

## 2017-2018 Annual Program Assessment Report

Please submit report to your department chair or program coordinator, the Associate Dean of your College, and to [james.solomon@csun.edu](mailto:james.solomon@csun.edu), Director of the Office of Academic Assessment and Program Review, by September 28, 2018. You may, but are not required to, submit a separate report for each program, including graduate degree programs, which conducted assessment activities, or you may combine programs in a single report. **Please identify your department/program in the file name for your report.**

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

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

**Program:** All undergraduate programs in Business

**Assessment liaison:** Ray Calnan, Nazarian College Assurance of Learning Director

**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 Natural Sciences learning 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, application, or GE assessment) 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
- if your program implemented **option D**, exclusively or simultaneously with **options A, B, and/or C**, identify the basic skill(s) assessed and the precise learning outcomes assessed, the assessment instruments and methodology employed, and the resulting scores
- 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 2018-19.** Include a brief description as reflective of a continuous program of ongoing assessment.

## 2. Overview of 2017-18 Assessment Projects:

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

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

In 2017-18, the Nazarian College measured and analyzed student work pertaining to the following 3 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. (**This SLO was dropped as will be discussed below**)

At the same time, the College used the results from the 2016-17 assessment of SLO Group 1 to perform program/curriculum review (closing-the-loop activity). The 3 SLOs in SLO Group 1 are:

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

- **If implemented assessment option A, identify which program SLOs were assessed (please identify the SLOs in full), in which classes and/or contexts, what assessment instruments were used and the methodology employed, the resulting scores, and the relation between this year’s measure of student work and that of past years: (include as an appendix any and all relevant materials that you wish to include).**

In 2017-18, the College measured and analyzed student work pertaining to the following 3 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. **(This SLO was dropped as will be discussed below)**

Measurement of each SLO is described in the following pages.

The past direct and indirect measures for all SLOs were reconsidered in order to find the optimal way to measure each SLO without using excessive resources on measures outcomes. Resources are then able to be redeployed to “close-the-loop” and ensure that measures are taken to improve future outcomes. Therefore, some historic measures have been eliminated.

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

Students’ understanding of the global context of modern business was assessed in 2017-18 through direct course embedded measures, specifically multiple choice examination questions in SOM 306 (Operations Management). This course is part of the upper division core curriculum for students in all business majors. Supplementing this direct embedded measure, SLO 4 was also assessed through an indirect measure. At the end of each academic year, graduating seniors from the Nazarian College are asked to respond to an exit survey, which since 2014-15 has contained questions pertaining to each of the College’s undergraduate business learning goals.

**Direct Course Embedded Measure in SOM 306:**

Assessment of SLO 4 through course embedded measures occurred primarily during the Spring 2018 semester. Multiple choice examination questions in SOM 306 tested students’ understanding of the global implications of systems and operations management (5 standard questions were developed and approved by the Systems and Operations Management Department for use in assessment). Each student’s individual understanding was assessed as being very good, good enough, or not good enough based on the number of questions correctly answered.

The work of students in 13 course sections was assessed (n=980). This represented all students enrolled in SOM 306 in the Spring 2018 semester. The performance of students who correctly answered all 5 questions was deemed very good, the performance of students who correctly answered 3 or 4 questions was deemed good enough, and the performance of students who correctly answered 0 to 2 questions was deemed not good enough. Altogether, 21.1% of students’ work was deemed very good, 58.6% was deemed good enough, and 20.3% was deemed not good enough. These results are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: “Global Context of Business” Assessed in SOM 306 (Direct, Course Embedded Measure)**

Year	SOM 306 (n)	Very Good	Good Enough	Not Good Enough
2017-18	(n=980)	21.1%	58.6%	20.3%
2015-16	(n=802)	20.8%	59.6%	19.6%
2013-14	(n=570)	28.6%	60.4%	11.1%

Overall, the 2017-18 assessment scores for “global context of business” as assessed with course embedded measures were comparable with those recorded when this SLO was last assessed in 2015-16. Scores for 2017-18 were similar to the scores in 2015-16.

The Nazarian College sets a standard of at least 70% of students with very good and good enough performance on course embedded measures of SLO 4. This benchmark was met when SLO 4 was measured in SOM 306 in 2017-18, as 79.7% of students, performed at a level deemed very good or good enough.

**Indirect Measure through Exit Survey:**

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

**Table 2: “Global Context of Business” Assessed through Exit Survey (Supplemental Indirect Measure)**

Exit Survey Question: “I have gained a thorough understanding of the global context of modern business.”								
	Strongly Agree	Agree	TOTAL* Strongly Agree + Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	TOTAL* Do Not Agree	TOTAL* Disagree + Strongly Disagree
2018 (n=394)	45.9%	39.6%	85.5%	9.6%	2.3%	2.5%	14.5%	4.8%
2017 (n=528)	44.9%	41.9%	86.7%	8.9%	3.0%	1.3%	13.3%	4.4%
2016 (n=521)	39.5%	47.2%	86.8%	9.6%	2.3%	1.3%	13.2%	3.6%
2015 (n=520)	42.5%	42.3%	84.8%	11.7%	2.3%	1.2%	15.2%	3.5%

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

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

Students' understanding of the cross-functional nature of business problems was assessed in 2017-18 through a direct course embedded measure in BUS 497A, Capstone-Strategic Management. This course is part of the upper division core curriculum for students in all business majors, and requires completion of the lower division business core and other upper division core classes as prerequisites. Additionally, this direct embedded measure of SLO 5 was supplemented by an indirect measure. At the end of each academic year, graduating seniors from the Nazarian College are asked to respond to an exit survey, which since 2014-15 has contained questions pertaining to each of the College's undergraduate business learning goals.

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

Written case assignments were collected from 14 course sections of BUS 497A taught by 6 instructors in Spring 2018. Students submitted their work to the individual instructors. A total of 433 papers were submitted altogether. A random number generator was used to select 7 papers from each section with a result of 98 papers in total.

Student work was assessed independently by two assessors employed to read and rate all 98 student papers using a standardized rubric created by the College's Curriculum Management and Policy Committee (CMAP). The rubric is new this year and differs from the rubrics used in previous years for measuring the same SLO. This simplified rubric is binary in nature as compared to the previous rubric, which had more variability resulting in differing assessments by the two assessors.

The results of the binary rubric are analyzed to determine if the individual students' work is very good, good enough, or not good enough. There are two dimensions in this SLO that are measured: "cross-functional perspective and information integration" (assessing whether the student identifies relevant cross-functional information needed to analyze a comprehensive business problem and whether the student integrates information from multiple functional perspectives), and "holistic solutions" (assessing whether the student recommends a holistic solution that recognizes the impact of decisions across functional areas).

The dimension for "cross-functional perspective and information integration" is determined by summing the points from the binary categories. There are total of on 9 categories that comprise this dimension with a total possible of 18 points. An assessment of "very good" corresponds to a numeric rating of 16-18, an assessment of "good enough" corresponds to a numeric rating of 9-15, and an assessment of "not good enough" corresponds to a numeric rating of 0-8.

There are 2 possible points for the dimension of "holistic solutions". An assessment of "very good" corresponds to a numeric rating of 2, an assessment of "good enough" corresponds to a numeric rating of 1, and an assessment of "not good enough" corresponds to a numeric rating of 0.

To derive an overall composite score for each student, ratings were weighted twice as heavily for the "cross-functional perspective and information integration" dimension as the "holistic solutions" dimension. The overall result is not simply an average of the reported values in Table 3, since some students may perform well in one dimension, but not in the other. This could result in an overall rating that is different from the individual dimensions.

On the dimension, "cross-functional perspective and information integration," 28.6% of students' work was deemed very good, 58.2% was deemed good enough, and 13.3% was deemed not good enough. On the dimension "holistic solutions," 2.0% of students' work was deemed very good, 74.5% was deemed good enough, and 23.5% was deemed not good enough. Overall results were 2.0% very good, 78.6% good enough, and 19.4% not good enough. These results are shown in tabular form in Table 3.

**Table 3: “Cross Functional Nature of Business” Assessed in BUS 497A (Direct, Course Embedded Measures)**

Rubric Dimension (n=98)	Very Good	Good Enough	Not Good Enough
Cross-Functional Perspective and Information Integration	28.6%	58.2%	13.3%
Holistic Solutions	2.0%	74.5%	23.5%
Overall Assessment	2.0%	78.6%	19.4%

The Nazarian College sets a standard of at least 70% of students with very good and good enough performance on course embedded measures of SLO 5. This benchmark was met in 2017-18 for both dimensions. For the dimension “cross-functional perspective and information integration,” 86.7% of students performed at a level deemed very good or good enough. However, for the dimension, “holistic solutions,” only 76.5% of students’ work was deemed very good or good enough. It is not clear whether the higher percentage of work deemed not good enough on the dimension “holistic solutions,” was due to deficient skills and learning or because the assignments collected for assessment from BUS 497A were not well aligned to the rubric and the holistic solutions dimension of SLO 5. The benchmark was met for the overall assessment of SLO 5 with 80.6% of students’ work deemed very good or good enough.

As compared with results from 2015-16, the last time SLO 5 was measured (n=100 randomly selected papers), some differences are apparent. The assessment rubric and dimensions were slightly different, therefore the results are not directly comparable. The overall assessment results for SLO 5 in 2015-16 were 2% very good, 84% good enough, and 14% not good enough. On the dimension, “cross-functional perspective,” 15% of students’ work was deemed very good, 81% was deemed good enough, and 4% was deemed not good enough. On the dimension “information integration,” 7% of students’ work was deemed very good, 84% was deemed good enough, and 9% was deemed not good enough. On the dimension “holistic solutions,” 4% of students’ work was deemed very good, 65% was deemed good enough, and 31% was deemed not good enough.

As compared with results from 2013-14 (n=60 randomly selected papers) some differences are apparent. The overall assessment results for SLO 5 in 2013-14 were 60% very good, 35% good enough, and 5% not good enough. On the dimension, “cross-functional perspective,” 65% of students’ work was deemed very good, 32% was deemed good enough, and 3% was deemed not good enough. On the dimension “information integration,” 58% of students’ work was deemed very good, 37% was deemed good enough, and 5% was deemed not good enough. On the dimension “holistic solutions,” 43% of students’ work was deemed very good, 47% was deemed good enough, and 10% was deemed not good enough.

The combined percentages deemed very good and good enough are shown below for the assessments since 2013-14 to the current assessment. As previously stated, the measurement tool has changed between assessment periods, therefore caution should be used when comparing between periods.

**Table 4: “Cross Functional Nature of Business” Assessed in BUS 497A Trend (Direct, Course Embedded Measures)**

Overall Assessment	Very Good	Good Enough	Not Good Enough
2017-18	2%	79%	19%
2015-16	2%	84%	14%
2013-14	60%	35%	5%

One possible explanation for these differences is that the 100 BUS 497A papers assessed in 2015-16 were pulled from only 5 course sections taught by 2 instructors, as compared with smaller samples from a wider range of BUS 497A course sections and instructors in 2013-14. Perhaps the assignments given in 2015-16 were not as well aligned with the dimensions measured for SLO 5, especially the dimension “holistic solutions.” Another contributing factor might be that the assessment of SLO 5 in 2013-14 was conducted by only 1 assessor, a teaching instructor, as compared with 2 outside assessors in 2015-16 and 2017-18.

**Indirect Measure through Exit Survey:**

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

**Table 5: “Cross Functional Nature of Business” Assessed through Exit Survey (Supplemental Indirect Measure)**

Exit Survey Question: “I have gained a strong understanding of the cross-functional nature of business problems (i.e., how different subjects such as marketing, finance, and business law interact with each other).”								
	Strongly Agree	Agree	TOTAL* Strongly Agree + Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	TOTAL* Do Not Agree	TOTAL* Disagree + Strongly Disagree
2018 (n=394)	55.6%	33.2%	88.8%	6.9%	2.0%	2.3%	11.2%	4.3%
2017 (n=528)	55.5%	36.4%	91.9%	5.3%	1.5%	1.3%	8.1%	2.8%
2016 (n=521)	53.0%	40.7%	93.7%	4.2%	1.2%	1.0%	6.3%	2.1%
2015 (n=522)	54.4%	38.9%	92.3%	5.6%	1.1%	1.0%	7.7%	2.1%

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

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

Students’ understanding and application of key business concepts was assessed in 2017-18 through three direct assessment methods supplemented by indirect measures.

1. SLO 6 was assessed through direct course embedded measures in BUS 302L (the Gateway Experience Lab) where students were required to complete multiple choice examinations in each of the 6 lower division core (LDC) business subjects: business law, financial accounting, management accounting, macroeconomics, microeconomics, and statistics. These examinations were administered in the Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 semesters.
2. SLO 6 was assessed through direct course embedded measures in upper division core (UDC) classes required of all business majors: FIN 303 (Financial Management) for knowledge of key finance concepts, MKT 304 (Introduction to Marketing Management) for knowledge of key marketing concepts, SOM 306 (Operations Management) for knowledge of key systems and operations management concepts, and MGT 360 (Management and Organizational Behavior) for knowledge of key management concepts.

- SLO 6 was assessed through supplemental indirect measures. At the end of each academic year, graduating seniors from the Nazarian College are asked to respond to an exit survey, which since 2014-15 has contained questions pertaining to each of the College’s undergraduate business learning goals. Graduating seniors were asked to indicate their perceptions regarding their own learning of accounting, business law, economics, finance, management, marketing, and systems and operations management.

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

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

The highest score earned on each LDC examination for each student enrolled in BUS 302L in Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 was recorded and used for assessment. (Students who initially fail an examination may repeat that exam.) Thus, assessment data captured the entire population of students enrolled in BUS 302L in the Fall 2017 (n=1102) and Spring 2018 (n=877) semesters.

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

For the Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 semesters, the passing rates were highest (and the failure rates lowest) for examinations in business law, followed by microeconomics, macroeconomics, management accounting, financial accounting, and statistics. The inclusive failure rates remained in the acceptable range with the exception of statistics which had a failure rate of 18.8% (Fall 2017) and 20.3% (Spring 2018). The exclusive failure rates for statistics also fell just out of the acceptable range of 15% in both semesters. The inclusive and exclusive failure and passing rates for each of the six LDC exams for both semesters are shown in tabular form in the table below.

**Table 6: “Key Business Concepts” Assessed in BUS 302L, LDC Exams (Direct, Course Embedded Measures)**

	Inclusive Passing Rates INCLUDING students who did not attempt exam		Exclusive Passing Rates EXCLUDING students who did not attempt exam	
	Fall 2017 (n = 1102)	Spring 2018 (n = 877)	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Business Law	93.0%	93.3%	95.8% (n = 1070)	96.2% (n = 850)
Financial Accounting	86.0%	85.5%	88.8% (n = 1067)	89.2% (n = 841)
Managerial Accounting	86.2%	85.9%	89.1% (n = 1066)	89.3% (n = 843)
Microeconomics	88.8%	88.5%	91.8% (n = 1066)	92.1% (n = 843)
Macroeconomics	88.6%	87.6%	91.4% (n = 1068)	91.3% (n = 841)
Statistics	81.2%	79.7%	84.2% (n = 1063)	83.2% (n = 840)



The Nazarian College sets a standard of at least 85% of students passing (no more than 15% failing) each LDC examination each semester. This benchmark was met in 2017-18 for all examinations other than statistics.

Overall, the 2017-18 assessment scores for “key business concepts” as assessed with the BUS 302L LDC exams are slightly lower than in recent years, including when SLO 6 was last assessed in 2015-16. Inclusive passing and failure rates for each of the LDC examinations since Fall 2013 are shown in Table 7. Passing rates have held relatively steady with minor fluctuations for LDC examinations covering business law, microeconomics, and macroeconomics. Passing rates have generally declined for financial accounting and to a lesser degree for management accounting. Passing rates have declined for statistics and have fallen short of the college benchmark of 85% each semester except Spring 2015. Additionally, inclusive failure rates for management accounting have hovered near 15% since Fall 2014 with a slight improvement in the 2017-18 year.

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

**Table 7: “Key Business Concepts” Assessed in BUS 302L, LDC Exams 2013-14 to 2017-18 Inclusive (Including Students Who Did NOT Attempt an Exam) Passing and Failure Rates**

Semester	Business Law		Micro-economics		Macro-economics		Financial Accounting		Management Accounting		Statistics	
	Passed	Failed	Passed	Failed	Passed	Failed	Passed	Failed	Passed	Failed	Passed	Failed
Fall 2013 (n=797)	92.2%	7.8%	88.7%	11.3%	88.3%	11.7%	89.1%	10.9%	86.2%	13.8%	84.9%	15.1%
Spring 2014 (n=724)	93.9%	6.1%	87.4%	12.6%	90.8%	9.2%	88.1%	11.9%	87.3%	12.7%	84.1%	15.9%
Fall 2014 (n=961)	93.6%	6.4%	89.2%	10.8%	90.2%	9.8%	89.4%	10.6%	85.7%	14.3%	83.6%	16.4%
Spring 2015 (n=807)	94.4%	5.6%	90.5%	9.5%	90.7%	9.3%	88.1%	11.9%	85.6%	14.4%	85.5%	14.5%
Fall 2015 (n=975)	92.4%	7.6%	89.1%	10.9%	88.7%	11.3%	88.5%	11.5%	86.0%	14.0%	82.9%	17.1%
Spring 2016 (n=901)	92.7%	7.3%	87.8%	12.2%	88.8%	11.2%	86.0%	14.0%	85.6%	14.4%	79.5%	20.5%
Fall 2016 (n=1027)	93.5%	6.5%	90.6%	9.4%	88.6%	11.4%	88.3%	11.7%	84.3%	15.7%	81.6%	18.4%
Spring 2017 (n=901)	93.2%	6.8%	88.4%	11.6%	86.5%	13.5%	86.7%	13.3%	84.7%	15.3%	76.9%	23.1%
Fall 2017 (n=1102)	93.0%	7.0%	88.8%	11.2%	88.6%	11.4%	86.0%	14.0%	86.2%	13.8%	81.2%	18.8%
Spring 2018 (n=877)	93.3%	6.7%	88.5%	11.5%	87.6%	12.4%	85.5%	14.5%	85.9%	14.1%	79.7%	20.3%

**Table 8: “Key Business Concepts” Assessed in BUS 302L, LDC Exams 2013-14 to 2017-18  
Exclusive (Excluding Students Who Did NOT Attempt an Exam) Passing and Failure Rates**

Semester	Business Law		Micro-economics		Macro-economics		Financial Accounting		Management Accounting		Statistics	
	Passed	Failed	Passed	Failed	Passed	Failed	Passed	Failed	Passed	Failed	Passed	Failed
Fall 2013	96.3% n=763	3.7%	92.9% n=761	7.1%	93.2% n=755	6.8%	93.9% n=756	6.1%	91.4% n=752	8.6%	90.0% n=752	10.0%
Spring 2014	97.3% n=699	2.7%	91.3% n=693	8.7%	94.5% n=695	5.5%	91.9% n=694	8.1%	91.5% n=691	8.5%	87.6% n=695	12.4%
Fall 2014	97.1% n=927	2.9%	93.0% n=922	7.0%	94.2% n=920	5.8%	93.5% n=919	6.5%	90.2% n=914	9.8%	88.1% n=911	11.9%
Spring 2015	97.7% n=780	2.3%	94.0% n=777	6.0%	94.2% n=777	5.8%	91.6% n=776	8.4%	89.4% n=773	10.6%	89.0% n=775	11.0%
Fall 2015	96.8% n=931	3.2%	93.4% n=930	6.6%	93.6% n=924	6.4%	93.4% n=924	6.6%	91.2% n=919	8.8%	88.1% n=917	11.9%
Spring 2016	96.1% n=869	3.9%	91.3% n=866	8.7%	92.7% n=863	7.3%	90.1% n=860	9.9%	90.0% n=857	10.0%	83.4% n=859	16.6%
Fall 2016	93.4% n=996	3.6%	93.8% n=992	6.3%	91.8% n=991	8.2%	91.2% n=995	8.8%	87.2% n=993	12.8%	84.7% n=989	15.3%
Spring 2017	96.1% n=874	3.9%	91.2% n=873	8.8%	89.6% n=869	13.4%	89.9% n=869	10.1%	88.4% n=863	11.6%	80.1% n=865	19.9%
Fall 2017	95.8% n=1070	4.2%	91.8% n=1066	8.2%	91.4% n=1068	8.6%	88.8% n=1067	11.2%	89.1% n=1066	10.9%	84.2% n=1063	15.8%
Spring 2018	96.2% n=850	3.8%	92.1% n=841	7.9%	91.3% n=841	8.7%	89.2% n=841	10.8%	89.3% n=843	10.7%	83.2% n=840	16.8%

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

Students’ understanding and application of key business concepts was also assessed in 2017-18 in the upper division core classes, FIN 303, MKT 304, SOM 306, and MGT 360. These courses are required of all students in all business majors.

In FIN 303, the work of students in 5 course sections taught by 3 different instructors (n=789) was used to assess students’ understanding and application of key finance concepts. Multiple choice examination questions developed by individual instructors tested key concepts pertaining to financing and investment analysis and decisions. The number of examination questions answered correctly determined students’ performance. For example, an individual instructor who asked 10 examination questions for assessment defined as very good the performance of students who correctly answered 9 or 10 questions, defined as good enough the performance of students who correctly answered 5 to 8 questions, and defined as not good enough the performance of students who correctly answered 0 to 4 questions. Altogether, 24.3% of students’ work was deemed very good, 56.5% was deemed good enough, and 19.1% was deemed not good enough. These results are shown in tabular form in Table 9.

The assessment results for MKT 304 are still pending.

In SOM 306, the work of students in 13 course sections (n=980) was used to assess students’ understanding and application of key systems and operations management concepts. This represents all students enrolled in SOM 306 in the Spring 2018 semester. Multiple choice examination questions in SOM 306 tested students’ understanding of key systems and operations management concepts (10 standard questions developed and approved by the Systems and Operations Management Department). The performance of students who correctly answered 9 or 10 questions was deemed very good, the performance of students who correctly answered 5 to 8 questions was deemed good enough, and the performance of students who correctly answered 0 to 4 questions was deemed not good enough. Altogether, 17.4% of students’ work was deemed very good, 61.0% was deemed good enough, and 21.6% was deemed not good enough. These results are shown in Table 9.

In MGT 360, the work of students in 3 course sections (n=473) was used to assess students’ understanding and application of key management concepts. Multiple choice examination questions in MGT 360 tested students’ understanding of concepts pertaining to planning, organizing, leading, and controlling; motivation; and individual differences (10 standard questions developed and approved by the Management Department). The performance of students who correctly answered 9 to 10 questions was deemed very good, the performance of students who correctly answered 6 to 8 questions was deemed good enough, and the performance of students who correctly answered 0 to 5 questions was deemed not good enough. Altogether, 64.5% of students’ work was deemed very good, 32.9% was deemed good enough, and 2.6% was deemed not good enough. These results are shown in Table 9.

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

	Very Good	Good Enough	Not Good Enough
FIN 303 (n=789)	24.3%	56.5%	19.1%
MKT 304 Pending			
SOM 306 (n=980)	17.4%	61.0%	21.6%
MGT 360 (n=473)	64.5%	32.9%	2.6%

Overall, the 2017-18 assessment scores for “key business concepts” as assessed with course embedded measures in the upper division core classes were comparable with those recorded when SLO 6 was last assessed in 2015-16. Scores in FIN 303 for 2015-16 were 31% very good, 54% good enough, and 15% not good enough (n=634). Scores in MKT 304 for 2015-16 were 24% very good, 64% good enough, and 12% not good enough (n=912). Scores in SOM 306 for 2015-16 were 12% very good, 62% good enough, and 26% not good enough (n=802). Scores in MGT 360 for 2015-16 were 25% very good, 58% good enough, and 18% not good enough (n=134). The academic year 2015-16 was the first year that SLO 6 was assessed in MGT 360.

The Nazarian College sets a standard of at least 70% of students with very good and good enough performance on course embedded measures of SLO 6. This benchmark was met for 2017-18 when SLO 6 was measured in FIN 303 (80.9% very good and good enough), and SOM 306 (78.8% very good and good enough). The results are still pending for MKT 304.

**Indirect Measures through Exit Survey:**

The direct measures for SLO 6 discussed above were supplemented by indirect measures to assess students’ perceptions of their learning. At the end of each academic year, graduating seniors from the Nazarian College are asked to respond to an exit survey, which since 2014-15 has contained questions pertaining to each of the Nazarian College’s undergraduate business learning goals. Pertaining to SLO 6, graduating seniors were asked in 7 separate questions to indicate their level of agreement with the following statement, “I have gained a thorough understanding of, and ability to apply, important concepts from ....” the 7 functional areas of accounting, business law, economics, finance, management, marketing, and systems and operations management. Responses are shown in Table 10 for academic years 2014-15 through 2017-18, indicating a relatively high level of student satisfaction or confidence with learning relevant to SLO 6. Student satisfaction or confidence with learning is generally highest for management, marketing, and business law; and slightly lower for the more quantitative subjects, accounting, economics, finance, and systems and operations management. Caution should be used in interpreting these measures, as they are measures of student perception, not direct measures of learning.

**Table 10: “Key Business Concepts” Assessed through Exit Survey  
(Supplemental Indirect Measures)**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	TOTAL* Strongly Agree + Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	TOTAL* Do Not Agree	TOTAL* Disagree + Strongly Disagree
Exit Survey Question: “I have gained a thorough understanding of, and ability to apply, important concepts from <u>Accounting</u> .								
2018 (n=394)	39.6%	35.0%	74.6%	15.5%	7.1%	2.8%	25.4%	9.9%
2017 (n=528)	36.4%	39.4%	75.8%	18.0%	3.8%	2.5%	24.2%	6.3%
2016 (n=521)	34.7%	42.2%	77.0%	16.7%	5.0%	1.3%	23.0%	6.3%
2015 (n=521)	35.1%	43.0%	78.1%	16.1%	3.8%	1.9%	21.8%	5.7%
Exit Survey Question: “I have gained a thorough understanding of, and ability to apply, important concepts from <u>Business Law</u> .								
2018 (n=394)	39.3%	42.1%	81.5%	11.7%	3.8%	3.0%	18.5%	6.9%
2017 (n=528)	39.4%	42.2%	81.6%	13.4%	2.8%	2.1%	18.4%	4.9%
2016 (n=521)	40.7%	45.7%	86.4%	11.1%	2.1%	0.4%	13.6%	2.5%
2015 (n=522)	43.5%	42.3%	85.8%	10.5%	2.7%	1.0%	14.2%	3.7%
Exit Survey Question: “I have gained a thorough understanding of, and ability to apply, important concepts from <u>Economics</u> .								
2018 (n=394)	34.3%	40.1%	74.4%	17.8%	4.8%	3.0%	25.6%	7.9%
2017 (n=528)	32.8%	40.5%	73.3%	19.7%	4.9%	2.1%	26.7%	7.0%
2016 (n=521)	27.1%	44.3%	71.4%	21.5%	5.4%	1.7%	28.6%	7.1%
2015 (n=520)	30.6%	47.9%	78.5%	15.4%	3.5%	2.7%	21.5%	6.2%
Exit Survey Question: “I have gained a thorough understanding of, and ability to apply, important concepts from <u>Finance</u> .								
2018 (n=394)	36.8%	35.8%	72.6%	16.2%	6.9%	4.3%	27.4%	11.2%
2017 (n=528)	36.7%	38.1%	74.8%	17.4%	5.1%	2.7%	25.2%	7.8%
2016 (n=521)	31.3%	40.9%	72.2%	17.5%	7.7%	2.7%	27.8%	10.4%
2015 (n=520)	35.6%	42.9%	78.5%	13.5%	5.0%	3.1%	21.5%	8.1%
Exit Survey Question: “I have gained a thorough understanding of, and ability to apply, important concepts from <u>Management</u> .								
2018 (n=394)	51.5%	36.8%	88.3%	6.1%	2.0%	3.6%	11.7%	5.6%
2017 (n=528)	53.2%	36.0%	89.2%	6.8%	2.3%	1.7%	10.8%	4.0%
2016 (n=521)	53.9%	34.9%	88.9%	8.3%	2.1%	0.8%	11.1%	2.9%
2015 (n=518)	51.4%	38.2%	89.6%	7.9%	1.3%	1.2%	10.4%	2.5%
Exit Survey Question: “I have gained a thorough understanding of, and ability to apply, important concepts from <u>Marketing</u> .								
2018 (n=394)	44.2%	37.6%	81.7%	12.4%	2.3%	3.6%	18.3%	5.8%
2017 (n=528)	48.3%	38.3%	86.6%	9.3%	2.5%	1.7%	13.4%	4.2%
2016 (n=521)	45.9%	41.8%	87.7%	10.2%	1.5%	0.6%	12.3%	2.1%
2015 (n=522)	46.2%	42.3%	88.5%	8.8%	1.5%	1.2%	11.5%	2.7%
Exit Survey Question: “I have gained a thorough understanding of, and ability to apply, important concepts from <u>Systems and Operations Management</u> .								
2018 (n=394)	31.5%	34.0%	65.5%	21.1%	8.4%	5.1%	34.5%	13.5%
2017 (n=528)	32.8%	35.0%	67.8%	18.8%	9.7%	3.8%	32.2%	13.4%
2016 (n=521)	25.3%	41.5%	66.8%	22.3%	6.7%	4.2%	33.2%	10.9%
2015 (n=523)	31.4%	40.5%	71.9%	17.2%	7.5%	3.4%	28.1%	10.9%

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

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

This SLO has been measured for numerous years with very strong results. The emphasis of teamwork has permeated throughout the program and exists in numerous courses with very positive results. In an effort to advance the mission of the college and focus resources on other areas, it has been decided that this SLO will no longer be measured. This was done as part of a modification and update of all the program SLOs.

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

The David Nazarian College of Business and Economics sets a standard of at least 70% of students with very good and good enough performance on course embedded measures of SLO 4 in upper division business core courses. This benchmark was met for 2017-18 when SLO 4 was assessed in SOM 306. The results of the assessment in SOM 306 showed that 79.7% of students performed at a level deemed very good or good enough. These percentages are comparable with those recorded during the last assessment of SLO 4 in 2015-16 with 80.4% at a level 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 SLO 4 with 85.5% who “agree” or “strongly agree” with the statement “I have gained a thorough understanding of the global context of modern business.”

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

The Nazarian College sets a standard of at least 70% of students with very good and good enough performance on course embedded measures of SLO 5. This benchmark was met in 2017-18 for the overall assessment (80.6% very good and good enough). However, for the dimension, “holistic solutions,” only 76.5% of students’ work was deemed very good or good enough, and 23.5% was deemed not good enough. It is not clear whether the higher percentage of work deemed not good enough on the holistic solutions dimension was due to deficient skills and learning or because the assignments collected for assessment from BUS 497A were not well aligned to the rubric and the holistic solutions dimension of SLO 5.

As compared with results from 2015-16, the last time SLO 5 was measured, some differences are apparent. While the combined percentages deemed very good and good enough were comparable between 2017-18 and 2015-16, there does to be a slight decrease in between assessment periods.

One possible explanation for the results could be that the assignments were not as well aligned with the dimensions measured for SLO 5, especially the dimension “holistic solutions.” Another contributing factor might be a result of changes to the rubric used in the assessment of SLO.

Responses to the annual exit survey of graduating seniors (an indirect measure) indicate a high level of student satisfaction or confidence with learning relevant to SLO 5. However, there does appear to be an increase in the percent of students who disagree with the statement “I have gained a strong understanding of the cross-functional nature of business problems (i.e., how different subjects such as marketing, finance, and business law interact with each other).” This could be in part due to the smaller number of students responding to the survey in 2017-18 compared to previous years.

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

For the BUS 302L lower division core (LDC) examinations, the Nazarian College sets a standard of at least 85% of students passing (no more than 15% failing) each semester. This benchmark was met in 2017-18 for all examinations other than statistics. The inclusive failure rates for the statistics exam were higher than 15% in both the Fall 2017 semester (18.8%) and the Spring 2018 semester (20.3%). The exclusive failure rate for the statistics exam was greater than 15% in

the Fall 2017 semester (15.8%) and the Spring 2018 semester (16.8%). Additionally, inclusive failure rates for the financial and management accounting exam have hovered near 15% in Spring 2018.

Overall, the 2017-18 assessment scores for “key business concepts” as assessed with the BUS 302L LDC exams were similar to the results in recent years. Passing rates have held relatively steady with minor fluctuations for LDC examinations covering business law, microeconomics, and macroeconomics. Passing rates for LDC examinations have generally declined for financial accounting and to a lesser degree for management accounting. Passing rates have remained lower than 85% for statistics and have fallen short of the Nazarian College benchmark.

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

For course embedded measures in upper division core courses (FIN 303, SOM 306, and MGT 360), the Nazarian College sets a standard of at least 70% of students with very good and good enough performance. This benchmark was met in 2017-18. Results for FIN 303 were 80.9% very good and good enough. Results for SOM 306 were 78.4% very good and good enough. Results for MGT 360 were 97.4% very good and good enough. The percentages for FIN 303 and MKT 304 are comparable with those recorded during the last assessment of SLO 6 in 2015-16. The assessment process for MGT 360 is still maturing, since SLO 6 was assessed for the first time in MGT 360 in 2015-16. The percentages for SOM 306 were somewhat higher in 2017-18 than in 2015-16 (78% very good and good enough in 2015-16 versus 74% in 2015-16). The 2017-18 results for SOM 306 exceed the 70% benchmark, but the Systems and Operations Management Department has already suggested that SOM 306 instructors will examine the causes for the lower scores, take proactive measures, and monitor future assessment results.

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

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

In 2017-18, the David Nazarian College of Business and Economics used the results from 2016-17 assessment of SLO Group 1 to perform program/curriculum review (closing-the-loop activity). The 3 SLOs in SLO Group 1 are:

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

The 2016-17 assessment results were examined first by the departments and units from which assessment data were collected, and then by the Assurance of Learning and Accreditation Committee (AoL Committee). These parties forwarded recommendations relevant to both the assessment process and the undergraduate curriculum to the Assurance of Learning Director for presentation to the Curriculum Management and Planning Committee (CMAP). Subsequently, CMAP examined the 2016-17 assessment results and the input of these groups and developed recommendations to address areas of concern. These were summarized in a memorandum from the Assurance of Learning Director and CMAP to Dean Chandra Subramaniam for discussion with responsible parties, primarily the coordinators of BUS 302 and BUS 497A.

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

With only one minor exception, assessment results found that students are achieving the benchmark of having at least 85% of students scoring “very good” or “good enough” on the “written and oral communication skills” learning objective. The reasons for why this is not an issue are stated below.

On the “written communication” portion of SLO 1, results are meeting our benchmarks in all three (BUS 302, BUS 497, UDWPE) samples/populations measured. Hence, no curricular changes are warranted for this portion of SLO 1.

On the “oral communication” portion of SLO 1, there was only one sample of students (BUS 302) measured. In that sample of 231 students’ oral presentations, approximately 18% of students’ presentation skills were rated as “not good enough,” which is higher than our goal of no more than 15% scoring at this level. For at least two key reasons, it seems that no curricular change is warranted. First, the difference between 82% and 85% of students achieving the benchmark is small, and the level of skill actually observed on any one particular presentation likely is a low-end estimate of a student’s actual skill level. Second, the sample of students rated—students currently enrolled in BUS 302—likely are not at the same skill level of our graduating students, as BUS 302 students still have many classes and many opportunities to hone their presentation skills ahead of them.

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

With regard to SLO 2, the problem solving and critical thinking, the results from the FIN 303 and SOM 306 show that the students are performing within the established criteria. In fact, over the recent past, student assessment measures have improved. However, we see a weakness in the area of clearly justifying solutions - this is particularly true with respect to BUS 497A. The CMAP, having recognized this, is currently working towards rectifying this deficiency. The CMAP is in the process of reviewing the overall curriculum, and hopes to align/redesign the courses to strengthen student performance.



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

As the AoL Committee summarizes, there are mixed results with how well students understand ethics and social responsibility, where students are able to develop strategies and identify ethical dilemmas, yet struggle somewhat with properly justifying solutions and/or courses of action. Notably, the modifications to SLO 3, now include details about how students will “identify ethical dilemmas, analyze them from multiple perspectives, develop solutions, and support their decisions.” The CMAP concurs with the AoL Committee recommendations to utilize BUS 302 to support the modifications to SLO 3 and formally include ethics and social responsibility in the introductory course to the core.

CMAP also recognizes the increasing role that technology will play in both the learning environments students face and their future industries/careers. Innovative and emerging technologies will involve unique ethical, social responsibility, and legal challenges for students, such as data supply, protection, and management issues involving security, storage, exchanges, employees, and analysis. It will be essential to update and include these challenges with technology and data in course material for an introductory course to the core.

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

SLO 4 most directly reflects the university’s commitment to diversity. SLO 4, “our students understand the global context of modern business,” recognizes the diversity inherent in global markets and workplaces.

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

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

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

Not applicable.

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

The David Nazarian College of Business and Economics will continue to perform assessment and closing-the-loop activity according to our staggered assessment/assurance of learning cycle. In 2018-19, the College will perform assessment (measure student work and analyze the results) for SLO Group 1, while applying the results of the 2017-18 assessment of SLO Group 2 to program review/curriculum review/revision (i.e., closing-the-loop activity).

In 2018-18, the College will measure and analyze student work pertaining to the following 3 SLOs, which comprise SLO Group 1:

- SLO1 - Communication: The student will write professional business reports, deliver strong oral presentations, and create effective visual materials.
- SLO2 - Critical Thinking/Problem Solving: The student will identify and analyze problems and devise appropriate solutions using qualitative and quantitative techniques.
- SLO3 - Ethics: The student will identify ethical dilemmas, analyze them from multiple perspectives, develop solutions, and support their decisions.

At the same time, the College will use the results from our 2017-18 assessment of SLO Group 2, which was discussed in the beginning sections of this report, to perform program/curriculum review (closing-the-loop activity).