2015-2016
Annual Assessment Report Template

For instructions and guidelines visit our **website**
or **contact us** for more help.

Report: | BS Business Administration

Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

Q1.1.
Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs) **did you assess?** [**Check all that apply**]

- ☑ 1. Critical Thinking
- ☐ 2. Information Literacy
- ☐ 3. Written Communication
- ☐ 4. Oral Communication
- ☑ 5. Quantitative Literacy
- ☐ 6. Inquiry and Analysis
- ☐ 7. Creative Thinking
- ☐ 8. Reading
- ☐ 9. Team Work
- ☐ 10. Problem Solving
- ☐ 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- ☐ 12. Intercultural Knowledge and Competency
- ☑ 13. Ethical Reasoning
- ☐ 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- ☑ 15. Global Learning
- ☐ 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- ☐ 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- ☑ 18. Overall Competencies in the Major/Discipline
- ☐ 19. Other, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

a.
b.
c.

Q1.2.
Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information such as how your specific PLOs are **explicitly** linked to the Sac State BLGs:

BLG	BSBA	MFT
Competence in the Disciplines *at least one major field of study*	Goal 1 **Fundamental Business Knowledge** Competence based on fundamental business knowledge. 1.1 Demonstrate understanding of fundamental business theories, concepts, and skills.	Disciplinary knowledge: · Accounting, Economics · Management · Quant Business Analysis · Finance

		· Marketing
		· Legal and Social Environment
		· Information Systems
		· International Issues

Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World	***Goal 4 Applied Business Capability***
	
	Ability to translate knowledge of business and management into practice.
	
	    · Create effective business solutions that are both ethically sound and socially responsible.
	
	    · Generate innovative and effective solutions for problem solving and decision making.
		Strategic Integration

Intellectual and Practical Skills, Including: *inquiry and analysis, critical, philosophical and creative thinking, written and oral communication, quantitative literacy, information literacy, teamwork and problem solvin*	Goal 2 **Integrative Business Competence** Business competence integrated with other business knowledge areas and ethical responsibility. 2.1 Ability to identify factors contributing to a managerial problem from a variety of business perspectives. 2.2 Enumerate the costs and benefits that potential solutions will have on the interdependent stakeholders of a firm. Goal 4 **Applied Business Capability** Ability to translate knowledge of business and management into practice. 4.2 Generate innovative and effective solutions for problem solving and decision making.	Strategic Integration Management Accounting Quantative Business Analysis Legal and Social Environment
Personal and Social Responsibility, Including: *civic knowledge and engagement—local and global,* intercultural knowledge*	***Goal 4 Applied Business Capability*** Ability to translate knowledge of business and management into practice. · Create effective business solutions that are both ethically sound and socially responsible.	International issues Legal and Social Environment

Q1.2.1.
Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?

○ 1. Yes, for all PLOs

○ 2. Yes, but for some PLOs

○ 3. No rubrics for PLOs

○ 4. N/A

◉ 5. Other, specify: | The ETS Major Field Exam is nationally normed |

Q1.3.
Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

Q1.4.
Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC))?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No (skip to **Q1.5**)

○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q1.5**)

Q1.4.1.
If the answer to Q1.4 is **yes**, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

Q1.5.
Did your program use the *Degree Qualification Profile* (DQP) to develop your PLO(s)?

○ 1. Yes

◉ 2. No, but I know what the DQP is

○ 3. No, I don't know what the DQP is

○ 4. Don't know

Q1.6.
Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable?

○ 1. Yes

◉ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

(**Remember**: Save your progress)

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the Selected PLO
Q2.1.
Select **ONE(1)** PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you *checked the correct box* for this PLO in Q1.1):

| Overall Competencies in the Major/Disicpline |

Q2.1.1.
Please provide more background information about the **specific PLO** you've chosen in Q2.1.

Applied the ETS Major Field Exam and administered to 400 students at the senior level--approximately 80% of seniors in the major.

Q2.2.

Has the program developed or adopted **explicit** standards of performance for this PLO?

- ○ 1. Yes
- ● 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know
- ○ 4. N/A

Q2.3.

Please **provide the rubric(s)** and **standards of performance** that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix.

Generally, the acceptable standard of performance is considered to be at or above the mean with respect to the exam and with respect to our peer institutions

📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached

Q2.4. PLO	Q2.5. Stdrd	Q2.6. Rubric	Please indicate where you have published the **PLO**, the **standard** of performance, and the **rubric** that was used to measure the PLO:
☑	☑	☐	1. In **SOME** course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
☐	☐	☐	2. In **ALL** course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
☐	☐	☐	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
☐	☐	☐	4. In the university catalogue
☐	☐	☐	5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters
☑	☑	☐	6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources, or activities
☐	☑	☐	7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
☑	☑	☐	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
☐	☐	☐	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
☑	☑	☐	10. Other, specify: Accreditation Reports

Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO

Q3.1.
Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for the selected PLO?

- ● 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No (skip to **Q6**)
- ○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)
- ○ 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

Q3.1.1.
How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO?

1

Q3.2.
Was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO?

- ● 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No (skip to **Q6**)

Q3.2.1.
Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected:

In Fall 2012 the Major Field Test (MFT) for Business was given to the GM 105 students. In Fall 2015 there was discussion about administering the examination again in Spring 2016 to provide comparison data for accreditation purposes. On February 15, 2016 a meeting was held with the faculty to discuss the administration process, timeline, and how this would be treated for grading purposes in the spring semester.

Faculty in attendance agreed to the following:

- The MFT would be a required assignment for all GM 105 students
- MFT exam would replace one assignment/test – up to 10% of grade (50% participation/50% performance on MFT)
- All students would receive gift card and top students (top 10 performers) would be recognized by the Dean
- Students in the online sections would be scheduled to take the exam during an alternatively scheduled time
- Students would receive test information (attachment) and sample test questions https://www.ets.org/Media/Tests/MFT/pdf/mft_samp_questions_business.pdf
- AD Faculty would work with the Dean to do the marketing of the information to the students – notification via SacSend and maybe an in-class visit to explain and answer questions

Implementation:

To accommodate a truncated timeline and space constraints, a paper administration was implemented. Angela Park Girouard provided all the technical assistance involved in scheduling, organizing, and proctoring, and processing the assessments. The assessment is designed to take 2 hours –2 one-hour sections, requiring a break in between. The check-in process for the paper administration took around 15 minutes and completion of the scantron prior to the beginning of the assessment took an additional 5-10 minutes. Sessions were scheduled for 2 hrs with 30 min between sessions—proving to be insufficient.   Evening sections administered the assessment during class and the daytime and online course students took the assessment outside of class time. Labs were scheduled for April 20-22, 2016. Since this assessment was set after faculty syllabi were already in place, incentives were provided to appreciate students for coming outside of regularly scheduled class time. *As a first-time process and because of the need to track the gift cards to the students individually, the manual process to set up the assessment materials required considerable extra time.*

Incentives to students included:

- Starbucks gift card for attendance and participation (became a UEI eateries gift card $10)
- Recognition for top 10 performers (letter of acknowledgement for performance from the Dean)
- Top 3 performers in each class receive an incentive (padfolio)

Costs for paper-based administration of MFT Business

Item	Unit Price	Qty	Ext Price	Total
Assessment	$ 27.00	420	$ 11,340.00	$ 11,340.00
Gift Cards	$ 10.00	415	$ 4,150.00	$ 15,490.00
Gift card fee	$ 100.00	1	$ 100.00	$ 15,590.00
Padfolio	$ 15.00	35	$ 525.00	$ 16,115.00
Staff time - CTO (160 hrs)			$ 4,500.00	$ 20,615.00
Reports subscription – 1yr	$ 700.00	1	$ 700.00	$ 21,315.00

Timeline

/7/16 – email to advise implementation meeting for assessment

/15/16 – GM 105 Assessment meeting with GM 105 faculty

/17/16 – email summary of meeting of 2/15/16 and process outline to GM 105 faculty

/29/16 – administration sessions set (labs reserved) and sign-up process set up with assistance from ATCS through SacCT

/2/16 – reminder email about timing of administrations and information to share with students

/2/16 – GM 105 day section students added to SacCT assessment shell to be able to sign up

/3/16 – reminder email with clarification about online sections

/8/16 – reminder email to faculty

/8/16 – students began signing up for administration sessions

/7/16 – administration of GM 105-09 (Hatton) in class

/14/16 – administration of GM 105-13 (Anderson) in class

/20-4/22/16 – administration in labs for daytime GM 105 students

/25/16 – administration of GM 105-05 (Caire) in class

/26/16 – prepared materials for return to ETS for scoring

/5/16 – results provided by ETS

/9/16 – results provided to faculty for distribution to students

Observations

few student comments indicated an uneven preparation by their instructors

lore than a few students expressed concern that faculty were treating the assessment differently – some with heavy weight on the grade and others not at all or simply as Extra Credit

espite heavy attention to communication—via instructors, SacCT, and emails—some students seemed not to have read the information

The manual process to set up the assessment materials required considerable extra time.

Outcomes

09 students were registered across 11 sections of GM 105, 10 did not take the assessment for a variety of reasons: 1) did not schedule at all, 2) did not appear at scheduled session, or 3) could not attend alternative sessions offered.

99 students completed the assessment (97.56% participation)

49 students (62.4%) of students scored 75% (150/200) or better on the assessment

SUS median score was 157 (146 students, 36.6% scored better than the CSUS median), ETS median score was 152

wo (2) students took the assessment with an accommodation – no problems

- One was handled through the AD Faculty office

- One was handled through the Testing Center

(**Remember**: Save your progress)

Question 3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.)

Q3.3.
Were direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) used to assess this PLO?

- ◉ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No (skip to **Q3.7**)
- ○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q3.7**)

Q3.3.1.
Which of the following direct measures were used? [**Check all that apply**]

- ☐ 1. Capstone project (e.g. theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
- ☐ 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program
- ☐ 3. Key assignments from elective classes
- ☐ 4. Classroom based performance assessment such as simulations, comprehensive exams, or critiques
- ☐ 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community-based projects
- ☐ 6. E-Portfolios
- ☐ 7. Other Portfolios
- ☑ 8. Other, specify: Major Field Exam

Q3.3.2.
Please **explain** and **attach** the direct measure you used to collect data:

https://www.ets.org/mft/about/content/bachelor_business

📎 **No file attached**   📎 **No file attached**

Q3.4.
What tool was used to evaluate the data?

- ○ 1. **No** rubric is used to interpret the evidence (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ○ 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ○ 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ○ 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ○ 5. The VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ○ 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ◉ 7. Used other means (Answer **Q3.4.1.**)

Q3.4.1.
If you used other means, which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]

- ☑ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 4. Other, specify: _____ (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

Q3.4.2.
Was the **rubric** aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

- ○ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know
- ○ 4. N/A

Q3.4.3.
Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the rubric**?

- ○ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know
- ○ 4. N/A

Q3.4.4.
Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

- ◉ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know
- ○ 4. N/A

Q3.5.
How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data **collection** of the selected PLO?

8

Q3.5.1.
How many faculty members participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for the selected PLO?

Pushed into following year due…

Q3.5.2.
If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)?

- ○ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know
- ◉ 4. N/A

Q3.6.
How did you **select** the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc.)?

All enrolled in GM 105

Q3.6.1.
How did you **decide** how many samples of student work to review?

All enrolled in GM 105

Q3.6.2.
How many students were in the class or program?

409

Q3.6.3.
How many samples of student work did you evaluated?

399

Q3.6.4.
Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?

- ◉ 1. Yes
- ◯ 2. No
- ◯ 3. Don't know

(**Remember**: Save your progress)

Question 3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)

Q3.7.
Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

- ◯ 1. Yes
- ◉ 2. No (skip to **Q3.8**)
- ◯ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8**)

Q3.7.1.
Which of the following indirect measures were used? [**Check all that apply**]

- ☐ 1. National student surveys (e.g. NSSE)
- ☐ 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR)
- ☐ 3. College/department/program student surveys or focus groups
- ☐ 4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
- ☐ 5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
- ☐ 6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews

☐ 7. Other, specify: [_____]

Q3.7.1.1.
Please explain and attach the indirect measure you used to collect data:

[text area]

📎 **No file attached**   📎 **No file attached**

Q3.7.2.
If surveys were used, how was the sample size **decided**?

[text area]

Q3.7.3.
If surveys were used, how did you **select** your sample:

[text area]

Q3.7.4.
If surveys were used, what was the response rate?

[text area]

Question 3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)

Q3.8.
Were external benchmarking data, such as licensing exams or standardized tests, used to assess the PLO?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No (skip to **Q3.8.2**)

○ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8.2**)

Q3.8.1.
Which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]

☑ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams

☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.)

☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.)

☐ 4. Other, specify: [_____]

Q3.8.2.
Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

○ 1. Yes

◉ 2. No (skip to **Q4.1**)

○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q4.1**)

Q3.8.3.
If other measures were used, please specify:

[   ]

| 📎 No file attached | 📎 No file attached |

(**Remember**: Save your progress)

Question 4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions

Q4.1.
Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLO for **Q2.1**:

Analytic Domain	Sac State Mean % Correct Spring 2016	536 Peer Institutions Mean % Correct (2013-15 Averaged)	D Peer
Accounting	44%	41.5%	2.5

| 📎 No file attached | 📎 No file attached |

Q4.2.
Are students doing well and meeting the program standard? If not, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?

Generally speaking, compared to previous administration (2013) students at the end (or within the last semester) of their academic preparation have been keeping pace with the national standard (mean).

When compared with the previous administrration of the exam, there have been some local gains (Finance, Marketing, Legal and Social Environment).

In fall 2016, the Assessment Committee will review the exam findings, conduct some mapping exercises with the curriculum and implement the Global Mindset curriculum in the courses leading to the capstone.

| 📎 No file attached | 📎 No file attached |

Q4.3.
For the selected PLO, the student performance:

○ 1. **Exceeded** expectation/standard

◉ 2. **Met** expectation/standard

○ 3. **Partially** met expectation/standard

○ 4. Did not meet expectation/standard

○ 5. No expectation/standard has been specified

○ 6. Don't know

Question 4A: Alignment and Quality

Q4.4.
Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

Q4.5.
Were **all** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures of the PLO?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)

Q5.1.
As a result of the assessment effort and based on prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate *making any changes* for your program (e.g. course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No (skip to **Q5.2**)

○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q5.2**)

Q5.1.1.
Please describe *what changes* you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO. Include a description of how you plan to assess the impact of these changes.

1. Review and disseminate the results of the exam

2. Align scope and sequence of curriculum with assessment indicators of the Major Field Exam

3. Map the Global Mindset Curriculum to CBA BSBA courses

4. Complete process of having all syllabi contain BSBA outcomes and course outcomes mapped with direct assessments and the Major Field Exam prior to next admin of exam in S 2018

6. Revisit Capstone Course to address PLOs not addressed in Major Field Exam--Written and Oral Communication--potentially with a business portfolio

Q5.1.2.
Do you have a plan to assess the *impact of the changes* that you anticipate making?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

Q5.2.

How have the assessment data from the last annual assessment been used so far? [**Check all that apply**]	1. Very Much	2. Quite a Bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Improving specific courses	○	○	○	○	◉
2. Modifying curriculum	○	○	○	○	◉
3. Improving advising and mentoring	○	○	○	○	◉
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals	○	○	○	○	◉
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	○	○	○	○	◉
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	○	○	○	○	◉
7. Annual assessment reports	○	○	○	○	◉
8. Program review	○	○	○	○	◉
9. Prospective student and family information	○	○	○	○	◉
10. Alumni communication	○	○	○	○	◉
11. WSCUC accreditation (regional accreditation)	○	○	○	○	◉
12. Program accreditation	○	○	○	○	◉
13. External accountability reporting requirement	○	○	○	○	◉
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations	○	○	○	○	◉
15. Strategic planning	○	○	○	○	◉
16. Institutional benchmarking	○	○	○	○	◉
17. Academic policy development or modifications	○	○	○	○	◉
18. Institutional improvement	○	○	○	○	◉
19. Resource allocation and budgeting	○	○	○	○	◉
20. New faculty hiring	○	○	○	○	◉
21. Professional development for faculty and staff	○	○	○	○	◉
22. Recruitment of new students	○	○	○	○	◉

23. Other, specify: _____

Q5.2.1.
Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above:

For a variety of reasons, assessment activity and the use of assessment reports developed previously has been limited. This assessment report and the recommendations within it has been prepared by the interim associate dean. There was no faculty assessment coordinator in the CBA for academic year 2016-17. There was an initiative to complete course embedded assessment in F15, however the analysis was limited by the condititions and framework of the administration and the scattered nature of course taking in the program. This led to the decision to administer the ETS course to the students completing the major to get a read of knowledge in the discipline.

(**Remember**: Save your progress)

Additional Assessment Activities

Q6.
Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspect of their program *that are not related to the PLOs* (i.e. impacts of an advising center, etc.). **If** your program/academic unit has collected data on program *elements*, please briefly report your results here:

| | No file attached | | No file attached |

Q7.
What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year? [**Check all that apply**]

- [ ] 1. Critical Thinking
- [ ] 2. Information Literacy
- [x] 3. Written Communication
- [x] 4. Oral Communication
- [ ] 5. Quantitative Literacy
- [ ] 6. Inquiry and Analysis
- [ ] 7. Creative Thinking
- [ ] 8. Reading
- [x] 9. Team Work
- [ ] 10. Problem Solving
- [ ] 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- [ ] 12. Intercultural Knowledge and Competency
- [ ] 13. Ethical Reasoning
- [ ] 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- [x] 15. Global Learning
- [ ] 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- [ ] 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- [ ] 18. Overall Competencies in the Major/Discipline
- [ ] 19. Other, specify any PLOs not included above:

a.
b.
c.

Q8. Please attach any additional files here:

| | No file attached | | No file attached | | No file attached | | No file attached |

Q8.1.
Have you attached any files to this form? If yes, please list every attached file here:

no attachments

Program Information (**Required**)

P1.
Program/Concentration Name(s): [by degree]

BS Business Administration

P1.1.
Program/Concentration Name(s): [by department]

Select...

P2.
Report Author(s):

Hecsh

P2.1.
Department Chair/Program Director:

Hecsh

P2.2.
Assessment Coordinator:

NA

P3.
Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit

Business Administration

P4.
College:

College of Business Administration

P5.
Total enrollment for Academic Unit during assessment semester (see Departmental Fact Book):

1995 Expressed Interest
1656 Majors

P6.
Program Type:

- ◉ 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
- ○ 2. Credential
- ○ 3. Master's Degree
- ○ 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.D./Ed.S./D.P.T./etc.)
- ○ 5. Other, specify:

P7. Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?

1

P7.1. List all the names:

Business Administration

P7.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?

Don't know

P8. Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?

2

P8.1. List all the names:

MBA

MSA

P8.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?
| Don't know |

P9. Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?
| 0 |

P9.1. List all the names:

P10. Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?
| 0 |

P10.1. List all the names:

When was your **assessment plan**...	1. Before 2010-11	2. 2011-12	3. 2012-13	4. 2013-14	5. 2014-15	6. No Plan	7. Don't know
P11. developed?	○	○	○	○	○	○	◉
P11.1. last updated?	○	○	○	○	○	○	◉

P11.3.
Please attach your latest **assessment plan**:

📎 **No file attached**

P12.
Has your program developed a **curriculum map?**
- ○ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ◉ 3. Don't know

P12.1.

Please attach your latest **curriculum map**:

📎 No file attached

P13.
Has your program indicated in the curriculum map where assessment **of student learning** occurs?

○ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

⦿ 3. Don't know

P14.
Does your program have a capstone class?

⦿ 1. Yes, indicate: GM 105

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

P14.1.
Does your program have **any** capstone project?

○ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

⦿ 3. Don't know

(**Remember**: Save your progress)

BS BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION – cut off information

Q4.1

Analytic Domain	Sac State Mean % Correct Spring 2016	536 Peer Institutions Mean % Correct (2013-15 Averaged)	D Peer
Accounting	44%	41.5%	2.5
Economics	41	39.8	1.2
Management	55	54.3	0.7
Quant Bus Analy	40	36.4	3.6
Finance	46	42.4	3.6
Marketing	58	55	3.0
Legal and Social	60	56	4.0
Information Systems	55	50.1	4.9
International Issues	41	40.03	0.97