

San Diego State University

Detailed Assessment Report 2016-2017 CBA BSBA Common *As of: 4/24/2017 12:18 PM PST*

Program Mission

The mission of the BSBA program is to provide outstanding undergraduate business education designed to educate, inspire, and motivate students to become successful professionals in a global economy.

Program Learning Goals

PLG 1: Communication

Written and Oral Communication - Communicate effectively with individuals, teams, and large groups, both in writing and orally.

Connected Documents

[CBA Oral Communication Rubric \(for group presentations\)](#)
[CBA Oral Communications Rubric \(for individual presentations\)](#)
[CBA Written Communications Rubric](#)

PLG 2: Critical Thinking

Analytical and Critical Thinking Skills - Demonstrate effective analytical and critical thinking skills to make an appropriate decision in a complex situation.

Connected Documents

[Critical Thinking Rubric, 2009-2010](#)
[Critical Thinking Rubric, 2010-2011](#)
[Critical Thinking Rubric, 2011-2012](#)
[Critical Thinking Rubric, 2012-2013](#)

PLG 3: Ethics

Ethical Reasoning - Distinguish and analyze ethical problems that occur in business and society, and choose and defend ethical solutions.

PLG 4: Global Perspective

Global Perspective – Demonstrate a global perspective and an understanding of the dynamics of the global economy in making decisions.

Connected Documents

[Global Perspective Rubric, 2009-2010 to 2012-2013](#)
[Global Perspective Rubric, 2013-2014](#)

PLG 5: Essential Business Knowledge

Essential Business Knowledge - Demonstrate an understanding of the major functional areas of Business.

Degree Learning Outcomes / Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Benchmarks, Findings, and Closes the Loop

DLO 1: Written Communication

Write well-organized and grammatically correct papers including letters, memos, case analyses, and research reports.

Connected Documents

[BSBA Map Spring 2016](#)
[CBA Written Communications Rubric](#)

Relevant Associations:

AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning Associations

AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning (15-21)

3.15.1 Management of Curricula: The school uses well documented, systematic processes to develop, monitor, evaluate, and revise the substance and delivery of the curricula of degree programs and to assess the impact of the curricula on learning. Curriculum management includes inputs from all appropriate constituencies which may include faculty, staff, administrators, students, faculty from non-business disciplines, alumni, and the business community served by the school. The standard requires use of a systematic process for curriculum management but does not require any specific courses in the curriculum. Normally, the curriculum management process will result in an undergraduate degree program that includes learning experiences in such general knowledge and skill areas as: Communication abilities. Ethical understanding and reasoning abilities. Analytic skills. Use of information technology. Dynamics of the global economy Multicultural and diversity understanding...

3.16.1 Bachelor's or undergraduate level degree: Knowledge and skills. Adapting expectations to the school's mission and cultural circumstances, the school specifies learning goals and demonstrates achievement of learning goals for key general, management-specific, and/or appropriate discipline-specific knowledge and skills that its students achieve in each undergraduate degree program.

3.17.1 The bachelor's or undergraduate level degree programs must provide sufficient time, content coverage, student effort, and student-faculty interaction to assure that the learning goals are accomplished.

Strategic Plan Associations

CBA- College of Business Administration

3.1.1 Assess the undergraduate curriculum in a mode of continuous improvement with emphasis on student learning, architecture and content.

3.2.1 Have the Dean talk with other Deans about criteria used to evaluate undergraduate programs.

3.2.2 Survey alumni on metrics associated with ranking criteria and quality programs. Use these data to improve program quality and to produce PR materials which feature areas of excellence from the surveys.

3.2.3 Feature recent success stories of outstanding alumni on CBA and department web sites.

3.2.4 Publicize outstanding efforts by faculty and specific classes. Focus once a month on a team that competed on a national competition, work of BA 404/SIFE students, business clubs, and other exceptional accomplishments by undergraduate students and classes.

Related Measures

M 1: Archived Assessment Reports (2007 - 2011)

Annual reports were produced starting in 2007 that reported assessment efforts including findings of assessed learning outcomes and action plans/loop closing for the given year. In 2012 SDSU began using WEAVE to report this information and annual written reports were no longer produced. All assessment efforts beginning in 2012 are reported as cycles in WEAVE. The annual reports from 2007 - 2011 are archived in the WEAVE Document Repository and linked here. Benchmarks and Findings listed below are empty in WEAVE as all information for 2007 - 2011 is found in the annual reports.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Connected Documents

[BSBA Common 2007 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2008 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2009 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2010 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2011 Report](#)

M 2: WPA Exam

Since 2008, written communication has been assessed using writing samples collected from CBA students on the university mandated Writing Proficiency Assessment (WPA) exam. These exams are graded by a standard rubric that produces scores deemed "Above Average" (scores of 10-12), Average (scores of 8-9), or "Below Average" (scores below 8). The WPA scores map to the CBA Written Communication Skills rubric in the same three categories. The mapping process that was initially undertaken to compare the two can be found in a document titled "WPA vs. CBA Comparison" stored in the Document Repository. The CBA written communications rubric can also be found in the Document Repository.

Additional Information on the WPA exam:

Abilities Tested: The Writing Placement Assessment (WPA) is a writing task that asks writers to analyze a short reading selection and write a coherent analysis. The WPA tests not only reading comprehension but also the ability to analyze and think critically about a text, which is demonstrated through clear, precise writing.

Basic Skills Necessary: Evaluators score essays on the writer's ability to analyze a written argument; to develop and organize ideas; to support these ideas with evidence or specific examples; to understand your essay's intended audience (i.e., faculty from a variety of disciplines); to employ language skillfully; and to demonstrate appropriate paragraphing, sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

Scoring Guide/Rubric for the WPA:

10 – Exceeds Expectations

- Writing prompt is proficiently addressed.
- Analysis of the reading is reasonable, credibly presented, and well developed indicating an awareness of the author's communicative intent in relation to the audience.
- Structure is clear, meeting the needs of the analysis.
- Examples and details provide sufficient support for the analysis .
- Prose style is good, particularly in terms of syntax and diction.
- Grammar and mechanics are solid; few distracting errors are present.

8/9 – Meets Expectations

- Writing prompt is adequately addressed.
- Analysis of the reading is present, if minimal.
- Structure is functional, yet mechanical.
- Examples and details support the analysis, but occasionally may be ill chosen.
- Prose style demonstrates adequate-if basic-syntax and diction.
- Grammar and mechanics flaws are noticeable, but few distracting errors are present.

Below 8 – Does not Meet Expectations

- Writing prompt is inadequately addressed
- Analysis of the reading is confused, repetitive or underdeveloped.
- Structure is forced, difficult to follow.
- Examples and details are sparse and often ill chosen.
- Prose style demonstrates difficulties with syntax and diction.
- Grammar and mechanics are poor; an accumulation of distracting errors is present.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Connected Documents

Benchmarks:

85% of students should meet or exceed expectations. This equates to a score on the WPA of 8 or higher.

Finding (2015-2016) - Benchmarks: Met

Goal #1 – Communication; SLO 1.1 (WEAVE DLO #1): Written Communication

The table below summarizes the results of the assessment of Written Communication conducted in Spring 2016 involving 1,262 students taking the WPA in calendar year 2015:

	Below Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Exceeding Expectations
SLO #1.1 (WEAVE DLO #1)	11.6%	75.6%	12.8%

Given the established benchmarks of 85% of our students meeting or exceeding expectations, it is noted that our student's written communication skills met the benchmark. The percentage meeting or exceeding was 88.4%.

Finding (2014-2015) - Benchmarks: Not Met

Goal #1 – Communication; SLO 1.1 (WEAVE DLO #1): Written Communication

The table below summarizes the results of the assessment of Written Communication conducted in Fall 2014:

	Below Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Exceeding Expectations
SLO #1.1 (WEAVE DLO #1)	26.5%	62.3%	11.2%

Given the established benchmarks of 85% of our students meeting or exceeding expectations, it is noted that our student's written communication skills did not meet the benchmark. The percentage meeting or exceeding was 73.5%.

Finding (2013-2014) - Benchmarks: Not Reported This Cycle

An assessment of this DLO was not conducted in 2013-2014.

Finding (2012 - 2013) - Benchmarks: Not Met

Goal #1 – Communication; SLO 1.1 (WEAVE DLO #1): Written Communication

The table below summarizes the results of the assessment of Written Communication conducted in Fall 2012:

	Below Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Exceeding Expectations
SLO #1.1	31.0%	54.0%	15.0%

Given the established benchmarks of 85% of our students meeting or exceeding expectations and 50% of our students exceeding expectations, it is noted that our student's written communication skills fall significantly below our expectations. These results are presented in greater detail in the file "2012-2013 Written Communication Findings PPT" found in the Document Repository and connected below. The file also includes comparison between these findings and previous assessments.

Additional information regarding a second measure of our students' writing can be found under the Capstone Exam Questions measure.

Finding (2011-2012) - Benchmarks: Not Met

PLEASE NOTE: All findings and loop closing prior to 2011-2012 for this and all goals and student learning outcomes can be found on the CBA Assessment website at: <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~cba/assessment/index.html>.

Goal #1 – Communication; SLO 1.1 (WEAVE DLO #1): Written Communication

The table below summarizes the results of the assessment of Written Communication conducted in Fall 2010:

	Below Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Exceeding Expectations
SLO #1.1	34.0%	53.0%	13.0%

Given the established benchmarks of 85% of our students meeting or exceeding expectations and 50% of our students exceeding expectations, it is noted that our student's written communication skills fall significantly below our expectations. These results are presented in greater detail in the file connected below: "2010-2011 Written Communication Findings PPT". The file also includes comparison with previous assessments of written communication.

[Related Closes the Loop \(by Established cycle, then alpha\):](#)

For full information, see the *Details of Closes the Loop* section of this report.

Additional Writing Courses

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012

SDSU has the following requirements based on a student's WPA score: Students scoring below 8 (below expectations) are required...

CBA Writing Center

Established in Cycle: 2012 - 2013

As noted in the 2011-2012 Loop Closing comments, the CBA Undergraduate Committee expressed the desire for a writing center. Sinc...

Change Benchmark to Drop Exceeds Expectations

Established in Cycle: 2012 - 2013

In presenting the findings of the 2012-2013, BSBA assessment to the Undergraduate Committee, the efficacy of having two levels o...

University Writing Center Update & Progress

Established in Cycle: 2014-2015

Established in Fall 2012, the university writing center appears to be a significant aid to the writing skills of CBA students. I...

M 7: Student Perceptions of Learning (Indirect)

Beginning in Spring 2017, an indirect measure was added to BSBA assessment as a supplement to the direct measures in place. On the EBKAT exam (which measures Essential Business Knowledge) students were asked 5 questions, pertaining to the BSBA Common Goals. Students were not asked, in this round, about Global Perspective as the DLOs for this goal are "on hold" following the implementation of a major loop closing effort. In the questions students were asked their perceptions about the degree to which the BSBA program provided them with the knowledge and skills related to the given goal.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Benchmarks:

No benchmark established for this initial data collection effort.

Finding (2016-2017) - Benchmarks: Not Reported This Cycle

In response to the statement, "Overall, as a result of the Business program at SDSU I have learned to be an effective written communicator.

- 51.6% responded "Quite Well"
- 40.8% responded "Somewhat"
- 6.1% responded "Very Little"
- 1.5% responded "Not at All"

DLO 2: Oral Communication

Make effective oral presentations that are informative as well as persuasive, as appropriate.

Connected Documents

[BSBA Map Spring 2016](#)

[CBA Oral Communication Rubric \(for group presentations\)](#)

[CBA Oral Communications Rubric \(for individual presentations\)](#)

Relevant Associations:

AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning Associations

AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning (15-21)

3.15.1 Management of Curricula: The school uses well documented, systematic processes to develop, monitor, evaluate, and revise the substance and delivery of the curricula of degree programs and to assess the impact of the curricula on learning. Curriculum management includes inputs from all appropriate constituencies which may include faculty, staff, administrators, students, faculty from non-business disciplines, alumni, and the business community served by the school. The standard requires use of a systematic process for curriculum management but does not require any specific courses in the curriculum. Normally, the curriculum management process will result in an undergraduate degree program that includes learning experiences in such general knowledge and skill areas as: Communication abilities. Ethical understanding and reasoning abilities. Analytic skills. Use of information technology. Dynamics of the global economy Multicultural and diversity understanding...

Strategic Plan Associations

CBA- College of Business Administration

3.1.1 Assess the undergraduate curriculum in a mode of continuous improvement with emphasis on

student learning, architecture and content.

3.2.1 Have the Dean talk with other Deans about criteria used to evaluate undergraduate programs.

3.2.2 Survey alumni on metrics associated with ranking criteria and quality programs. Use these data to improve program quality and to produce PR materials which feature areas of excellence from the surveys.

3.2.3 Feature recent success stories of outstanding alumni on CBA and department web sites.

3.2.4 Publicize outstanding efforts by faculty and specific classes. Focus once a month on a team that competed on a national competition, work of BA 404/SIFE students, business clubs, and other exceptional accomplishments by undergraduate students and classes.

Related Measures

M 1: Archived Assessment Reports (2007 - 2011)

Annual reports were produced starting in 2007 that reported assessment efforts including findings of assessed learning outcomes and action plans/loop closing for the given year. In 2012 SDSU began using WEAVE to report this information and annual written reports were no longer produced. All assessment efforts beginning in 2012 are reported as cycles in WEAVE. The annual reports from 2007 - 2011 are archived in the WEAVE Document Repository and linked here. Benchmarks and Findings listed below are empty in WEAVE as all information for 2007 - 2011 is found in the annual reports.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Connected Documents

[BSBA Common 2007 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2008 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2009 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2010 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2011 Report](#)

M 3: Oral Presentations

Oral Presentations in capstone courses throughout the CBA are rated using one of the two CBA Oral Communication Skills rubrics. The rubric for individual presentations was developed in 2011. In 2013, noting that many oral presentations were made as part of a larger group presentation, the original rubric was modified to include an evaluative dimension of the students' ability to transition between presenters (rubric for group presentations). The appropriate rubric is distributed to students in classes throughout the CBA.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Connected Documents

[CBA Oral Communication Rubric \(for group presentations\)](#)

[CBA Oral Communications Rubric \(for individual presentations\)](#)

Benchmarks:

85% of students should meet or exceed expectations.

Finding (2016-2017) - Benchmarks: Not Reported This Cycle

Finding (2015-2016) - Benchmarks: Partially Met

Goal #1 – Communication; SLO 1.2 (WEAVE DLO #2): Oral Communication.

The table below summarizes the results of the assessment of Oral Communication conducted in spring 2016:

SLO #1.2	Below Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Exceeding Expectations
Organization 1 - logical sequence, focus, effective time	9.6%	74.1%	16.3%
Organization 2 - opening and closing, strong integration	37.8%	43.7%	18.5%
Voice Quality & Pace	14.8%	64.4%	20.7%
Mannerisms & Body Language	17.0%	63.0%	20.0%
Rapport w/ Audience & Use of Media	3.0%	75.6%	21.5%
Professionalism & Appearance	17.2%	62.5%	20.3%
Overall	14.8%	70.4%	14.8%

Since effective communication is compensatory model comprised of many factors, an overall row has been added to the six dimension model. Overall percentages are based on first computing an average of a student's scores (where 1, 2, and 3 are assigned for to performance that does not meet, meet and exceed expectations, respectively) across all dimensions, and then applying cut-off scores of less than 1.60 (not meets), 1.60 to less than 2.5 (meets) and 2.5 or greater (exceeds). Given the established benchmarks of 85% of our students meeting or exceeding expectations, it is noted that although the benchmark of "meeting or exceeding expectations" was met overall, the benchmark was not met on three of the six categories of SLO #1.2 (WEAVE DLO #2).

Finding (2013-2014) - Benchmarks: Partially Met

After a norming session, two independent raters (not the classroom instructors) visited four sections of MGT 405, the capstone course for all students earning the BSBA, to observe and rate regularly scheduled presentations made by 144 students.

Goal #1 – Communication; SLO 1.2 (WEAVE DLO #2): Oral Communication.

The table below summarizes the results of the assessment of Oral Communication conducted in Fall 2013:

SLO #1.2	Below Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Exceeding Expectations
Organization 1 - logical sequence, focus, effective time	5.4%	61.6%	33.1%
Organization 2 - opening and closing, strong integration	22.3%	51.8%	25.9%
Voice Quality & Pace	8.0%	60.7%	31.3%
Mannerisms & Body Language	14.3%	58.0%	27.7%
Rapport w/ Audience & Use of Media	13.4%	52.7%	33.9%
Professionalism & Appearance	7.1%	29.5%	63.4%

Given the established benchmarks of 85% of our students meeting or exceeding expectations, it is noted that the benchmark of "meeting or exceeding expectations" was met for each dimension of SLO #1.2 (WEAVE DLO #2) except "Organization 2 – opening and closing, strong integration." Following up with MGT 405 instructors, it was determined that more often than not the individual presentation rubric was used instead of the group presentation rubric.

Connected Document

[CBA Oral Communication Rubric \(for group presentations\)](#)

Finding (2012 - 2013) - Benchmarks: Not Reported This Cycle

An assessment of this DLO was not conducted in 2012-2013.

Finding (2011-2012) - Benchmarks: Partially Met

PLEASE NOTE: All findings and loop closing prior to 2011-2012 for this and all goals and student learning outcomes can be found on the CBA Assessment website at: <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~cba/assessment/index.html>.

Goal #1 – Communication; SLO 1.2 (WEAVE DLO #2): Oral Communication

-

The table below summarizes the results of the assessment of Oral Communication conducted in Fall 2010:

SLO #1.2	Below Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Exceeding Expectations
Organization	12.8%	51.5%	35.6%

Voice Quality & Pace	9.8%	65.2%	25.0%
Mannerisms & Body Language	6.1%	59.8%	34.1%
Rapport w/ Audience & Use of Media	13.6%	56.1%	30.3%
Professionalism & Appearance	1.5%	31.8%	66.7%

Given the established benchmarks of 85% of our students meeting or exceeding expectations and 50% of our students exceeding expectations, it is noted that the benchmark of "meeting or exceeding expectations" was met for each dimension of SLO #1.2 (WEAVE DLO #2). The benchmark for "Exceeding" was met only for the dimension of Professionalism & Appearance. These results are presented in greater detail in the file "2010-2011 Oral Communication Findings PPT" found in the Document Repository and connected below. The file also includes comparison between these findings and previous assessments of oral communication.

Connected Document

[2010-2011 Oral Communications Findings PPT](#)

Related Closes the Loop (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the *Details of Closes the Loop* section of this report.

New Writing in Business Settings Course - RWS 390W

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Beginning fall 2017, a new upper-division business writing course, RWS 390 – Writing in Business Settings, will be available t...

M 7: Student Perceptions of Learning (Indirect)

Beginning in Spring 2017, an indirect measure was added to BSBA assessment as a supplement to the direct measures in place. On the EBKAT exam (which measures Essential Business Knowledge) students were asked 5 questions, pertaining to the BSBA Common Goals. Students were not asked, in this round, about Global Perspective as the DLOs for this goal are "on hold" following the implementation of a major loop closing effort. In the questions students were asked their perceptions about the degree to which the BSBA program provided them with the knowledge and skills related to the given goal.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Benchmarks:

No benchmark established for this initial data collection effort.

Finding (2016-2017) - Benchmarks: Not Reported This Cycle

In response to the statement, "Overall, as a result of the Business program at SDSU I have learned to be an effective oral communicator.

- 52.1% responded "Quite Well"
- 40.1% responded "Somewhat"
- 6.1% responded "Very Little"
- 1.7% responded "Not at All"

DLO 3: Apply Info & Draw Conclusions

Apply relevant information and arrive at a well-reasoned conclusion.

Connected Documents

[BSBA Map Spring 2016](#)
[Critical Thinking Rubric - 2014-2015](#)
[Critical Thinking Rubric, 2009-2010](#)
[Critical Thinking Rubric, 2010-2011](#)
[Critical Thinking Rubric, 2011-2012](#)
[Critical Thinking Rubric, 2012-2013](#)

Relevant Associations:

AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning Associations

AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning (15-21)

3.15.1 Management of Curricula: The school uses well documented, systematic processes to develop, monitor, evaluate, and revise the substance and delivery of the curricula of degree programs and to assess the impact of the curricula on learning. Curriculum management includes inputs from all appropriate constituencies which may include faculty, staff, administrators, students, faculty from non-business disciplines, alumni, and the business community served by the school. The standard requires use of a systematic process for curriculum management but does not require any specific courses in the curriculum. Normally, the curriculum management process will result in an undergraduate degree program that includes learning experiences in such general knowledge and skill areas as: Communication abilities. Ethical understanding and reasoning abilities. Analytic skills. Use of information technology. Dynamics of the global economy Multicultural and diversity understanding...

3.16.1 Bachelor's or undergraduate level degree: Knowledge and skills. Adapting expectations to the school's mission and cultural circumstances, the school specifies learning goals and demonstrates achievement of learning goals for key general, management-specific, and/or appropriate discipline-specific knowledge and skills that its students achieve in each undergraduate degree program.

3.17.1 The bachelor's or undergraduate level degree programs must provide sufficient time, content coverage, student effort, and student-faculty interaction to assure that the learning goals are accomplished.

Strategic Plan Associations

CBA- College of Business Administration

- 3.1.1 Assess the undergraduate curriculum in a mode of continuous improvement with emphasis on student learning, architecture and content.
- 3.1.2 Assess the graduate curriculum in a mode of continuous improvement with emphasis on student learning, architecture and content.
- 3.1.3 Study online/hybrid/flexible teaching models and develop where appropriate.
- 3.2.1 Have the Dean talk with other Deans about criteria used to evaluate undergraduate programs.
- 3.2.2 Survey alumni on metrics associated with ranking criteria and quality programs. Use these data to improve program quality and to produce PR materials which feature areas of excellence from the surveys.
- 3.2.3 Feature recent success stories of outstanding alumni on CBA and department web sites.
- 3.2.4 Publicize outstanding efforts by faculty and specific classes. Focus once a month on a team that competed on a national competition, work of BA 404/SIFE students, business clubs, and other exceptional accomplishments by undergraduate students and classes.

Related Measures

M 1: Archived Assessment Reports (2007 - 2011)

Annual reports were produced starting in 2007 that reported assessment efforts including findings of assessed learning outcomes and action plans/loop closing for the given year. In 2012 SDSU began using WEAVE to report this information and annual written reports were no longer produced. All assessment efforts beginning in 2012 are reported as cycles in WEAVE. The annual reports from 2007 - 2011 are archived in the WEAVE Document Repository and linked here. Benchmarks and Findings listed below are empty in WEAVE as all information for 2007 - 2011 is found in the annual reports.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Connected Documents

- [BSBA Common 2007 Report](#)
- [BSBA Common 2008 Report](#)
- [BSBA Common 2009 Report](#)
- [BSBA Common 2010 Report](#)
- [BSBA Common 2011 Report](#)

M 4: Capstone Exam Questions

General Description of the Measure:

Final exam essay questions from MGT 405 (the college-wide capstone course) are rated by two raters, following a norming session. Depending on whether the raters are assessing critical thinking or global perspective in a given cycle, appropriate rubrics are used. The rubrics are reviewed and updated as appropriate over time. Past rubrics can be found in the Document Repository (and are linked to the respective Goal and DLOs), the most recent rubrics used for critical thinking and global perspective respectively, are connected here. Student work samples to illustrate the rubric levels of "meeting expectations" are also connected.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Documents

- [Critical Thinking Rubric - 2014-2015](#)
- [Global Perspective Rubric, 2013-2014](#)
- [Student Work Sample, Exceeds Expectations on Critical thinking, DLO #3](#)
- [Student Work Sample, Exceeds Expectations on Global Perspective DLOs #8 & #9](#)
- [Student Work Sample, Meets Expectations on Critical Thinking, DLO #3](#)
- [Student Work Sample, Meets Expectations on Global Perspective DLOs #8 & #9](#)

Benchmarks:

85% of our students should meet or exceed expectations.

Finding (2014-2015) - Benchmarks: Met

In assessing the Critical Thinking learning outcome (DLO #3): Apply relevant information and arrive at a well-reasoned conclusion, two questions were asked. Question 1 - discuss the similarities and differences in the effects of each factor on the two firms, identifying whether it is an opportunity and/or threat for the firm; and Question 2 - how should the two companies respond (or not respond) to each of the factors? Justify your recommendations, making sure you take into consideration the internal environment and strategy of the firms.

The method of assessing critical thinking was initiated by selecting a random sample of 150 final exam answers from all sections of BA 405, the principal capstone course in the BSBA. The instructor's scoring sheet was then removed from each exam.

In an attempt to define assessment categories in more familiar percentage grade cutoffs, the two independent raters were told a percentage score related to an answer assessed to be less than 75% was categorized as Does Not Meet Expectations.* This was followed by a 70-minute norming session with the raters.

After completion of the assessment process, only those cases in which the raters agreed on a "Does Not Meet Expectations/Meet or Exceed Expectations" categorization for each of the two questions resulted in a yield of 107 responses for question 1 (an agreement rate of 73.1%) and 89 responses for question 2 (an

agreement rate of 59.3%). The table below summarizes the results of the responses to each question:

	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meet or Exceed Expectations
Question 1	21.5%	78.5%
Question 2	21.3%	78.7%

Given the established benchmarks that 85% of our students would meet or exceed expectations, it is noted that the benchmark of 85% was not met for either question. For the purpose of completeness, 10.3% and 6.7% of the answers exceeded expectations to question 1 and 2, respectively.

Upon further comparison of the sample results to each instructor's individual results, it was noted that the exams of one instructor had been scored unusually low by both raters. And, upon further inspection of these exams, it was noted that exams were liberally laced with critical comments in red. Given these comments could have cued and therefore biased the independent raters' evaluations, this instructors' 14 final exam answers were removed from the sample, resulting in 98 responses for question 1 (an agreement rate of 72.1%) and 79 responses for question 2 (an agreement rate of 59%). The table below summarizes the results after retabulation:

	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meet or Exceed Expectations
Question 1	16.3%	83.7%
Question 2	12.7%	87.4%

Given the established benchmarks, it is noted that on average the benchmark of 85% was met. Again for the purpose of completeness, now 11.2% and 7.6% of the answers exceeded expectations to question 1 and 2, respectively.

Finding (2013-2014) - Benchmarks: Not Reported This Cycle

An assessment of this DLO was not conducted in 2013-2014.

Finding (2012 - 2013) - Benchmarks: Partially Met

(2012-2013): Goal #2 – Critical Thinking (both SLOs, DLOs #3 & #4)

The table below summarizes the results of the assessment of both Critical Thinking student learning outcomes:

	Below Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Exceeding Expectations
SLO #1 (WEAVE DLO #3)	5.7%	74.60%	19.70%
SLO #2 (WEAVE DLO #4)	6.60%	77.90%	15.60%

Given the established benchmarks of 85% of our students meeting or exceeding expectations and 50% of our students exceeding expectations, it is noted that both SLOs met the "meeting or exceeding" benchmark while neither SLO met the "exceeding" benchmark. These results are presented in greater detail, including dimension-by-dimension data, in the file "2012-2013 Critical Thinking Findings PPT" found in the Document Repository and connected below.

Connected Documents

- [2011-2012 Critical Thinking Findings PPT](#)
- [2012-2013 Critical Thinking Findings PPT](#)

Finding (2011-2012) - Benchmarks: Partially Met

PLEASE NOTE: All findings and loop closing prior to 2011-2012 for this and all goals and student learning outcomes can be found on the CBA Assessment website at: <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~cba/assessment/index.html>.

Goal #2 – Critical Thinking

The table below summarizes the results of the assessment of both Critical Thinking student learning outcomes:

	Below Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Exceeding Expectations
SLO #1 (WEAVE DLO #3)	7.1%	64.2%	28.8%
SLO #2 (WEAVE DLO #4)	9.2%	75.0%	15.8%

Given the established benchmarks of 85% of our students meeting or exceeding expectations and 50% of our students exceeding expectations, it is noted that both SLOs met the "meeting or exceeding" benchmark while neither SLO met the "exceeding" benchmark. These results are presented in greater detail, including dimension-by-dimension data, in the file "2011-2012 Critical Thinking Findings PPT" found in the Document Repository and connected below.

Connected Document

[2011-2012 Critical Thinking Findings PPT](#)

Related Closes the Loop (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the *Details of Closes the Loop* section of this report.

Improving Critical Thinking

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012

The CBA Program Assurance/Assessment Committee planned and implemented a college-wide workshop entitled "Best Practices in Criti..."

Benchmark Consideration

Established in Cycle: 2012 - 2013

The Undergraduate Committee has agreed, after four full cycles of Critical Thinking assessment data, to consider whether a bench...

Change Benchmark to Drop Exceeds Expectations

Established in Cycle: 2012 - 2013

In presenting the findings of the 2012-2013, BSBA assessment to the Undergraduate Committee, the efficacy of having two levels...

M 7: Student Perceptions of Learning (Indirect)

Beginning in Spring 2017, an indirect measure was added to BSBA assessment as a supplement to the direct measures in place. On the EBKAT exam (which measures Essential Business Knowledge) students were asked 5 questions, pertaining to the BSBA Common Goals. Students were not asked, in this round, about Global Perspective as the DLOs for this goal are "on hold" following the implementation of a major loop closing effort. In the questions students were asked their perceptions about the degree to which the BSBA program provided them with the knowledge and skills related to the given goal.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Benchmarks:

No benchmark established for this initial data collection effort.

Finding (2016-2017) - Benchmarks: Not Reported This Cycle

In response to the statement, "Overall, as a result of the Business program at SDSU I have learned critical thinking skills.

- 63.2% responded "Quite Well"
- 31.4% responded "Somewhat"
- 4.6% responded "Very Little"
- 0.9% responded "Not at All"

DLO 4: Ethical Dimensions

Explain the various ethical dimensions of business decision making.

Connected Document

[BSBA Map Spring 2016](#)

Relevant Associations:

AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning Associations

AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning (15-21)

3.15.1 Management of Curricula: The school uses well documented, systematic processes to develop, monitor, evaluate, and revise the substance and delivery of the curricula of degree programs and to assess the impact of the curricula on learning. Curriculum management includes inputs from all appropriate constituencies which may include faculty, staff, administrators, students, faculty from non-business disciplines, alumni, and the business community served by the school. The standard requires use of a systematic process for curriculum management but does not require any specific courses in the curriculum. Normally, the curriculum management process will result in an undergraduate degree program that includes learning experiences in such general knowledge and skill areas as: Communication abilities. Ethical understanding and reasoning abilities. Analytic skills. Use of information technology. Dynamics of the global economy Multicultural and diversity understanding...

3.16.1 Bachelor's or undergraduate level degree: Knowledge and skills. Adapting expectations to the school's mission and cultural circumstances, the school specifies learning goals and demonstrates achievement of learning goals for key general, management-specific, and/or appropriate discipline-specific knowledge and skills that its students achieve in each undergraduate degree program.

3.17.1 The bachelor's or undergraduate level degree programs must provide sufficient time, content coverage, student effort, and student-faculty interaction to assure that the learning goals are accomplished.

Strategic Plan Associations

CBA- College of Business Administration

- 3.1.1 Assess the undergraduate curriculum in a mode of continuous improvement with emphasis on student learning, architecture and content.
- 3.1.2 Assess the graduate curriculum in a mode of continuous improvement with emphasis on student learning, architecture and content.
- 3.1.3 Study online/hybrid/flexible teaching models and develop where appropriate.
- 3.2.1 Have the Dean talk with other Deans about criteria used to evaluate undergraduate programs.
- 3.2.2 Survey alumni on metrics associated with ranking criteria and quality programs. Use these data to improve program quality and to produce PR materials which feature areas of excellence from the surveys.
- 3.2.3 Feature recent success stories of outstanding alumni on CBA and department web sites.
- 3.2.4 Publicize outstanding efforts by faculty and specific classes. Focus once a month on a team that competed on a national competition, work of BA 404/SIFE students, business clubs, and other exceptional accomplishments by undergraduate students and classes.

Related Measures

M 1: Archived Assessment Reports (2007 - 2011)

Annual reports were produced starting in 2007 that reported assessment efforts including findings of assessed learning outcomes and action plans/loop closing for the given year. In 2012 SDSU began using WEAVE to report this information and annual written reports were no longer produced. All assessment efforts beginning in 2012 are reported as cycles in WEAVE. The annual reports from 2007 - 2011 are archived in the WEAVE Document Repository and linked here. Benchmarks and Findings listed below are empty in WEAVE as all information for 2007 - 2011 is found in the annual reports.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Connected Documents

- [BSBA Common 2007 Report](#)
- [BSBA Common 2008 Report](#)
- [BSBA Common 2009 Report](#)
- [BSBA Common 2010 Report](#)
- [BSBA Common 2011 Report](#)

M 5: Ethics Final Exam Questions

Embedded questions on a comprehensive final exam in BA 300 (Ethical Decision Making in Business) are used to assess student learning outcomes related to the Ethics goal. Questions are mapped to the SLOs.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Benchmarks:

70% of students should be able to answer the multiple choice questions correctly.

Finding (2016-2017) - Benchmarks: Met

The Ethical Dimensions SLO (DLO 5 or the 1st SLO of Goal #3 - Ethical Reasoning) is assessed through three questions asked on the common final exam given to all BA 300 students. The fall 2016 results of this assessment are found in the following table:

Question	Subtotals			
	Number of Students	Correct	Incorrect	%Correct
Overall for the SLO	665	1,625	370	81.5%

Finding (2014-2015) - Benchmarks: Met

The Ethical Dimensions SLO (DLO 5 or the 1st SLO of Goal #3 - Ethical Reasoning) is assessed through three questions asked on the common final exam given to all BA 300 students. The fall 2014 results of this assessment are found in the following table:

Question	Subtotals			%Correct
	Number of Students	Correct	Incorrect	
1	514	444	70	86.4%
2	514	351	163	68.3%
3	514	427	117	73.0%

Overall for the SLO	514			75.9%
---------------------	-----	--	--	-------

Finding (2013-2014) - Benchmarks: Not Reported This Cycle

An assessment of this DLO was not conducted in 2013-2014.

Finding (2012 - 2013) - Benchmarks: Met

The Ethical Dimensions SLO (DLO 5 or the 1st SLO of Goal #3 - Ethical Reasoning) is assessed through three questions asked on the common final exam given to all BA 300 students. The Spring 2013 results of this assessment are found in the following table. The results are presented in greater detail in the file "2012-2013 Ethical Reasoning Findings PPT" found in the Document Repository and connected below. The file also includes comparison between these findings and previous assessments.

Question	Subtotals			%Correct
	Number of Students	Correct	Incorrect	
1	544	475	69	87.3%
2	544	406	138	74.6%
3	544	427	117	78.5%
Overall for the SLO	544			80.2%

Connected Documents

[2011-2012 Ethical Reasoning Findings, PPT](#)

[2012-2013 Ethical Reasoning Findings PPT](#)

Finding (2011-2012) - Benchmarks: Met

PLEASE NOTE: All findings and loop closing prior to 2011-2012 for this and all goals and student learning outcomes can be found on the CBA Assessment website at: <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~cba/assessment/index.html>.

The Ethical Reasoning DLO #5 is assessed through three questions asked on the common final exam given to all BA 300 students. The Fall 2011 results of this assessment are found in the following table. The results are presented in greater detail in the file "2011-2012 Ethical Reasoning Findings PPT" found in the Document Repository and connected below. The file also includes comparison to previous assessments.

Question	Subtotals			%Correct
	Number of Students	Correct	Incorrect	
1	633	576	57	91.0%
2	633	375	258	59.2%
3	633	420	213	66.4%
Overall for the SLO	633	457	176	72.2%

Connected Document

[2011-2012 Ethical Reasoning Findings, PPT](#)

M 7: Student Perceptions of Learning (Indirect)

Beginning in Spring 2017, an indirect measure was added to BSBA assessment as a supplement to the direct measures in place. On the EBKAT exam (which measures Essential Business Knowledge) students were asked 5 questions, pertaining to the BSBA Common Goals. Students were not asked, in this round, about Global Perspective as the DLOs for this goal are "on hold" following the implementation of a major loop closing effort. In the questions students were asked their perceptions about the degree to which the BSBA program provided them with the knowledge and skills related to the given goal.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Benchmarks:

No benchmark established for this initial data collection effort.

Finding (2016-2017) - Benchmarks: Not Reported This Cycle

In response to the statement, "Overall, as a result of the Business program at SDSU I have learned ethical reasoning skills.

- 68.2% responded "Quite Well"
- 23.7% responded "Somewhat"
- 6.1% responded "Very Little"
- 2.0% responded "Not at All"

DLO 5: Affected Parties

Explain the role of various affected parties in business decision making.

Connected Document

[BSBA Map Spring 2016](#)

Relevant Associations:

AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning Associations

AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning (15-21)

3.15.1 Management of Curricula: The school uses well documented, systematic processes to develop, monitor, evaluate, and revise the substance and delivery of the curricula of degree programs and to assess the impact of the curricula on learning. Curriculum management includes inputs from all appropriate constituencies which may include faculty, staff, administrators, students, faculty from non-business disciplines, alumni, and the business community served by the school. The standard requires use of a systematic process for curriculum management but does not require any specific courses in the curriculum. Normally, the curriculum management process will result in an undergraduate degree program that includes learning experiences in such general knowledge and skill areas as: Communication abilities. Ethical understanding and reasoning abilities. Analytic skills. Use of information technology. Dynamics of the global economy Multicultural and diversity understanding...

3.16.1 Bachelor's or undergraduate level degree: Knowledge and skills. Adapting expectations to the school's mission and cultural circumstances, the school specifies learning goals and demonstrates achievement of learning goals for key general, management-specific, and/or appropriate discipline-specific knowledge and skills that its students achieve in each undergraduate degree program.

3.17.1 The bachelor's or undergraduate level degree programs must provide sufficient time, content coverage, student effort, and student-faculty interaction to assure that the learning goals are accomplished.

Strategic Plan Associations

CBA- College of Business Administration

3.1.1 Assess the undergraduate curriculum in a mode of continuous improvement with emphasis on student learning, architecture and content.

3.1.2 Assess the graduate curriculum in a mode of continuous improvement with emphasis on student learning, architecture and content.

3.1.3 Study online/hybrid/flexible teaching models and develop where appropriate.

3.2.1 Have the Dean talk with other Deans about criteria used to evaluate undergraduate programs.

3.2.2 Survey alumni on metrics associated with ranking criteria and quality programs. Use these data to improve program quality and to produce PR materials which feature areas of excellence from the surveys.

3.2.3 Feature recent success stories of outstanding alumni on CBA and department web sites.

3.2.4 Publicize outstanding efforts by faculty and specific classes. Focus once a month on a team that competed on a national competition, work of BA 404/SIFE students, business clubs, and other exceptional accomplishments by undergraduate students and classes.

Related Measures

M 1: Archived Assessment Reports (2007 - 2011)

Annual reports were produced starting in 2007 that reported assessment efforts including findings of assessed learning outcomes and action plans/loop closing for the given year. In 2012 SDSU began using WEAVE to report this information and annual written reports were no longer produced. All assessment efforts beginning in 2012 are reported as cycles in WEAVE. The annual reports from 2007 - 2011 are archived in the WEAVE Document Repository and linked here. Benchmarks and Findings listed below are empty in WEAVE as all information for 2007 - 2011 is found in the annual reports.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Connected Documents

[BSBA Common 2007 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2008 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2009 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2010 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2011 Report](#)

M 5: Ethics Final Exam Questions

Embedded questions on a comprehensive final exam in BA 300 (Ethical Decision Making in Business) are used to assess student learning outcomes related to the Ethics goal. Questions are mapped to the SLOs.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Benchmarks:

70% of students should be able to answer the multiple choice questions correctly.

Finding (2016-2017) - Benchmarks: Met

The Ethical Dimensions SLO (DLO 5 or the 2nd SLO of Goal #3 - Ethical Reasoning) is assessed through three questions asked on the common final exam given to all BA 300 students. The fall 2016 results of this assessment are found in the following table:

Question	Subtotals			%Correct
	Number of Students	Correct	Incorrect	
Overall for the SLO	665	1,721	274	86.3%

Finding (2014-2015) - Benchmarks: Met

The Affected Parties (DLO 6 or the 2nd SLO of Goal #3 - Ethical Reasoning) is assessed through three questions asked on the common final exam given to all BA 300 students. The fall 2014 results of this assessment are found in the following table:

Question	Subtotals			%Correct
	Number of			

	Students	Correct	Incorrect	
1	514	385	129	74.9%
2	514	372	142	72.4%
3	514	466	48	90.7%
Overall for the SLO	514			79.3%

Finding (2013-2014) - Benchmarks: Not Reported This Cycle

An assessment of this DLO was not conducted in 2013-2014.

Finding (2012 - 2013) - Benchmarks: Met

The Affected Parties (DLO 5 or the 2nd SLO of Goal #3 - Ethical Reasoning) is assessed through three questions asked on the common final exam given to all BA 300 students. The Spring 2013 results of this assessment are found in the following table. The results are presented in greater detail in the file "2012-2013 Ethical Reasoning Findings PPT" found in the Document Repository and connected below. The file also includes comparison between these findings and previous assessments.

Question	Subtotals			%Correct
	Number of Students	Correct	Incorrect	
1	540	464	76	85.9%
2	540	442	98	81.9%
3	540	482	58	89.3%
Overall for the SLO	540			85.7%

Connected Documents

[2011-2012 Ethical Reasoning Findings. PPT](#)
[2012-2013 Ethical Reasoning Findings PPT](#)

Finding (2011-2012) - Benchmarks: Met

PLEASE NOTE: All findings and loop closing prior to 2011-2012 for this and all goals and student learning outcomes can be found on the CBA Assessment website at: <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~cba/assessment/index.html>.

The Ethical Reasoning DLO #6 is assessed through three questions asked on the common final exam given to all BA 300 students. The Fall 2011 results of this assessment are found in the following table. The results are presented in greater detail in the file "2011-2012 Ethical Reasoning Findings PPT" found in the Document Repository and connected below. The file also includes comparison between these findings and previous assessments.

Question	Subtotals			%Correct
	Number of Students	Correct	Incorrect	
1	633	565	68	89.3%
2	633	517	116	81.7%
3	633	513	120	81.0%
Overall for the SLO	633	532	101	84.0%

Connected Document

[2011-2012 Ethical Reasoning Findings. PPT](#)

M 7: Student Perceptions of Learning (Indirect)

Beginning in Spring 2017, an indirect measure was added to BSBA assessment as a supplement to the direct measures in place. On the EBKAT exam (which measures Essential Business Knowledge) students were asked 5 questions, pertaining to the BSBA Common Goals. Students were not asked, in this round, about Global Perspective as the DLOs for this goal are "on hold" following the implementation of a major loop closing effort. In the questions students were asked their perceptions about the degree to which the BSBA program provided them with the knowledge and skills related to the given goal.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Benchmarks:

No benchmark established for this initial data collection effort.

Finding (2016-2017) - Benchmarks: Not Reported This Cycle

In response to the statement, "Overall, as a result of the Business program at SDSU I have learned ethical reasoning skills.

- 68.2% responded "Quite Well"
- 23.7% responded "Somewhat"

- 6.1% responded "Very Little"
- 2.0% responded "Not at All"

DLO 6: Decision Rules

Assess the ethics of decision alternatives using different ethical decision rules.

Connected Document

[BSBA Map Spring 2016](#)

Relevant Associations:

AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning Associations

AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning (15-21)

3.15.1 Management of Curricula: The school uses well documented, systematic processes to develop, monitor, evaluate, and revise the substance and delivery of the curricula of degree programs and to assess the impact of the curricula on learning. Curriculum management includes inputs from all appropriate constituencies which may include faculty, staff, administrators, students, faculty from non-business disciplines, alumni, and the business community served by the school. The standard requires use of a systematic process for curriculum management but does not require any specific courses in the curriculum. Normally, the curriculum management process will result in an undergraduate degree program that includes learning experiences in such general knowledge and skill areas as: Communication abilities. Ethical understanding and reasoning abilities. Analytic skills. Use of information technology. Dynamics of the global economy Multicultural and diversity understanding...

3.16.1 Bachelor's or undergraduate level degree: Knowledge and skills. Adapting expectations to the school's mission and cultural circumstances, the school specifies learning goals and demonstrates achievement of learning goals for key general, management-specific, and/or appropriate discipline-specific knowledge and skills that its students achieve in each undergraduate degree program.

3.17.1 The bachelor's or undergraduate level degree programs must provide sufficient time, content coverage, student effort, and student-faculty interaction to assure that the learning goals are accomplished.

Strategic Plan Associations

CBA- College of Business Administration

3.1.1 Assess the undergraduate curriculum in a mode of continuous improvement with emphasis on student learning, architecture and content.

3.1.2 Assess the graduate curriculum in a mode of continuous improvement with emphasis on student learning, architecture and content.

3.1.3 Study online/hybrid/flexible teaching models and develop where appropriate.

3.2.1 Have the Dean talk with other Deans about criteria used to evaluate undergraduate programs.

3.2.2 Survey alumni on metrics associated with ranking criteria and quality programs. Use these data to improve program quality and to produce PR materials which feature areas of excellence from the surveys.

3.2.3 Feature recent success stories of outstanding alumni on CBA and department web sites.

3.2.4 Publicize outstanding efforts by faculty and specific classes. Focus once a month on a team that competed on a national competition, work of BA 404/SIFE students, business clubs, and other exceptional accomplishments by undergraduate students and classes.

Related Measures

M 1: Archived Assessment Reports (2007 - 2011)

Annual reports were produced starting in 2007 that reported assessment efforts including findings of assessed learning outcomes and action plans/loop closing for the given year. In 2012 SDSU began using WEAVE to report this information and annual written reports were no longer produced. All assessment efforts beginning in 2012 are reported as cycles in WEAVE. The annual reports from 2007 - 2011 are archived in the WEAVE Document Repository and linked here. Benchmarks and Findings listed below are empty in WEAVE as all information for 2007 - 2011 is found in the annual reports.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Connected Documents

[BSBA Common 2007 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2008 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2009 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2010 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2011 Report](#)

M 5: Ethics Final Exam Questions

Embedded questions on a comprehensive final exam in BA 300 (Ethical Decision Making in Business) are used to assess student learning outcomes related to the Ethics goal. Questions are mapped to the SLOs.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Benchmarks:

70% of students should be able to answer the multiple choice questions correctly.

Finding (2016-2017) - Benchmarks: Met

The Ethical Dimensions SLO (DLO 5 or the 3rd SLO of Goal #3 - Ethical Reasoning) is assessed through three questions asked on the common final exam given to all BA 300 students. The fall 2016 results of this assessment are found in the following table:

Question	Subtotals			
	Number of Students	Correct	Incorrect	% Correct
Overall for the SLO	665	1,497	498	75.0%

Finding (2014-2015) - Benchmarks: Met

The decision rules (DLO 7 or the 3rd SLO of Goal #3 - Ethical Reasoning) is assessed through three questions asked on the common final exam given to all BA 300 students. The fall 2014 results of this assessment are found in the following table:

Question	Subtotals			%Correct
	Number of Students	Correct	Incorrect	
1	514	454	60	88.3%
2	514	447	67	87.0%
3	514	358	182	44.2%
Overall for the SLO	514			73.2%

Finding (2013-2014) - Benchmarks: Not Reported This Cycle

An assessment of this DLO was not conducted in 2013-2014.

Finding (2012 - 2013) - Benchmarks: Met

The Decision rules (DLO 7 or the 3rd SLO of Goal #3 - Ethical Reasoning) is assessed through three questions asked on the common final exam given to all BA 300 students. The Spring 2013 results of this assessment are found in the following table. The results are presented in greater detail in the file "2012-2013 Ethical Reasoning Findings PPT" found in the Document Repository and connected below. The file also includes comparison between these findings and previous assessments.

Question	Subtotals			%Correct
	Number of Students	Correct	Incorrect	
1	540	350	190	64.8%
2	540	458	82	84.8%
3	540	358	182	66.3%
Overall for the SLO	540			72.0%

Connected Documents

[2011-2012 Ethical Reasoning Findings. PPT](#)

[2012-2013 Ethical Reasoning Findings PPT](#)

Finding (2011-2012) - Benchmarks: Met

PLEASE NOTE: All findings and loop closing prior to 2011-2012 for this and all goals and student learning outcomes can be found on the CBA Assessment website at: <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~cba/assessment/index.html>.

The Ethical Reasoning DLO #7 is assessed through three questions asked on the common final exam given to all BA 300 students. The Fall 2011 results of this assessment are found in the following table. The results are presented in greater detail in the file "2011-2012 Ethical Reasoning Findings PPT" found in the Document Repository and connected below. The file also includes comparison between these findings and previous assessments.

Question	Subtotals			%Correct
	Number of Students	Correct	Incorrect	
1	633	419	214	66.2%
2	633	585	48	92.4%
3	633	501	132	79.1%
Overall for the SLO	633	502	131	79.3%

Connected Document

[2011-2012 Ethical Reasoning Findings. PPT](#)

M 7: Student Perceptions of Learning (Indirect)

Beginning in Spring 2017, an indirect measure was added to BSBA assessment as a supplement to the direct measures in place. On the EBKAT exam (which measures Essential Business Knowledge) students were asked 5 questions, pertaining to the BSBA Common Goals. Students were not asked, in this round, about Global Perspective as the DLOs for this goal are "on hold" following the implementation of a major loop closing effort. In the questions students were asked their perceptions about the degree to which the BSBA program provided them with the knowledge and skills related to the given goal.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Benchmarks:

No benchmark established for this initial data collection effort.

Finding (2016-2017) - Benchmarks: Not Reported This Cycle

In response to the statement, "Overall, as a result of the Business program at SDSU I have learned ethical reasoning skills.

- 68.2% responded "Quite Well"
- 23.7% responded "Somewhat"
- 6.1% responded "Very Little"
- 2.0% responded "Not at All"

DLO 7: Decision Rule Application

Apply ethical decision-making rules to cases drawn from various business sub-disciplines.

Connected Document

[BSBA Map Spring 2016](#)

Relevant Associations:

AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning Associations

AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning (15-21)

3.15.1 Management of Curricula: The school uses well documented, systematic processes to develop, monitor, evaluate, and revise the substance and delivery of the curricula of degree programs and to assess the impact of the curricula on learning. Curriculum management includes inputs from all appropriate constituencies which may include faculty, staff, administrators, students, faculty from non-business disciplines, alumni, and the business community served by the school. The standard requires use of a systematic process for curriculum management but does not require any specific courses in the curriculum. Normally, the curriculum management process will result in an undergraduate degree program that includes learning experiences in such general knowledge and skill areas as: Communication abilities. Ethical understanding and reasoning abilities. Analytic skills. Use of information technology. Dynamics of the global economy Multicultural and diversity understanding...

3.16.1 Bachelor's or undergraduate level degree: Knowledge and skills. Adapting expectations to the school's mission and cultural circumstances, the school specifies learning goals and demonstrates achievement of learning goals for key general, management-specific, and/or appropriate discipline-specific knowledge and skills that its students achieve in each undergraduate degree program.

3.17.1 The bachelor's or undergraduate level degree programs must provide sufficient time, content coverage, student effort, and student-faculty interaction to assure that the learning goals are accomplished.

Strategic Plan Associations

CBA- College of Business Administration

- 3.1.1 Assess the undergraduate curriculum in a mode of continuous improvement with emphasis on student learning, architecture and content.
- 3.1.2 Assess the graduate curriculum in a mode of continuous improvement with emphasis on student learning, architecture and content.
- 3.1.3 Study online/hybrid/flexible teaching models and develop where appropriate.
- 3.2.1 Have the Dean talk with other Deans about criteria used to evaluate undergraduate programs.
- 3.2.2 Survey alumni on metrics associated with ranking criteria and quality programs. Use these data to improve program quality and to produce PR materials which feature areas of excellence from the surveys.
- 3.2.3 Feature recent success stories of outstanding alumni on CBA and department web sites.
- 3.2.4 Publicize outstanding efforts by faculty and specific classes. Focus once a month on a team that competed on a national competition, work of BA 404/SIFE students, business clubs, and other exceptional accomplishments by undergraduate students and classes.

Related Measures

M 1: Archived Assessment Reports (2007 - 2011)

Annual reports were produced starting in 2007 that reported assessment efforts including findings of assessed learning outcomes and action plans/loop closing for the given year. In 2012 SDSU began using WEAVE to report this information and annual written reports were no longer produced. All assessment efforts beginning in 2012 are reported as cycles in WEAVE. The annual reports from 2007 - 2011 are archived in the WEAVE Document Repository and linked here. Benchmarks and Findings listed below are empty in WEAVE as all information for 2007 - 2011 is found in the annual reports.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Connected Documents

- [BSBA Common 2007 Report](#)
- [BSBA Common 2008 Report](#)
- [BSBA Common 2009 Report](#)
- [BSBA Common 2010 Report](#)
- [BSBA Common 2011 Report](#)

M 5: Ethics Final Exam Questions

Embedded questions on a comprehensive final exam in BA 300 (Ethical Decision Making in Business) are used to assess student learning outcomes related to the Ethics goal. Questions are mapped to the SLOs.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Benchmarks:

70% of students should be able to answer the multiple choice questions correctly.

Finding (2016-2017) - Benchmarks: Met

The Ethical Dimensions SLO (DLO 5 or the 4th SLO of Goal #3 - Ethical Reasoning) is assessed through three questions asked on the common final exam given to all BA 300 students. The fall 2016 results of this assessment are found in the following table:

Question	Subtotals	

	Number of Students	Correct	Incorrect	%Correct
Overall for the SLO	665	1,780	215	89.2%

Finding (2014-2015) - Benchmarks: Met

The Decision Rule Application (DLO 8 or the 4th SLO of Goal #3 - Ethical Reasoning) is assessed through three questions asked on the common final exam given to all BA 300 students. The fall 2014 results of this assessment are found in the following table:

Question	Subtotals			%Correct
	Number of Students	Correct	Incorrect	
1	514	489	25	95.1%
2	514	474	40	92.2%
3	514	340	174	66.2%
Overall for the SLO	514			84.5%

Finding (2013-2014) - Benchmarks: Not Reported This Cycle

An assessment of this DLO was not conducted in 2013-2014.

Finding (2012 - 2013) - Benchmarks: Met

The Decision rule Application (DLO 8 or the 4th SLO of Goal #3 - Ethical Reasoning) is assessed through three questions asked on the common final exam given to all BA 300 students. The Spring 2013 results of this assessment are found in the following table. The results are presented in greater detail in the file "2012-2013 Ethical Reasoning Findings PPT" found in the Document Repository and connected below. The file also includes comparison between these findings and previous assessments.

Question	Subtotals			%Correct
	Number of Students	Correct	Incorrect	
1	540	523	17	96.9%
2	540	500	40	92.6%
3	540	370	152	70.9%
Overall for the SLO	540			86.8%

Connected Documents

[2011-2012 Ethical Reasoning Findings. PPT](#)

[2012-2013 Ethical Reasoning Findings PPT](#)

Finding (2011-2012) - Benchmarks: Met

PLEASE NOTE: All findings and loop closing prior to 2011-2012 for this and all goals and student learning outcomes can be found on the CBA Assessment website at: <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~cba/assessment/index.html>.

The Ethical Reasoning DLO #8 is assessed through three questions asked on the common final exam given to all BA 300 students. The Fall 2011 results of this assessment are found in the following table. The results are presented in greater detail in the file "2011-2012 Ethical Reasoning Findings PPT" found in the Document Repository. The file also includes comparison between these findings and previous assessments.

Question	Subtotals			%Correct
	Number of Students	Correct	Incorrect	
1	633	568	65	89.7%
2	633	405	228	64.0%
3	633	486	147	76.8%
Overall for the SLO	633	486	147	76.8%

Connected Document
[2011-2012 Ethical Reasoning Findings. PPT](#)

M 7: Student Perceptions of Learning (Indirect)

Beginning in Spring 2017, an indirect measure was added to BSBA assessment as a supplement to the direct measures in place. On

the EBKAT exam (which measures Essential Business Knowledge) students were asked 5 questions, pertaining to the BSBA Common Goals. Students were not asked, in this round, about Global Perspective as the DLOs for this goal are "on hold" following the implementation of a major loop closing effort. In the questions students were asked their perceptions about the degree to which the BSBA program provided them with the knowledge and skills related to the given goal.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Benchmarks:

No benchmark established for this initial data collection effort.

Finding (2016-2017) - Benchmarks: Not Reported This Cycle

In response to the statement, "Overall, as a result of the Business program at SDSU I have learned ethical reasoning skills.

- 68.2% responded "Quite Well"
- 23.7% responded "Somewhat"
- 6.1% responded "Very Little"
- 2.0% responded "Not at All"

DLO 8: Global Economy Impact

Identify and describe the impact of the global economy on business decisions.

Connected Documents

- [BSBA Map Spring 2016](#)
- [Global Perspective Rubric, 2009-2010 to 2012-2013](#)
- [Global Perspective Rubric, 2013-2014](#)

Relevant Associations:**AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning Associations****AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning (15-21)**

3.15.1 Management of Curricula: The school uses well documented, systematic processes to develop, monitor, evaluate, and revise the substance and delivery of the curricula of degree programs and to assess the impact of the curricula on learning. Curriculum management includes inputs from all appropriate constituencies which may include faculty, staff, administrators, students, faculty from non-business disciplines, alumni, and the business community served by the school. The standard requires use of a systematic process for curriculum management but does not require any specific courses in the curriculum. Normally, the curriculum management process will result in an undergraduate degree program that includes learning experiences in such general knowledge and skill areas as: Communication abilities. Ethical understanding and reasoning abilities. Analytic skills. Use of information technology. Dynamics of the global economy Multicultural and diversity understanding...

3.16.1 Bachelor's or undergraduate level degree: Knowledge and skills. Adapting expectations to the school's mission and cultural circumstances, the school specifies learning goals and demonstrates achievement of learning goals for key general, management-specific, and/or appropriate discipline-specific knowledge and skills that its students achieve in each undergraduate degree program.

3.17.1 The bachelor's or undergraduate level degree programs must provide sufficient time, content coverage, student effort, and student-faculty interaction to assure that the learning goals are accomplished.

Strategic Plan Associations**CBA- College of Business Administration**

- 3.1.1 Assess the undergraduate curriculum in a mode of continuous improvement with emphasis on student learning, architecture and content.
- 3.1.2 Assess the graduate curriculum in a mode of continuous improvement with emphasis on student learning, architecture and content.
- 3.1.3 Study online/hybrid/flexible teaching models and develop where appropriate.
- 3.2.1 Have the Dean talk with other Deans about criteria used to evaluate undergraduate programs.
- 3.2.2 Survey alumni on metrics associated with ranking criteria and quality programs. Use these data to improve program quality and to produce PR materials which feature areas of excellence from the surveys.
- 3.2.3 Feature recent success stories of outstanding alumni on CBA and department web sites.
- 3.2.4 Publicize outstanding efforts by faculty and specific classes. Focus once a month on a team that competed on a national competition, work of BA 404/SIFE students, business clubs, and other exceptional accomplishments by undergraduate students and classes.

Related Measures**M 1: Archived Assessment Reports (2007 - 2011)**

Annual reports were produced starting in 2007 that reported assessment efforts including findings of assessed learning outcomes and action plans/loop closing for the given year. In 2012 SDSU began using WEAVE to report this information and annual written reports were no longer produced. All assessment efforts beginning in 2012 are reported as cycles in WEAVE. The annual reports from 2007 - 2011 are archived in the WEAVE Document Repository and linked here. Benchmarks and Findings listed below are empty in WEAVE as all information for 2007 - 2011 is found in the annual reports.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Connected Documents

- [BSBA Common 2007 Report](#)
- [BSBA Common 2008 Report](#)
- [BSBA Common 2009 Report](#)
- [BSBA Common 2010 Report](#)
- [BSBA Common 2011 Report](#)

M 4: Capstone Exam Questions**General Description of the Measure:**

Final exam essay questions from MGT 405 (the college-wide capstone course) are rated by two raters, following a norming session. Depending on whether the raters are assessing critical thinking or global perspective in a given cycle, appropriate rubrics are used. The rubrics are reviewed and updated as appropriate over time. Past rubrics can be found in the Document Repository (and are linked to the respective Goal and DLOs), the most recent rubrics used for critical thinking and global perspective respectively, are connected here. Student work samples to illustrate the rubric levels of "meeting expectations" are also connected.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Documents

[Critical Thinking Rubric - 2014-2015](#)
[Global Perspective Rubric, 2013-2014](#)
[Student Work Sample, Exceeds Expectations on Critical thinking, DLO #3](#)
[Student Work Sample, Exceeds Expectations on Global Perspective DLOs #8 & #9](#)
[Student Work Sample, Meets Expectations on Critical Thinking, DLO #3](#)
[Student Work Sample, Meets Expectations on Global Perspective DLOs #8 & #9](#)

Benchmarks:

70% of students will meet or exceed expectations.
30% of students will exceed expectations.

Finding (2013-2014) - Benchmarks: Partially Met

The table below summarizes the results of the assessment of the Global Perspective the student learning outcome (DLO #9) of identify and describe the impact of the global economy on business decisions.
:

	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets or Exceeds Expectations
DLO #9	26.6%	73.4%

Given the established benchmark of 70% of our students meeting or exceeding expectations, it is noted that the benchmark for DLO #9 was achieved. With respect to the established benchmark of 30% of students exceeding expectations, on DLO #9, 9.6% and 6.4% of the exams were rated as exceeding expectations by the first and second rater, respectively.

Connected Document

[Global Perspective Rubric, 2013-2014](#)

Finding (2012 - 2013) - Benchmarks: Not Reported This Cycle

This DLO was not assessed in 2012-2013.

Finding (2011-2012) - Benchmarks: Not Met

PLEASE NOTE: All findings and loop closing prior to 2011-2012 for this and all goals and student learning outcomes can be found on the CBA Assessment website at: <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~cba/assessment/index.html>.

Goal #4 – Global Perspective (These are findings from 2010-2011 - as per explanation elsewhere, WEAVE DLO #9 was not assessed in 2011-2012)

The table below summarizes the results of the assessment of both Global Perspective student learning outcomes:

	Below Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Exceeding Expectations
SLO #1 (WEAVE DLO #9)	28.3%	22.5%	40.8%	8.3%
SLO #2 (WEAVE DLO #10)	25.0%	15.0%	48.3%	11.7%

Given the established benchmarks of 70% of our students meeting and 30% of our student exceeding expectations, the benchmarks were not met. A more expanded presentation of these results are in the file "2010-2011 Global Perspective Findings PPT" found in the Document Repository and connected below. The file also includes a comparison between these findings and previous assessments and a closer look at some sub-groups including students who studied abroad and students who take a required global course.

Connected Document

[2010-2011 Global Perspective Findings PPT](#)

Related Closes the Loop (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the *Details of Closes the Loop* section of this report.

New Course and a Shift in Content

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

The plan to close the loop on our students inability to strategize in a global environment will entail shifting some of the co...

DLO 9: Global Perspective Application

Explain and apply a global perspective in making business decisions.

Connected Documents

[BSBA Map Spring 2016](#)
[Global Perspective Rubric, 2009-2010 to 2012-2013](#)
[Global Perspective Rubric, 2013-2014](#)

Relevant Associations:

AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning Associations

AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning (15-21)

3.15.1 Management of Curricula: The school uses well documented, systematic processes to develop, monitor, evaluate, and revise the substance and delivery of the curricula of degree programs and to assess the impact of the curricula on learning. Curriculum management includes inputs from all appropriate constituencies which may include faculty, staff, administrators, students, faculty from non-business disciplines, alumni, and the business community served by the school. The standard requires use of a systematic process for curriculum management but does not require any specific courses in the curriculum. Normally, the curriculum management process will result in an undergraduate degree program that includes learning experiences in such general knowledge and skill areas as: Communication abilities. Ethical understanding and reasoning abilities. Analytic skills. Use of information technology. Dynamics of the global economy Multicultural and diversity understanding...

3.16.1 Bachelor's or undergraduate level degree: Knowledge and skills. Adapting expectations to the school's mission and cultural circumstances, the school specifies learning goals and demonstrates achievement of learning goals for key general, management-specific, and/or appropriate discipline-specific knowledge and skills that its students achieve in each undergraduate degree program.

3.17.1 The bachelor's or undergraduate level degree programs must provide sufficient time, content coverage, student effort, and student-faculty interaction to assure that the learning goals are accomplished.

Strategic Plan Associations

CBA- College of Business Administration

3.1.1 Assess the undergraduate curriculum in a mode of continuous improvement with emphasis on student learning, architecture and content.

3.1.2 Assess the graduate curriculum in a mode of continuous improvement with emphasis on student learning, architecture and content.

3.1.3 Study online/hybrid/flexible teaching models and develop where appropriate.

3.2.1 Have the Dean talk with other Deans about criteria used to evaluate undergraduate programs.

3.2.2 Survey alumni on metrics associated with ranking criteria and quality programs. Use these data to improve program quality and to produce PR materials which feature areas of excellence from the surveys.

3.2.3 Feature recent success stories of outstanding alumni on CBA and department web sites.

3.2.4 Publicize outstanding efforts by faculty and specific classes. Focus once a month on a team that competed on a national competition, work of BA 404/SIFE students, business clubs, and other exceptional accomplishments by undergraduate students and classes.

Related Measures

M 1: Archived Assessment Reports (2007 - 2011)

Annual reports were produced starting in 2007 that reported assessment efforts including findings of assessed learning outcomes and action plans/loop closing for the given year. In 2012 SDSU began using WEAVE to report this information and annual written reports were no longer produced. All assessment efforts beginning in 2012 are reported as cycles in WEAVE. The annual reports from 2007 - 2011 are archived in the WEAVE Document Repository and linked here. Benchmarks and Findings listed below are empty in WEAVE as all information for 2007 - 2011 is found in the annual reports.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Connected Documents

[BSBA Common 2007 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2008 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2009 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2010 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2011 Report](#)

M 4: Capstone Exam Questions

General Description of the Measure:

Final exam essay questions from MGT 405 (the college-wide capstone course) are rated by two raters, following a norming session. Depending on whether the raters are assessing critical thinking or global perspective in a given cycle, appropriate rubrics are used. The rubrics are reviewed and updated as appropriate over time. Past rubrics can be found in the Document Repository (and are linked to the respective Goal and DLOs), the most recent rubrics used for critical thinking and global perspective respectively, are connected here. Student work samples to illustrate the rubric levels of "meeting expectations" are also connected.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Documents

[Critical Thinking Rubric - 2014-2015](#)

[Global Perspective Rubric, 2013-2014](#)

[Student Work Sample, Exceeds Expectations on Critical thinking, DLO #3](#)

[Student Work Sample, Exceeds Expectations on Global Perspective DLOs #8 & #9](#)

[Student Work Sample, Meets Expectations on Critical Thinking, DLO #3](#)

[Student Work Sample, Meets Expectations on Global Perspective DLOs #8 & #9](#)

Benchmarks:

70% of students will meet or exceed expectations.

30% of students will exceed expectations.

Connected Documents

[2010-2011 Global Perspective Findings PPT](#)

[2011-2012 Global Perspective Findings PPT](#)

[Global Perspective Rubric, 2013-2014](#)

Finding (2013-2014) - Benchmarks: Not Met

The table below summarizes the results of the assessment of the Global Perspective DLO #10: Explain and apply a global perspective in making business decisions.

	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets or Exceeds Expectations
DLO #10	65.5%	34.5%

Given the established benchmark of 70% of our students meeting or exceeding expectations, it is noted that the benchmark for DLO #2 was not achieved. With respect to the established benchmark of 30% of students exceeding expectations, on DLO #10, 5.3% and 7.4% of the exams were rated as exceeding expectations by the first and second rater, respectively. Overall, our students were uniformly weak when asked to formulate a strategy for a global business.

Connected Document

[Global Perspective Rubric, 2013-2014](#)

Finding (2012 - 2013) - Benchmarks: Not Reported This Cycle

This SLO was not assessed in 2012-2013.

Finding (2011-2012) - Benchmarks: Met

PLEASE NOTE: All findings and loop closing prior to 2011-2012 for this and all goals and student learning outcomes can be found on the CBA Assessment website at: <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~cba/assessment/index.html>.

Goal #4 – Global Perspective -- (These findings are from 2010-2011):

The table below summarizes the results of the assessment of both Global Perspective student learning outcomes:

	Below Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Exceeding Expectations
SLO #1 (WEAVE DLO #9)	28.3%	22.5%	40.8%	8.3%
SLO #2 (WEAVE DLO #10)	25.0%	15.0%	48.3%	11.7%

Given the established benchmarks of 70% of our students meeting or exceeding expectations and 30% of our students exceeding expectations, it is noted that neither SLO came close to meeting either benchmark. These results, quite disappointing, are presented in greater detail in the file “2010-2011 Global Perspective Findings PPT” found in the Document Repository and connected below. The file also includes a comparison between these findings and previous assessments and a closer look at some sub-groups including students who studied abroad and students who take a required global course.

Goal #4 -- Global Perspective -- 2011-2012

-

	Below Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Exceeding Expectations
SLO #2 (WEAVE DLO #10)	4.3%	9.9%	25.3%	57.4%

Given the established benchmarks of 70% of our students meeting or exceeding expectations and 30% of our students exceeding expectations, it is noted that the benchmarks were achieved. These results are quite different from the results of the previous assessment although the measure used was almost identical. Consideration will be given to the process for rating prior to the next assessment of this student learning outcome.

Connected Documents

[2010-2011 Global Perspective Findings PPT](#)
[2011-2012 Global Perspective Findings PPT](#)

Related Closes the Loop (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the *Details of Closes the Loop* section of this report.

New Course and a shift in content

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

The plan to close the loop on our students inability to strategize in a global environment will entail shifting some of th...

DLO 10: Business Concepts

Describe basic concepts in each major functional area of business.

Connected Document

[BSBA Map Spring 2016](#)

Relevant Associations:

AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning Associations

AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning (15-21)

3.15.1 Management of Curricula: The school uses well documented, systematic processes to develop, monitor, evaluate, and revise the substance and delivery of the curricula of degree programs and to assess the impact of the curricula on learning. Curriculum management includes inputs from all appropriate constituencies which may include faculty, staff, administrators, students, faculty from non-business disciplines, alumni, and the business community served by the school. The standard requires use of a systematic process for curriculum management but does not require any specific courses in the curriculum. Normally, the curriculum management process will result in an undergraduate degree program that includes learning experiences in such general knowledge and skill areas as: Communication abilities. Ethical understanding and reasoning abilities. Analytic skills. Use of information technology. Dynamics of the global economy Multicultural and diversity understanding...

3.16.1 Bachelor's or undergraduate level degree: Knowledge and skills. Adapting expectations to the school's mission and cultural circumstances, the school specifies learning goals and demonstrates achievement of learning goals for key general, management-specific, and/or appropriate discipline-specific knowledge and skills that its students achieve in each undergraduate degree program.

3.17.1 The bachelor's or undergraduate level degree programs must provide sufficient time, content coverage, student effort, and student-faculty interaction to assure that the learning goals are accomplished.

Strategic Plan Associations

CBA- College of Business Administration

3.1.1 Assess the undergraduate curriculum in a mode of continuous improvement with emphasis on student learning, architecture and content.

3.1.2 Assess the graduate curriculum in a mode of continuous improvement with emphasis on student learning, architecture and content.

3.1.3 Study online/hybrid/flexible teaching models and develop where appropriate.

3.2.1 Have the Dean talk with other Deans about criteria used to evaluate undergraduate programs.

3.2.2 Survey alumni on metrics associated with ranking criteria and quality programs. Use these data to improve program quality and to produce PR materials which feature areas of excellence from the surveys.

3.2.3 Feature recent success stories of outstanding alumni on CBA and department web sites.

3.2.4 Publicize outstanding efforts by faculty and specific classes. Focus once a month on a team that competed on a national competition, work of BA 404/SIFE students, business clubs, and other exceptional accomplishments by undergraduate students and classes.

Related Measures

M 1: Archived Assessment Reports (2007 - 2011)

Annual reports were produced starting in 2007 that reported assessment efforts including findings of assessed learning outcomes and action plans/loop closing for the given year. In 2012 SDSU began using WEAVE to report this information and annual written reports were no longer produced. All assessment efforts beginning in 2012 are reported as cycles in WEAVE. The annual reports from 2007 - 2011 are archived in the WEAVE Document Repository and linked here. Benchmarks and Findings listed below are empty in WEAVE as all information for 2007 - 2011 is found in the annual reports.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Connected Documents

[BSBA Common 2007 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2008 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2009 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2010 Report](#)

[BSBA Common 2011 Report](#)

M 6: EBKAT Exam

The Essential Business Knowledge Assessment Test (EBKAT) was developed on the SDSU campus to replace the BAT (Business Assessment Test) which had been used to measure essential business knowledge in previous years. Similar to the BAT, the EBKAT is an 80 item multiple choice test that measures across a number of business-related sub-disciplines. The EBKAT was developed to replace the BAT as we believe that it maps more precisely to our degree learning outcomes. The test is administered in the capstone strategy course, BA 405.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Benchmarks:

Performance above the mean of the prior administration of the EBKAT in each subject area. Since spring 2015 was the first administration of the EBKAT, a rationale for this type of benchmark is given below and the results relative to the benchmark are not reported this cycle.

There are two reasons why a relative benchmark (i.e., progressive improvement over time of average scores on the EBKAT), rather than absolute benchmark (i.e., an average score of x percent on the EBKAT) is being used. The first reason is that it is difficult to defend an absolute benchmark because of the length of time between when the EBKAT is taken and when students had been exposed to the subject area in a course (i.e., the recency effect). The second reason to use a relative benchmark is that because the EBKAT is administered in the BSBA capstone course, instructors of this course have resisted substantive incentives for performance on material they don't teach.

Finding (2016-2017) - Benchmarks: Met

Program Learning Goal 5 – Essential Business Knowledge

The table below summarizes the comparative results (all in percentages except the number of students) of the assessment of Essential Business Knowledge by subject area conducted in fourteen sections of BA 405, spring semester 2017 via the EBKAT.

Goal #5 - Essential Business Knowledge Subject Area	2015 Results Average Percentage Score	2017 Results Average Percentage Score
Accounting	50.3	51.2
Business Law	35.5	39.7
Economics	50.3	61.7
Finance	54.9	58.6
Information Systems	54.8	57.0
Management	62.0	68.7
Marketing	54.7	59.1
Operations	58.0	67.2
Statistics	42.6	46.6
Overall	51.3	56.3
Number of students	296	516

Finding (2014-2015) - Benchmarks: Not Reported This Cycle

Program Learning Goal 5 – Essential Business Knowledge

The table below summarizes the results (all in percentages except the number of students) of the assessment of Essential Business Knowledge by subject area conducted in seven sections of BA 405, spring semester 2015 via the EBKAT.

Goal #5 - Essential Business Knowledge Subject Area	Average Percentage Score
Accounting	50.3
Business Law	35.5
Economics	50.3
Finance	54.9
Information Systems	54.8
Management	62.0
Marketing	54.7
Operations	58.0
Statistics	42.6
Overall	51.3
Number of students	296

M 7: Student Perceptions of Learning (Indirect)

Beginning in Spring 2017, an indirect measure was added to BSBA assessment as a supplement to the direct measures in place. On the EBKAT exam (which measures Essential Business Knowledge) students were asked 5 questions, pertaining to the BSBA Common Goals. Students were not asked, in this round, about Global Perspective as the DLOs for this goal are "on hold" following the implementation of a major loop closing effort. In the questions students were asked their perceptions about the degree to which the BSBA program provided them with the knowledge and skills related to the given goal.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Benchmarks:

No benchmark established for this initial data collection effort.

Finding (2016-2017) - Benchmarks: Not Reported This Cycle

In response to the statement, "Overall, as a result of the Business program at SDSU I have learned essential business knowledge.

- 61.8% responded "Quite Well"
- 34.3% responded "Somewhat"
- 3.7% responded "Very Little"
- 0.2% responded "Not at All"

DLO 11: Business Applications

Apply techniques and theories from various areas of Business to business situations.

Connected Document

[BSBA Map Spring 2016](#)

Relevant Associations:

AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning Associations

AACSB 2011 Business Accreditation Standards for Assurance of Learning (15-21)

3.15.1 Management of Curricula: The school uses well documented, systematic processes to develop, monitor, evaluate, and revise the substance and delivery of the curricula of degree programs and to assess the impact of the curricula on learning. Curriculum management includes inputs from all appropriate constituencies which may include faculty, staff, administrators, students, faculty from non-business disciplines, alumni, and the business community served by the school. The standard requires use of a systematic process for curriculum management but does not require any specific courses in the curriculum. Normally, the curriculum management process will result in an undergraduate degree program that includes learning experiences in such general knowledge and skill areas as: Communication abilities. Ethical understanding and reasoning abilities. Analytic skills. Use of information technology. Dynamics of the global economy Multicultural and diversity understanding...

3.16.1 Bachelor's or undergraduate level degree: Knowledge and skills. Adapting expectations to the school's mission and cultural circumstances, the school specifies learning goals and demonstrates achievement of learning goals for key general, management-specific, and/or appropriate discipline-specific knowledge and skills that its students achieve in each undergraduate degree program.

3.17.1 The bachelor's or undergraduate level degree programs must provide sufficient time, content coverage, student effort, and student-faculty interaction to assure that the learning goals are accomplished.

Strategic Plan Associations

CBA- College of Business Administration

- 3.1.1 Assess the undergraduate curriculum in a mode of continuous improvement with emphasis on student learning, architecture and content.
- 3.1.2 Assess the graduate curriculum in a mode of continuous improvement with emphasis on student learning, architecture and content.
- 3.1.3 Study online/hybrid/flexible teaching models and develop where appropriate.
- 3.2.1 Have the Dean talk with other Deans about criteria used to evaluate undergraduate programs.
- 3.2.2 Survey alumni on metrics associated with ranking criteria and quality programs. Use these data to improve program quality and to produce PR materials which feature areas of excellence from the surveys.
- 3.2.3 Feature recent success stories of outstanding alumni on CBA and department web sites.
- 3.2.4 Publicize outstanding efforts by faculty and specific classes. Focus once a month on a team that competed on a national competition, work of BA 404/SIFE students, business clubs, and other exceptional accomplishments by undergraduate students and classes.

Related Measures

M 1: Archived Assessment Reports (2007 - 2011)

Annual reports were produced starting in 2007 that reported assessment efforts including findings of assessed learning outcomes and action plans/loop closing for the given year. In 2012 SDSU began using WEAVE to report this information and annual written reports were no longer produced. All assessment efforts beginning in 2012 are reported as cycles in WEAVE. The annual reports from 2007 - 2011 are archived in the WEAVE Document Repository and linked here. Benchmarks and Findings listed below are empty in WEAVE as all information for 2007 - 2011 is found in the annual reports.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Connected Documents

[BSBA Common 2007 Report](#)
[BSBA Common 2008 Report](#)
[BSBA Common 2009 Report](#)
[BSBA Common 2010 Report](#)
[BSBA Common 2011 Report](#)

M 6: EBKAT Exam

The Essential Business Knowledge Assessment Test (EBKAT) was developed on the SDSU campus to replace the BAT (Business Assessment Test) which had been used to measure essential business knowledge in previous years. Similar to the BAT, the EBKAT is an 80 item multiple choice test that measures across a number of business-related sub-disciplines. The EBKAT was developed to replace the BAT as we believe that it maps more precisely to our degree learning outcomes. The test is administered in the capstone strategy course, BA 405.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Benchmarks:

Performance above the mean of the prior administration of the EBKAT in each subject area. Since spring 2015 was the first administration of the EBKAT, a rationale for this type of benchmark is given below and the results relative to the benchmark are not reported this cycle.

There are two reasons why a relative benchmark (i.e., progressive improvement over time of average scores on the EBKAT), rather than absolute benchmark (i.e., an average score of x percent on the EBKAT) is being used. The first reason is that it is difficult to defend an absolute benchmark because of the length of time between when the EBKAT is taken and when students had been exposed to the subject area in a course (i.e., the recency effect). The second reason to use a relative benchmark is that because the EBKAT is administered in the BSBA capstone course, instructors of this course have resisted substantive incentives for performance on material they don't teach.

Finding (2014-2015) - Benchmarks: Not Reported This Cycle

Program Learning Goal 5 – Essential Business Knowledge

The table below summarizes the results (all in percentages except the number of students) of the assessment of Essential Business Knowledge by subject area conducted in seven sections of BA 405, spring semester 2015 via the EBKAT.

Goal #5 - Essential Business Knowledge Subject Area	Average Percentage Score
Accounting	50.3
Business Law	35.5
Economics	50.3
Finance	54.9
Information Systems	54.8
Management	62.0
Marketing	54.7
Operations	58.0
Statistics	42.6
Overall	51.3
Number of students	296

M 7: Student Perceptions of Learning (Indirect)

Beginning in Spring 2017, an indirect measure was added to BSBA assessment as a supplement to the direct measures in place. On the EBKAT exam (which measures Essential Business Knowledge) students were asked 5 questions, pertaining to the BSBA Common Goals. Students were not asked, in this round, about Global Perspective as the DLOs for this goal are "on hold" following the implementation of a major loop closing effort. In the questions students were asked their perceptions about the degree to which the BSBA program provided them with the knowledge and skills related to the given goal.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Benchmarks:

No benchmark established for this initial data collection effort.

Finding (2016-2017) - Benchmarks: Not Reported This Cycle

In response to the statement, "Overall, as a result of the Business program at SDSU I have learned essential business knowledge.

- 61.8% responded "Quite Well"
- 34.3% responded "Somewhat"
- 3.7% responded "Very Little"
- 0.2% responded "Not at All"

Details of Closes the Loop for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Additional Writing Courses

SDSU has the following requirements based on a student's WPA score:

- Students scoring below 8 (below expectations) are required to take a lower-division remedial writing course followed by an upper-division writing-intensive course.
- Students scoring 8 or 9 (meeting expectations) are required to take an upper-division writing-intensive course.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Student Learning Outcomes):

Measure: WPA Exam | **Student Learning Outcomes:** Written Communication

Implementation Description: The College of Business (CBA) has completed an initial evaluation of the effectiveness of the university-level loop closing activity. Students in two CBA writing-intensive courses were given a WPA-like exam near the end of the course. Performance on the exam was compared to the students' original WPA performance. Results of this analysis can be found in the document repository. Additional analysis of the effectiveness of the university loop closing activity is required.

Additional Resources: Based on the initial analysis of the effectiveness of the existing loop closing, the CBA Undergraduate Committee believe that a university-level and/or college-level writing center would be helpful.

Connected Document

[Written Communication Loop Closing Analysis](#)

Improving Critical Thinking

See description of workshop found under SLO #3.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Improving Critical Thinking

The CBA Program Assurance/Assessment Committee planned and implemented a college-wide workshop entitled "Best Practices in Critical Thinking". This workshop included a panel of faculty members who presented various approaches they used at different levels and in different programs within the CBA designed to enhance student critical thinking skills. Discussion and more sharing of ideas amongst all faculty members in attendance occurred. Faculty were encouraged to incorporate the ideas into their classes. The workshop took place on April 20, 2012.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Student Learning Outcomes):

Measure: Capstone Exam Questions | **Student Learning Outcomes:** Apply Info & Draw Conclusions

Projected Completion Date: 04/2012

Improving Essential Business Knowledge

Findings have consistently suggested that our students' weakest skills are in the disciplines of Finance and Statistics. In the case of Finance, an on-line review of Finance basics has been developed and students in our college-wide capstone course are highly encouraged to complete it in order to be better prepared to complete case analyses used in the class. In the case of Statistics, in Fall 2012 the Stats Department is implementing an optional 1 unit course to be taken concurrently with STAT 119 (the required lower-division statistics course). The optional unit will focus on problem-solving and application. Our students will be tracked to see whether those who take the course have improved performance.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Improving Essential Business Knowledge

Findings have consistently suggested that our students' weakest skills are in the disciplines of Finance and Statistics. In the case of Finance, an on-line review of Finance basics has been developed and students in our college-wide capstone course are highly encouraged to complete it in order to be better prepared to complete case analyses used in the class. In the case of Statistics, in Fall 2012 the Stats Department is implementing an optional 1 unit course to be taken concurrently with STAT 119 (the required lower-division statistics course). The optional unit will focus on problem-solving and application. Our students will be tracked to see whether those who take the course have improved performance.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Improving Oral Communication

A review of time spent on oral communication skills in the CBA required course, BA 290 (Business Communications) suggested that most or in some cases all of the time in the course was devoted to written communication. As class sizes have grown, BA 290 faculty have found it impossible to ask students to make individual oral presentations in the class. A one-period in-class exercise was developed that is now used in all BA 290 classes. The exercise involves the class reviewing the CBA Oral Communication Skills rubric, watching a playback of students making oral presentations, evaluating the presenters using the rubric, and then discussing the results.

In Fall 2012, Dean Michael Cunningham announced an initiative to improve oral communication skills throughout the college via an opportunity for all students to enroll in a Toastmasters club or workshop. This opportunity will be implemented beginning in Spring 2013.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Implementation Description: This exercise has been implemented in all BA 290 courses for the past several years.

Benchmark Consideration

The Undergraduate Committee has agreed that with four full cycles of Critical Thinking assessment data, it is time to evaluate whether a benchmark of having 50% of our students exceed expectations is realistic.

Established in Cycle: 2012 - 2013

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Benchmark Consideration

The Undergraduate Committee has agreed, after four full cycles of Critical Thinking assessment data, to consider whether a benchmark of having 50% of our students exceed expectations is realistic.

Established in Cycle: 2012 - 2013

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Student Learning Outcomes):

Measure: Capstone Exam Questions | **Student Learning Outcomes:** Apply Info & Draw Conclusions

CBA Writing Center

As noted in the 2011-2012 Loop Closing comments, the CBA Undergraduate Committee expressed the desire for a writing center. Since the university is developing such a center, there are no immediate plans for one to be developed in the CBA.

Established in Cycle: 2012 - 2013

Implementation Status: Terminated

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Student Learning Outcomes):**Measure:** WPA Exam | **Student Learning Outcomes:** Written Communication**Change Benchmark to Drop Exceeds Expectations**

In presenting the findings of the 2012-2013, BSBA assessment to the Undergraduate Committee, the efficacy of having two levels of benchmarks for student achievement, (i.e., 85% meet expectations and 50% exceed expectations) was revisited. Based on four full cycles of assessment data, the Committee approved dropping, where applicable, the "exceeds expectations" benchmark. The justification for dropping this benchmark is based on it being unrealistic (i.e., currently only about 10-15% of students exceed expectations on any goal), and the impracticality of finding an appropriate a loop closing activity to elevate student performance to the "exceeds" expectations level. Although the change makes the benchmark across all applicable BSBA goals uniform, evaluation rubrics will still contain an "exceeds expectations" rating category and the Committee will continue to monitor performance in this category for potential trends. Beginning 2013-2014, the benchmark for critical thinking, (SLOs 2.1 and 2.2) will be that at least 85% of the students meet or exceed expectations.

Established in Cycle: 2012 - 2013**Implementation Status:** Finished**Priority:** High**Change Benchmark to Drop Exceeds Expectations**

In presenting the findings of the 2012-2013, BSBA assessment to the Undergraduate Committee, the efficacy of having two levels of benchmarks for student achievement, (i.e., 85% meet expectations and 50% exceed expectations) was revisited. Based on four full cycles of assessment data, the Committee approved dropping, where applicable, the "exceeds expectations" benchmark. The justification for dropping this benchmark is based on it being unrealistic (i.e., currently only about 10-15% of students exceed expectations on any goal), and the impracticality of finding an appropriate a loop closing activity to elevate student performance to the "exceeds" expectations level. Although the change makes the benchmark across all applicable BSBA goals uniform, evaluation rubrics will still contain an "exceeds expectations" rating category and the Committee will continue to monitor performance in this category for potential trends. Beginning 2013-2014, the benchmark for critical thinking, (SLOs 2.1 and 2.2) will be that at least 85% of the students meet or exceed expectations.

Established in Cycle: 2012 - 2013**Implementation Status:** Finished**Priority:** High**Relationships (Measure | Student Learning Outcomes):****Measure:** Capstone Exam Questions | **Student Learning Outcomes:** Apply Info & Draw Conclusions**Change Benchmark to Drop Exceeds Expectations**

In presenting the findings of the 2012-2013, BSBA assessment to the Undergraduate Committee, the efficacy of having two levels of benchmarks for student achievement, (i.e., 85% meet expectations and 50% exceed expectations) was revisited. Based on four full cycles of assessment data, the Committee approved dropping, where applicable, the "exceeds expectations" benchmark. The justification for dropping this benchmark is based on it being unrealistic (i.e., currently only about 10-15% of students exceed expectations on any goal), and the impracticality of finding an appropriate a loop closing activity to elevate student performance to the "exceeds" expectations level. Although the change makes the benchmark across all applicable BSBA goals uniform, evaluation rubrics will still contain an "exceeds expectations" rating category and the Committee will continue to monitor performance in this category for potential trends. Beginning 2013-2014, the benchmark for written communications, (SLO 1.1) will be that at least 85% of the students meet or exceed expectations.

Established in Cycle: 2012 - 2013**Implementation Status:** Finished**Priority:** High**Change Benchmark to Drop Exceeds Expectations**

In presenting the findings of the 2012-2013, BSBA assessment to the Undergraduate Committee, the efficacy of having two levels of benchmarks for student achievement, (i.e., 85% meet expectations and 50% exceed expectations) was revisited. Based on four full cycles of assessment data, the Committee approved dropping, where applicable, the "exceeds expectations" benchmark. The justification for dropping this benchmark is based on it being unrealistic (i.e., currently only about 10-15% of students exceed expectations on any goal), and the impracticality of finding an appropriate a loop closing activity to elevate student performance to the "exceeds" expectations level. Although the change makes the benchmark across all applicable BSBA goals uniform, evaluation rubrics will still contain an "exceeds expectations" rating category and the Committee will continue to monitor performance in this category for potential trends. Beginning 2013-2014, the benchmark for written communications, (SLO 1.1) will be that at least 85% of the students meet or exceed expectations.

Established in Cycle: 2012 - 2013**Implementation Status:** Finished**Priority:** High**Relationships (Measure | Student Learning Outcomes):****Measure:** WPA Exam | **Student Learning Outcomes:** Written Communication**Projected Completion Date:** 01/2015**Toastmasters**

In Spring 2013 all CBA students were invited to participate in a Toastmasters session offered on campus to improve oral communication skills. This was voluntary.

Established in Cycle: 2012 - 2013**Implementation Status:** Finished**Priority:** High**BA 290 to RWS 290**

In an agreement between the College of Business Administration and the Rhetoric & Writing Department (in the College of Arts & Letters), the Business Communication course will move from the CBA to RWS beginning in Fall 2014. This switch is anticipated to enhance the level of content delivery in the course.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Distribution of the Oral Communication Rubric, revised for group presentations.

Each semester the Director of Assessment sends an email to all CBA faculty asking them to post to Blackboard both the oral and written communication rubrics for the courses they are teaching that semester. Since spring semester 2015 will be the third time the revised oral communication rubric (for group presentations) will be used, there should be a more complete awareness of the importance of transitioning between presenters.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 06/2015

Making Students Aware of the Usage of the Oral Communication Rubric for group presentations

It is noted that the benchmark of "meeting or exceeding expectations" was met for each dimension of SLO #1.2 except "Organization 2 – opening and closing, strong integration." In following up with Management 405 instructors, it was determined that more often than not the old evaluation rubric was used instead of the new, 2013 rubric. In future semesters Management 405 instructors will be asked to make students aware that the effectiveness of their presentations will be evaluated using the 2013 rubric.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

New Course and a shift in content

The plan to close the loop on our students inability to strategize in a global environment will entail shifting some of the content from MGT 405 to the new course on BA 310 - Foundations of Business in a Global Environment. Specifically, the content of BA 310 will address DLO #1, the impact of the global economy on business decisions through three of its SLOs: Describe the rise of globalization and the evolution of international business; identify the various factors influencing the global business environment; and identify and describe the impact of globalization on business and business management. This course should not only heighten student awareness of the competitive pressures/barriers a business faces in entering a country but also free up time for MGT 405 instructors to provide a greater focus on applying a global perspective in making business decisions (DLO #2).

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Student Learning Outcomes):

Measure: Capstone Exam Questions | **Student Learning Outcomes:** Global Perspective Application

New Course and a Shift in Content

The plan to close the loop on our students inability to strategize in a global environment will entail shifting some of the content from MGT 405 to the new course on BA 310 - Foundations of Business in a Global Environment. Specifically, the content of BA 310 will address DLO #1, the impact of the global economy on business decisions through three of its SLOs: Describe the rise of globalization and the evolution of international business; identify the various factors influencing the global business environment; and identify and describe the impact of globalization on business and business management. This course should not only heighten student awareness of the competitive pressures/barriers a business faces in entering a country but also free up time for MGT 405 instructors to provide a greater focus on applying a global perspective in making business decisions (DLO #2).

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Student Learning Outcomes):

Measure: Capstone Exam Questions | **Student Learning Outcomes:** Global Economy Impact

Projected Completion Date: 12/2017

Better Academically Prepared Students

Because of the upward trend in applications for admission, business has been able to be more selective (i.e., higher SAT scores, A/P credits and average GPAs) in freshmen offers for enrollment. This same trend has also been experienced in offers for enrollment of transfer students.

Established in Cycle: 2014-2015
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Better Academically Prepared Students

Because of the upward trend in applications for admission, business has been able to be more selective (i.e., higher SAT scores, A/P credits and average GPAs) in freshmen offers for enrollment. This same trend has also been experienced in offers for enrollment of transfer students.

Established in Cycle: 2014-2015
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Enhanced Writing Center WPA Workshops

Beginning spring 2016, the Writing Center increased the variety and number of WPA preparation workshops from one to three and from three to fifteen workshops, respectively. This loop closing effort should be even more effective because attendance in these workshops a further incentivized by their listing on the Business Passport event schedule and by being discussed in BA 310 in the same semester as students normally must sit for the WPA.

Established in Cycle: 2014-2015
Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

More Qualified Communicators

Qualifying verbal scores continue to go up for every entering freshman class at SDSU. Specifically, the average SDSU, SAT verbal score was 511 in 2009, 529 in 2011, and 545 in 2014.

Established in Cycle: 2014-2015

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

University Writing Center Update & Progress

Established in Fall 2012, the university writing center appears to be a significant aid to the writing skills of CBA students. In Fall 2014, CBA students represented the largest group of majors using the center. CBA faculty are encouraged each semester to direct their students to the center by discussing it in class and posting information about the center on course syllabi and Black Board sites. Although the percent of CBA students assessed in Fall 2014 for writing skills did not meet the established benchmark it did represent an increase from Fall 2012 when the writing center was first being established. The CBA faculty will continue to strongly encourage students to make use of the writing center. We believe that as even more do, we will continue to see increases in writing skills.

Established in Cycle: 2014-2015

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Student Learning Outcomes):

Measure: WPA Exam | **Student Learning Outcomes:** Written Communication

Emphasis on College oral communications rubric

The College oral communications rubric needs to be emphasized by BA 405 instructors as a guide for their students to make effective presentations and tied to achieving top scores on the rubric they use in-class.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Make BA 405 Instructors More Aware of Evaluation Rubric

At the beginning of a semester and again two weeks before presentations are made, encourage BA 405 instructors to promote the oral communications rubric as a guide to making effective presentations in their classes.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

New Writing in Business Settings Course - RWS 390W

Beginning fall 2017, a new upper-division business writing course, RWS 390 – Writing in Business Settings, will be available to business students. As part of this course topics on crafting and delivering business presentations and integrating visuals in PowerPoint and Prezi set the stage for final class-week presentations (see attached syllabus).

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: In-Progress

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Student Learning Outcomes):

Measure: Oral Presentations | **Student Learning Outcomes:** Oral Communication

Connected Document

[RWS 390 Syllabus](#)