

2018-2019 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, 2019. 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 include this form with your report in the same file and identify your department/program in the file name.

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 programs in business, excluding Economics

Assessment liaison: Ray Calnan, College Director of Learning Assurance

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 Arts and Humanities student 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 2019-20.

Include a brief description as reflective of a continuous program of ongoing assessment.

2) Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s).

Explanation of Reasons for Assessment Activities

In May 2012 the faculty of the David Nazarian College of Business and Economics approved a staggered assessment/assurance of learning cycle. The 5 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. The SLOs were updated in 2017-18 and are shown below.

In AY 2018-19, the Nazarian College measured and analyzed student work pertaining to the following three 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 used the results from the AY 2017-18 assessment of SLO Group 2 to perform program/ curriculum review (closing-the-loop activities). The two SLOs in SLO Group 2 are:

- SLO4 - Global Context and Diversity: The student will recognize and evaluate the role of diversity, inclusion, and multiculturalism in the global business environment.
- SLO5 - Cross-Disciplinary Knowledge: The student will demonstrate proficiency in the functional areas of business as well as the ability to synthesize and apply this knowledge across disciplines.

Option A - Program Assessment and Results

In AY 2018-19, the Nazarian College measured and analyzed student work pertaining to the following three 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

The measurement of each SLO is summarized in the following pages.

SLO1 - Communication:

The student will write professional business reports, deliver strong oral presentations, and create effective visual materials.

Oral and written communication skills were assessed through direct course-embedded measures. Assignments are required of students in BUS 302 (Gateway Experience) and in BUS 497A (Capstone-Strategic Management). These two required courses are part of the upper division core curriculum for students in all business majors. Additionally, responses to Student Exit Surveys are included to supplement the information gathered in the courses. Assessment of SLO 1 occurred during the Spring 2019 semester.

Oral Communication – Direct Measure

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. Each student's individual oral presentation was assessed as being "very good," "good enough," or "not good enough" on two dimensions, "organization" and "delivery."

The oral presentations of 531 students were assessed. These were students across 22 course sections of BUS 302 taught by six instructors.

In the dimension of "organization," 12% of students were rated as "not good enough." This reflects a slip from the assessment in 2016-17, which showed that only 10% of students were in this category.

In the dimension of "delivery," 18% of students were rated as "not good enough." This reflects a slight improvement from the assessment in 2016-17, which showed that only 19% of students were in this category.

The rating of “very good” slipped in both dimensions, resulting in a greater number of students in the “good enough” category. The College has a target of no more than 15% of students in the “not good enough” ranking. Therefore, attention should be given to the dimension of “delivery” in order to improve student outcomes.

Table 1 - Oral Communication Assessed in BUS 302 2018-19

Dimension	Very Good	Good Enough	Not Good Enough
Organization	28.2%	59.5%	12.2%
Delivery	25.4%	56.9%	17.7%

Table 2 - Oral Communication Assessed in BUS 302 2016-17

Dimension	Very Good	Good Enough	Not Good Enough
Organization	34.6%	55.0%	10.4%
Delivery	28.6%	52.8%	18.6%

Oral Communication – Indirect Measure

The direct measures of the SLO 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. 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 the table below, indicating relatively high levels of student satisfaction or confidence with learning relevant to this SLO. However, caution should be used in interpreting this measure as it is a measure of student perception, not a direct measure of learning

Table 3 -Exit Survey Results for Oral Communication

Rating	Strongly Agree	Agree	TOTAL* Strongly Agree + Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	TOTAL* Do Not Agree	TOTAL* Disagree + Strongly Disagree
2019 (n=513)	51.7%	40.4%	92.0%	6.4%	1.0%	0.6%	8.0%	1.6%
2018 (n=394)	50.0%	37.1%	87.1%	7.1%	3.3%	2.5%	12.9%	5.8%
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%

*Totals may be off due to rounding

Written Communication – Direct Measure

In past years, business students' written communication skills were assessed through direct embedded measures in two courses. Written assignments were in both required in BUS 302 and in BUS 497A. However, in 2017-18 the decision was made to streamline the data collection in order to place more emphasis and resources on improving the program. Therefore, in 2018-19 artifacts were only collected in the business capstone course, 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.

The individually written case assignments were collected from 18 course sections of BUS 497A taught by eight instructors in Spring 2019. A total of 452 papers were submitted from which a random sample of $n=100$ was selected. Student work was assessed independently by 2 outside assessors employed to read and rate all 100 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. Each student's individual written work was assessed as being "very good," "good enough," or "not good enough" on the three dimensions "purpose and organization," "language," and "document construction." All three 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 three dimensions, therefore, can range from a possible 3 to 9 for each assessor.

To derive the individual dimension score for student performance, values assigned by the assessors to the individual dimension were summed and averaged (divided by 2). Student work with an average score of 3 (very good) across all three dimensions was categorized as "very good," student work with an average score across the assessors of 2 or 2.5 was categorized as "good enough," and student work with an average score of 1 or 1.5 across the assessors was categorized as "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 (divided by 6). Student work with an average score of 3 (very good) across all three dimensions was categorized as "very good," student work with an average score across the three dimensions of 2-2.9 was categorized as "good enough," and student work with an average score of less than 2 across the three dimensions was categorized as "not good enough."

Results of this assessment are summarized in the table below. On the dimension "purpose and organization," 4% of the students' work was deemed not good enough. On the dimension "language," 7% of the students' work was deemed not good enough. On the dimension "document construction," 2% of the students' work was deemed not good enough. 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 three dimensions. On the basis of these overall composite scores, 35% of the students' work was deemed very good, 57% good enough, and 8% not good enough.

For comparison, the results from the prior assessment cycle are also presented below as a separate table. The College has a target of no more than 15% of students in the "not good enough" ranking.

Table 4 - Written Communication Results 2018-19

n=100	Very Good	Good Enough	Not Good Enough
Purpose and Organization	39%	57%	4%
Language	15%	78%	7%
Document Construction	49%	49%	2%
Overall	6%	87%	7%

Table 5 - Written Communication Results 2016-17

n=98	Very Good	Good Enough	Not Good Enough
Purpose and Organization	21%	66%	12%
Language	8%	78%	14%
Document Construction	41%	47%	12%
Overall	4.1%	87.8%	8.2%

Written Communication – Direct Measure (non-embedded)

The direct course-embedded measures from BUS 497A used to assess written communication is 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.

Nazarian College UDWPE performance is shown in the table below. 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 6 - UDWPE Results

Academic Year	Very Good (Score = 10-12)	Good Enough (Score = 8- 9)	Not Good Enough (Score = 0-7)
2017-18 (n=2,088)	8.40%	65.10%	26.5%
2016-17 (n=2,021)	11.53%	73.78%	14.70%
2015-16 (n=2,263)	10.25%	72.38%	17.37%
2014-15 (n=1,947)	10.48%	78.07%	11.45%
2013-14 (n=1,791)	13.01%	75.71%	11.28%
2012-13 (n=952)	13.55%	75.63%	10.82%

Written Communication – Indirect Measure

The direct measures of the SLO 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. Graduating seniors were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement, “I have developed strong written communication skills.” Responses are shown in the table below, indicating relatively high levels of student satisfaction or confidence with learning relevant to this SLO. However, caution should be used in interpreting this measure as it is a measure of student perception, not a direct measure of learning.

Table 7 - Exit Survey Results for Written Communication

Rating	Strongly Agree	Agree	TOTAL* Strongly Agree + Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	TOTAL* Do Not Agree	TOTAL* Disagree + Strongly Disagree
2019 (n=513)	48.9%	43.7%	92.6%	5.8%	0.4%	1.2%	7.4%	1.6%
2018 (n=394)	49.7%	36.8%	86.5%	8.6%	1.8%	3.0%	13.5%	4.8%
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%

SLO2 - Critical Thinking/Problem Solving:

The student will identify and analyze problems and devise appropriate solutions using qualitative and quantitative techniques.

Students’ problem-solving and critical thinking skills were assessed through direct embedded measures in BUS 497A, Capstone-Strategic Management. This course is part of the upper division core curriculum for students in all business majors.

Direct Course Embedded Measure in BUS 497A

In BUS 497A, the same case assignments used to assess written communication (see SLO 1, n=100 from 18 course sections taught by 8 instructors) were used to assess SLO 2, problem-solving and critical thinking. As explained in the discussion of SLO 1, a total of 452 papers were submitted from which a random sample of 100 was selected. Student work was assessed independently by 2 outside assessors employed to read and rate all 100 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. The rubric calls for student work to be assessed as being “very good,” “good enough,” or “not good enough” on the three dimensions “identify business problems and key assumptions,” “use of analytical skills,” and “clearly justified solution.”

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 three rubric dimensions in AY 2016-17 (and beyond) whereas only two rubric dimensions were applied in AY 2014-15.

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 three dimensions, therefore, can range from a possible 3 to 9 for each assessor.

To derive the individual dimension score for student performance, values assigned by the assessors to the individual dimension were summed and averaged (divided by 2). Student work with an average score of 3 (very good) across all three dimensions was categorized as “very good,” student work with an average score across the assessors of 2 or 2.5 was categorized as “good enough,” and student work with an average score of 1 or 1.5 across the assessors was categorized as “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 (divided by 6). Student work with an average score of 3 (very good) across all three dimensions was categorized as “very good,” student work with an average score across the three dimensions of 2-2.9 was categorized as “good enough,” and student work with an average score of less than 2 across the three dimensions was categorized as “not good enough.”

Results of the critical thinking and problem solving assessment from BUS 497A are summarized in the table below. On the dimension “identify business problems and key assumptions,” 5% of the students’ work was deemed not good enough. On the dimension “use of analytical skills,” 7% of the students’ work was deemed not good enough. On the dimension “clearly justified solution,” 7% of the students’ work was deemed not good enough. On the basis of these overall composite scores, 6% of the students’ work was deemed very good, 87% good enough, and 7% not good enough.

For comparison, the results from the prior assessment cycle are also presented below as a separate table. The College has a target of no more than 15% of students in the “not good enough” ranking.

Table 8 - Critical Thinking and Problem Solving Results 2018-19

n=100	Very Good	Good Enough	Not Good Enough
Identify Business Problems and Key Assumptions	45%	50%	5%
Use of analytical skills	42%	51%	7%
Clearly Justified Solution	42%	51%	7%
Overall	35%	57%	8%

Table 9 - Critical Thinking and Problem Solving Results 2016-17

n=98	Very Good	Good Enough	Not Good Enough
Identify Business Problems and Key Assumptions	11%	70%	18%
Use of analytical skills	17%	67%	15%
Clearly Justified Solution	8%	51%	41%
Overall	4%	78%	16%

The current assessment results show an improvement over the prior cycle. This could be in part due to interventions in our courses that encourage students to provide the reasoning for assumptions and support for conclusions. We also ensured that all instructors were familiar with the rubric used in assessment in an effort to encourage complete prompts for student assignments.

Critical Thinking and Problem Solving – Indirect Measure

The direct measures of the SLO 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. Graduating seniors were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement, “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 the table below, indicating relatively high levels of student satisfaction or confidence with learning relevant to this SLO. 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 - Exit Survey Responses to "I have developed strong problem-solving and critical thinking skills."

Rating	Strongly Agree	Agree	TOTAL* Strongly Agree + Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	TOTAL* Do Not Agree	TOTAL* Disagree + Strongly Disagree
2019 (n=513)	52.2%	42.1%	94.3%	3.9%	0.8%	1.0%	5.7%	1.8%
2018 (n=394)	50.3%	39.6%	89.8%	6.3%	1.3%	2.5%	10.2%	3.8%
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%

Table 11 - Exit Survey Responses to "I have learned to use information technology to solve business problems."

Rating	Strongly Agree	Agree	TOTAL* Strongly Agree + Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	TOTAL* Do Not Agree	TOTAL* Disagree + Strongly Disagree
2019 (n=513)	45.2%	40.9%	86.2%	9.9%	2.7%	1.2%	13.8%	3.9%
2018 (n=394)	41.4%	37.6%	78.9%	12.7%	4.6%	3.8%	21.1%	8.4%
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%

SLO3 - Ethics:

The student will identify ethical dilemmas, analyze them from multiple perspectives, develop solutions, and support their decisions.

Students' understanding of ethics and social responsibility was assessed through a direct embedded measure in BUS 302, Gateway Experience. This course is part of the upper division core curriculum for students in all business majors.

Ethics - Direct Course Embedded Measure in BUS 302

The individually written case assignments were collected from 21 course sections of BUS 302 taught by seven instructors in Spring 2019. A total of 100 papers were randomly selected from the course submissions. Student work was assessed independently by 2 outside assessors employed to read and rate all 100 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. Each student's individual written work was assessed as being "very good," "good enough," or "not good enough" on the three 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" 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 three dimensions, therefore, can range from a possible 3 to 9 for each assessor.

To derive the individual dimension score for student performance, values assigned by the assessors to the individual dimension were summed and averaged (divided by 2). Student work with an average score of 3 (very good) across all three dimensions was categorized as "very good," student work with an average score across the assessors of 2 or 2.5 was categorized as "good enough," and student work with an average score of 1 or 1.5 across the assessors was categorized as "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 (divided by 6). Student work with an average score of 3 (very good) across all three dimensions was categorized as “very good,” student work with an average score across the three dimensions of 2-2.9 was categorized as “good enough,” and student work with an average score of less than 2 across the three dimensions was categorized as “not good enough.”

Results of this assessment are summarized in the table below. On the dimension “identify ethical dilemma and major analytical frameworks,” 22% of the students’ work was deemed not good enough. On the dimension “identify interests and develop alternative strategies using ethical/social responsibility,” 21% of the students’ work was deemed not good enough. On the dimension “use ethical/social responsibility to justify course of action,” 34% of the students’ work was deemed not good enough. On the basis of these overall composite scores, 7% of the students’ work was deemed very good, 63% good enough, and 30% not good enough.

For comparison, the results from the prior assessment cycle are also presented below as a separate table. The College has a target of no more than 15% of students in the “not good enough” ranking. Therefore, there is significant opportunity for improvement in this SLO. Work is already underway to increase the opportunities for discussion in the area. The BUS 302 course is currently under review for major revision in order to increase exposure to ethics and using data for responsible decision-making. It is anticipated that the new course will be available in Spring 2021.

Table 12 - Ethics and Social Responsibility Results 2018-19

n=100	Very Good	Good Enough	Not Good Enough
Identify Ethical Dilemmas and Major Analytical Frameworks	23%	55%	22%
Identify Interests and Develop Alternative Strategies using Ethical/ Social Responsibility	26%	53%	21%
Use Ethics/Social Responsibility to Justify Course of Action	20%	46%	34%
Overall	7%	63%	30%

Table 13 - Ethics and Social Responsibility 2016-17

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%

Ethics and Social Responsibility – Indirect Measure

The direct measures of the SLO 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. 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 the table below, indicating relatively high levels of student satisfaction or confidence with learning relevant to this SLO. However, caution should be used in interpreting this measure as it is a measure of student perception, not a direct measure of learning.

Table 14 - Exit Survey Results for Ethics and Social Responsibility

Rating	Strongly Agree	Agree	TOTAL* Strongly Agree + Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	TOTAL* Do Not Agree	TOTAL* Disagree + Strongly Disagree
2019 (n=513)	58.9%	33.7%	92.6%	4.9%	1.4%	1.2%	7.4%	2.5%
2018 (n=394)	59.4%	31.2%	90.6%	4.6%	2.0%	2.8%	9.4%	4.8%
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%

Option B - Conclusions and Recommendations

In the past year, the David Nazarian College of Business and Economics revised standards for all SLOs and modified the standards so that all SLOs have a target of at least 85% of students with “very good” and “good enough” performance and no more than 15% “not good enough.” This was done to ensure that we constantly strive to improve and to clearly identify areas that need greater resources and attention. While we continue to strive to move more students from “good enough” to “very good” the main emphasis and effort will be on students in the “not good enough” ranking. SLOs with greater than 15% in “not good enough” will require serious attention to improve the outcomes.

SLO1 - Communication:

The student will write professional business reports, deliver strong oral presentations, and create effective visual materials.

The results for Oral Communication show that effort still needs to be made in improving student performance in “Delivery” of content. The College has increased the number of guest speakers and continues to increase offerings through the Career Education and Professional Development office. These programs provide students with opportunities to interact with professionals and see how others present. By exposing students to more speakers, it is hoped that they will gain confidence and see examples of best practices in the delivery of presentations. Additionally, the BUS 302 course is currently in the process of being replaced with a new course that will focus on ethics and decision-making using data. As a major component of this new course, students will be trained in the art of presentation and delivery.

The results of Written Communication are promising as signs of improvement are evident. This may be in part a result of better communication between instructors and students on the requirements of the assignment.

Both of these categories will be closely monitored, both to ensure improvement and to ensure continued positive improvements in some dimensions.

SLO2 - Critical Thinking/Problem Solving:

The student will identify and analyze problems and devise appropriate solutions using qualitative and quantitative techniques.

The results of Critical Thinking and Problem Solving are promising as signs of improvement are evident. This may be in part a result of better communication between instructors and students on the requirements of the assignment. It could also be the result of the greater emphasis in all courses of having students better explain the “why” of their assumptions and responses. While not as reliable, the exist survey results also increased student satisfaction in this area. This bolsters the results found through direct assessment.

The BUS 302 course is currently in the process of being replaced with a new course that will focus on ethics and decision-making using data. As a major component of this new course, students will be trained in the analyzing data use technical tools in order to be better decision makers. This is key to students having the ability to critically think about current business challenges and opportunities.

SLO3 - Ethics:

The student will identify ethical dilemmas, analyze them from multiple perspectives, develop solutions, and support their decisions.

The results from the assessment of Ethics and Social Responsibility show a decrease in the performance in the individual dimensions and overall. This is a concerning result and is not a trend that the College wants to see.

The BUS 302 course is currently in the process of being replaced with a new course that will focus on ethics and decision-making using data. The current curriculum allows students to take an ethics courses as a communications requirement, but does not require students to specifically take an ethics course. This is an issue that has been on the minds of the faculty and is a major reason for the overhaul of the BUS 302 course. Additionally, discussing with several departments in the College have taken place with the hope of adding Ethics, Social Responsibility, and Diversity to the existing curriculum, as appropriate.

Option C - Application of Previous Results

During the past year, the College was preparing for an accreditation visit from AACSB. There was a preliminary visit in May 2019 with the full team and comprehensive visit in October 2019. A major component of accreditation is Assurance of Learning.

Some of the major endeavors in the past year(+) include the modification of the prompts given to students to ensure that they are aware of the expectations of the assessment assignments. This has added benefits in that more faculty members are likely to adopt “transparent” assignment best practices. The result of which could be improved learning and less uncertainty to students.

As previously stated, all of the SLOs were revised to ensure that we are tracking goals that are important for students graduating in the current business environment. The modification also allows us the ability to not monitor particular outcomes as closely since we have historically done so well in embedded them within the program and many courses. An example is teamwork.

Another major change to the assessment process is that beginning 2019-20 the college will be measuring all SLOs in one year. The following year, 2020-21 will be used to analyze and modify practices and curriculum. This change is possible due to the reduction in SLOs and assessment points. It should allow faculty more time to consider the results rather than focusing on the collection of data. An anticipated benefit is the ability to make changes that impact multiple SLOs at one time, rather than smaller, piecemeal, changes. Collecting and analyzing the data for all SLOs at the same time will provide insights on issues that cross SLOs.

Option D - GE Assessment

No GE SLOs were measured in the College during this period. The College does not offer GE courses in this area.

Commitment to Diversity

The SLOs that were assessed in AY 2018-19 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.

As previously stated, the SLOs have been revised and updated to be more inclusive and relevant to the current business and social environment. As part of the improvement, the "Globalization" SLO was modified to now be stated as "SLO4 - Global Context and Diversity: The student will recognize and evaluate the role of diversity, inclusion, and multiculturalism in the global business environment." It is our hope and expectation that this will better align our program with the University's, and the College's, commitment to diversity.

Other Assessment Information

The College has modified the SLOs, as shown below and the assessment schedule to improve student outcomes, the assessment process, and the responsiveness of the faculty to results.

NEW Student Learning Outcomes

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.

SLO4 - Global Context and Diversity: The student will recognize and evaluate the role of diversity, inclusion, and multiculturalism in the global business environment.

SLO5 - Cross-Disciplinary Knowledge: The student will demonstrate proficiency in the functional areas of business as well as the ability to synthesize and apply this knowledge across disciplines.

OLD Student learning outcomes

Students in Business will learn the following:

- Our students have strong written and oral communication skills.
- Our students have strong problem-solving and critical thinking skills, including the application of information technology.
- Our students understand ethics and social responsibility.
- Our students understand the global context of modern business.
- Our students understand the cross-functional nature of business problems.
- Our students understand and apply key business concepts.
- Our students can work effectively in teams.

Data Collection/Assessment Cycle

The College has modified the collection/analysis/closing the loop cycle. Data will now be collected for every SLO in academic year beginning with an odd number (2019-20, 2021-22, etc.). Closing the loop activities, such as course and program modifications, will take place during academic years with an even beginning year (2020-21, 2022-23, etc.).

3) Preview of planned assessment activities for 2019-20

As stated, the College has taken steps to modify the Assurance of Learning process. One key change to assessment will begin in 2019-20. This relates to the collection of data. In the coming year, the College will measure and assess all the SLOs. The data collection will mainly occur in the Spring 2020 semester. The results of the data collection will then be analyzed and modifications to the curriculum, process, and program will be completed in the 2020-21 year. The following year, 2021-20, will again be used for data collection.

The 2019-20 year will also be used to continue the work towards improving the program core with initial emphasis being on the revision of the “gateway” BUS 302 course. Another improvement under discussion is the possible inclusion of students representatives in the curriculum review and creation process.

The College will also be collecting and analyzing data related to the University GE of Social Sciences. The assessment will be conducted in several Economics course, both in the Lower- and Upper-Division. The Marketing 350 course will also be used to collect and analyze student outcomes for the GE SLO.