

# Department/Service Area Assessment Report - Four Column

## DeAnza College Dept - (B/CS) Business

Program Level Outcomes (PLOs)	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Data Summaries	Enhancement/Action & Follow-Up
<p>Dept - (B/CS) Business - Business Department - Each student shall acquire the knowledge and skills described in the course level SLOs (Student Learning Outcomes) of the Business courses that student completed at De Anza College.</p> <p><b>Year(s) to be Assessed:</b> 2009-2010 2010-2011</p> <p><b>Outcome Creation Date:</b> 04/15/2011</p> <p><b>PLO Status:</b> Active</p>	<p><b>Assessment Method:</b> To evaluate the Business Department or Program as a whole, as a group we reviewed and discussed the summary of SLOAC reports prepared on all courses in the department. In particular, we reviewed key statistics and the instructor's recommended enhancements. We then calculated a weighted average of student success from all course-level SLOs across all our courses. It was weighted by the number of sections of each course offered during the 2011-12 academic year.</p> <p><b>Assessment Method Type:</b> Underlying Course</p> <p><b>Target for Success:</b> We agreed to establish a 70% baseline success rate for the program as a whole.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">BUS Program PLOAC S12.doc</a></p>	<p>06/07/2012 - The SLOAC reports were compiled in a spreadsheet to facilitate comparison. Please see attached: Business PLO Embedded Assessment S12.doc. The calculations for the weighted average success rate are also located at the end of the attached file. The weighted average success rate was calculated to be 79% across the courses in the Business Department. This is well above our baseline success rate of 70%.</p> <p><b>Target :</b> Target Met</p> <p><b>Program Review Reporting Year:</b> 2010-2011</p> <p><b># people involved in Reflection &amp; Analysis::</b> 13.0000</p> <p><b>Reflection and Analysis:</b> After reviewing the objective of the meeting (to measure how well our department was encouraging student learning), we began discussing what level of success was ?good enough? for the program as a whole. As a result, the 70% baseline success rate was established; which matches nicely with transfer expectations to the CSU system. We also discussed whether or not the weighted success rate would be a good metric to use. Some instructors expressed concern about the inherent variability among different sections of students, which would make improvements difficult to track. Other instructors expressed concern about the rising proportion of international students with weak English skills, which might cause the metrics to degrade. Others felt that at least a third of students were unprepared or underprepared for college. As we reviewed the summarized SLOAC reports, it also became evident that a few of the reports didn?t have quantifiable statistics to include in our overall metric. As a result of these issues, it was generally agreed that the most valuable part of the program level</p>	<p>06/14/2012 - In order to resolve the problem of performance variability among different sections of students, someone suggested that we measure student success at the course level by comparing a pre-test and a post-test oriented to the course level outcomes. The comparison of the two sets of scores would provide clear evidence of the level of learning in that section. In addition, this approach would not be vulnerable to macro-level demographic shifts. Everyone agreed that this was an excellent process to implement in the next round of course assessments. A related benefit of this approach would be that all SLOAC reports would provide clear statistical data related to student success which would make it easier to aggregate and thus assess the Business Program overall.</p> <p>Another recommendation was that instructors needed to reinforce and review the learning objectives towards the end of the course, prior to the final exam and the SLO post-test. The intent of this review is to prevent students from ?forgetting? the concepts that were taught early in the quarter.</p> <p>Several course level SLO statements were identified as needing revision. Michele agreed to coordinate formation of committees of interested faculty to work on these revisions: SLO 2 for Bus 56: Human Relations in the Workplace, SLO2 for BUS 90: Principles of</p>

Program Level Outcomes (PLOs)	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Data Summaries	Enhancement/Action & Follow-Up
		<p>outcome assessment cycle was the collaboration and exchange of ideas, rather than metrics.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">BUS Program PLOAC S12.doc</a></p>	<p>Marketing, and SLO3 for BUS 91: Introduction to Personal Finance.</p> <p>In conclusion, our ongoing goal for the Business Program is to meet or exceed the 70% baseline success rate. We will also strive to improve our overall success rate above 79% in the next review cycle.</p> <p>The following people participated in the PLOAC review meeting:  Richard Brien, Manny Cappello, Moaty Fayek, Michele Fritz, Emily Garbe, Mike Gough, Willie Hernandez, Byron Lilly, Gary Niedermier, Dan Salah, Wendy Shan, Sandra Spencer, &amp; David Stringer</p>