**CRAIG SCHOOL OF BUSINESS**

**ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR 2015-2016**

**B.S. in Business Administration**

The CSB Assessment Team, in consultation with faculty, implemented in 2014-2015 a revised assessment plan compared to previous years. The revised plan includes 11 student learning outcomes derived from the following program goals:

BA graduates will:

**CSB 1.0** Have discipline specific knowledge

**CSB 2.0** Make judgments utilizing business decision support and productivity tools

**CSB 3.0** Work effectively with others

**CSB 4.0** Demonstrate an understanding and appreciation for global, cultural and ethical values

**CSB 5.0** Demonstrate professional development with an applied experience in business

**WASC 1.0** Meet core competency in critical thinking

**WASC 2.0** Meet core competency in oral communication

**WASC 3.0** Meet core competency in written communication

**WASC 4.0** Meet core competency in quantitative reasoning

**WASC 5.0** Meet core competency in information literacy

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?**   **CSB SLO 1.1.**  BA Graduates will demonstrate comprehension of all functional areas of business (e.g., accounting, finance, marketing, organizational behavior, human resources, legal and social issues, information systems, etc.).  **CSB SLO 2.1.**  BA Graduates will demonstrate the ability to make data informed judgments utilizing spreadsheets and other analytical tools and technology.  **CSB SLO 3.1.**  BA Graduates will demonstrate ability to work effectively with other people through effective teamwork practices and to contribute substantively to a group product.  **CSB SLO 4.1.**  BA Graduates will demonstrate awareness of global business environments and cultural diversity in addressing business problems.  **CSB SLO 4.2.**  BA Graduates will apply often conflicting ethical theories to manage their behavior in business situations.  **CSB SLO 5.1.**  BA Graduates will demonstrate professional career development as a result of at least one applied experience in business.  **WASC SLO 2.1.**  BA Graduates will prepare and deliver a coherent, professional oral presentation on a business issue.  **WASC SLO 3.1.**  BA Graduates will demonstrate the ability to write a clear, concise, well-organized and properly framed analysis of a business issue.  **WASC SLO 4.1.**  BA Graduates will demonstrate the ability to reason quantitatively. |
| 1. **What instruments (assignment) did you use to assess them?**   **CSB SLO 1.1.**  Functional Areas Exit Exam. Students in their last semester in the program take the Exit Exam, which is administered at the end of the semester in the capstone business courses for the various options. The Exit Exam consists of five fundamental questions from each of the program’s functional areas. The questions are selected from a pool of questions prepared by faculty coordinating and teaching the program core courses. Five versions of the exam are administered with each version consisting of ten questions—five each, from two functional areas. That is, a given student is only tested on two areas, but by randomly distributing the versions, all ten functional areas are assessed. Over 50 students for each version are assessed. Exams were graded centrally and results were summarized for this report. The benchmark for the Exit Exam is 60 percent.  **CSB SLO 2.1.**  Information Technology Assignment. Students in the core business course IS130 create models to support business scenario analysis (what-if) and decision-making using spreadsheet software (e.g., MS Excel). Students use the model they create to make calculations and projections with specific data and based on the results they make business decisions and write up a recommendation. Instructors teaching the course assess each model and recommendations using the Information Technology Rubric, which examines five categories at three levels. The assessment categories are: Problem Identification, Model Creation, Incorporation of Relevant Data, Technology Execution, Results Interpretation and the levels are: 3=exceeds expectations, 2=meets or marginally exceeds expectations, and 1=does not meet expectations. The benchmark for the Information Technology Assignment is that at least 70 percent of the students meet or exceed the benchmark of 60 percent (a score of 1.8 or higher).  The Assessment Center Activity described in others SLOs below also assesses students on decision making  **CSB SLO 3.1.**  Team Work Activity. Students in the course MGT 110 participate in a business simulation where they are required to write memos, give an impromptu presentation, and take part in group meetings. The activity is part of the CSB Assessment Center, is approximately a three-hour session, and is video-taped. The teamwork activity is assessed by trained, independent raters not affiliated with the university. The results can be compared to a comparison group of approximately 10,000 participants. The raters assess teamwork using the Assessment Center Teamwork Rubric, which examines five categories. The categories are: Contribution to Team Meetings, Facilitation of Other Members’ Contributions, Timely Completion and Quality of Individual Tasks, and Conflict Resolution. The results are presented as percentiles in the context of the comparison group. The benchmark for the Teamwork Activity the 60 percent percentile.  **CSB SLO 4.1.**  Global Awareness Unit. Students in the Course MKTG 100s complete a unit on awareness of global business environments and cultural diversity and take an exam after they complete the unit. The exam consists of 30 multiple choice questions. Exams are collected and graded by the course coordinator. The benchmark for the exam is 60 percent.  The Functional Area Exit Exam described in CSB SLO 1.1 above also assesses students on global awareness.  **CSB SLO 4.2.**  Ethical Behavior Activity. Students in the course MGT 110 participate in a business simulation where they are required to write memos, give an impromptu presentation, and take part in group meetings. The activity is part of the CSB Assessment Center, is approximately a three-hour session, and is video-taped. The Ethical Behavior Activity is assessed by trained, independent raters not affiliated with the university. The results can be compared to a comparison group of approximately 10,000 participants. The raters assess teamwork using the Assessment Center Teamwork Rubric, which examines five categories. The categories are: Identification of Ethical Issues, Identification of Ethical Theories or Concepts, Ethical Self-awareness, and Analysis of Ethical Issues. The results are presented as percentiles in the context of the comparison group. The benchmark is the 60 percent percentile.  The Functional Area Exit Exam described in CSB SLO 1.1 above also assesses students on ethics.  **CSB SLO 5.1.**  Service Learning Activity. Students in the course MKTG 100s participate in a service learning activity/project. At the end of the activity/project students write a reflection of the activity/project. Course instructors assess a sample of the reflections using the Service Learning Checklist, which examines three assessment areas. In each of the three assessment areas, namely, (i)Engagement in Professional Activities, (ii) Enhancement of Professional Skills, and (iii) Exposure to Quality Learning Experience, CSB adopted a benchmark of 70% or higher off the maximum aggregate score in each assessment area.  Internship Program. Students who take part in an internship obtain work experiences in a local business or nonprofit organization. Employers and Interns fill out a survey assessing the intern skills at both the beginning and the end of the internship.  International Business Programs Study Abroad Survey. Students participate in the optional Study Abroad Summer Program. In this program, students take classes and visit local business organizations. Students fill out the survey before and after the end of the program. The survey provides an indirect measure of improvement in 12 categories at six level. The categories are: Verbal Communication, Written Communication, Ethical Judgment, Interpersonal Skills, Motivation/Initiative, Work Ethic, Team Work Skills, Analytical/Quantitative, Flexibility/Adaptability, Computer Skills, Intercultural Skills, and Global Knowledge.  **WASC SLO 2.1.**  Oral Presentation Assignment. Students in the course MGT 110 complete a presentation assignment which is built on the results identified in the CSB Assessment Center Activity in the course. More specifically, students are required to record a video of themselves giving a presentation regarding how they were going to improve, and or build upon, the CSB Assessment Center results identified in their feedback. These presentations are approximately four minutes in length and have to be recorded and uploaded as private YouTube videos. Once the videos are recorded, the students send the link to their MGT 110 lab instructor. The lab instructor uses the Oral Presentation Rubric to score the presentations, which assesses videos in four categories. The categories are Organization, Language Usage, Presentation Skills, and Video Recording Technology Usage. The benchmark for the Oral Presentation is that at least 70 percent of the students meet or exceed the benchmark of 60 percent.  **WASC SLO 3.1.**  Writing Assignment Checklist. Students in the course BA105W write a piece as part of the course requirements. Five writing samples are collected from each section. Faculty volunteers and business professional volunteers assess the samples using the Writing Checklist, which assesses writing in three categories and two levels. The categories are: Central Message/Content, Organization, Mechanics, and Professionalism, and two levels: Y=Meets Expectations and N=Does not meet expectations. The benchmark for the Written Assignment is that at least 70 percent of the students meet or exceed the benchmark of 60 percent.  **WASC SLO 4.1.**  Quantitative Reasoning Assignment. Students in the course DS71, DS73, and DS123 create and analyze mathematical models that may include formulas, graphs, tables, or schematics, and draw inferences from them. Instructors teaching the curse assess each model using the Quantitative Reasoning Rubric, which examines four categories and four levels. The assessment categories are: Accuracy of Algebraic Representation, Accuracy of Graphic Displays, Identification of Relevant Quantitative Information, and Correctness and the levels are: 4=Exemplary, 3=Competent, 2= Developing, and 1=Beginning. The benchmark for the Quantitative Reasoning Assignment is that at least 60 percent of the students score the benchmark score of 2. |
| 1. **What did you discover from the data?** Discuss the student performance in relation to your standards or expectations. Be sure to clearly indicate how many students did (or did not) meet the standard for each outcome measured. Where possible, indicate the relative strengths and weaknesses in student performance on the outcome(s).   **CSB SLO 1.1.**  Functional Areas Exit Exam. CSB created and implemented for the first time the Exit Exam in Spring 2015. Based upon item analysis, the exam was modified and similarly administered at the end of the Fall, 2015 and Spring, 2016 semesters. There were over 50 students for each version each semester. The results of the Exit Exam are depicted below:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Exit Exam | Spring 2015 | | Fall 2015 | | Spring 2016 | | | Area | Mean% | %>=60% | Mean% | %>=60% | Mean% | %>=60% | | Management | 64% | 83% | 66% | 82% | 65% | 78% | | Global | 72% | 93% | 73% | 90% | 73% | 93% | | Economics | 56% | 58% | 64% | 73% | 62% | 70% | | Ethics | 50% | 51% | 65% | 71% | 64% | 78% | | Marketing | 82% | 95% | 76% | 86% | 78% | 89% | | Finance | 48% | 44% | 59% | 58% | 61% | 66% | | Accounting | 48% | 43% | 51% | 53% | 57% | 61% | | Business Law | 42% | 32% | 49% | 44% | 58% | 63% | | Information Systems | 58% | 63% | 71% | 74% | 73% | 85% | | Decision Sciences | 42% | 31% | 77% | 88% | 70% | 81% |   **Table 1. Exit Exam**  As depicted, the scores for the Spring 2015 implementation were less than stellar. With a benchmark of at least 60 percent, only three areas achieved a goal of at least 70 percent of the students achieving the benchmark: Management, Global, and Marketing. After item analysis assisted in improving questions on the exam, there was significant improvement each subsequent semester. For both Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, all but three areas (Finance, Accounting, and Business Law) achieved the goal of at least 70 percent of the students achieving the benchmark score of 60 percent or better, and even these three areas showed substantial improvement each semester.  **CSB SLO 2.1.**  Information Technology Assignment. The results of the Information Technology Assignment assessment are depicted below.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Results from Technology Rubric | | | | | 2015 | - | 2016 |  | |  | Identify | Translate | Info Eval | Apply | Interpret |  | %Total | n | | Mean | 1.89 | 1.91 | 1.93 | 1.97 | 1.91 |  | 63.1% | 192 | | Count=1 | 36 | 38 | 23 | 28 | 63 |  | 150 | Count>=60% | | Percent=1 | 19% | 20% | 12% | 15% | 33% |  | 78% | % >=60% |   **Table 2. Information Technology and Decision Making**  As depicted, with the exception of the category interpretation at 33 percent, the percentage of students not meeting expectations (score = 1) are at or below 20 percent. With a total mean score of 63.1 percent, the results exceed the goal by 8 percentage points that at least 70 percent of students meet or exceed expectations with a benchmark of 60% (with a score of 1.8 or above). The categories of Project Translation, Technology Application, and Project Interpretation are the most relevant based on the assessment assignment used with the first two showing a low percent of students not meeting expectation and the last one with a significant percent of students continuing not to meet expectations compared with the previous year. Clearly, the interpretation of results is a skill that needs to be emphasized. That is, students are capable of using the information technology to create a model, but need improvement in interpreting the results obtained.  The results of Decision-Making Activity of the CSB Assessment Center shown in Table 3 below show that scores are consistently improving almost reaching the 50 percentile goal.  **CSB SLO 3.1.**  Team Work Activity. The results of the Teamwork Activity of the CSB Assessment Center are summarized below. Since the scores are in percentiles, the goal is for average scores near or above the 50 percentile. In the most recent terms, this goal has been accomplished for leadership, teamwork, and ethics. Further, scores for decision-making in spring 2016 were near the 50 percentile, showing significant improvement. So, it will be interesting to observe future semesters as to whether this latter result is an anomaly or evidence of improvement. Scores are consistently lower than the referent group in the areas of planning and organizing, oral communication, and writing, all of which are areas of focus over the remainder of the curriculum.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Skill** | **Fall 2013 N=284** | **Spring 2014 N=271** | **Fall 2014 N=274** | **Spring 2015 N=316** | **Fall 2015 N=397** | **Spring 2016 N=459** | | Leadership | 50.3 | 39.3 | 41.9 | 52.8 | 50.0 | 48.4 | | Decision-Making | 32.9 | 19.9 | 24.8 | 30.3 | 34.8 | 49.0 | | Planning and Organizing | 30.1 | 30.6 | 34.5 | 38.5 | 39.5 | 37.3 | | Oral Communication | 42.1 | 42.9 | 34.0 | 39.5 | 36.8 | 37.6 | | Teamwork | 55.3 | 50.7 | 60.4 | 55.7 | 61.6 | 56.3 | | Ethics | 56.1 | 50.8 | 51.4 | 54.2 | 52.9 | 56.6 | | Writing | 36.8 | 36.4 | 29.7 | 34.5 | 32.8 | 36.6 |   \*Note: All values in table are percentiles. These percentiles are against a normative database of overall 10,000 university students. A higher values means a better result.  **Table 3. Assessment Center**  **CSB SLO 4.1.**  Global Awareness. The results of the Global Awareness post unit test show a mean score of 81 and 68 percent for the Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 respectively, with a 91 and 77 percent of respective scores meeting the benchmark of 60 percent.  The results from the Exit Exam in Table 1 above depict an average global score each semester exceeding 70% with 90% or more of participants meeting or exceeding the benchmark score of 60%.  **CSB SLO 4.2.**  Ethical Behavior Activity. The results for the Ethical Behavior Activity as part of the CSB Assessment Center in Table 3 above show that ethical behavior scores have consistently met the expectation of on or above the 50 percentile.  The results from the Exit Exam in Table 1 above depict an average ethics score the last two semesters of about 65% with the percentage of students achieving a benchmark score of 60% meeting or exceeding the 70% target.  **CSB SLO 5.1.**  Service Learning Activity. The results of the Service Learning activity for a sample of 21 students are depicted below.  **The Student engaged in the following professional activities…**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Completed two or more tasks related to Marketing. (If yes, award 2 points) | n = 16  n = 5 | | Completed only one task related to Marketing. (If yes, award 1 point) | | Made 3 or more observations about Marketing in/during the Service Learning experience. (If yes, award 2 points) | n = 4  n = 11 | | Made 1 to 2 observations about Marketing in/during the Service Learning experience. (If yes, award 1 point) | | Had engaged in at least 12 of the required 15 hours of Service Learning via Marketing related work (not clerical/admin/manual duties). [If yes, award 2 points] | n = 21  n = 0 | | Had engaged in 8 to 11+ hours of the required 15 hours of Service Learning via Marketing related work (not clerical/admin/manual duties). [If yes, award 1 point] | | *Sub-Total: (maximum 6 points per report x 21 reports = maximum possible 126 points)* | 98 out of 126 =  78% |  |  |  | | --- | --- | | Student was exposed to a quality learning environment in the context/s of …….  (*check up to two items below).* | | | Frequent communication with supervisor/mentor | n = 4 | | Friendly, flexible, and/or safe work environment/s | n = 18 | | Adequate resources to complete/do the project (i.e. workspace, company materials & resources, computer, printer, etc.) | n = 15 | | Constructive feedback on the performance on a regular basis | n = 0 | | Guidance from project supervisor/mentor | n = 7 | | *Sub-Total (Enter 1 point in the Sub-Total cell if only one item was checked.*  *Enter 2 points if two or more items above were checked)*  21 reports x 2 times maximum for this section = 42 points sub-total maximum | 38 pts out of 42  = 90% | | The student’s professional business skills, were enhanced/utilized as a result of the SLP experience. *(Check up to two areas only)* | | | Problem solving skills | n = 5 | | Creativity Skills | n = 6 | | Technical/software skills | n = 3 | | Organizational skills | n = 8 | | Communication skills (verbal and/or written) | n = 10 | | *Sub-Total (Enter 1 point in the Sub-Total cell if only one area/item was checked.*  *Enter 2 points if two or more areas/items above were checked).*  21 reports x 2 times maximum for this section = 42 points sub-total maximum | 28 out of 42 =  67% | | Total Points (sum of all three sub-totals; maximum 10 points) | **164** of 210 points, or **78%** |   For the categories of engagement in professional activities and exposure to quality learning experiences, as well as for the total points, the average scores exceed the benchmark of 70%. The average for enhancement of professional skills was near the benchmark at 67%. Generally, the students are engaging in professional activities with multiple quality learning experiences resulting in enhancement of skill, although there is room for improvement with skills enhancement.  Internship Program. The results of the Internship program surveys are depicted below:   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Area | **Employer Rated Intern Start Average** | **Intern Self Rated Start Average** | **Employer Rated Intern End Average** | **Intern Self Rated End Average** | | Critical thinking | 4.41 | 4.45 | 5.2 | 5.12 | | Ethical awareness | 4.87 | 4.76 | 5.32 | 5.27 | | Global awareness | 4.15 | 3.93 | 4.7 | 4.56 | | Integrated knowledge of business | 4.12 | 4.12 | 5.02 | 5.04 | | Motivation/Initiative | 4.77 | 4.78 | 5.36 | 5.38 | | Oral communication skills | 4.48 | 4.4 | 5.22 | 5.28 | | Quantitative reasoning | 4.44 | 4.28 | 5.06 | 4.88 | | Team work | 4.76 | 4.86 | 5.42 | 5.41 | | Technology usage | 4.67 | 4.53 | 5.32 | 5.26 | | Time management | 4.65 | 4.44 | 5.33 | 5.33 | | Written communication skills | 4.44 | 4.46 | 5.09 | 5.11 |   **Table 4. Internship Program**  Two hundred and fifty-five students participated in the internship program. As depicted, the results show high scores and the scores increased after completion of the internship.  International Business Programs Study Abroad Survey. The results of the Study Abroad program survey are depicted below:   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Areas** | **Before**  **Study Abroad** | **After**  **Study Abroad** | **% Increase** | | Verbal communication skills | 4.270 | 4.919 | 15% | | Written communication skills | 4.486 | 4.829 | 8% | | Ethical judgment | 4.757 | 5.135 | 8% | | Interpersonal skills | 4.559 | 5.144 | 13% | | Motivation/Initiative | 4.640 | 5.189 | 12% | | Work ethic | 4.901 | 5.207 | 6% | | Team work skills | 4.739 | 5.315 | 12% | | Analytical/Quantitative skills | 4.604 | 4.946 | 7% | | Flexibility/Adaptability | 4.505 | 5.342 | 19% | | Computer skills | 4.721 | 4.928 | 4% | | Intercultural skills | 4.216 | 5.198 | 23% | | Global knowledge | 3.883 | 5.027 | 29% |   **Table 5. Study Abroad Program**  One hundred and eighteen students participated in the Summer Abroad program in 2015. They spend two weeks in Barcelona, Spain attending seminars and participating in in-class presentations and corporate and cultural visitations. As depicted, students developed and gained different experiences, with the greater increases in Global knowledge (29%), Intercultural skills (23%), and Flexibility and Adaptability (19%) categories. These three skills are rated the lowest by students prior to the experience and show great improvements.  **WASC SLO 2.1.**  Oral Presentation. As an improvement to the process in spring, 2016, students prepared two videos—one as a pretest and another as a post-test following analysis of initial pretest results. For both semesters, the videos were then scored as part of their class grade in the areas of organization, language usage, presentation skills, and technology usage. Scores were tabulated by two raters. The format is performed using a behavioral checklist which encourages a high degree of consistency. Scores across the two instructors did not vary meaningfully across any of the four dimensions. Results are shown below.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Oral Presentations-Spring 2015 & 2016** | | | |  | |  | |  | |  | **Organization** | **Language Usage** | **Presentation Skills** | | **Technology Usage** | | **Total** | | | **Sp 2015 N=222** |  |  |  | |  | |  | | | **Averages** | 76% | 92% | 86% | | 88% | | N/A | | | **Percent>=70%** | 64% | 96% | 71% | | 68% | | N/A | | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | | | **Sp 2016** |  |  |  | |  | |  | | | **Pretest N=280** |  |  |  | |  | |  | | | **Averages** | 78% | 81% | 82% | | 85% | | 81% | | | **Percent>=70%** | 75% | 70% | 73% | | 89% | | 89% | | |  |  |  |  | |  | |  | | | **Posttest N=274** |  |  |  | |  | |  | | | **Averages** | 80% | 86% | 83% | | 88% | | 84% | | | **Percent>=70%** | 83% | 77% | 73% | | 94% | | 93% | |   **Table 6. Oral Presentation**  Language Usage, Presentation Skills, and Technology usage consistently exceeded a goal of at least 70% of the scores meeting or exceeding a score of 70%. Organization and technology usage fell short of the goal in spring 2015, but met the goal in 2016. Comparison of pretest to post-test results for spring 2016 indicate modest improvement.  The oral communications scores from the Assessment Center Activity depicted in Table 1 show consistent results below the 50 percentile. The scores from the Internship Program (Table 4) and Study Abroad (Table 5) show improvement upon completion of the respective activity.  **WASC SLO 3.1.**  Writing Assignment Checklist. The results for writing assessment as part of the CSB Assessment Center in Table 3 above show that writing scores are consistently lower than expected. Writing is however an area of focus over the reminder of the curriculum, and the scores from the Internship Program (Table 4) and Study Abroad (Table 5) show improvement upon completion of the respective activity.  Writing is explicitly assessed as part of the BA105W business writing course. In Spring 2016, all BA105W courses used a similar writing assignment where students prepared a business letter to respond to a customer complaint. A sample of 122 student assignments were selected using a systematic random sample from all BA 105W sections. Each assignment was evaluated by a CSB faculty member using a checklist of elements (shown at the conclusion of this memorandum), to which an evaluator checks yes or no. 84 of the sampled assignments were evaluated by community members on the Business Advisory Council. These evaluations were similar to evaluations from a sample of BA 105W assignments sampled from Spring 2015.  The average weighted score from the evaluations was 74.2 out of 100 possible points. The checklist items were in four groups. The percentage scores overall for individual groups were 80.3% for content, 72.8% for organization, 69.4% for mechanics, and 72.1% for professionalism. The School’s goal is for each of these averages to be 70% or better and was achieved for all areas but mechanics, which was almost 70%.  In the prior assessment of writing assignments in Spring 2015, the average total score was 67 out of 100. The percentage scores for content, organization, mechanics, and professionalism were 64%, 66%, 69%, and 70%, respectively. Thus, the overall average score improved considerably, as did the average percentage score on content. The other group areas were slightly better or about the same.  Another School goal is for at least 70% of students to score 60 or better out of 100 possible points. We exceeded that goal with 82.5% of the students scoring 60 or higher in total score. In Spring 2015, 69% scored 60 or higher so there was substantial improvement.  BA 105W is taken by business administration majors and non-business majors. In the sampled evaluations, 147 were sampled assignments from business majors and 69 were from non-business majors. The non-business majors scored a little higher, with an average total score of 76.4 and with 86.4% scoring 60 or better. Business majors had an average score of 73.3, with 81% scoring 60 or better. In the assessment of student writing in Spring 2015, business majors did a little better than non-business majors.  In comparing the 122 evaluations done by faculty to the 84 evaluations done by community business professionals, the average total scores were about the same: 74.3 for faculty and 74.0 for business professionals. However, there were interesting differences in the component group scores. On mechanics, faculty evaluators assigned an average of 65.6% of possible points in comparison to 75.0% for business professional evaluators. However, in the professionalism group, the faculty average score of 78.3% of the possible points, while the business professional average score was only 63.1%.  Although the final score averages were higher in Spring 2016 than in Spring 2015, the main reason for the change was largely due to substantially higher scores in the content group (purpose, main point, support.) Some of the improvement in content may be explained by the use of a different assignment rather than improvement in student writing from 2015 to 2016. The average scores in the organization area, while better than in 2015, is only slightly above the goal of 70%.  **CSB SLO 4.1.**  Quantitative Reasoning Assignment. The results of the Quantitative Reasoning Assignment assessment are depicted below.   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Results All DS Classes 2015 - 2016** | | | | | |  | **Algebraic** | **Graphic** | **Numeric** | **Verbal** | | **1** | 5.39% | 6.70% | 7.40% | 7.17% | | **2** | 14.40% | 13.05% | 15.31% | 21.86% | | **3** | 43.00% | 36.90% | 41.72% | 43.28% | | **4** | 37.22% | 43.35% | 35.57% | 27.69% | |  |  |  |  |  | | **% 2 - 4** | 94.61% | 93.30% | 92.60% | 92.83% |   **Table 7. Quantitative Reasoning**  As depicted, with a total means score of 93.3 percent, the results exceed the goal by 23 percentage points that at least 70 percent of students score between two (Developing) and four (Exemplary). The four categories also show comparable high scores with very high percentages exceeding a score of 1. This was a significant improvement compared to last year with 77.2%, 81.7%, 75.2%, and 70.9% for the respective categories. |
| 1. **What changes did you make as a result of the data?** Describe how the information from the assessment activity was reviewed and what action was taken based on the analysis of the assessment data.   **CSB SLO 1.1.**  Functional Areas Exit Exam. An item analysis of the exam questions and improvement of the instrument was performed after the first implementation in Spring, 2015 and again after the Fall, 2015 exam. Now that the content of the exam has settled with the third iteration this past Spring, 2016, the focus will turn toward those areas where performance could use the most improvement. This coming year, a set of descriptions of the concepts associated with the most frequently missed questions on the exam will be distributed to all faculty in the school, and they will be strongly encouraged to emphasize these concepts throughout the curriculum whenever appropriate, in the hope that a larger percentage of students will be able to demonstrate understanding of these concepts.  **CSB SLO 3.1.**  Team Work Activity. The Team Work Activity is assessed as part of the Assessment Center Activity.  This activity to date has been conducted in the core MGT 110 course which is generally taken fairly early in the upper division curriculum and thus represents a pretest to our upper division curriculum. So, based upon these results, we plan to conduct a similar activity in capstone courses taken in the last semester of the undergraduate program to gather post-test results.  **WASC SLO 2.1.**  Oral Presentation. A second oral presentation video assignment was added to the MGT 110 course to assess both pre-test and post-test presentations.  **WASC SLO 3.1.**  Writing Assignment Checklist. The signature assignment for the BA 105W course was revised. Future efforts should consider taking steps to improve mechanics (based on faculty evaluators) and professionalism of student writing (based on business professional evaluators).  **WASC SLO 4.1.**  **Quantitative Reasoning.** From last year’s assessment activities for the quantitative reasoning course (DS 71), we determined that for every one of the 22 Blackboard quizzes that students completed, on average they earned 0.051 grade points on their final semester grade for the class. So, a student who completed only 10 of the 22 quizzes earned a half a letter grade higher on the final course grade (10 x 0.051 = 0.51) than they would have earned had they not completed any of our Blackboard quizzes. For students who completed at least 20 of the 22 Blackboard quizzes supporting the class, they earned a full letter grade higher on the final course grade (20 x 0.051 = 1.02) than they would have earned had they not taken any of our Blackboard quizzes.  In an attempt to improve student classroom performance, we summarized participation rates for each of the DS 71sections and across sections by each instructor. Each instructor was given the summary of their participation rates with which we reinforced the significance of student participation in completing the Blackboard quizzes supporting the class. The results were discussed at the DS Coordinating Meetings. As a result, the scores from the quantitative reasoning rubric showed improvement this year. |
| 1. **What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2016-2017 AY?** List the outcomes and measures or assessment activities you will use to evaluate them. These activities should be the same as those indicated on your current SOAP timeline; if they are not please explain.   The same assessment measures will be utilized again this coming year. Additional activities will also include (1) emphasis on misunderstood concepts identified as a result of the exit exam and (2) Assessment Center Activity for capstone classes to gather post-test results from students completing their undergraduate program. |
| 1. **What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?** Please provide a brief description of progress made on each item listed in the action plan. If no progress has been made on an action item, simply state “no progress.”  * Assessment Team was reorganized to increase faculty participation. Currently seven faculty members and the Associate Dean work in the team. * Curriculum committee has direct communication with the Assessment Team with one member of the Assessment Team serving as a member and liaison in the curriculum Committee. * Course and Assessment Assignment Coordinators received the results of the assessment and were urged to take improvement actions   **Additional Guidelines:** If you have not fully described the assignment then please attach a copy of the questions or assignment guidelines. If you are using a rubric and did not fully describe this rubric (or the criteria being used) than please attach a copy of the rubric. If you administered a survey please attach a copy of the survey so that the Learning Assessment Team (LAT) can review the questions. |