



## Report of Outcomes Assessment Results

---

---

Institution	Franklin University
Academic Business Unit	Ross College of Business
Academic Year	2015-2016

---

---

## Outcomes Assessment Plan

Is the outcomes assessment plan that you submitted to the IACBE still current or have you made changes?

The outcomes assessment plan that we have previously submitted is still current.

Changes have been made and the revised plan is attached.

We have made changes and the revised plan will be sent to the IACBE by: January 28, 2017

## Directions

Complete the Outcomes Assessment Results form below. **Note:** Section II of the form (Operational Assessment) needs to be completed only if you received first-time accreditation or reaffirmation of accreditation after January 1, 2011.

An example of a completed form can be found in a separate document that is available for download on the IACBE's website at: [www.iacbe.org/accreditation-documents.asp](http://www.iacbe.org/accreditation-documents.asp).

Section I (Student Learning Assessment) of the Outcomes Assessment Results form must be completed for each business program that is accredited by the IACBE (i.e., a separate table must be provided for each program).

Add tables, and insert or delete rows in the tables as needed in order to accommodate the number of your (i) business programs, (ii) intended student learning outcomes, and (iii) intended operational outcomes. In the sections of the assessment results tables entitled "Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes" and "Summary of Achievement of Intended Operational Outcomes," **DO NOT ADD OR DELETE COLUMNS**. Space is provided in these sections for four direct measures of student learning, four indirect measures of student learning, and eight operational assessment measures/methods. If you are employing fewer than this number of assessment instruments, simply leave cells in the unused columns blank. If you are employing more than this number of instruments, you will need to create additional summary-of-achievement tables to report your assessment information.

In the sections of the assessment results tables entitled "Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes" and "Summary of Achievement of Intended Operational Outcomes," enter "Met" in a given cell of the table if the performance target for the instrument in that column was achieved for the intended outcome in that row; "Not Met" if the performance target for the instrument in that column was not achieved for the intended outcome in that row; or "NA" (Not Assessed) if the instrument in that column does not measure the intended outcome in that row.

At the bottom of each assessment results table, space is provided to identify changes and improvements that you plan to make as a result of your assessment activity.

Italicized entries in the form represent areas where the academic business unit should insert its own assessment information.

Please be sure to delete these directions before submitting your form to the IACBE.

## Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2015-2016

### Section I: Student Learning Assessment

Student Learning Assessment for: <i>Associate of Science, Accounting</i>	
Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes (Program ISLOs)	
1. <i>Graduates will demonstrate technical accounting skills in intermediate-level accounting topics/concepts.</i>	
2. <i>Graduates will demonstrate the ability to research and analyze specific intermediate-level accounting issues.</i>	
3. <i>Graduates will demonstrate oral and written communication skills.</i>	
4. <i>Graduates will demonstrate the ability to research and analyze specific federal income tax issues related to the taxation of individuals.</i>	
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:
<i>Exam scores in both ACCT 310, Intermediate Accounting I and ACCT 320, Intermediate Accounting II.</i>	<i>In 70% or above instances for each criterion, students scored at or above either the 70% mark (“Acceptable”) or 80% mark (“Proficient”).</i>
<i>ACCT 320: Intermediate Accounting II – “U.S. GAAP vs. IFRS Research and Presentation” assignment.</i>	<i>In 70% or above instances for each criterion, students scored at or above either the 70% mark (“Acceptable”) or 80% mark (“Proficient”).</i>
<i>ACCCT 390: Federal Income Taxation I – “Tax Research Memo # 4” assignment.</i>	<i>In 70% or above instances for each criterion, students scored at or above either the 70% mark (“Acceptable”) or 80% mark (“Proficient”).</i>
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Indirect Measures:
1. <i>Graduating Student Survey</i>	<i>At least 90% of graduating students in the school of business in which the major in Accounting is reported will be satisfied with the content of their curriculum and at least 90% of graduating students in the school of business in which the major in Accounting is reported will be satisfied with their major program courses.</i>
2. <i>Student End of Course Survey</i>	<i>The average percentages of course recommend and faculty recommend for the Accounting program would be 80% or higher.</i>

3. Faculty Post-Course Interviews

Faculty consensus on all four criteria is above average (i.e., course quality, relevance, innovation and consistency).

**Learning Assessment Results: Associate of Science, Accounting**

**Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:**

1. *Outcome 1: There were six (6) AS in Accounting students in ACCT 310 and nine (9) AS in Accounting students in ACCT 320 in the 2015-2016 academic year identified. The limited AS student in Accounting makes it statistically difficult to develop definitive conclusions about measures of student learning. Additionally, some AS students transferred in one or more of the accounting courses required for the degree. Acknowledging these limitations, in ACCT 310, in Test 1, Test 2, Test 3 and Test 4, 79, 87%, 82% and 86%, respectively, met the "Acceptable" or "Proficient" criterion. In ACCT 320, in Test 1, Test 2, Test 3 and Test 4, 72%, 69%, 75% and 77%, respectively, met the "Acceptable" or "Proficient" criterion. Thus, during this time period, the limited pool of AS students did meet the "Acceptable" or "Proficient" in 70% or above instances for each criterion regarding exam scores except for ACCT 320 exam 2.*

2. *Outcomes 2 and 3: There were nine (9) AS in Accounting students in the 2015-2016 academic year identified. The limited AS student in Accounting makes it statistically difficult to develop definitive conclusions about measures of student learning. Additionally, some AS students transferred in one or more of the accounting courses required for the degree. However, during the AY 2015-2016 assessment period, the student's average grade was 93%, representing Proficient on the criterion of the "US GAAP vs. IFRS Research & Presentation" assignment. The score demonstrates that the students have the ability to research and analyze specific intermediate-level accounting issues and demonstrates proficient oral and written communication skills.*

3. *Outcomes 3 and 4: There were nine (9) AS in Accounting students in the 2015-2016 academic year identified. The limited AS student in Accounting makes it statistically difficult to develop definitive conclusions about measures of student learning. Additionally, some AS students transferred in one or more of the accounting courses required for the degree. However, during the AY 2015-2016 assessment period, the student's average grade was 94%, representing Proficient on the criterion of the "Tax Research Memo # 4" assignment. The score demonstrates that the students have the ability to research and analyze specific federal income tax issues and demonstrates proficient oral and written communication skills.*

**Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:**

1. *Graduating Student Survey: Response to satisfaction with "Content of Curriculum" question on Graduating Student Survey for Winter Term 2016 was 42% "Very Satisfied", 50% "Somewhat Satisfied", and 8% "Somewhat Dissatisfied". : Response to satisfaction with "Major Program Courses" question on Graduating Student Survey for Winter Term 2016 was 67% "Very Satisfied", 25% "Somewhat Satisfied" and 8% "Somewhat Dissatisfied".*

2. *Student End of Course Survey: The average percentage of recommend accounting course for AY 2015-2016 was 89.6% and the average percentage of recommend accounting faculty was 90.9% for AY 2015-2016. This is an increase of 3.4% and 3.7% respectively.*

3. *Faculty post-course interviews: Ongoing feedback obtained at the end of each term and during the annual faculty meeting indicates that the faculty consensus on all four assessment criteria with respect to the course quality, relevance, innovation and consistency was Acceptable or Proficient for not only each course, but also for the accounting program overall.*

**Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes:**

Intended Student Learning Outcomes	Learning Assessment Measures							
Program ISLOs	<i>Direct Measure 1: Exam Scores in ACCT 310 and 320</i>	<i>Direct Measure 2: "US GAAP vs IFRS Research and Presentation"</i>	<i>Direct Measure 3: "Tax Research Memo #4"</i>	<i>Direct Measure 4</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 1: Graduating Student Survey</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 2: Student End of Course Survey</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 3: Faculty Post-Course Interviews</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 4</i>
	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...
<i>1. Graduates will demonstrate technical accounting skills in intermediate-level accounting topics/concepts.</i>	Met				Met	Met	Met	
<i>2. Graduates will demonstrate the ability to research and analyze specific intermediate-level accounting issues.</i>		Met			Met	Met	Met	
<i>3. Graduates will demonstrate oral and written communication skills.</i>		Met	Met		Met	Met	Met	
<i>4. Graduates will demonstrate the ability to research and analyze specific federal income tax issues related to the taxation of individuals.</i>			Met		Met	Met	Met	

**Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:**

- 1. Students identified as A.S. students in Intermediate Accounting will be monitored closely throughout the year to afford the students the ability to a) receive instructor assistance as necessary; b) adaptive learning opportunities in McGraw Hill Connect; and c) identification for assistance to the Franklin University Student Learning Center.*
- 2. Although indirect measures performance targets were met for 1, 2, and 3, these indirect measures will be replaced by a reflection paper and survey for 2017-2018 that specifically relate to program ISLOs.*

## Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2015-16

### Section I: Student Learning Assessment

Student Learning Assessment for Associate of Science (AS) – Business Administration	
Intended Student Learning Outcomes for Associate of Science in Business Administration:	
1. Describe the functions, roles, and skills of a manager.	
2. Evaluate the planning, organizing, leading, and controlling functions of a business using stated criteria.	
3. Write and present error-free arguments for an internal business audience.	
Assessment Tools for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Targets/Criteria for Direct Measures:
1. Grading outcome results for the primary course and assignments for the Associate of Science for Business Administration: MGMT 312 Management Dilemma: Outcomes 1 and 3 MGMT 312 Historical Perspective of Mgmt: Outcomes 2 and 3 MGMT 312 Presentation: Outcome 3	The average student achievement score for the assessed assignments in the foundation course will be above the performance target of 70%
Assessment Tools for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Targets/Criteria for Indirect Measures:
1. Graduating Student Survey Results	Results will reflect students were satisfied with the associate degree curriculum at or above an 85% satisfaction level.
2. Faculty Evaluations	Faculty in the Associate of Business Administration program will receive a recommendation rate of 85% or higher.
3. Course Evaluations	Courses in in the Associates of Business Administration program will receive a recommendation rate of 85% or higher.
4. Program Advisory Board	The Business Administration Advisory Board will meet at least once per year to make recommendations on curriculum changes. The board will

	provide recommendations on curriculum alignment with today's business environment.	
5. Adjunct Faculty Retreats and Communications	Teaching faculty within the Business Administration program will meet (in-person or via teleconference) at least once per year to discuss course level outcomes, course relevancies, and review any course changes.	
Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:		Performance Target Was...
		Met      Not Met
1. MGMT 312 Management Dilemma: Outcomes 1 and 3 – average grade 93% MGMT 312 Historical Perspective of Mgmt: Outcomes 2 and 3 – average grade 96% MGMT 312 Presentation: Outcome 3– average grade 94%		X
Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:		Performance Target Was...
		Met      Not Met
1. Graduating Student Survey Results were not available this academic year.		Not Available
2. The aggregate scores of the overall undergraduate Business Administration Program course evaluations showed a & 91.9% recommend by students and the instructor evaluations for this academic year reflected a 93% recommend		X
3. by students. Although segmenting these by the significantly lower number of associate degree students was not feasible, the total results reflected very favorably upon recommendations by associate degree only students.		
4. The Business Administration Advisory Board met once during this academic year in May to review changes to the program curriculum and formulate recommendations on program improvements. The meeting focused on making the BSAD program more transfer friendly in order to increase enrollment in the program. The AS and BS Advisory Board is the same.		X
5.. The AS faculty and the Business Administration (BSAD) Adjunct Faculty are combined and met via phone conference this academic year. Main topic was number of sections offered and staffing. Additionally, a number of individual meetings and phone meetings were held throughout the academic year.		X
Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Areas for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:		
1.		
<b>Learning Improvement: Please identify how learning has improved upon the implementation of action items from previous years</b>		



*Students in the AS program are doing well and the outcomes are being met. Given the success of these students we are working on strategies to move more students into the BSAD program.*

## Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2015-2016

### Section I: Student Learning Assessment

Student Learning Assessment for: AS, Financial Management	
Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes (Program ISLOs)	
1. Graduates will be able to conduct analyses of financial statements.	
2. Graduates will be able to utilize time-value-of-money techniques in the valuation of securities.	
3. Graduates will be able to compare capital investment opportunities using capital budgeting tools.	
4. Graduates will be able to identify the functions of financial markets and institutions and examine their impact on the level of interest rates and interest rate differentials.	
5. Graduates will be able to appraise the risk and return of various investments and their combination in the creation and management of investment portfolios.	
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:
1. Online quiz Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: Outcomes 1, 2, and 3	Score at or above 70% on relevant quiz questions in quizzes 1, 2, and 3 in FINA 301
2. Application of evaluation rubrics to student work Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: Outcome 4	“Acceptable” or “Proficient” met in 70% or above in Final Project Reports in FINA 340
3. Application of evaluation rubrics to student work Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: Outcome 5	“Acceptable” or “Proficient” met in 70% or above in Portfolio Project (part III)-Risk-Adjusted Return Analyses in FINA 405
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Indirect Measures:
1. Graduating Student Survey: Percent Recommend: FINA Courses Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: N/A	85% or above overall satisfaction with program

2. Graduating Student Survey: Percent Recommend: FINA Faculty Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: N/A	85% or above overall satisfaction with program

**Learning Assessment Results: AS, Financial Management**

**Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:**

In the 2015-2016 academic year online results for quiz 1 in FINA 301-Principles of Finance the average score for AS students was 95% (77% in 2014-2015; 81% in 2013-2014)

In the 2015-2016 academic year online results for quiz 1 in FINA 301-Principles of Finance the average score for AS students was 95% (77% in 2014-2015; 81% in 2013-2014)

In the 2015-2016 academic year online results for quiz 3 in FINA 301-Principles of Finance the average score for AS students was 69% (73% in 2014-2015; 53% in 2013-2014)

In the 2015-2016 academic year results for Bank Portfolio-Final Analysis in FINA 340 for AS students the average score was \_\_\_\_ (88% in 2014-2015; 94% in 2013-2014)

In the 2015-2016 academic year the Portfolio Project (part III)-Risk-Adjusted Return Analyses in FINA 405 for AS students average score was \_\_\_\_ (100% in 2014-2015; 94.75% in 2013-2014)

**Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:**

4. N/A

5. N/A

6. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 3*

7. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 4*

**Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes:**

Intended Student Learning Outcomes	Learning Assessment Measures							
Program ISLOs	<i>Direct Measure 1</i>	<i>Direct Measure 2</i>	<i>Direct Measure 3</i>	<i>Direct Measure 4</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 1</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 2</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 3</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 4</i>

	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...
1. <i>Program Learning Outcome 1</i>	Met							
2. <i>Program Learning Outcome 2</i>		Met						
3. <i>Program Learning Outcome 3</i>			Met					
4. <i>Program Learning Outcome 4</i>								
5. <i>Program Learning Outcome 5</i>								
<b>Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:</b>								
3. <i>Course of Action 1</i>								
4. <i>Course of Action 2</i>								
5. <i>Course of Action 3</i>								
6. <i>Course of Action 4</i>								

## Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2015 - 2016

### Section I: Student Learning Assessment

Student Learning Assessment for: <i>Associate of Science (AS) – Forensic Accounting</i>	
Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes (Program ISLOs)	
1. <i>Graduates will demonstrate technical accounting skills in intermediate-level accounting topics/concepts.</i>	
2. <i>Graduates will demonstrate the ability to research and analyze specific intermediate-level accounting issues.</i>	
3. <i>Graduates will demonstrate oral and written communication skills.</i>	
4. <i>Graduates will demonstrate the ability to research and analyze fraudulent activities in an organization and recommend needed internal control measures.</i>	
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:
1. ISLO # 1: Exam scores in both ACCT 310, Intermediate Accounting 1 and ACCT 320, Intermediate Accounting II.	<i>In 70% or above instances for each criterion, students scored at or above either the 70% mark (“Acceptable”) or the 80% mark (“Proficient”).</i>
2. ISLO # 2: ACCT 320 – Intermediate Accounting II, “U. S. GAAP vs. IFRS Research & Presentation” assignment.	<i>In 70% or above instances for each criterion, students scored at or above either the 70% mark (“Acceptable”) or the 80% mark (“Proficient”).</i>
3. ISLOs # 3 & 4: ACCT 341 – Fraud Examination, – “Occupational Fraud Research Paper” Assignment.	<i>In 70% or above of the instances for each criterion, students scored at or above either the 70% mark (“Acceptable”) or 80% mark (“Proficient”).</i>

<b>Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:</b>	<b>Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Indirect Measures:</b>
1. ISLOs # 1, 2, 3, and 4: <i>Graduating Student Reflection Survey</i> (to be embedded in ACCT 495).	<i>Using the Reflection Survey, students will rate to what extent they think this program has prepared them to meet the learning outcomes, based on ratings of Below, At, or Above expectations. For each Learning Outcome, at least 80% of students' responses will meet or exceed the "At Expectations" or "Above Expectations" mark.</i>
<b>Learning Assessment Results: Associate of Science (AS) – Forensic Accounting</b>	
<b>Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:</b>	
1. ISLO # 1: There was one (1) AS in Forensic Accounting student in AY 2015-2016 reflected in ACCT 310, Intermediate Accounting I. The student's average score for the four exams in ACCT 310 was 70% (Acceptable). Having one or no students makes it statistically impossible to develop definitive conclusions about measures of student learning. Additionally, some AS students transferred in one or more of the accounting courses required for the degree.	
2. ISLO # 2: There was one (1) AS in Forensic Accounting student in AY 2015-2016 reflected in ACCT 320, Intermediate Accounting II. The student's average score for the four exams in ACCT 320 was 67.3% (Unacceptable). Having one or no students makes it statistically impossible to develop definitive conclusions about measures of student learning. Additionally, some AS students transferred in one or more of the accounting courses required for the degree.	
3. ISLO # 3 & 4: There were two (2) AS in Forensic Accounting students in AY 2015-2016 reflected in ACCT 341, Fraud Examination. Only 1 student completed the criterion assignment, receiving a score of 100%, or Proficient. Having only two students makes it statistically impossible to develop definite conclusions about measures of student learning.	

**Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:**

1. Graduating Student Reflection Survey: For each Learning Outcome, 80% of students' responses met or exceeded the "At Expectations" or "Above Expectations" mark.

**Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes:**

Intended Student Learning Outcomes	Learning Assessment Measures							
Program ISLOs	<i>Direct Measure 1</i>	<i>Direct Measure 2</i>	<i>Direct Measure 3</i>	<i>Direct Measure 4</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 1</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 2</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 3</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 4</i>
	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...
1. <i>Program Learning Outcome 1</i>	Met							
2. <i>Program Learning Outcome 2</i>		Not Met						
3. <i>Program Learning Outcome 3</i>			Met					
4. <i>Program Learning Outcome 4</i>			Met					

**Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:**

1. *Course of Action 1 – Not applicable.*
2. *Course of Action 2 - ISLO # 2: No course of action is planned at this time, due to low enrollment of students in this program.*
3. *Course of Action 3 – Not applicable.*
4. *Course of Action 4 – Not applicable.*

## Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2015-2016

### Section I: Student Learning Assessment

Student Learning Assessment for: <i>Bachelor of Science, Accounting</i>	
Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes (Program ISLOs)	
1. <i>Graduates will apply logical thinking and critical analysis.</i>	
2. <i>Graduates will research specific financial accounting issues.</i>	
3. <i>Graduates will research specific federal income tax issues.</i>	
4. <i>Graduates will analyze ethical issues in the accounting profession.</i>	
5. <i>Graduates will analyze information systems through evaluation of process controls and organizational system risks within a business process.</i>	
6. <i>Graduates will demonstrate written communication skills in accounting.</i>	
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:
1. <i>ACCT 495: Accounting Research and Analysis – “Critical Thinking” Assignment.</i>	<i>In 70% or above instances for each criterion, students scored at or above either the “Acceptable” mark or the “Proficient” mark.</i>
2. <i>ACCT 495: Accounting Research and Analysis – “Auditor’s Observation of Physical Inventory” assignment.</i>	<i>In 70% or above instances for each criterion, students scored at or above either the “Acceptable” mark or the “Proficient” mark.</i>
3. <i>ACCT 420: Federal Income Tax II – “Tax Research Memo # 3” Assignment.</i>	<i>In 70% or above instances for each criterion, students scored at or above either the “Acceptable” mark or the “Proficient” mark.</i>
4. <i>ACCT 495: Accounting Research and Analysis – “Application of Classical Ethical Theories” assignment.</i>	<i>In 70% or above instances for each criterion, students scored at or above either the “Acceptable” mark or the “Proficient” mark.</i>
5. <i>ACCT 425: Accounting and Information Systems – Accounting Information Systems Final Project.</i>	<i>In 70% or above instances for each criterion, students scored at or above either the “Acceptable” mark or the “Proficient” mark.</i>
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Indirect Measures:



1. <i>Graduating Student Survey</i>	<i>At least 90% of graduating students in the school of business in which the major in Accounting is reported will be satisfied with the content of their curriculum and at least 90% of graduating students in the school of business in which the major in Accounting is reported will be satisfied with their major program courses.</i>
2. <i>Student End of Course Survey</i>	<i>The average percentages of course recommend and faculty recommend for the Accounting program would be 80% or higher.</i>
3. <i>Faculty post-course interviews</i>	<i>Faculty consensus on all four criteria is above average (i.e., course quality, relevance, innovation and consistency).</i>

**Learning Assessment Results: Bachelor of Science, Accounting**

**Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:**

1. *Outcome 1: Results reflect that students have a strong grasp of logical thinking and critical analysis skills. 97% scored Proficient, 2% scored Acceptable and 2% scored Unacceptable.*
2. *Outcome 2: Results reflect that students had a strong grasp of researching specific financial skills. 82% scored Proficient and 18% scored Acceptable.*
3. *Outcome 3: Results reflect that students had a strong grasp of researching specific federal income tax issues. 81% scored Proficient, 16% scored Acceptable and 3% scored Unacceptable.*
4. *Outcome 4: Results reflect that students had a strong grasp of analyzing ethical issues in the accounting profession. 80% scored Proficient and 20% scored Acceptable.*
5. *Outcome 5: Results reflect that students had an acceptable to good grasp of analyzing information systems through evaluation of process controls and organizational system risks. 67% scored Proficient, 30% scored Acceptable and 3% scored Unacceptable.*
6. *Outcome 6: Results reflect that students had a strong grasp of demonstrating written communication skills in accounting. 78% scored Proficient, 21% scored Acceptable and 2% scored Unacceptable.*

**Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:**

1. *Graduating Student Survey: Response to satisfaction with "Content of Curriculum" question on Graduating Student Survey for Winter Term 2016 was 42% "Very Satisfied", 50% "Somewhat Satisfied", and 8% "Somewhat Dissatisfied". : Response to satisfaction with "Major Program Courses" question on Graduating Student Survey for Winter Term 2016 was 67% "Very Satisfied", 25% "Somewhat Satisfied" and 8% "Somewhat Dissatisfied".*
2. *Student End of Course Survey: The average percentage of recommend accounting course for AY 2015-2016 was 89.6% and the average*

percentage of recommend accounting faculty was 90.9%for AY 2015-2016. This is an increase of 3.4% and 3.7% respectively.

3. Faculty post-course interviews: Ongoing feedback obtained at the end of each term and during the annual faculty meeting indicates that the faculty consensus on all four assessment criteria with respect to the course quality, relevance, innovation and consistency was Acceptable or Proficient for not only each course, but also for the accounting program overall.

**Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes:**

Intended Student Learning Outcomes	Learning Assessment Measures							
Program ISLOs	Direct Measure 1: ACCT 425 "Critical Thinking"	Direct Measure 2: ACCT 495 "Auditor's Observation of Physical Inventory"	Direct Measure 3: ACCT 420 "Tax Research Memo #3"	Direct Measure 4: ACCT 495 "Application of Classical Ethical Theories"	Direct Measure 5: ACCT 425 "Accounting Information Systems Final Project"	Indirect Measure 1: Graduating Student Survey	Indirect Measure 2: Student End of Course Survey	Indirect Measure 3: Faculty Post-Course Interviews
	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...
1. Graduates will apply logical thinking and critical analysis	Met					Met	Met	Met
2. Graduates will research specific financial accounting issues		Met				Met	Met	Met
3. Graduates will research specific federal income tax issues			Met			Met	Met	Met
4. Graduates will analyze ethical issues in the accounting profession				Met		Met	Met	Met
5. Graduates will analyze information systems through evaluation of process controls and organizational system risks within a business process					Met	Met	Met	Met
6. Graduates will demonstrate written communication skills in accounting	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met

**Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:**

1. Outcome 1: Based on the favorable results for this outcome, no additional design/development efforts are planned.

2. *Outcome 2: Based on the favorable results for this outcome, no additional design/development efforts are planned.*

3. *Outcome 3: Based on the favorable results for this outcome, no additional design/development efforts are planned.*

4. *Outcome 4: Based on the favorable results for this outcome, no additional design/development efforts are planned.*

5. *Outcome 5: Based on the favorable results for this outcome, no additional design/development efforts are planned.*

6. *Outcome 6: Based on the favorable results for this outcome, no additional design/development efforts are planned.*

## Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2015-2016

### Section I: Student Learning Assessment

Student Learning Assessment for <i>Bachelor of Science, Applied Management</i>	
Intended Student Learning Outcomes for <i>Applied Management</i>	
1. Analyze the essential functions necessary to manage a successful organization	
2. Recommend process design solutions and operations strategies to address common classes of business problems	
3. Create a project plan based on the theories of project management.	
4. Apply supervisory principles to simple and complex processes to accomplish organizational and departmental goals.	
5. Design a performance plan or project design based on the application of management theory and principles	
Assessment Tools for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Targets/Criteria for Direct Measures:
1. <i>AMGT 440 assignment Week 2 “Mission &amp; Scope”</i> <i>Outcome assessed: #2</i>	<i>At least 80% of students who major in Applied Management will meet the outcome at or above the acceptable level (2 points on a 3 point scale).</i>
2. <i>AMGT 450 assignment Week 6 “Product vs. Process”</i> <i>Outcome assessed: #3</i>	<i>At least 80% of students who major in Applied Management will meet the outcome at or above the acceptable level (2 points on a 3 point scale).</i>
3. <i>AMGT497 Simulation</i>	<i>Students will score at least 50 percentile in the simulation on the national ranking</i>
Assessment Tools for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Targets/Criteria for Indirect Measures:
1. <i>Graduating Student Survey</i>	<i>At least 85% of graduating students who majored in Applied Management will be satisfied with the content of their curriculum.</i>

2. <i>Course Evaluations</i>	<i>Courses in the Applied Management program will receive a recommendation rate of 85% or higher.</i>	
Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Target Was...	
	Met	Not Met
1. <i>Outcome 2 – AMGT 440 assignment week 2 “Mission &amp; Scope”:</i> Overall, 79% met the outcome at an acceptable level of above. (Two students did not complete this assignment which made it fall slightly below the 80%) Without including those two students, it met the target	X	
2. <i>Outcome 3 – AMGT 450 assignment week 6 “Product vs. Process”:</i> Overall, 94% met outcome at an acceptable level or above. All artifacts were from online sections. There were no f2f sections. (over 80% on the assignment)	X	
Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Target Was...	
	Met	Not Met
1. <i>Reflection paper (overall students were satisfied with the program)</i>	X	
2. <i>Course Evaluations for the terms Winter 2016 100% recommend in the capstone course and Summer 2016-72%, recommend for the capstone course. Summer often seems to have a lower recommend. It could be that students are busier and have less time to spend on the course and therefore don’t do as well.</i>	X	
Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Areas for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:		
1. <i>The courses are undergoing some major updates with a new program chair</i>		
2. <i>A new assessment plan is being put into place to assess the capstone course and use summative assessment</i>		
<b>Learning Improvement: Please identify how learning has improved upon the implementation of action items from previous years</b>		
<i>New action plans are being put into place and the trends will be developed from using the new</i>		

**Outcomes Assessment Results**  
**For Academic Year: 2015-16**

**Section I: Student Learning Assessment**

Student Learning Assessment for <i>Bachelor of Science, Business Administration</i>	
Intended Student Learning Outcomes	
1.	Define, explain, and properly use the terms, concepts and principles in the functional areas of management, marketing, accounting, finance, and economics.
2.	Define and discuss the legal and ethical obligations for working within the social environment of businesses.
3.	Differentiate and evaluate business concepts and theories to solve complex problems in domestic and international environments using a multi-functional approach.
4.	Demonstrate proficiency in the use of business tools
5.	Research and analyze existing informational resources.
6.	Integrate business theories and concepts to determine the optimal strategic direction for an organization.
Assessment Tools for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Targets/Criteria for Direct Measures:
1.	Peregrine CPC-COMP exam during Capstone course – standard CPC topic modules (Outcomes assessed: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 6)
2.	BSAD 495 – Assignment: Reflection Survey/Paper
	Scores to be compared against peers on a national level with the target being “average” to “approaching or at above average”.
	Based on student responses, at least 80% of students who major in Business Administration will meet this program outcome at or above the acceptable level (2 points on a 3 point scale with 3 points being “proficient”).
Assessment Tools for Intended Student Learning Outcomes—	Performance Targets/Criteria for Indirect Measures:

Indirect Measures of Student Learning:			
1. Graduating Student Survey	Based on the findings from an annual and comprehensive survey of Business Administration graduates, at least 90% of program alumni will state favorable opinions about the program curriculum.		
2. Course Evaluations	Student evaluations gathered over a three trimester period will reflect that at least 90 percent of surveyed students would recommend their course to another student.		
2. Faculty Evaluations	Student evaluations gathered over a three trimester period will reflect that at least 90 percent of surveyed students would recommend their previous program faculty member for a given course to another student.		
3. Outcomes from Business Administration Program Advisory Board Meetings	The Business Administration Advisory Board will meet each year to perform a comprehensive review of the program curriculum and make recommendations on curriculum changes. The board will provide recommendations on curriculum alignment with today's management and leadership environment.		
4. Outcomes from Business Administration Program Adjunct Faculty Retreats	Teaching faculty within the Business Administration program will meet (in-person or via teleconference) each year to review and recommend course changes and exchange best teaching practices for material.		
Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:		Performance Target Was...	
		Met	Not Met
1. Peregrine CPC-COMP results. <b>Outcome 1:</b> The average Total Score for the combined Peregrine-CPC-COMP areas of Management, Marketing, Accounting, Finance, & Economics was <b>57%</b> which corresponds to "average" to near "above average" based on CPC-COMP guidelines. <b>Outcome 2:</b> Scores for Legal Environment of Business and ethics were <b>62%</b> and <b>58%</b> respectfully which correspond to "above average" and "average" based on CPC-COMP guidelines <b>Outcome 3:</b> The score for Global Dimensions of Business was <b>50%</b> , which corresponds to "average" based on CPC-COMP guideline.		X	

<p><b>Outcome 4.</b> The score for Information Management Systems was <b>62%</b> which corresponds to “above average” to near “high” based on CPC-COMP guideline.</p> <p><b>Outcome 6:</b> The score for Business Integration and Strategic Management was <b>65%</b>, which corresponds to “average” based on CPC-COMP guideline.</p>		
<p>Peregrine CPC-COMP results.</p> <p><b>Outcome 5:</b> The score for Quantitative Research Techniques was <b>55%</b>, which corresponds to “average” based on CPC-COMP guideline.</p>	X	
<p><b>Outcome 5:</b> Based on external review of student artifacts using evaluation rubrics 92% of students met the outcome at acceptable or proficient levels on this outcome.</p>	X	
<p><b><u>2- Reflection Survey/Paper –</u></b></p> <p>The student responses were as follows:</p> <p>Outcome 1 – 100 % at meets or exceeds</p> <p>Outcome 2 – 98 % at meets or exceeds</p> <p>Outcome 3 – 97 % at meets or exceeds</p> <p>Outcome 4 – 100 % at meets or exceeds</p> <p>Outcome 5 – 100 % at meets or exceeds</p> <p>Outcome 6 – 97 % at meets or exceeds</p>	X	
<p>Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:</p>	Performance Target Was...	
	Met	Not Met
<p>1. Graduating student surveys for the academic period reflect that on average 100% of the Business Administration students stated they were very satisfied to somewhat satisfied with the program curriculum content and major program courses.</p>	Not Available	



2.	Course evaluations completed by students over a three trimester period reflect that 91.9% of students would recommend the BSAD course they just completed be taken by another university student.	X	
3.	Faculty Evaluations taken over a three-trimester period reflect that 93% of students would recommend their previous BSAD faculty member for a select course to another student.	X	
4.	The Business Administration Advisory Board met once during this academic year in May to review changes to the program curriculum and formulate recommendations on program improvements. The meeting focused on making the BSAD program more transfer friendly in order to increase enrollment in the program.	X	
5.	The Business Administration (BSAD) Adjunct Faculty met via phone conference this academic year. Main topic was enrollment and retention and the need to communicate with students who are late on assignments or quizzes. Additionally, a number of individual meetings and phone meetings were held throughout the academic year.	X	
Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Areas for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:			
<b>Learning Improvement: Please identify how learning has improved upon the implementation of action items from previous years</b>			
1.	<i>The Peregrine aggregate results for BSAD for the 2014-2015 aggregate results were 58.3%. This year they were at 57%. This shows a slight decrease that will need to be monitored to determine if action is needed.</i>		

## Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2015-2016

### Section I: Student Learning Assessment

Student Learning Assessment for: <i>Bachelor of Science, Business Economics</i>	
Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes (Program ISLOs)	
1. <i>Evaluate financial and non-financial data for decision-making.</i>	
2. <i>Demonstrate communication skills in economics.</i>	
3. <i>Analyze ethical issues in economic policies and regulations.</i>	
4. <i>Analyze current and historical economic trends and issues.</i>	
<b>Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:</b>	<b>Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:</b>
1. <i>Direct Measure 1: Comprehensive Exam (Peregrine)</i> Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: <i>Outcomes 1, 3, 4</i>	<i>Seventy percent (70%) of the students will perform at or above 40%, which is defined as average by Peregrine CPC.</i>
<b>Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:</b>	<b>Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Indirect Measures:</b>
1. <i>Indirect Measure 1: Program Reflective Survey</i> Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: <i>Outcomes 1-4</i>	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Indirect Measure 1: 90% will rate the program at 3 or 4 (on the four-point scale), indicating that the program provided “substantial” (3) and “exceptional” (4) support in helping students meet the program outcomes.</i>
<b>Learning Assessment Results: <i>Name of Program 1</i></b>	
<b>Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:</b>	

1. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 1. All ECON students (5) scored higher than the IACBE recommended average score 40. The score ranges are 55-87. The averages for total score is 70. The averages for the different topics range from 55 to 86.*

2. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 2*

3. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 3*

4. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 4*

**Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:**

1. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 1. The program reflective survey asks students to comment on to what extent their program prepares to meet each program outcome. This survey was built into the capstone course in Summer 2016. Response from one student was collected, who rated the program at the highest level (4 on a four-point scale, program providing exceptional support) for all four program outcomes.*

2. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 2*

3. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 3*

4. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 4*

**Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes:**

Intended Student Learning Outcomes	Learning Assessment Measures							
	<i>Direct Measure 1</i>	<i>Direct Measure 2</i>	<i>Direct Measure 3</i>	<i>Direct Measure 4</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 1</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 2</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 3</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 4</i>
	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...
1. <i>Program Learning Outcome 1</i>	Met							
2. <i>Program Learning Outcome 2</i>								
3. <i>Program Learning Outcome 3</i>								
4. <i>Program Learning Outcome 4</i>								
5. <i>Program Learning Outcome 5</i>								

**Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:**

1. *Course of Action 1 An indirect assessment is being added. A reflection paper will be put into the ENTR495 curriculum*

2. *Course of Action 2*

3. *Course of Action 3*

4. *Course of Action 4*

## Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2015 - 2016

### Section I: Student Learning Assessment

Student Learning Assessment for: <i>Bachelor of Science (BS) – Business Forensics</i>	
Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes (Program ISLOs)	
1. <i>Graduates will define, explain, and properly use the terms, concepts, and principles in the functional areas of management, marketing, accounting, finance, and economics.</i>	
2. <i>Graduates will define and discuss the legal and ethical obligations for working within the social environment of business.</i>	
3. <i>Graduates will differentiate and evaluate business concepts and theories to solve complex problems in domestic and international environments using a multi-functional approach.</i>	
4. <i>Graduates will demonstrate proficiency in the use of business tools.</i>	
5. <i>Graduates will research and analyze existing informational resources.</i>	
6. <i>Graduates will integrate business theories and concepts to determine the optimal strategic direction for an organization.</i>	
7. <i>Graduates will construct documentation of the findings of an interview plan.</i>	
8. <i>Graduates will construct documentation of the findings of a fraud investigation.</i>	
9. <i>Graduates will construct documentation analyzing internal controls.</i>	
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:
1. ISLOs # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6: Peregrine CPC-COMP exam during ACCT 495 (capstone course) – standard CPC topic modules.	Peregrine Exam results will reflect that students are at or above average in competency exam ranking when compared to student results aggregated from multiple colleges of business exam outcomes.
2. ISLO # 7 – ACCT 342: <i>Interviewing Techniques for Fraud Investigations – Conducting an Interview – Final Project.</i>	In 70% or more of the instances for feach criterion, students will score at or above either the 70% (“Acceptable”) mark or 80% (“Proficient”) mark.
3. ISLO # 8 – ACCT 343: <i>Legal Elements of Fraud – Final Report Project Assignment.</i>	In 70% or more of the instances for feach criterion, students will score at or above either the 70% (“Acceptable”) mark or 80% (“Proficient”) mark.

4. ISLO # 9 – ACCT 344: <i>Corporate Governance and Internal Control Assessment – Internal Control Analysis Project Assignment.</i>	In 70% or more of the instances for feach criterion, students will score at or above either the 70% (“Acceptable”) mark or 80% (“Proficient”) mark.
<b>Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:</b>	<b>Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Indirect Measures:</b>
1. ISLOs # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6: End of course Student Self-assessment Survey (to be embedded in BSAD 495.	In 70% or more of the instances for each criterion, students will score at or above either the 70% (“Acceptable”) mark or 80% (“Proficient”) mark.
2. <i>Indirect Measure 2</i> Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: <i>Outcomes List</i>	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Indirect Measure 2</i>
3. <i>Indirect Measure 3</i> Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: <i>Outcomes List</i>	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Indirect Measure 3</i>
4. <i>Indirect Measure 4</i> Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: <i>Outcomes List</i>	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Indirect Measure 4</i>
<b>Learning Assessment Results: Bachelor of Science (BS) – Business Forensics</b>	
<b>Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:</b>	
1. ISLOs # 1, 2, 3, & 4: The average total score for the combined Peregrine-CPC-COMP areas of Management, Marketing, Accounting, Finance, & Economics was 57.4%; for Business Ethics, 60%; for Legal Environment of Buisness, 62%; for Global Dimensions of Business, 52%; and, for Business Integration and Strategic Management, 65%.	
2. ISLO # 4: Holistically, 97% of students demonstrated proficiency at or above the Acceptable level.	
3. ISLO # 5: Holistically, 98% of students demonstrated proficiency at or above the Acceptable level.	
4. ISLO # 6: Not measured in 2015-2016.	
5. ISLO # 7: Results showed that some improvement has been achieved compared to previous years, with nearly 100% of students exceeding the 70% (Acceptable) mark for all but one of the assessment criteria. Additional improvement is needed in the criterion, “Plan and evaluate the order of interview questions.”	
6. ISLO # 8: Although results showed that some improvement has been achieved, additional improvement is needed in some aspects of preparing a fraud report (i.e., appropriateness and accuracy of documentary evidence, and visual aids).	
7. ISLO # 9: Although results showed that some improvement has been achieved, additional improvement is needed in some aspects of preparing an internal control test plan fraud report.	

8. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 4*

**Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:**

1. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 1*

2. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 2*

3. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 3*

4. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 4*

**Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes:**

Intended Student Learning Outcomes	Learning Assessment Measures							
Program ISLOs	<i>Direct Measure 1</i>	<i>Direct Measure 2</i>	<i>Direct Measure 3</i>	<i>Direct Measure 4</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 1</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 2</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 3</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 4</i>
	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...
1. <i>ISLO # 1</i>	Met							
2. <i>ISLO # 2</i>	Met							
3. <i>ISLO # 3</i>	Met							
4. <i>ISLO # 4</i>	Met							
5. <i>ISLO # 5</i>	Met							
6. <i>ISLO # 6</i>	Met							
7. <i>ISLO # 7</i>	Met							
8. <i>ISLO # 8</i>	Met							
9. <i>ISLO # 9</i>	Met							

**Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:**

1. *Course of Action 1* – ISLOs 7, 8, & 9: Faculty members responsible for teaching ACCT 342, 343, & 344 have been encouraged to spend more time and attention teaching and reinforcing the skills related to students’ work regarding these ISLOs (most recently in an online faculty meeting held in June 2016). Greater emphasis will continue to be placed on students’ achievement and quality improvement regarding these three ISLOs.

2. *Course of Action 2*

3. *Course of Action 3*

4. *Course of Action 4*



## Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2015-2016

### Section I: Student Learning Assessment

<b>Student Learning Assessment for: <i>Bachelor of Science, Financial Management</i></b>	
<b>Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes (Program ISLOs)</b>	
<i>1. Graduates will be able to use data provided within financial statements to calculate and analyze financial ratios and common-size statements.</i>	
<i>2. Graduates will be able to apply time-value-of-money and other techniques to determine the value of financial securities.</i>	
<i>3. Graduates will be able to calculate the weighted-average-cost-of-capital in the assessment of a firm's capital structure.</i>	
<i>4. Graduates will be able to evaluate the capital structure and investment alternatives of a firm.</i>	
<i>5. Graduates will be able to assess the impact of participation in global financial markets on a firm's decision-making.</i>	
<b>Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:</b>	<b>Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:</b>
<i>1. Relevant questions on locally developed comprehensive exam</i>	Scores at or above 70% on relevant comprehensive examination questions
<i>2. Relevant questions on locally developed comprehensive exam</i>	Scores at or above 70% on relevant comprehensive examination questions
<i>3. Relevant questions on locally developed comprehensive exam</i>	Scores at or above 70% on relevant comprehensive examination questions
<i>4. Relevant questions on locally developed comprehensive exam</i>	Scores at or above 70% on relevant comprehensive examination questions
<i>5. Relevant questions on locally developed comprehensive exam</i>	Scores at or above 70% on relevant comprehensive examination questions
<b>Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:</b>	<b>Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Indirect Measures:</b>
<i>1. Student Course Evaluations</i>	85% or above overall satisfaction with program

2. *Graduating Student Survey*

85% or above overall satisfaction with program

**Learning Assessment Results: *Bachelor of Science, Financial Management***

**Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:**

1. Financial management comprehensive examination (initially developed in Winter 2011, first administered in Summer 2011, and revised in Winter 2012 and Winter 2014). Assessment of the relevant questions (Questions 3 and 4 on common-sized statements and Questions 4-9 and 27 on financial ratios) from the comprehensive examinations of the 46 students enrolled in the finance capstone FINA 495 in the 2015-2016 academic year showed poorer results. Proficiency scores were as follows:
  - Common size statements (balance sheet): 50.0% (80.77% in 2014-2015; 76.47% in 2013-2014; 57.69% in 2012-2013)
  - Common size statements (income statement): 71.74% (92.31% in 2014-2015; 73.53% in 2013-2014; 84.60% in 2012-2013)
  - Quick ratio: 67.39% (88.46% in 2014-2015; 82.35% in 2013-2014; 86.54% in 2012-2013)
  - Return on assets: 89.13% (94.23% in 2014-2015; 100% in 2013-2014; 92.31% in 2012-2013)
  - Equity multiplier: 69.56% (86.54% in 2014-2015; 82.35% in 2013-2014; 80.77% in 2012-2013)
  - Cash coverage: 86.96% (90.39% in 2014-2015; 94.12% in 2013-2014; 88.46% in 2012-2013)
  - Return on equity: 65.22% (88.46% in 2014-2015; 85.29% in 2013-2014; 75.00% in 2012-2013)
  - Earnings per share: 82.61% (84.62% in 2014-2015; 79.41% in 2013-2014; 86.54% in 2012-2013)
  - Overall proficiency on relevant questions in the comprehensive exam was 72.83% (88.22% in 2014-201; 84.19% in 2013-2014; 80.91% in 2012-2013).
2. Financial management comprehensive examination (initially developed in Winter 2011, first administered in Summer 2011, and revised in Winter 2012 and Winter 2014). Assessment of the relevant questions (Questions 11, 22, 23, 24, and 26) from the comprehensive examination of the 46 students enrolled in the finance capstone FINA 495 in 2015-2016 on the valuation of publicly traded securities also showed poorer results as follows:
  - Common Stock (price-earnings): 78.26% (96.15% in 2014-2015; 85.29% in 2013-2014; 100% in 2012-2013)
  - Straight Bonds: 32.61% (65.39% in 2014-2015; 73.53% in 2013-2014; 38.46% in 2012-2013)
  - Callable Bonds: 34.78% (65.39% in 2014-2015; 60% in 2013-2014; 43.31% in 2012-2013)
  - Common Stock (constant dividends): 36.96% (88.46% in 2014-2015; 97.06% in 2013-2014; 90.38% in 2012-2013)
  - Preferred Stock: 76.09% (84.62% in 2014-2015; 82.35% in 2013-2014; 82.69% in 2012-2013)
  - Overall proficiency on relevant questions was 51.74% (80.00% in 2014-2015; 75.98% in 2013-2014; 64.10% in 2012-2013). This outcome no longer meets the performance target.
3. Financial management comprehensive examination (initially developed in Winter 2011, first administered in Summer 2011, and revised in Winter 2012 and Winter 2014). Assessment of the relevant questions (a basic Question 10 and the progressively more difficult Questions 16 and 17) from the comprehensive examination of the 46 students enrolled in the finance capstone FINA 495 subsequent to the last exam revision:  
Question 10: 56.52% (75.00% in 2014-2015; 70.59% in 2013-2014)

Question 16: 50.00% (65.38% in 2014-2015; 70.59% in 2013-2014)

Question 17: 41.30% (55.77% in 2014-2015; 54.94% in 2013-2014)

The two, more challenging questions 16 and 17 measuring the ability to calculate weighted average cost of capital (16 and 17) showed a worsening in proficiency from the previous year: 45.65% (vs. 61.77% in 2014-2015) but better than the initial results (34.62% in 2012-2013). Overall proficiency on the three relevant questions was 49.28% (65.39% in 2014-2015; and 65.37% in 2013-2014). This outcome still does not meet the performance target.

4. Financial management comprehensive examination (initially developed in Winter 2011, first administered in Summer 2011, and revised in Winter 2012 and Winter 2014). Assessment of the relevant questions (Questions 1, 7, 12, 13, 14, and 15) from the comprehensive examination of the 46 students enrolled in the finance capstone FINA 495 in the academic year 2014-2015. Questions on understanding and measuring capital structure (1 and 7) showed a proficiency level of 61.96% (81.73% in 2014-2015; 90.63% in 2013-2014; 81.73% in 2012-2013). Proficiency scores in the evaluation of capital investment alternatives (Questions 12, 13, 14, and 15) were as follows:

- Net present value: 47.83% (84.62% in 2014-2015; 64.71% in 2013-2014; 44.23% in 2012-2013)
- Internal rate of return (new question in 2013-2014): 26.09% in 2014-2015 (55.77% in 2014-2015; 67.65% in 2013-2014)  
Discounted payback (uneven cash flows): 32.61% (65.39% in 2014-2015; 52.94% in 2013-2014; 48.08% in 2012-2013)
- Equivalent annual cost: 50.00% (65.39% in 2014-2015; 64.71% in 2013-2014; 42.31% in 2012-2013)
- Overall proficiency on the 6 questions was 46.74% (72.44% in 2014-2015; 70.01% in 2013-2014; 54.81% in 2012-2013). This outcome no longer meets the performance target.

5. Financial management comprehensive examination (initially developed in Winter 2011, first administered in Summer 2011, and revised in Winter 2012 and Winter 2014). Assessment of the relevant questions (Questions 19, 20, 21, and a new 28) from the comprehensive examination of the 46 students enrolled in the finance capstone FINA 495 in the academic year 2014-2015:

- Currency premium in the forward market: 63.04% (84.62% in 2014-2015; 82.35% in 2013-2014)
- Currency spot conversion: 69.56% (90.39% in 2014-2015; and 91.18% in 2013-2014)
- Purchasing power parity: 28.26% (53.85% in 2014-2015; and 76.47% in 2013-2014)
- Currency transaction gain or loss (new question in 2013-2014): 58.70% (67.31% in 2014-2015; 58.82% in 2013-2014)
- Overall proficiency on the 5 questions was 59.89% (74.04% in 2014-2015; 77.21% in 2013-2014). On the three questions remaining from the previous version of the comprehensive exam the proficiency was 53.62% (76.28% in 2014-2015; 83.33% in 2013-2014; 56.41% in 2012-2013).

#### **Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:**

1. Responses by students to “Percent Recommend” of financial management courses in the 2015-2016 academic year were 89.0%, above goal of 85%, and better than in two of the three previous academic years (86.1% in 2014-2015; 90.1% in 2013-2014; 88.2% in 2012-2013).
2. Responses by students in the Graduating Student Survey: Percentage “Very Satisfied” and “Somewhat Satisfied” with “Major Program courses” was 100% in 2015-2016 (100%. In 2013-2014).

#### **Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes:**

Intended Student Learning Outcomes	Learning Assessment Measures							
Program ISLOs	Direct Measure 1	Direct Measure 2	Direct Measure 3	Direct Measure 4	Direct Measure 5	Indirect Measure 1	Indirect Measure 2	Indirect Measure 3
	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...
1. <i>Graduates will be able to use data provided within financial statements to calculate and analyze financial ratios and common-size statements</i>	Met							
2. <i>Graduates will be able to apply time-value-of-money and other techniques to determine the value of financial securities</i>		Not Met						
3. <i>Graduates will be able to calculate the weighted-average-cost-of-capital in the assessment of a firm's capital structure</i>			Not Met					
4. <i>Graduates will be able to evaluate the capital structure and investment alternatives of a firm</i>				Not Met				
5. <i>Graduates will be able to assess the impact of participation in global financial markets on a firm's decision-making</i>					Not Met			
<b>Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:</b>								
1. <i>For all 4 Program Learning Outcomes not met in the last academic year, the course and instructor performance in the course sections in which the comprehensive examination is delivered will be reviewed.</i>								

## Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2015-2016

### Section I: Student Learning Assessment

<b>Student Learning Assessment for <i>Bachelor of Science (BS) - Financial Planning</i></b>		
Intended Student Learning Outcomes for <i>(Program 1)</i> :		
1. Demonstrate written communication skills in financial planning.		
2. Analyze ethical issues in the financial planning profession.		
3. Apply strategies and techniques to manage financial exposure due to personal or business risk.		
4. Apply financial planning strategies and techniques to maximize the present value of the client's after-tax net worth.		
5. Apply strategies to efficiently preserve and distribute accumulated wealth.		
6. Develop long-term strategies and recommendations for a comprehensive financial plan.		
Assessment Tools for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Targets/Criteria for Direct Measures:	
1. Application of evaluation rubrics to the comprehensive financial plan project in FPLN495 capstone course.	80% met the outcome criteria at an acceptable level or above.	
2. Assignment 1-1 Ethics and Professional Responsibility in FPLN 495 capstone course.	Score at or above 85% on the Ethics and Professional Responsibility assignment.	
Assessment Tools for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Targets/Criteria for Indirect Measures:	
1. End of course reflection survey	80% of students feel that the program has provided some or above support to help them meet the program learning outcomes.	
Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Target Was...	
	Met	Not Met
1. <i>Outcome 1: 8% of the students have met the outcome at an acceptable level and 92% of the student met the proficient level. Overall, students have all met the outcome at an acceptable or above level yet there is room for enhancing business communication skills with a goal of moving the majority of students to the proficient level.</i>	X	

<p><i>Outcome 3: 92% of the students have met the outcome at an acceptable level or above. Students were able to identify the personal and business risks in the financial plan.</i></p> <p><i>Outcome 4: 92% of the students have met the outcome at an acceptable level or above. 92% of students provide sufficient investment strategy justifications.</i></p> <p><i>Outcome 5: 92% of the students have met the outcome at an acceptable level or above.</i></p> <p><i>Outcome 6: 92% of the students have met the outcome at an acceptable level or above. Students have provided financial planning recommendations in each of the major areas covered in the comprehensive plan.</i></p>	X	
<p>2. <i>Outcome 2: The eleven students who completed the Ethics and Professional Responsibility Assignment have an average of 100%.</i></p>	X	
<p>Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:</p>	Performance Target Was...	
	Met	Not Met
<p>1. <i>Outcome 1: Among the 5 responses, 40%, 40%, and 20% of the respondents reported that they feel the program has prepared them to demonstrate written communication skills in financial planning with some, substantial and excellent support respectively.</i></p> <p><i>Outcome 2: Among the 5 responses, 60% and 40% of the respondents reported that they feel the program has prepared them to analyze ethical issues in the financial planning profession with some and substantial support respectively.</i></p> <p><i>Outcome 3: Among the 5 responses, 40%, 20%, and 40% of the respondents reported that they feel the program has prepared them to apply strategies and techniques to manage financial exposure due to personal or business risk with some, substantial and excellent support respectively.</i></p> <p><i>Outcome 4: Among the 5 responses, 40%, 20%, and 40% of the respondents reported that they feel the program has prepared them to apply financial planning strategies and techniques to maximize the present value of the client's after-tax net worth with some, substantial and excellent support respectively.</i></p> <p><i>Outcome 5: Among the 5 responses, 40%, 20%, and 40% of the respondents reported that they feel the program has prepared them to apply strategies to efficiently preserve and distribute accumulated wealth with some, substantial and excellent support respectively.</i></p> <p><i>Outcome 6: Among the 5 responses, 40%, 20%, and 40% of the respondents reported that they feel the program has prepared them to Develop long-term strategies and recommendations for a comprehensive financial plan with some, substantial and excellent support respectively.</i></p>	X	

The overall results suggest that among the five respondents in the end of course reflection survey, they feel that the program has prepared them to accomplish the program learning outcomes with		
---	--	--

**Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Areas for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:**

1. *There is a significant improvement in the assessment results in verbal and written communication skills, specifically the % of student meeting the proficient level increased from 70% to 92% and the % of students meeting the acceptable level dropped from 30% to 8%. This is the result of a revision of curriculum after last year's assessment. Multiple communication skill related assignments were created and imbedded in the financial planning major area courses to improve the weakness in student's performance shown from last year's assessment results. Communication is a critical skill set for financial planning majors as there is active interaction with clients when practicing financial planning. The program chair will continue monitoring students' performance in this area and put an emphasis on providing constructive feedback to peers in communication assignments.*
2. *A few action plans are created below based on the quantitative feedback in the reflection survey:*
  - *Provide a template for the comprehensive financial plan project*
  - *Place more emphasis on ethics discussions*
  - *Continue using the same textbook for the capstone course; multiple positive feedback on the case studies provided in the textbook. Create case study assignments in a variety formats.*

## Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2015 - 2016

### Section I: Student Learning Assessment

Student Learning Assessment for: <i>Bachelor of Science (BS) – Forensic Accounting</i>	
Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes (Program ISLOs)	
1. Graduates will apply logical thinking and critical analysis.	
2. Graduates will research specific financial accounting issues.	
3. Graduates will analyze ethical issues in the accounting profession.	
4. Graduates will analyze information systems through evaluation of process controls and organizational system risks within a business process.	
5. Graduates will demonstrate written communication skills in accounting.	
6. Graduates will construct documentation of the findings of an interview plan.	
7. Graduates will construct documentation of the findings of a fraud investigation.	
8. Graduates will construct documentation analyzing internal controls.	
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:
1. ISLO # 1 – ACCT 495: <i>Accounting Research and Analysis</i> , “Critical Thinking” assignment.	In 70% or more instances for each criterion, students scored at or above either the 70% mark (“Acceptable”) or 80% mark (“Proficient”).
2. ISLO # 2 – ACCT 495: <i>Accounting Research and Analysis</i> , “Auditor’s Observation of Physical Inventory” assignment.	In 70% or more instances for each criterion, students scored at or above either the 70% mark (“Acceptable”) or 80% mark (“Proficient”).
3. ISLO # 3 – ACCT 495: <i>Accounting Research and Analysis</i> , “Application of Classical Ethical Theories” assignment.	In 70% or more instances for each criterion, students scored at or above either the 70% mark (“Acceptable”) or 80% mark (“Proficient”).
4. ISLO # 4 – ACCT 425: <i>Accounting Information Systems</i> , “Accounting Information Systems Final Project.	In 70% or more instances for each criterion, students scored at or above either the 70% mark (“Acceptable”) or 80% mark (“Proficient”).



5. ISLO # 5 – ACCT 495: <i>Accounting Research and Analysis</i> , “Written Communication Skills” assignment.	In 70% or more instances for each criterion, students scored at or above either the 70% mark (“Acceptable”) or 80% mark (“Proficient”).
6. ISLO # 6 – ACCT 342: <i>Interviewing Techniques for Fraud Investigations – “Interview Critique Write-Up”</i>	In 70% or more of the instances for each criterion, students will score at or above either the 70% mark (“Acceptable”) or the 80% mark (“Proficient”).
7. ISLO # 7 – ACCT 343: <i>Legal Elements of Fraud – “Fraud Case Write-Up”</i>	In 70% or more of the instances for each criterion, students will score at or above either the 70% mark (“Acceptable”) or the 80% mark (“Proficient”).
8. ISLO # 8 – ACCT 344: <i>Corporate Governance and Internal Control Assessment – “Internal Control – Final Project and Presentation”</i>	In 70% or more of the instances for each criterion, students will score at or above either the 70% mark (“Acceptable”) or the 80% mark (“Proficient”).
<b>Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:</b>	<b>Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Indirect Measures:</b>
1. ISLOs # 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5: End of course Reflection Survey (to be embedded in ACCT 495).	Using the Reflection Survey, students will rate to what extent they think this program has prepared them to meet the learning outcomes, based on ratings of Below, At, or Above Expectations. For each Learning Outcome, at least 80% of students’ responses will meet or exceed the “At Expectations” or “Above Expectations” mark.
<b>Learning Assessment Results: Bachelor of Science (BS) – Forensic Accounting</b>	
<b>Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:</b>	
1. ISLO # 1: Results showed that students are proficient in the application of logical thinking and critical analysis, with 99% of students scoring at or above the 70% mark (“Acceptable”).	
2. ISLO # 2: Results showed that students are proficient in research and analysis of financial accounting issues, with 100% of students scoring at or above the 70% mark (“Acceptable”).	
3. ISLO # 3: Results showed that students analyze ethical issues in the accounting profession, with 100% of students scoring at or above the 70% mark (“Acceptable”).	
4. ISLO # 4: Results showed that students analyze information systems through evaluation of process controls and organizational system risks within a business process, with 97% of students scoring at or above the 70% mark (“Acceptable”).	
5. ISLO # 5: Results showed that students demonstrate effective written communication skills in accounting, with 98% of students scoring at or above the 70% mark (“Acceptable”).	

6. ISLO # 6: Results showed that some improvement has been achieved compared to previous years, with nearly 100% of students exceeding the 70% (Acceptable) mark for all but one of the assessment criteria. Additional improvement is needed in the criterion, “Plan and evaluate the order of interview questions.”
7. ISLO # 7: Although results showed that some improvement has been achieved, additional improvement is needed in some aspects of preparing a fraud report (i.e., appropriateness and accuracy of documentary evidence, and visual aids).
8. ISLO # 8: Although results showed that some improvement has been achieved, additional improvement is needed in some aspects of preparing an internal control test plan fraud report.

**Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:**

1. ISLOs # 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 – Graduating Student Reflection Survey: For each Learning Outcome, 80% of students’ responses met or exceeded the “At Expectations” or “Above Expectations” mark.

**Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes:**

Intended Student Learning Outcomes	Learning Assessment Measures							
Program ISLOs	<i>Direct Measure 1</i>	<i>Direct Measure 2</i>	<i>Direct Measure 3</i>	<i>Direct Measure 4</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 1</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 2</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 3</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 4</i>
	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...
1. <i>Program Learning Outcome 1</i>	Met							
2. <i>Program Learning Outcome 2</i>	Met							
3. <i>Program Learning Outcome 3</i>	Met							
4. <i>Program Learning Outcome 4</i>	Met							
5. <i>Program Learning Outcome 5</i>	Met							
6. <i>Program Learning Outcome 6</i>	Met							
7. <i>Program Learning Outcome 7</i>	Met							
8. <i>Program Learning Outcome 8</i>	Met							

**Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:**

1. *Course of Action* – ISLOs 6, 7, & 8: Faculty members responsible for teaching ACCT 342, 343, & 344 have been encouraged to spend more time and attention teaching and reinforcing the skills related to students’ work regarding these ISLOs (most recently in an online faculty meeting held in June 2016). Greater emphasis will continue to be placed on students’ achievement and quality improvement regarding these three ISLOs.

2. *Course of Action 2*

3. *Course of Action 3*

4. *Course of Action 4*

## Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2015-2016

### Section I: Student Learning Assessment

Student Learning Assessment for: <i>Bachelor of Science, Human Resource Management</i>	
Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes (Program ISLOs)	
1. <i>Integrate Human Resources theories and concepts to determine the optimal strategic direction for an organization</i>	
2. <i>Apply concepts and theories of compensation to realistic organizational situations</i>	
3. <i>Analyze a workplace situation and create a training/development program to meet the needs of the organization</i>	
4. <i>Evaluate an organization's staffing requirements and recommend methods for improvement</i>	
5. <i>Apply employee and labor relations concepts and theories to organizational situations</i>	
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:
1. <i>HRM 493 GCC Strategic Planning Paper</i>	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 1 80 % of students who major in Human Resource Management will score at least 2.0 (on a 3-point scale) on the capstone evaluation rubric.</i>
2. <i>HRM 495 Final Exam</i>	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 2 80 % of students who major in Human Resource Management will score at least 80% on the final exam.</i>
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Indirect Measures:
1. <i>Course Recommend</i>	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Indirect Measure 1: At least 80% of students majoring in HRM will recommend the course</i>
2. <i>Faculty Recommend</i>	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Indirect Measure 2: At least 80% of students majoring in HRM will recommend the faculty</i>
3. <i>Course Rating</i>	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Indirect Measure 3: The course rating for students majoring in HRM will be at least 3.0 (on a 4-point scale)</i>

**Learning Assessment Results: Bachelor of Science, Human Resource Management**

**Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:**

1. HRM 495 GCC Strategic Planning Paper – 100 % of students in the Human Resource Management degree program scored at least 2.0 (on a 3 point scale) on the capstone evaluation rubric.
2. HRM 495 Final Exam - 93 % of students in the Human Resource Management degree program scored at least 80% on the HRM 495 Final Exam.

**Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:**

3. Course Recommend- 87.8% of students majoring in HRM recommended the course
4. Faculty Recommend- 87.6% of students majoring in HRM recommended their faculty
5. Course Rating - The course rating for students majoring in HRM was 3.41 (on a 4-point scale)

**Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes:**

Intended Student Learning Outcomes	Learning Assessment Measures							
Program ISLOs	Direct Measure 1	Direct Measure 2	Direct Measure 3	Direct Measure 4	Indirect Measure 1	Indirect Measure 2	Indirect Measure 3	Indirect Measure 4
	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...
1. Integrate Human Resources theories and concepts to determine the optimal strategic direction for an organization	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
2. Apply concepts and theories of compensation to realistic organizational situations	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
3. Analyze a workplace situation and create a training/development program to meet the needs of the organization	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
4. Evaluate an organization's staffing requirements and recommend methods for improvement	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met

5. <i>Apply employee and labor relations concepts and theories to organizational situations</i>	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

**Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:**

1. *No action required as all learning performance measures were met*

## Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2015-2016

### Section I: Student Learning Assessment

Student Learning Assessment for: <i>Bachelor of Science, Management and Leadership</i>	
Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes (Program ISLOs)	
1. <i>Analyze organizational culture and evaluate its impact on organizational performance</i>	
2. <i>Analyze the organizational behavior of a department or business and recommend changes for improvement</i>	
3. <i>Analyze, recommend, and apply change management processes to real world situations</i>	
4. <i>Create a leadership development plan through the integration of transformational leadership theory.</i>	
5. <i>Integrate management and leadership theories and concepts to determine the optimal strategic</i>	
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:
1. <i>MGMT 440 Week 6 Final Paper</i>	<i>Based on an assessment of this core course assignment, at least 80% of students who major in Management and Leadership will meet this program outcome at or above the acceptable level (2 points on a 3 point scale with 3 points being “proficient”).</i>
2. <i>MGMT 325 – Final Paper</i>  <i>Peregrine CPC Exam</i>	<i>Based on an independent assessment of this core course assignment by trained university assessors, at least 80% of students who major in Management and Leadership will meet this program outcome at or above the acceptable level (2 points on a 3 point scale with 3 points being “proficient”).</i>  <i>Peregrine Exam results will reflect that students are at or above average in competency exam results based upon guidelines provided by the Peregrine Exam.</i>
3. <i>MGMT 425 Final Case Study Assignment</i>	<i>Based on a course embedded assessment of this core course assignment, at least 80% of students who major in Management and Leadership will meet this program outcome at or above the “meets expectations” or</i>

	<i>“exceeds expectations” level (points on a 3 point scale with 3 points being “exceeds expectations”).</i>
4. <i>MGMT 470 Final Paper</i>  <i>Peregrine CPC Exam</i>	<i>Based on an independent assessment of this core course assignment by trained university assessors, at least 80% of students who major in Management and Leadership will meet this program outcome at or above the acceptable level (2 points on a 3 point scale with 3 points being “proficient”).</i>  <i>Peregrine Exam results will reflect that students are at or above average in competency exam results based upon guidelines provided by the Peregrine Exam.</i>
5. <i>MGMT 495 Portfolio – Assignment: Strategic Plan Document</i>  <i>MGMT 495 CPC Peregrine Exam</i>	<i>Based on an independent assessment of this core course assignment by trained university assessors, at least 80% of students who major in Management and Leadership will meet this program outcome at or above the acceptable level (2 points on a 3 point scale with 3 points being “proficient”).</i>  <i>Peregrine Exam results will reflect that students are at or above average in competency exam results based upon guidelines provided by the Peregrine Exam.</i>
<b>Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:</b>	<b>Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Indirect Measures:</b>
1. <i>Program reflective survey results for all Management and Leadership program outcomes</i>	<i>85% of the students will rank the Management and Leadership program outcomes as meeting and exceeding expectations.</i>
<b>Learning Assessment Results: Bachelor of Science, Management and Leadership</b>	
<b>Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:</b>	
1. <i>Holistically, 100% of the students met this outcome as follows: the exceeds expectations level (79%) and at the meets expectations level (21%).</i>	
2. <i>This outcome is not slated for formal assessment this academic year. However, Peregrine Business Core Exam results for the academic year 2015-2016 reflect that program students scored at the average level for competency which was 56% within the 40-59% score range for IACBE Outbound Average Rankings.</i>	



3. Overall, 94% of the students met this outcome as follows: at the exceeds expectations level (75%) and at the meets expectations level (19%).

4. This outcome is not slated for formal assessment this academic year. However, Peregrine Business Core Exam results for the academic year 2015-2016 reflect that program students scored at the average level for competency for "Business Leadership which was 50% or within the 40-59% score range for IACBE Outbound Average Rankings.

5. This capstone program outcome is not slated for formal assessment this academic year. However, Peregrine Business Core Exam results for the academic year 2015-2016 reflect that program students scored at the average level or 52% for competency for "Integrated Strategic Management" which is in the average range in comparison to IACBE Outbound aggregate national scores.

**Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:**

1. 94% of program students rated this outcome as meeting or exceeding expectations.
2. 97% of program students rated this outcome as meeting or exceeding expectations.
3. 96% of program students rated this outcome as meeting or exceeding expectations.
4. 90% of program students rated this outcome as meeting or exceeding expectations.
5. 97% of program students rated this outcome as meeting or exceeding expectations.

**Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes:**

Intended Student Learning Outcomes	Learning Assessment Measures							
Program ISLOs	Direct Measure 1	Direct Measure 2	Direct Measure 3	Direct Measure 4	Indirect Measure 1	Indirect Measure 2	Indirect Measure 3	Indirect Measure 4
	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...
1. Analyze organizational culture and evaluate its impact on organizational performance	Met				Met			
2. Analyze the organizational behavior of a department or business and recommend changes for improvement	N/A				Met			
3. Analyze, recommend, and apply change management processes to real world situations	Met				Met			

4. <i>Create a leadership development plan through the integration of transformational leadership theory</i>	N/A				Met			
5. <i>Integrate management and leadership theories and concepts to determine the optimal strategic direction of an organization</i>	N/A				Met			

**Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:**

1. *There is not a need for a substantive course of action to improve performance targets at this time.*

## Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2015-16

### Section I: Student Learning Assessment

Student Learning Assessment for: <i>Bachelor of Science, Marketing</i>	
Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes (Program ISLOs)	
5. Demonstrate knowledge of foundational terms, concepts, principles, and theories of the marketing profession.	
6. Use consumer behavior constructs and marketing research methods to assess information needs and to collect, analyze and interpret data.	
7. Apply promotional tactics to shape product image and the purchase decision	
8. Analyze and evaluate the design, development, and implementation of digital marketing initiatives.	
9. Create and present a strategic Marketing plan.	
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:
1. Comprehensive objective test Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 1	Students who major in Marketing will score at least an average of 70% on the comprehensive objective test.
2. Capstone written project Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 2, 3, 4, 5	Students who major in Marketing will score the mathematical equivalent of at least a 2.0 on a 3.0 scale on the capstone written project
3. Capstone oral presentation Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 5	Students who major in Marketing will score the mathematical equivalent of at least a 2.0 on a 3.0 scale on the capstone oral presentation
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Indirect Measures:
4. Capstone reflection paper Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: n/a	At least 80% of graduating students who major in Marketing will express satisfaction with the content of the curriculum relative to the ISLOs.
<b>Learning Assessment Results: <i>Marketing</i></b>	
<b>Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:</b>	

4. While average score met the threshold, it is clear that some students do not retain the knowledge of foundational marketing concepts through their college career.

5. Students are performing well.

6. Students are performing well.

**Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:**

2. N/A - data was not collected in 2015-16 academic year.

**Intended Student Learning Outcomes**

Program ISLOs	Direct Measure 1	Direct Measure 2	Direct Measure 3	Indirect Measure 1
	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...
5. Program Learning Outcome 1	met			n/a
6. Program Learning Outcome 2		met		n/a
7. Program Learning Outcome 3		met		n/a
8. Program Learning Outcome 4		met		n/a
9. Program Learning Outcome 5		met	met	n/a

**Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:**

5. n/a

6. n/a

7. n/a

8. n/a

## Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2015-2016

### Section I: Student Learning Assessment

Student Learning Assessment for: <i>Operations &amp; Supply Chain Management</i>	
Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes (Program ISLOs)	
1. <i>Build network models using Linear Programming methods and software.</i>	Broad-Based Student Learning Goals Associated with this Outcome: 3,4 Key Learning Outcomes for Bachelor's-Level Business Programs to which this Outcome is Linked: 6,7
2. <i>Create plans to optimize manufacturing and service processes with minimal impact on the environment.</i>	Broad-Based Student Learning Goals Associated with this Outcome: 3,4 Key Learning Outcomes for Bachelor's-Level Business Programs to which this Outcome is Linked: 6,7
3. <i>Produce quality standards for manufacturing and service processes that meet customer requirements.</i>	Broad-Based Student Learning Goals Associated with this Outcome: 3,4 Key Learning Outcomes for Bachelor's-Level Business Programs to which this Outcome is Linked: 6,7
4. <i>Design efficient supply chains.</i>	Broad-Based Student Learning Goals Associated with this Outcome: 3,4 Key Learning Outcomes for Bachelor's-Level Business Programs to which this Outcome is Linked: 6,7
5. <i>Create processes for moving resources efficiently between locations.</i>	Broad-Based Student Learning Goals Associated with this Outcome: 3,4 Key Learning Outcomes for Bachelor's-Level Business Programs to which this Outcome is Linked: 6,7
6. <i>Formulate efficient ways to acquire and store resources.</i>	Broad-Based Student Learning Goals Associated with this Outcome: 3,4 Key Learning Outcomes for Bachelor's-Level Business Programs to which this Outcome is Linked: 6,7
7. <i>Explain the principles and processes required to efficiently manage multiple projects.</i>	Broad-Based Student Learning Goals Associated with this Outcome: 3,4 Key Learning Outcomes for Bachelor's-Level Business Programs to which this Outcome is Linked: 6,7
8. <i>Design a program plan for the development of a product</i>	Broad-Based Student Learning Goals Associated with this Outcome: 1,2,3,4 Key Learning Outcomes for Bachelor's-Level Business Programs to which this Outcome is Linked: 6,7

<b>Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:</b>	<b>Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:</b>
1. <i>Program Plan Capstone Project Assessment, Assessing All Outcomes 1-8</i>	<i>Students will meet the outcomes at an acceptable level or above.</i>
2. <i>Peregrine CPC-Comp exam during Capstone course – standard CPC topic modules. Assessing Business Core Outcomes</i>	<i>The average Final Scores for OSCM students will be above the Average level, which is 40%, as defined by Peregrine.</i>
<b>Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:</b>	<b>Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Indirect Measures:</b>
1. <i>Reflection Object in OSCM 495 to assess all outcomes.</i>	<i>80% will rate the OSCM program as “meet expectations” or above on all outcomes</i>

**Learning Assessment Results: Name of Program 1**

**Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:**

1. *26 students meet the outcomes at an acceptable level or above.*
2. *26 students scored above 40% on the CPC exam. The average score on the CPC exam by the students was 65.4%*

**Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:**

1. *The reflection object was not added to this program in time for this assessment interval. However, of the students answering the course survey, 80.4% recommended professors and 89.1% recommended courses in the OSCM program.*

**Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes:**

Intended Student Learning Outcomes	Learning Assessment Measures							
	<i>Direct Measure 1</i>	<i>Direct Measure 2</i>	<i>Direct Measure 3</i>	<i>Direct Measure 4</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 1</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 2</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 3</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 4</i>
<b>Program ISLOs</b>	<b>Performance Target Was...</b>	<b>Performance Target Was...</b>	<b>Performance Target Was...</b>	<b>Performance Target Was...</b>	<b>Performance Target Was...</b>	<b>Performance Target Was...</b>	<b>Performance Target Was...</b>	<b>Performance Target Was...</b>
1. <i>Program Learning Outcome 1</i>	Met	Met	NA	NA	Met	NA	NA	NA
2. <i>Program Learning Outcome 2</i>	Met	Met	NA	NA	Met	NA	NA	NA
3. <i>Program Learning Outcome 3</i>	Met	Met	NA	NA	Met	NA	NA	NA
4. <i>Program Learning Outcome 4</i>	Met	Met	NA	NA	Met	NA	NA	NA

5. <i>Program Learning Outcome 5</i>	Met	Met	NA	NA	Met	NA	NA	NA
6. <i>Program Learning Outcome 6</i>	Met	Met	NA	NA	Met	NA	NA	NA
7. <i>Program Learning Outcome 7</i>	Met	Met	NA	NA	Met	NA	NA	NA
8. <i>Program Learning Outcome 8</i>	Met	Met	NA	NA	Met	NA	NA	NA

**Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:**

1. *All performance targets were met, no changes are required currently. Reflection paper should be put in course by end of 2016.*

2. *Course of Action 2*

3. *Course of Action 3*

4. *Course of Action 4*

## Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2015-2016

### Section I: Student Learning Assessment

Student Learning Assessment for: <i>Master of Science in Accounting</i>	
Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes (Program ISLOs)	
5. <i>Program Learning Outcome 1: Investigate and evaluate specific enterprise-wide planning system issues.</i>	
6. <i>Program Learning Outcome 2: Investigate and evaluate forensic accounting issues.</i>	
7. <i>Program Learning Outcome 3: Investigate and evaluate audit or data mining issues.</i>	
8. <i>Program Learning Outcome 4: Investigate and evaluate specific risk assessment and implementation issues.</i>	
9. <i>Program Learning Outcome 5: Research and synthesize specific accounting information to create new knowledge.</i>	
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:
4. <i>Direct Measure 1</i>  <i>ACCT 731: Enterprise Resource Planning Systems – “<u>Final Research Paper</u>”. This assignment will demonstrate a student’s ability to research and analyze issues related to enterprise-wide software systems in organizations. Measures Intended Student Learning Outcome 1.</i>	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 1</i> <i>Students’ score on all criteria is 2 (i.e. acceptable) or higher on the embedded measure.</i> <i>Actual score 3.</i>
5. <i>Direct Measure 2</i>  <i>ACCT 732: Forensic Accounting – “<u>Final Research Paper</u>”. This assignment will demonstrate a student’s ability to research and analyze issues related to detecting and/or preventing fraudulent accounting prolems in organizations. Measures Intended Student Learning Outcome 2.</i>	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 2</i> <i>Students’ score on all criteria is 2 (i.e. acceptable) or higher on the embedded measure.</i> <i>Actual score 3</i>
6. <i>Direct Measure 3</i>  <i>ACCT 733: Advanced Auditing and Data Mining Techniques – “<u>Final Research Paper</u>”. This assignment will demonstrate a student’s ability to research and evaluate auditing issues facing organizations. Measures Intended Student Learning Outcome 3.</i>	<i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 3</i> <i>Students’ score on all criteria is 2 (i.e. acceptable) or higher on the embedded measure.</i> <i>Actual score 3</i>



<p>7. <i>Direct Measure 4</i></p> <p><i>ACCT 734: Enterprise Risk Analysis and Management – “<u>Final Research Paper</u>”. This assignment will demonstrate a student’s ability to research and analyze issues related to various financial and non-financial risks facing an organization. Measures Intended Student Learning Outcome 4.</i></p>	<p><i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 4</i></p> <p><i>Students’ score on all criteria is 2 (i.e. acceptable) or higher on the embedded measure.</i></p> <p><i>Actual score 2.72</i></p>
<p>8. <i>Direct Measure 5</i></p> <p><i>ACCT 795: Accounting Research Seminar – “<u>Final Research Paper</u>”. This assignment will demonstrate a student’s ability to communicate specific research and findings facing the accounting profession. Measures Intended Student Learning Outcome 5.</i></p>	<p><i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Direct Measure 5</i></p> <p><i>Students’ score on all criteria is 2 (i.e. acceptable) or higher on the embedded measure.</i></p> <p><i>Actual score 2.93</i></p>
<b>Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:</b>	<b>Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Indirect Measures:</b>
<p>5. <i>Indirect Measure 1</i></p> <p><i>Embedded program survey in the Capstone (Acct 795) course.</i></p>	<p><i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Indirect Measure 1:</i></p> <p><i>At least 80% of graduating students who’s major is Master of Science in Accounting will be satisfied with the content of their curriculum.</i></p>
<p>6. <i>Indirect Measure 2</i></p> <p><i>Capstone Reflection Survey with embedded learning outcome questionnaire. (Measures learning outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, &amp; 5</i></p>	<p><i>Objective (Target/Criterion) for Indirect Measure 2:</i></p> <p><i>At least 80% of MSA students will score at least 2.0 (on a 4 point scale) on each of the five learning outcomes on the embedded learning outcome questionnaire.</i></p>
<b>Learning Assessment Results: <i>Name of Program 1</i></b>	
<b>Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:</b>	
4. <i>Summary of Results for Direct Measure 1: Actual score 3.</i>	
5. <i>Summary of Results for Direct Measure 2: Actual score 3.</i>	

6. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 3: Actual score 3.*

7. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 4: Actual score 2.72*

8. *Summary of Results for Direct Measure 5: Actual score 2.93*

**Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:**

8. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 1: The Capstone survey indicated that students are generally satisfied with the content of their curriculum. All courses received 80% or better with the one exception being Acct 733 which indicated a satisfaction rating of 60%. Given this single exception, the overall content of the program as a whole receives satisfactory ratings from students.*

9. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 2: This measure shows students are overall satisfied with the MSA Program. Of the students responding to the survey, 80% rated the program as a 3 or 4 on a 4 point scale. A weakness is indicated in the tax courses where the ratings were much less than the overall program and the other courses. Every tax course received a rating of 2 or 3 on a 4 point scale and no course received a 4.*

**Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes:**

Intended Student Learning Outcomes	Learning Assessment Measures							
	<i>Direct Measure 1</i>	<i>Direct Measure 2</i>	<i>Direct Measure 3</i>	<i>Direct Measure 4</i>	<i>Direct Measure 5</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 1</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 2</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 3</i>
	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...
6. <i>Program Learning Outcome 1</i>	Met							
7. <i>Program Learning Outcome 2</i>		Met						
8. <i>Program Learning Outcome 3</i>			Met					
9. <i>Program Learning Outcome 4</i>				Met				
10. <i>Program Learning Outcome 5</i>					met			

**Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:**

7. *Course of Action 1*

8. *Course of Action 2*

9. *Course of Action 3*

10. *Course of Action 4*

## Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2015-2016

### Section I: Student Learning Assessment

<b>Student Learning Assessment for: <i>Master of Business Administration</i></b>	
<b>Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes (Program ISLOs)</b>	
1. Create and communicate sustained, coherent arguments in two or more media to both internal and external audiences of a business organization.	
2. Integrate and initiate tactical, operational, and strategic decision making to address organizational challenges.	
3. Design and execute solutions for problems using a multi-functional business approach.	
4. Deconstruct and reformulate business decisions by applying theoretical and practical perspectives from multiple disciplines.	
<b>Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:</b>	<b>Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:</b>
1. ETS Major Field Test Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 2 and 4	The Institutional Test Score for the MBA Program will fall within one standard deviation of the ETS mean, as indicated on the Comparative Data Guide.
2. GLO-BUS Business Simulation Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 1, 2, 3 and 4	In the MBA Program, at least 85% of teams will score a 60 or better on the GLO-BUS simulation Investor Expectation (IE) score.
<b>Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:</b>	<b>Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Indirect Measures:</b>
1. Graduating Student Survey  Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: N/A	85% or above overall satisfaction with program

<p>2. End of Course Evaluations</p> <p>Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: N/A</p>	<p>85% or above overall satisfaction with program</p>
<p><b>Learning Assessment Results: <i>Name of Program 1</i></b></p>	
<p><b>Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:</b></p>	
<p>For the assessment period of 2015-2016, the MBA Program Institutional Test Score average was 245.194 (245.37 in 2014-2015; 243 in 2013-2014; 247 in 2012-2013). The ETS average reported in the 2016 Comparative Data Guide was 247.9 (248.1 in 2014-2015; 249 in 2013-2014; 248 in 2012-2013) with a Standard Deviation of 16.1 (16.1 in 2014-2015; 9.2 in 2013-2014 and 8.3 in 2012-2013). In 2015-2016 the Franklin MBA score average of 245.194 was well within one standard deviation of the 2016 ETS mean (232.0 to 264.2). (In 2014-2015 the Franklin MBA score of 245.37 was similarly well within one standard deviation of the ETS mean (231.8 to 264.0)).</p> <p>Average scores/number of students for subsets of MBA students in 2015-2016 (2014-2015) were:</p> <p>Domestic Face-to-Face: 245.66/58 (244.78/73)</p> <p>Domestic Online: 247.97/115 (248.49/125)</p> <p>All Domestic: 247.195/173 (246.91/218)</p> <p>Oman: 227.143/28 (230.28/46)</p> <p>Poland: 256.471/17 (249.69 (36)</p> <p>Serbia: 234.333/3</p> <p>All International: 237.979/48 (242.08/102)</p> <p>All Domestic and International: 245.194/221 (245.37/320)</p>	
<p>2. For the assessment period of 2015-2016, of the 271 MBA students who took part in the GLO-BUS simulation 87.82% scored 60 or better on the Investor Expectation (IE) score. This number is a decrease from the previous year but still above the performance target. Prior results were 96.83 in 2014-2015; 87.14% in 2013-2014; and 87.18% in percent in 2012-2013.</p>	
<p>3. <i>Summary of Results for Direct Measure 3</i></p>	
<p>4. <i>Summary of Results for Direct Measure 4</i></p>	
<p><b>Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:</b></p>	

1. For the 2015-2016 assessment period 94.44% of survey respondents were very or somewhat satisfied with the overall content of their curriculum (92.105% in 2013-2014).

2. For the 2015-2016 assessment period average percent recommendation of the Master of Business Administration courses was 87.8% (90.0% in 2014-2015; 87.8% in 2013-2014.)

3. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 3*

4. *Summary of Results for Indirect Measure 4*

**Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes:**

Intended Student Learning Outcomes	Learning Assessment Measures							
	<i>Direct Measure 1</i>	<i>Direct Measure 2</i>	<i>Direct Measure 3</i>	<i>Direct Measure 4</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 1</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 2</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 3</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 4</i>
	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...
11. <i>Program Learning Outcome 1</i>		Met			Met	Met		
12. <i>Program Learning Outcome 2</i>	Met	Met			Met	Met		
13. <i>Program Learning Outcome 3</i>		Met			Met	Met		
14. <i>Program Learning Outcome 4</i>	Met	Met			Met	Met		
15. <i>Program Learning Outcome 5</i>								

**Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:**

11.*Course of Action 1*

12.*Course of Action 2*

13.*Course of Action 3*

14.*Course of Action 4*

## Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2015-16

### Section I: Student Learning Assessment

<b>Student Learning Assessment for: <i>MS in Marketing &amp; Communication (MCM)</i></b>	
<b>Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes (Program ISLOs)</b>	
1. Develop research and theory-based marketing communication strategies to support organizational goals and objectives.	
2. Recommend and evaluate traditional and contemporary processes and tactics to implement marketing communication strategies.	
3. Communicate with internal and external audiences.	
4. Integrate scholarly marketing communication knowledge into marketing communication practices.	
<b>Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:</b>	
<b>Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:</b>	
1. Marketing Communication Plan	At least 90% of students in the Master of Science in Marketing & Communication program will be assessed at a level of acceptable or above on the MCM program outcomes as measured by the following program master course assignment: Marketing Communication Plan - MCM 733 Marketing Communication Planning.
2. Agency Presentation	At least 90% of students in the Master of Science in Marketing & Communication program will be assessed at a level of acceptable or above on the MCM program outcomes as measured by the following program mastery course assignment: Agency Presentation - MCM 733 Marketing Communication Planning.
3. Report to Shareholders Presentation	At least 90% of students in the Master of Science in Marketing & Communication program will be assessed at a level of acceptable or above on the MCM program outcomes as measured by the following program mastery course assignment: Report to Shareholders Presentation - MCM 737: Marketing Communication Management and Leadership.

4. Scholarly Research Paper	At least 90% of students in the Master of Science in Marketing & Communication program will be assessed at a level of acceptable or above on the MCM program outcomes as measured by the following program mastery course assignment: Completing the Scholarly Research Paper - MCM 741: MCM Capstone.
<b>Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:</b>	<b>Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Indirect Measures:</b>
1. End of Course Course Evaluations	At least 85% of students on average in the Master of Science in Marketing & Communication program will express satisfaction with the course.
2. End of Course Faculty Evaluations	At least 85% of students on average in the Master of Science in Marketing & Communication program will express satisfaction with the faculty member teaching the course.
<b>Learning Assessment Results: MS in Marketing &amp; Communication (MCM)</b>	
<b>Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:</b>	
1. MCM 733 Marketing Communication Plan - % of students rated as acceptable or above: Outcome 1 (100%) Outcome 2 (100%)	
2. MCM 733 Agency Presentation - % of students rated as acceptable or above: Outcome 3 (100%)	
3. MCM 737 Report to Shareholders Presentation - % of students rated as acceptable or above: Outcome 1 (100%) Outcome 2 (100%) Outcome 3 (100%)	



4. MCM 741 - Scholarly Research Paper - % of students rated as acceptable or above:  
 Outcome 1 (100%)  
 Outcome 4 (100%)

**Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:**

1. On average, 88.0% of MCM students would “Recommend” the course based on End of Course Evaluations.  
 2. On average, 86.9% of MCM students would “Recommend” the instructor based on End of Course Evaluations.

**Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes:**

Intended Student Learning Outcomes	Learning Assessment Measures							
Program ISLOs	<i>Direct Measure 1</i>	<i>Direct Measure 2</i>	<i>Direct Measure 3</i>	<i>Direct Measure 4</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 1</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 2</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 3</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 4</i>
	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...
1. Develop research and theory-based marketing communication strategies to support organizational goals and objectives.	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met		
2. Recommend and evaluate traditional and contemporary processes and tactics to implement marketing communication strategies.	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met		
3. Communicate with internal and external audiences.	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met		
4. Integrate scholarly marketing communication knowledge into marketing communication practices.	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met		

Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:								
5. na								
6. na								
7. na								
8. na								