearly justified solution,” only 59.2% of students’ work was deemed very good or good enough.

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 problem-solving and critical thinking overall, but less satisfaction or confidence with learning to use information technology to solve business problems.

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

The Nazarian College sets a standard of at least 70% of students with very good and good enough performance on this learning goal. This benchmark was met when SLO 3 was measured in FIN 303, as 87.4% of students performed at a level deemed very good or good enough. The standard was also met when SLO 3 was measured in BUS 302, with 90% of students performing at a level deemed very good or good enough overall (composite score). In general, students showed stronger performance on the dimensions “identify ethical dilemma and major analytical frameworks” (88% very good and good enough) and “identify interests and develop alternative strategies using ethics/social responsibility” (94% very good and good enough). Performance relative to the dimension “use ethics/social responsibility to justify course of action” was somewhat weaker (75% very good and good enough), but still met the standard and showed improvement over AY 2014-15 (71% very good and good enough). An effort was made to provide BUS 302 students with more focused instruction on ethics and social responsibility, and the AY 2016-17 results provide evidence of improved learning. The David Nazarian College of Business and Economics must continue to emphasize ethics instruction and focus on students’ ability to justify a course of action based on ethics and social responsibility.

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 3.

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

In AY 2016-17, the David Nazarian College of Business and Economics used the results from AY 2015-16 measurement of SLO Group 2 to perform program/curriculum review (closing-the-loop activities). The 4 SLOs in SLO Group 2 are:

- 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.

The Assurance of Learning Director, the departments or units in which assessment data were collected, the Assurance of Learning (AoL) Committee, and the Curriculum Review and Policy (CMAP) Committee examined assessment results. The following sections summarize their suggestions offered for improvement. The relevant committees and departments will discuss these suggestions further in Fall 2017 to determine where change is needed and can be realistically implemented.

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

In an earlier assessment cycle, SLO 4 was assessed on a trial basis in all upper division core business courses, and the Nazarian College decided in AY 2012-13 that FIN 303 and SOM 306 are the most appropriate venues for assessment of SLO 4. The Curriculum Management and Policy Committee (CMAP) confirmed this in AY 2014-15. However, CMAP suggested in AY 2016-17 that a broader assessment of SLO 4 is desirable. Also, whereas most Nazarian College assessment includes written work or an oral presentation, direct assessment of SLO 4 is conducted only through multiple-choice examinations in two classes, supplemented by the CSU-BAT and by an indirect measure through the exit survey. Similarly, the Assurance of Learning (AoL) Committee suggested that the College should explore additional courses in the curriculum to determine if they can be used to assess SLO 4 so as to provide further assurance.

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

The review of AY 2015-16 assessment results noted that students met the College-defined benchmarks overall. The College sets a standard of at least 70% of students with “very good” or “good enough” performance on course embedded measures of SLO 5. The common rubric used to assess SLO 5 includes 3 dimensions. Students exceeded the benchmark for 2 of the 3 dimensions, with 96% performing at a level deemed very good or good enough on the dimension, “cross-functional perspective,” and 91% performing at a level deemed very good or good enough on the dimension, “information integration.” However, for the third dimension, “holistic solutions,” only 69% of students’ work was deemed very good or good enough. Further, concerns were raised that the work of relatively few students was classified as “very good.” The lower performance on the dimension “holistic solutions,” appears to be consistent with lower performance on application-oriented dimensions of other SLOs, i.e., those which involve developing or justifying a solution or course of action, so this is an area requiring more attention throughout the curriculum.

Concerns were raised by all reviewing parties that assignments in BUS 497A are not designed specifically to assess SLO 5 and therefore may not be well-aligned with the rubric. Concerns were also raised that only a relatively small number of instructors/course sections submitted student papers for assessment. The BUS 497A Unit Response indicated that the BUS 497A Affinity Group should review the assignment selected for the assessment to see if it

can more specifically be brought into alignment with the assessment rubric criteria. It was also advised that the BUS 497A Affinity Group should endeavor to increase participation among instructors to provide a broader student population from which to sample. In collecting work for AY 2016-17 assessment, participation among instructors was improved, so this last suggestion has already been implemented.

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

SLO 6 was assessed in the upper division core classes FIN 303, MKT 304, SOM 306, and MGT 360 pertaining to key finance, marketing, operations management, and management concepts; and through the 6 BUS 302L Lower Division Core examinations covering financial accounting, management accounting, macroeconomics, microeconomics, business law, and statistics. These course-embedded direct measures were supplemented by the CSU-BAT exam (a direct non-embedded measure) and through the Exit Survey of graduating seniors (an indirect measure). CSU-BAT results showed CSUN students performing as well or better than other CSUs using the CSU-BAT exam. The Exit Survey found graduating seniors indicating a relatively high level of satisfaction or confidence with learning relevant to SLO 6.

For course-embedded instruments other than the BUS 302L examinations, the College sets a benchmark of 70% very good and good enough performance. The benchmark was met and exceeded in AY 2015-16 in FIN 303, MKT 304, SOM 306, and MGT 360, and some improvement was noted. Continued improvement was noted for SOM 306, attributed to actions taken following the AY 2012-13 assessment cycle, such as more class interaction and quizzes. Improvement also was noted in MKT 304, attributed to greater instructional attention given to content categories where the benchmark was previously not met.

For BUS 302L examinations, the College has set the benchmark as a success/passing rate of 85% (i.e., at least 85% of students should obtain a passing grade on each exam). The College reports both inclusive and exclusive passing rates. Exclusive passing rates, which exclude students who are enrolled in BUS 302L and did not take a specific examination, showed the benchmark being met for all subjects with the exception of statistics, which showed an 83.4% passing rate in the Spring 2016 semester. Inclusive passing rates, which count students who are enrolled in BUS 302L and did not take a specific exam as having failed that exam, showed the benchmark being met for all subjects except statistics (82.9% passing rate in Fall 2015, 79.5% passing rate in Spring 2016). The BUS 302L Unit Level response and the Assurance of Learning (AoL) Committee response noted that performance on the statistics sub-test of the CSU-BAT exam has been strong, and suggested that the newly revised statistics BUS 302L exam should be evaluated to determine if it is perhaps too difficult.

Additionally, the Assurance of Learning (AoL) Committee questioned the appropriateness of setting the benchmark for course-embedded direct measures of key business concepts at only 70% of students expected to perform at a level considered very good or good enough. The AoL Committee suggested that the benchmark be revisited to determine if a higher standard should be applied. Finally, the Curriculum Management and Policy (CMAP) Committee advanced a number of observations and suggestions to encourage greater consistency in the way that key business concepts are tested in the 4 upper division core classes, FIN 303, MKT 304, SOM 306, and MGT 360.

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

SLO7 was assessed in BUS 302, Gateway Experience, and in BUS 497A, Capstone-Strategic Management, using peer evaluations. Assessment results for AY 2015-16 easily exceeded the benchmarks established by the College. Further, it was noted by reviewing parties that students do appear to thoughtfully and honestly complete the peer evaluations and differentiate the performance of their peers (rather than simply assigning high or low marks to everyone). Both the Assurance of Learning (AoL) Committee and the Curriculum Management and Policy (CMAP)

Committee suggested considering the expansion of assessment to possibly include a measure beyond peer evaluation.

- **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.**

The SLOs that were assessed in AY 2016-17 are generally unrelated to the university’s commitment to diversity, except insofar as Nazarian College instructors always seek to ensure that their assignments and activities respect that commitment. For example, for SLO 1, “our students have strong written and oral communication skills,” the oral and written work of all students is treated with respect. Although SLO 3, “our students understand ethics and social responsibility,” might pertain to diversity, the assignment used to assess it did not specifically address diversity issues.

- **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.**

The David Nazarian College of Business and Economics anticipates a core review, which may involve some revision of defined SLOs.

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 activities according to our staggered assessment/assurance of learning cycle. In AY 2017-18, the College will perform assessment (measure student work and analyze the results) for SLO Group 2, while applying the results of the 2016-17 assessment of SLO Group 1 to program review/curriculum review/revision (i.e., closing-the-loop activity).

In 2017-18, the College will measure and analyze 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 will use the results from our 2016-17 measurement of SLO Group 1, which was discussed in the beginning sections of this report, to perform program/curriculum review (closing-the-loop activities).