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# I. Overview

The academic year 2015-2016 included a variety of new and substantial changes in Curriculum Management (CM) within the College of Business. In both major areas of CM, curriculum development and assurance of learning (AOL), there were some significant changes and improvements. These changes resulted in a new revision of the Curriculum Management Handbook (December, 2015).

In curriculum development, there were a variety of developments, including the in-house approval of a new program of study (BBA in Supply Chain Management). Another major (BS-Information Systems), approved at UCA last academic year, was approved at the state level and is now a formal course of study at UCA, starting in Fall 2015. For AOL, this year was the first full academic year of using our new process for assessing and improving student learning. This report will examine both of these areas.

# II. Curriculum Development and Review

There were a host of curricula development items that were approved over the course of the past academic year. The primary purpose of these changes were to provide a “current, responsive, and innovative curriculum” [COB Vision].

In Spring 2015, the first major, the BBA-MIS was presented to interested faculty to some interesting discussion. The presentation covered current curriculum, curricula at other institutions, current pedagogies (online, hybrid, face-to-face), the new proposed major, BS in Information Systems, relationships between MIS and external stakeholders, and the future of MIS. A copy of this presentation is available on the UCA COB Pool Drive (P:\COB\Committees\CAC\CurriculumReviews).

**Major Curricula Highlights (2015-2016)**

**Major Curricula Changes Past Year**

* New proposed program: BBA in Logistics & Supply Chain Management
* One new minor and significant changes in allowable minors
* New couses: three new courses
* Electronic Delivery: twenty-eight courses approved for online delivery
* Significant improvement in online course delivery
* BS-Information Systems approved at the state level

Below are highlights:

1. **New Program: Bachelor of Business Administration in Logistics and Supply Chain Management.** This was approved at the COB CAC in February 2016. It was approved by the Undergraduate Council and Council of Deans in April/May 2016. It is now at the Arkansas Department of Higher Education (ADHE) for final approval. This is expected in the summer of 2016; the projected start date for the program is in 2017. This proposed major resulted from substantial involvement with the transportation industry in Arkansas, in particular the trucking industry. The city of Conway is fortuitously located in the middle of the I-40 corridor, along with major trucking companies. The Marketing and Management Department received a $3,000,000 grant in part to start this major. Another new program, the BS-Information Systems, was approved by ADHE and formally started in Fall 2016.

2. **New Minor:** one new minor was approved in Logistics and Supply Chain Management. For students who major in another discipline, this provides a convenient minor in this growing area.

3. **Changes in Current Minors**: business majors (BBA degree only) do not require a minor nor have they been allowed to minor in any business discipline. Minors in business disciplines (of which there are several), have come strictly from majors outside the College of Business (except for a few BS/BA Economics majors). This seemed unnecessarily restrictive, and led to discussions at many levels within the COB. Both faculty and students suggested it would be prudent to allow BBA majors to diversify into other business disciplines and receive recognition by completing a minor. This was proposed and was approved by UCA in May 2016. Now, any business major may also minor in a business discipline; the only exception is that BBA majors may NOT minor in General Business. Four current minors have been approved to accept BBA majors: Accounting, Management, Marketing and MIS.

4. **New Courses**. Three new courses were approved in the COB. One belongs to the MBA program, MBA 6349 Management of Small & Family-owned Business. This is an elective in the program. One is ACCT 4382 Internship in Accounting, which is a second internship opportunity for Accounting majors. The last course is co-listed as either Management or Marketing (3385): Safety and Motor Carrier Policy. This course will be one of the courses required in the new proposed major, Logistics & Supply Chain Management.

5. **Electronic Delivery**. In support of the new online General Business degree, as well as departmental goals, 28 courses were approved for electronic delivery. In addition, the quality of online teaching has significantly improved in the past year. A UCA initiative to enhance online teaching has gained ground in the past eighteen months. While this is a campus-wide initiative, the College of Business has been one of the key players and participants. Here are some of the facets of the initiative:

* UCA hired (for the first time ever) a Director of Online Learning
* Started UCA Online, a program designed to attract (initially) those with AA degrees who would like to finish their degree online. Two programs were selected to start this, one in nursing and the other the BBA Business Administration
* Set up a formal training program and certification process for faculty to prepare courses for online delivery. This includes a common format for the Blackboard shell (so students see the same thing in the same location on Blackboard for all courses), personalized help for faculty to prepare to teach online, a studio to record video for online courses, and a process for faculty to be certified for online teaching.
* UCA hired three new Instructional Designers or online developers (to train and assist faculty), out of the Center for Teaching Excellence.
* The COB received a grant to develop its own video studio to assist faculty as they prepare online lessons.

6. **Other Changes**. There were several other more minor curricula changes, including modifying prerequisites and changing course titles.

The Curriculum Management Handbook was updated/revised this past year (December 2015). The handbook, approved by the Curriculum and Assessment Committee, Executive Committee and Dean, formalized the process of using Improvement Teams to make both process and learning changes to enhance student learning.

Overall, the curriculum development and review process has been busy the past year, with new programs, concentrations, courses and the first formal curriculum review.

# III. Assurance of Learning Process

The AOL process consists of assessing each learning objective twice in a five year window. The first assessment results are examined by an appropriate Improvement Team, which makes recommendations for both systematic and direct learning improvements. Improvement team members, typically one from each department, are faculty experts in the specific area and frequently teach some of the pertinent courses where learning occurs for an objective. The team recommendations flow to each individual department, the college Curriculum & Assessment Committee, the Executive Committee and to the Dean for input and approval. The approved changes are put in place. The second assessment then occurs, and the Improvement Team again examines the data. Changes that worked (enhanced learning) are institutionalized (“closing the loop”). The team again makes improvement recommendations, and the process continues. This process of continual improvement helps ensure that assessment data is used as it should be--to improve student learning.

The transition to using Improvement Teams to recommend changes was fully implemented in the past year. The following summarizes the Improvement Team actions that were taken the past year. The next section discusses

**Improvement Team Progress**

A. Improvement Teams Formed (with learning objectives listed); all formed in past year except as noted:

* Oral Communications (BBA 4b, MAcc 2b, MBA 3b; team formed in Spring 2015)
* Quantitative Skills (BBA 1b)
* Ethical Issues (BBA 3a, MAcc 2a, MBA 2a, BS/BA 3a)
* Accounting Standards (MAcc 1c, 3a)
* Global Perspective (BBA 2a, MBA 1a)
* Written Communications (BBA 4a, MAcc 3b, MBA 3a, BS/BA 2a)
* Leadership Skills (MAcc 4a, MBA 5a)
* Advanced Knowledge (HLC-8: Marketing and Accounting)

B. Improvement Team Actions Completed by Learning Objective (approved by Dean)

* Oral Communications (BBA 4b-team met in Spring 2015; approved January 2016)
* Quantitative Skills (BBA 1b)
* Ethical Issues (BBA 3a)
* Tax Law (MAcc 1c)
* Quantity/Quality of Information (MAcc 3a)
* Oral Communications (MAcc 2b)
* Oral Communications (MBA 3b)
* Ethical Issues (MBA 2a)
* Advanced Knowledge (Marketing)

C. Improvement Teams in Process (teams have met, recommendations in routing)

* Global Perspective (BBA 2a)
* Written Communications (BBA 4a)
* Written Communications (MAcc 3a)
* Written Communications (MBA 3a)
* Global Perspective (MBA 1a)
* Advanced Knowledge (Accounting)

**Improvement Team Highlights (2015-2016)**

**Improvement Teams {Past Year}**

* First Improvement Team recommendations were approved in January 2016 (BBA Oral Communications)
* Eight Improvement Teams formed (one in late Spring 2015)
* Nine Learning Objectives were assessed, examined and recommendatins approved using Improvement Teams
* Six Learning Objectives were examined by Improvement Teams, with recommendations in routing

**Reporting Assessment Information**

The assessment process within the College of Business is essentially the same, regardless of where the information might be reported. We conduct assessments to monitor student learning and use the assessment data to develop ways to improve such learning. We do not do assessment in order to report it to some external body. That said, there are external accrediting bodies that do receive assessment reports. For this reason, we divide the AOL sections that follow (Sections IV-X) according to the accrediting body and program, as outlined in the table below:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Accrediting Body** | **AACSB** | **HLC (Specific Degree Programs)** | **HLC** |
| Programs Assessed | * Bachelor of Business Administration  (single degree) * Bachelor of Science-Information Systems * Master of Accountancy * Master of Business Administration | * Bachelor of Business Administration with distinct majors * Bachelor of Science in Information Systems * Master of Accountancy * Master of Business Administration * Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Arts in Economics | * General Education (UCA) Core Courses |

## 1. Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)

AACSB examines assessment at the programmatic level, including BBA, BS, MAcc, and MBA. It does not examine assessment at the particular major level (such as Accounting or Finance), unless the program and the major are the same (which is true for the BS-IS, MAcc and MBA). All majors within the BBA degree are treated as one. The past year***, one new program was added, the BS-Information Systems***. This new program (and major) was approved by the state in Summer 2015 and formally started in Fall 2015. The AACSB Peer Review Team, which visited in February 2016, assessed this new program and stated that it should be considered “an accredited CoB degree”. The BS-IS has the same learning goals/objectives as the BBA, except it has one less goal and three fewer objectives. Sections V-VIII examines AACSB assessment for the BBA, BS-IS, MAcc, and MBA programs.

**2. Higher Learning Commission (HLC-Specific Degrees Programs)**

The current HLC learning goals and objectives for the College of Business programs include the same goals and objectives as reported to AACSB with the following differences:

* An additional learning goal (and objective) is added to each BBA major, as well as the BS-Information System. Thus each of the nine majors has one discipline-specific objective. The additional goals and objectives were formalized in Spring 2013 (2015 for the BS-Information Systems) and are labeled HLC #8 (it is the BBA’s 8th goal and the BS-IS 7th goal).
* The BS/BA in Economics has its own set of learning objectives as it is not assessed under the AACSB program. These goals and objectives were formalized in Spring 2013, and are delineated in Section IX.
* The Master of Accountancy assessment for AACSB and HLC are identical.
* The Master of Business Administration assessment for AACSB and HLC are identical.

Assessment details for HLC-Specific Degrees programs are provided in Section IX.

**3. Higher Learning Commission (HLC-General Education Core Courses)**

The UCA Core, the general education program at UCA, is outlined at www.uca.edu/core. It is a two tiered program with 11 objectives at both the lower-division and upper-division level. The assessment of general education is still in development with some flux. More detail is provided in Section X.

# IV. Assurance of Learning in the BBA (AACSB)

For the BBA program, there are seven goals and eleven learning objectives. The goals/objectives are summarized in the table below, along with the measure, course(s) used, and benchmark.

## Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) Assurance of Learning Plan

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal** | **Objective: Students will be able to** | **Measure: Students will** | **Course** | **Benchmark** |
| 1. Our graduates shall possess critical thinking and analytical thinking skills | 1a. Use appropriate analytical techniques to identify and frame problems, generate and compare alternatives, and use knowledge and reasoning skills to optimize organizational performance. | Demonstrate learning and mastery of subject matter through their performance on the Capstone © Business Simulation. | MGMT 4347 | The College’s mean score will be in the 50th percentile or above. |
| 1b. Accurately apply the appropriate quantitative skills to solve specific problems in various business disciplines. | Students will demonstrate sufficient quantitative skills through their performance on targeted post-testing in QMTH 2330 and a rubric in both QMTH 2330 and FINA 3330 | QMTH 2330  FINA 3330 | Mean score of all students on post-testing will be 70% or above; mean scores of all students on rubric will be 70% (8.4 of 12 points) in QMTH 2330 and 75% (9 of 12 points) in FINA 3330 |
| 2. Our graduates shall possess awareness of the global business environment | 2a. Identify cultural/global perspectives among stakeholders. | Take a series of Blackboard-hosted quizzes related to global business. | ECON 2310 | The mean number of points for all students assessed will be ≥ 70% of the total possible points. |
| Take a pre-test and a post-test of questions regarding global perspectives. | MKTG 3350  ACCT 3315  MGMT 3344 | There will be a statistically significant improvement in the mean score between the pre-test and the post-test. |
| 3. Our graduates shall possess ethical reasoning abilities | 3a. Be aware of ethical issues inherent in business decisions and articulate the manner in which they arrived at an ethical decision. | Students will complete an assignment (business case or other writing assignment) dealing with ethical decision making or the social responsibility of business. The assignment will be assessed with the Ethical Decision Making/Social Responsibility Rubric. | MGMT 3340 | Mean score of students assessed with the rubric will be 75% (15 of 20 points). |
| 3b. Be aware of legal issues inherent in business decisions. | Demonstrate knowledge of government regulation, employment law, property law, and contract law by their performance on objective questions embedded in an exam. | ACCT 2321 | Mean score of students assessed will be ≥ 70%. |
| 4. Our graduates shall possess effective communication abilities | 4a. Produce professional quality written documents. | Prepare a report, paper, or case analysis on a discipline-specific topic in the writing intensive course designated in their major. | MGMT 4348, ECON 4380, INSU 4320, ACCT 4317, MGMT 4376, MIS 3328, MKTG 4355, FINA 4336 | Mean rubric score of students assessed will be nine (9) points or greater, of the fourteen (14) available points. |
| 4b. Deliver professional quality oral presentations. | Give an oral presentation on a business topic. | MKTG 2376, MGMT 2301 | Mean rubric score will be eleven (11) out of sixteen (16) points. |
| 5. Our graduates shall possess effective collaborative skills | 5a. Work in teams to solve business problems. | Complete group projects as part of the Capstone© Business Simulation. Using Capstone's internal teamwork assessment process, each student will be assessed by peers several times during the semester. | MGMT 4347 | The cumulative mean score will be ≥ 70% on Capstone’s teamwork assessment. |
| 6. Our graduates shall possess effective information management skills | 6a. Effectively apply business-oriented software applications to manage data in support of business operations. | Be assessed using a test question set that requires a demonstration of Microsoft Excel and Access application skills. | MIS 2343 | Mean score of all students assessed will be ≥ 70% of the points possible. |
| 6b. Understand the role of information systems in support of organizational activities. | Be assessed by their performance on objective questions embedded in an exam. | ACCT 3320  MIS 3321 | Mean score of all students assessed will be ≥ 70% of the points possible. |
| 7. Our graduates shall possess an understanding of a broad range of business disciplines | 7a. Demonstrate comprehension of key concepts and theories in various functional areas of business, and demonstrate the ability to draw on knowledge and insights from a variety of disciplines when analyzing and formulating solutions to problems and opportunities. | Demonstrate learning and mastery of subject matter through their performance on the Capstone © Comp-XM examination. | MGMT 4347 | Mean score of all students completing the exam will be ≥ 50%. |

Each learning objective is assessed twice every five year period. This section includes only those objectives which were either assessed or where assessment results were examined by an Improvement Team. Objectives which were neither assessed nor examined are not included. The first text box lists all of the objectives that were assessed in the past year.

**Objectives Assessed (2015-2016)**

**Assessed Summer 2015**

* MAcc 1b Unstructured Problems

**Assessed Fall 2015**

* BBA 3b Legal Issues
* BBA 6a Information Management
* MAcc 1a Accounting Standards (Financial)
* MAcc 4a Leadership
* MAcc 5a Global Perspective
* MAcc 7a Dynamic Communications
* HLC-8 Innovation & Entrepreneurship
* HLC-8 Insurance

**Assessed Spring 2016**

* BBA 4b Oral Communications
* MAcc 1b Accounting Standards (Auditing)
* MAcc 3b Database Technology
* MAcc 6a Ethics
* MBA 4a Role of IS
* MBA 5b Teamwork
* BS/BA 1a, 2a, 2b, 3a Economics
* HLC-8 Economics
* HLC-8 Finance

The next section examines those objectives for which Improvement Teams met along with the disposition (if applicable). Usually Improvement Teams which meet in the spring semester make recommendations, but these are not finally approved until the following fall semester. The following objectives were examined by Improvement Teams, with details of each below.

**Improvement Teams Which Met (2015-2016)**

**Improvement Teams {Fall}**

* BBA 1b Quantitative Skills
* BBA 3a/MBA 2a Ethical Issues
* BBA 4a/MAcc 2b/MBA 3b Oral Communications
* MAcc 1c Tax Laws
* MAcc 3a Quantity/Quality of Information
* HLC-8 Marketing Advanced Knowledge

**Improvement Teams {Spring}**

* BBA 2a/MBA 1a Global Perspective
* BBA 4a/MAcc 3a/MBA 3a Written Communications
* HLC-8 Accounting Advanced Knowledge

**BBA 1b Quantitative Thinking Skills**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| BBA Objective 1b |  |
| Goal: | Our graduates shall possess critical thinking and analytical thinking skills |
| Objective: | Students will be able to accurately apply the appropriate quantitative skills to solve specific problems in various business disciplines. |
| Course(s): | QMTH 2330; FINA 3330; MGMT 3344 OR ACCT 4315 |
| Measure: | Students will demonstrate sufficient quantitative skills through their performance on targeted pre- and post-testing in designated courses |
| Benchmark: | Mean score of students assessed will improve; post-test mean score of students assessed will be 70% or above |
| Program Placement: | Quantitative skills are assessed in three classes throughout the BBA curriculum. The first assessment in QMTH 2330 is in a business statistics course required of all majors. The second assessment will be in FINA 3330, of which QMTH 2330 is a prerequisite, and also required by all business majors. The third assessment will take place in MGMT 3344 or, for accounting majors, ACCT 4315 (both similar courses). |
| Data Collection: | Data were collected in Spring 2015 in 13 sections of four different courses. The data are as follows:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | BBA 1b Quantitative Skills Assessment Results-Spring 2015 | | | | | | | |  | **# Sections** | **n** | **Pre-test** | **Post-test** | **Improvement** | **t-test** | | QMTH 2330 | 4 | 161 | 29.7% | 77.7% | 61.8% | 10.11\*\* | | FINA 3330 | 4 | 100 | 22.8% | 64.0% | 64.4% | 5.90\*\* | | MGMT 3344 | 4 | 106 | 52.5% | 92.9% | 43.5% | 7.41\*\* | | ACCT 4315 | 1 | 46 | 45.1% | 80.0% | 43.6% | 4.22\*\* | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | All | 13 | 413 | 35.4% | 78.6% | 54.9% | 13.15\*\* | |
| Notes on Data  The data collected in Spring 2015 consisted of pre- and post-test aggregate numbers. For both lower division course sections (in QMTH 2330) and upper division courses (FINA 3330, MGMT 3344, and ACCT 4315), both benchmarks were passed. There was a significant difference between pre- and post-test means, and overall, the post-test scores were above 70% (actually 78.6%). However, the data were not paired (there was no requirement to do so), which means the magnitude of growth in individuals during the semester was not measured. Further, only aggregate data were reported, which means there is no way to know what specific areas were weak and which were not. | | |
| Improvement Team Recommendations  1. Closing the Loop: Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report.  2. Learning Improvement Recommendations: Recommendations to directly improve student learning were impossible to make (see Notes above). For assessments in the future, detailed data will be retained, so that areas of weakness may be pinpointed.  3. System Improvement Recommendations: All of the recommendations for this cycle are for system improvements. In accordance with the new procedures, assessment data will focus in the future on all data, so that improvements may be recommended for individual weak areas in the future.  Specific improvement recommendations follow:  1. Reduce the number of courses assessed: currently there are four courses assessed, one in the lower division (QMTH 2330) and three in the upper division. For the upper division courses, two of the three are required; all majors take FINA 3330, while all majors except accounting take MGMT 3344 and accounting majors take ACCT 4315. The team recommends the deletion of MGMT 3344 and ACCT 4315. This leaves two courses for assessing this objective, and both courses are required by all majors in the COB (QMTH 2330 and FINA 3330).  2. Eliminate the pre- and post-test assessment methodology. Pre- and post-test methodology can be useful in establishing what students learn during a semester, but are also problematic. Because the pre-test usually occurs outside of a graded exercise (students haven’t learned it yet, after all), students have little incentive to do well, and indeed there is some incentive to NOT do well. In the place of this methodology, the team recommends using both a rubric as well as post-test as detailed in the following for the two courses:  A. QMTH 2330: assess eight specific areas that are deemed important for students studying business statistics. These areas are attached to this document. The measurement will be post-test of these areas; that is, the assessment will occur using problems on a test or graded exercise after the instruction has occurred. In addition, a Quantitative Skills rubric will be used to assess one advanced area, constructing confidence intervals and hypothesis testing. Thus, this course will include two assessment measures, a post-test and rubric.  B. FINA 3330: the upper division course will be assessed by presenting students with a quantitative problem and using a Quantitative Skills rubric to assess performance. This rubric (also attached), is the same to be used in QMTH 2330. By using the same rubric, it may also allow some ability to compare performance between lower and upper division students. FINA 3330 is also the course used to assess Critical Thinking for the UCA Core (upper division), using the same rubric (Critical Inquiry C (Quantitative). Thus the rubric may be used for both Core and BBA assessments.  3. Benchmark:  The current benchmark applies to a pre- and post-test environment. Given new assessment measures (post-test and rubric), the benchmarks must also change. For the post-test, the recommendation is for students to attain at least a 70% overall (though all eight areas will be examined individually). For the rubric, for the lower division course (QMTH 2330) 70% is expected and for upper division course (FINA 3330) a 75% is expected. The benchmark should read:  In the lower division course (QMTH 2330), students shall attain a score of at least 70% overall on the test; students shall attain a score of 70% on the rubric (8.4 of the 12 total points). For the upper division course (FINA 3330), students shall attain a score of 75% (9 of the total 12 points). | | |
| Disposition  Departments met between 1/14/16 and 2/10/16; CAC met 4/4/16. All bodies essentially concurred with the Improvement Team recommendations. The following was approved by the Dean:  1. Assess this objective in QMTH 2330 Business Statistics and FINA 3330 Managing Finance and Capital; discontinue assessing in MGMT 3344 and ACCT 4315.  2. Use the revised rubric for both QMTH 2330 and FINA 3330.  3. Use a benchmark of 70% (for QMTH 2330) and 75% (for FINA 3330), for the rubric for both courses and 70% for the post-test for the former. In Fall 2016 a sub-group of faculty will meet to examine the issue of benchmarking, including types of benchmarks, rubric labels and standards. This group shall make recommendations to appropriate departments, the college CAC and Dean for review and approval. | | |

**BBA 3a Ethical Issues**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| BBA Objective 3A |  |
| Goal: | Our graduates shall possess ethical reasoning abilities. |
| Objective: | Our students will be aware of ethical issues inherent in business decisions and articulate the manner in which they arrived at an ethical decision |
| Course(s): | MGMT 3340 |
| Measure: | Students will complete an assignment (business case or other writing assignment) dealing with ethical decision making or the social responsibility of business. |
| Benchmark: | Mean score of students assessed with the rubric will be four (4) points, or greater, out of the available six (6) points. |
| Program Placement: | Students in the BBA program take MGMT 3340 in their junior and senior year after completion of the required courses needed for entry into the College of Business. |
| Data Collection: | Students in each section of the assessment course completed a written case in which they had to resolve an ethical decision or evaluate the social responsibility of business. Course instructors evaluated each student’s response using the rubric described above and submitted mean score and number of students assessed. Data for all sections were combined for a mean score per semester. Data were collected in Fall 2012 and Spring 2013.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | BBA 3a Ethical Reasoning Assessment Results | | | | | | | | | |  | **Inst. 1** | | **Inst. 2** | | **Inst. 3** | | **By Semester** | | |  | **n** | **mean** | **n** | **mean** | **n** | **mean** | **n** | **mean** | | Fall 2012 | 43 | 4.16 | 60 | 5.13 | 21 | 4.90 | 124 | 4.76 | | Spring 2013 | 25 | 4.20 | 50 | 4.90 | 20 | 5.30 | 95 | 4.85 | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | All Students: n = 219 mean = 4.77 | | | | | | | | | |
| Notes on Data: | Data from 2012/2013 that were collected for this objective are only in aggregate. That is, we do not have performance information on individual rubric items. We know, for example, that overall the benchmark of 4 (of 6 or 66.67%) was met the last four semesters. But it is not known how students did on any particular rubric item. This will be resolved for the next cycle (see recommended system improvements below). |
| Improvement Team Recommendations: | **1.** **Closing the Loop:** Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report.  **2.** **Learning Improvement Recommendations**: There were no recommendations to directly improve student learning, given the lack of individual rubric items (see Notes above). Therefore it is not known specific areas of weakness for students. This information will be available in the future.  **3. System Improvement Recommendations:** The improvement team makes the following system improvement recommendations:  1. **Rubric**. The current BBA rubric has three items, which are scored from 0-2 (hence 6 max points). The University Core rubric (which is Responsible Living Goal A) is similar, but has a scale of 0-4. Both rubrics have three items, and each of these items are compatible. In an effort to standardize both assessment rubrics, the team recommends altering the current BBA rubric to change the scale from 0-2 to 0-5. The recommended revised rubric is attached, along with the current BBA and University Core rubrics.  **Benchmark**. The current benchmark states the following: Mean rubric score will be four (4) points, or greater, out the available six (6) points. This only examines aggregate scores, and this is no longer acceptable. Each rubric item must be examined individually, in order to determine if improvements should be made. In addition, 66.7% is too low for a benchmark, for either aggregate scores of for individual rubric items. The team recommends the following change to the benchmark:  Students shall attain a score of at least 80% on each individual item in the rubric; this equates to a minimum score of 3.20 for each item (anchors are from 0 – 4). ). Students shall attain an aggregate score of 9.6 out of the 12 available points (80%).  3. **University Core Requirement**. For the BBA (and AACSB), this ethics objective (3a) is assessed in MGMT 3340 Managing People and Work. The University Core also assesses ethics in Responsible Living, Goal A (Ethics). The objectives are essentially the same, as are the rubrics. The course used to assess ethics in the University Core is not the same, however. The Core uses MIS 3321 Managing Systems and Technology or ACCT 3320 Accounting Information Systems (although this course actually assesses Responsible Living Goal B Well-Being). The team recommends standardizing this: assess ethics for the BBA and Responsible Living for the University Core in the same course, MGMT 3340. |
| Disposition: | Departments met between 1/13/2016 and 2/10/2016. All departments essentially concurred with the Improvement Team recommendations. CAC met on 4/4/2016 and concurred as well. It recommended (like others) that some team examine rubrics/benchmarks. The following was approved by the Dean:  1. Revised rubric for this objective is approved, which can be used for both Core and AASCB.  2. Use a benchmark of 75% for this objective. In Fall 2016 a sub-group of faculty will meet to examine the issue of benchmarking, including types of benchmarks, rubric labels and standards. This group shall make recommendations to appropriate departments, the college CAC and Dean for review and approval.  3. As agreed to by Management & Marketing Department (meeting of 2/10/2016 above), submit MGMT 3340 as a UCA Core Responsible Living course; submit paperwork to remove MIS 3321 and ACCT 3320 as Responsible Living courses. |

**BBA 4a Oral Communications**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| BBA Objective 3A |  |
| Goal: | Our graduates shall possess effective communication abilities. |
| Objective: | Students will be able to deliver professional quality oral presentations |
| Course(s): | MGMT 2301 or MKTG 2376 |
| Measure: | Students will give an oral presentation on a business topic. A grading rubric will be used to assess levels of skills. |
| Benchmark: | Mean rubric score of students assessed with the rubric will be 11 points, or greater, out of the 16 available points. |
| Program Placement: | MGMT 2301 or, for Innovation and Entrepreneurship majors, MKTG 2376, is a business communications course dedicated to the study and practice of a variety of types of business communications including an oral presentation. While students may take this course at any time, it is usually taken in the sophomore or junior year. |
| Data Collection: | Data were collected from six sections of MGMT 2310, from Fall 2014. Divided by content area, here is the data:   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Organization | Language/Audience Awareness | Supporting Material/Evidence | Topic/Thesis | Overall | | Scores | 3.06 | 2.78 | 2.94 | 2.87 | 11.65 | | Benchmark (max = 4) | 2.75 | 2.75 | 2.75 | 2.75 | 11 | | MGMT 2301, six sections. n = 198. Benchmark is 11 of 16 points (69%), or 2.75 of 4 (69%) per item. | | | | | | |
| Notes on Data: | Data from 2012/2013 that were collected previously were only in the aggregate. For perhaps the first time, we collected full data and can use that for figuring out improvements. As can be seen, the area of Language/Audience was the weakest area. |
| Improvement Team Recommendations: | **1.** **Closing the Loop:** Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report.  **2.** **Learning Improvement Recommendations**:  1. Provide examples of good (or great) presentations to students in the course. Several potential ways:  A. Videotape a presentation given by some group that excelled in doing so (such as for the Target or Windstream competitions); show this tape in all classes as an example of a good way to do a presentation.  B. Have a group (like the one in A above) come into classrooms and personally give the presentation to students. Alternatively, let the group do it during an x-period and have all (available) students in the courses attend. The advantage of this one is that students will leave with a better idea of how to do good presentations when they see it in person. The disadvantage is that it is almost impossible to do the first (in-class presentations) for all classes every semester; it is more possible to do it once during x-period, but getting this done each semester would be difficult and not all students would make it (even if required).  **3. System Improvement Recommendations:** One of the real problems in improving oral communications is the lack of understanding as to the real issues. The biggest obstacle in this is the rubric. The current rubric has four items, none which really examine the actual presentation (the four examine content, mostly). To remedy this the improvement team examined rubrics from other institutions, as well as the UCA Core and MBA/MAcc rubrics. The rubric must be changed. In addition to the rubric, the current benchmark was examined. It states: “Mean score of students assessed with the rubric will be eleven (11) points, or greater, out of the sixteen (16) available points”. This benchmark is for aggregated (across students) scores, which is not what is needed. In addition, 11 of 16 means the aggregate passing score is 69%. The improvement team recommends changing the benchmark so that each item is examined as well as raising it. Here the specific recommendations:  1. Change the rubric so that it includes sections on visual aids and presentation techniques. This rubric can be used to satisfy the UCA Core requirement as well. The revised rubric is attached.  2. Change the benchmark to 85% and include wording such that it examines the average of each item rather than aggregating across students. The benchmark should read:  Students shall attain a score of at least 85% on each individual item in the rubric; this equates to a minimum score of 4.25 for each item (anchors are from 0 – 5). ). Students shall attain an aggregate score of 59.5 out of the 70 available points (85%). |
| Disposition: | Departments met to examine the recommendations between 9/24/2015 and 10/14/2015. CAC met 11/18/2015. Both bodies recommended revising the rubric for this objective. Both agreed that a group needs to examine benchmarking. The Dean approved the following:  1.New rubric for BBA Oral Communications  2. Benchmark to be set at 75% (52.5 of 70 points) |

# V. Assurance of Learning in the MAcc (AACSB/HLC)

The MAcc program started out with seven goals and thirteen learning objectives. The improvement teams which met in 2015-2016 all suggested that the number of goals/objectives needed to be reduced. This was echoed by the last two Peer Review Teams. To examine this, a committee was formed of Accounting faculty. The committee, after much deliberation, came up with a revised assessment plan which includes four goals and seven learning objectives. The new plan actually only eliminated two of the original objectives (3b Understand the development and structure of a database and 7a Speaking Extemporaneously). The other changes included:

-Old objectives 1a, 1b, 1c, 3a, and 5a (1) were combined to form a new objective: 1a Accounting Standards

-Old objectives 1d and 5a (2) were combined to form new objective: 1b Unstructured Problems

-Other objectives were merely renumbered

The plan was presented to the COB Curriculum & Assessment Committee and Executive Committee as part of three objectives being examined by Improvement Teams in Fall 2015. These bodies recommended approval of this new assessment plan, and the Dean approved it in Spring 2016. Specifics of these actions are covered below. The approved plan is presented below.

There were four objectives for which Improvement Teams met. Three of these occurred in the fall; the last one in the spring. The fall Improvement Team recommendations were eventually approved in Spring 2016. The one in spring will move forward in Fall 2016. Each of these objectives are covered below.

**Master of Accountancy (MAcc) Assessment Plan**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal** | **Objective: Students will be able to** | **Measure: Students will** | **Course** | **Benchmark** |
| (1) Our graduates shall be competent in the theory and practice of accounting in a global environment. | (1A) Correctly apply accounting standards for financial accounting, auditing, and tax. | Complete test questions or assignments in which research and/or application of authoritative literature is required | ACCT 6310  ACCT 6317  ACCT 6309 | Students will score at least 80% (20 of 25 points) on the rubric |
| (1B) solve unstructured problems involving the application of accounting standards and practices. | write an individual solution to a business case problem | ACCT 6340 | 80% of students will score > 38 out of 55 on rubric. |
| (2) Our graduates shall be able to recognize ethical dilemmas and respond ethically. | (2A) identify ethical dilemmas and choose an appropriate course of action | complete an exam question related to an ethical issue | ACCT 6317 | 80% of students will score > 4 out of 6 on rubric. |
| (3) Our graduates shall be able to communicate effectively. | (3A) communicate effectively in writing | write a research paper on a financial accounting issue | ACCT 6310 | 80% of students will score > 11 out of 14 on rubric; 80% will receive no zeros. |
| (3B) communicate effectively in an oral presentation | make a presentation on an auditing standard | ACCT 6317 | 80% of students will score > 38 out of 55 on rubric. |
| (3C) work effectively in teams | Student groups will solve a business problem | ACCT 6340 | 80% of students will score > 14 out of 20 on rubric. |
| (4) Our graduates shall be able to demonstrate effective leadership. | (4A) demonstrate the qualities necessary for effective leadership | demonstrate whether they possess leadership qualities in classroom interactions | ACCT 6350 | 80% of students will score > 98 out of 140 on rubric. |

**MAcc 1c Tax Law (now new objective 1a)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MAcc Objective 1c (combined into new objective 1a Accounting Standards) | |
| Goal: | Our graduate shall be competent in the theory and practice of accounting. |
| Objective: | Students will be able to correctly apply the tax law. |
| Course(s): | ACCT6309 |
| Measure: | Students will prepare a solution to a tax research project. |
| Benchmark: | 80% of students will score > 6 out of 8 on rubric. |
| Program Placement: | The MAcc program may be started and completed in any semester, so there is no course sequencing. However, this is a required course, so all MAcc students will be assessed during completion of the program. |
| Data Collection: | Data were collected in four consecutive semesters (below).   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **MAcc 1c Tax Law** | | | | | | | | | | **Term** | **n** | **Estab. Relevant Facts** | **ID Issues** | **Dev. Conclusions & Recommendations** | **Communicate Results** | **Approp. knowledge  (# Yes's)** | **% of Yes's** | **Total** | | Fall 2011 | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.55 | | Fall 2012 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.20 | | Fall 2013 | 13 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.81 | 1.69 | 12 | 92% | 7.50 | | Fall 2014 | 8 | 1.94 | 1.94 | 1.81 | 1.88 | 8 | 100% | 7.56 | | **Total** | 51 | 1.98 | 1.98 | 1.81 | 1.76 |  |  | 7.08 | | **Total (13-14)** | 21 | 1.98 | 1.98 | 1.81 | 1.76 |  |  | 7.52 | |
| Notes on Data: | In three of these semesters, the benchmark was passed. After the 1st failure (Fall 2011), when only 76.2% of students scored at least a six on the rubric, faculty were permitted to award half-points on the rubric. The semester data does not tell the full story, however. The first two years we assessed this, we only have aggregate scores. But the last two years we have averages for each rubric item: |
| Improvement Team Recommendations: | **1.** **Closing the Loop:** Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report.  **2.** **Learning Improvement Recommendations**:  According to Pam Spikes, who teaches this class, the biggest problem with students is creating the progression from issue to rule to conclusion. Even when it is present in development of a solution, the students don’t communicate it well.  To improve student learning, the improvement team wants to add a diagramming piece to the writing assignment. In this case, students will be required to pre-write the solutions to tax research in a diagram format similar to the following:    The hope is that the use of arrows to indicate that something is a logical result, conclusion, or next step will force students to consider if that is in fact the case.  **3. System Improvement Recommendations:**  The improvement team makes one recommendation: change the rubric somewhat. The current rubric is not clear nor specific enough with respect to the categories covered. This causes some students to be evaluated in a category above where they should be. For example, here is the first item and one category:  #1: Establish the relevant facts; 0-Unacceptable: facts identified are irrelevant  This suggests that to get a 0, students identified zero relevant facts. The change would be this:  0-Unacceptable: facts identified are mostly irrelevant or few relevant facts are identified.  All four of the items in this rubric have some recommended changes. |
| Disposition: | The Accounting Department met to discuss this 1/13/2016. Much of their discussion revolved around redesigning the assessment plan for the MAcc. They recommend reducing the number of objectives being assessed. This includes eliminating 3b (DB structure and development) and 7a (speaking extemporaneously) and combining and reordering other objectives. This would combine this objective (1c) with four other current objectives into a new objective.  The department will use the diagramming logic piece for the writing assignment (provided above). It will also be used for objective 1b (solve unstructured problems)--using the objectives as stated in the new proposal. It is hoped that this improvement will help students learn and retain the material. The department did not discuss changing the rubric, because a new rubric is proposed.  CAC met 3/7/2016 and recommended approval for each of the recommendations presented. The Dean approved the following:  1. Reduce the number of objectives in the MAcc from 13 to 7, noting that this actually eliminates only two objectives and combines others.  2. Revised rubric for new objective 1a (Apply accounting standards).  3. Use a benchmark of 80% for this new objective. In Fall 2016 a sub-group of faculty will meet to examine the issue of benchmarking, including types of benchmarks, rubric labels and standards. This group shall make recommendations to appropriate departments, the college CAC and Dean for review and approval.  4. Add the diagramming piece to the curriculum. |

**MAcc 3b Oral Communications (old 2b)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MAcc Objective 3b (old objective 2b) | |
| Goal: | Our graduates shall be able to communicate effectively. |
| Objective: | Students will be able to communicate effectively in an oral presentation. |
| Course(s): | ACCT 6317 |
| Measure: | Students will make a presentation on an auditing standard. |
| Benchmark: | 80% of students will score > 80% on the rubric. |
| Program Placement: | The MAcc program may be started and completed in any semester, so there is no course sequencing. However, this is a required course, so all MAcc students will be assessed during completion of the program. |
| Data Collection: | Data were collected in Spring 2015.   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | **Spring 2015** | | | |  |  | **#** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Benchmark** | | **Presentation Skills** | **Speaking & Volume** | **11** | **3.77** | **.98** | **3.45** | | **Speaking vs. Reading** | **11** | **4.45** | **.82** | **3.45** | | **Mannerisms** | **11** | **4.64** | **.67** | **3.45** | | **Connect with Audience** | **11** | **4.82** | **.40** | **3.45** | | **Visual Aids** | **Readability** | **11** | **4.18** | **1.08** | **3.45** | | **Effectiveness** | **11** | **4.82** | **.40** | **3.45** | | **Quality & Organization** | **11** | **4.91** | **.30** | **3.45** | | **Content** | **Introduction** | **11** | **5.00** | **0** | **3.45** | | **Coverage of Subject Matter** | **11** | **4.91** | **.30** | **3.45** | | **Conclusion** | **11** | **4.64** | **.50** | **3.45** | | **Questions & Comments** | **11** | **4.45** | **.69** | **3.45** | | **Average** | | **11** | **50.59** | **4.38** | **38** | |
| Notes on Data: | This objective was assessed for the first time in Spring 2015. It passed the benchmark, with all students scoring greater than 38 of 55 rubric points. Means and standard deviations are provided below, extrapolating a 69% benchmark (3.45 of 5.00) to each rubric item. All rubric items passed, assuming we use the same 69% that we currently have for the aggregate (38 or 55 is 69%). This particular objective has only been assessed once, and its sample size is fairly small, only 11. In the future we intend to combine two classes to increase sample size before objectives are examined. |
| Improvement Team Recommendations: | **1.** **Closing the Loop:** Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report.  **2.** **Learning Improvement Recommendations**:  The team considered it more important to concentrate on system improvements for this round, because there are some significant ones that will set the stage for assessing learning in the future.  **3. System Improvement Recommendations:**  The improvement team makes the following system improvement recommendations:  1**. Rubric and Benchmark Change:** the improvement team recommends no change in the rubric as it is now, but raised two issues that has and will have an effect on all rubrics and benchmarks for BBA, BS-IS, MBA and MAcc. The two issues concerned rubric labels/scale and benchmarking:  **Rubric labels/scale**: currently rubrics used in the COB consist of three to four columns (usually three), with different labels and different scales. This probably causes faculty confusion and leads to some degree of measurement error in the data. Here are the labels and scales in a common MAcc rubric:  *Unacceptable (0-1) Acceptable (2-3) Outstanding (4-5)*  Others (in BBA, MBA and MAcc) use the same labels, but include a scale of 0, 1, 2. Some use other labels:  *Did not meet expectations (0-1)*  *Met expectations (or Mostly met expectations) (2-3)*  *Exceeded expectations (or Mostly exceeded expectations (4-5)*  The last label (in parenthesis above) is particularly troublesome, because it suggests the exactly meeting expectations occurs somewhere in between the scale of 3-4.  **Benchmarking**. Rubrics provide for some minimum level of acceptable performance or skill level. It could be called “Acceptable” or “Met expectations” or “Average” or something similar. Typically this minimum level is set by faculty members and departments, in some kind of common understanding of the goals and objectives of the learning desired. In the scales, this may be represented by a 1 (in the 0-2) scales or a 2 (or 3) in the 0-5 scales. Given this, the question is where do we want to set the benchmark? The Improvement Team thinks that we should set a benchmark above the minimum, because the COB should strive for more than the minimum. The team also notes a difference between undergraduate and graduate education. Shouldn’t graduate students be expected to perform at a higher level than undergraduates, assuming they are being assessed for similar objectives (like oral and written communications)? While it is not imperative that all undergraduate benchmarks be the same (or all graduate benchmarks), it can create uncertainty and confusion if they are different.  **Team Recommendations**  The team recommends that some COB body examine both rubrics and benchmarks to standardize the labels, scales and benchmarks. As such, it is difficult to make a solid recommendation as to changes in this particular rubric or benchmark. As an initial start point, the team suggests that rubric benchmarks for undergraduate rubrics be set at about 70% (which would be a 3.5 for items on the 0-5 scale) and about 85% for graduate rubrics (4.25 of 5).  **MAcc recommendations**: for this particular objective, and with an understanding that both labels and benchmarks could be altered by some COB body, in the interim the team recommends the labels and scale stay the same for the MAcc 2b Oral Communications rubric:  *Did not meet expectations (0-1) Met expectations (2-3) Exceeded expectations*  Further, the team recommends the following benchmark:  Students shall attain a score of at least 85% on each of the individual items in the rubric; this equates to a minimum score of 4.25 for each item (anchors are from 0 – 5). Students shall attain an aggregate score of 46.75 if the 55 available points (85%). |
| Disposition: | The Accounting Department met to discuss this 1/13/2016. Much of their discussion revolved around redesigning the assessment plan for the MAcc. They recommend reducing the number of objectives being assessed. This includes eliminating 3b (DB structure and development) and 7a (speaking extemporaneously) and combining and reordering other objectives. This would renumber to 3b.  The department concurs with the recommendation not to alter the content of the rubric. It does not concur with the recommendation to go with a single benchmark, but to continue using similar benchmarks as before.  CAC met 3/7/2016 and recommended approval for each of the recommendations presented, except to exclude any benchmark for individual rubric items (only use aggregate). The Executive Committee met 4/13/2016; they concurred with CAC recommendations. The Dean approved the following:  1. Reduce the number of objectives in the MAcc from 13 to 7, noting that this actually eliminates only two objectives and combines others. This objective will remain the same except it will now be 3b.  2. Use a benchmark of 80% for this new objective. In Fall 2016 a sub-group of faculty will meet to examine the issue of benchmarking, including types of benchmarks, rubric labels and standards. This group shall make recommendations to appropriate departments, the college CAC and Dean for review and approval. |

**MAcc 3a Quantity/Quality of Information (new objective 1a)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MAcc Objective 3a (combined into new objective 1a Accounting Standards) | |
| Goal: | Our graduates shall be able to effectively manage information. |
| Objective: | Students will be able to locate the appropriate quality and quantity of information needed to solve a problem. |
| Course(s): | ACCT 6309 |
| Measure: | Students will prepare a solution to a tax research project |
| Benchmark: | 80% of students will score > 6 out of 8 on rubric. |
| Program Placement: | The MAcc program may be started and completed in any semester, so there is no course sequencing. However, this is a required course, so all MAcc students will be assessed during completion of the program. |
| Data Collection: | Data were collected four consecutive fall semesters (2011-2014).   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **MAcc 3a Information Quality/Quantity** | | | | | | | | | | **Term** | **n** | **References Timely** | **References Appropriate** | **Reference Quantity** | **Reference Quality** | **Approp. knowledge  (# Yes's)** | **% of Yes's** | **Total** | | Fall 2011 | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.70 | | Fall 2012 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.20 | | Fall 2013 | 13 | 1.38 | 1.81 | 1.69 | 1.38 | 12 | 92.3% | 6.81 | | Fall 2014 | 8 | 2.00 | 1.95 | 1.81 | 2.00 | 8 | 100% | 7.63 | | **Total** | **51** | **1.62** | **1.86** | **1.74** | **1.62** |  |  | **6.97** | | **Total (13-14)** | **21** | **1.62** | **1.86** | **1.74** | **1.62** |  |  | **7.12** | |
| Notes on Data: | This objective passed all four semesters it has been assessed. The overall percentages of students who met the benchmark (at least 6 on the rubric) are presented above. This does not tell the full story, however. The first two years we assessed this, we only have aggregate scores. But the last two years we have averages for each rubric item (also above). |
| Improvement Team Recommendations: | **1.** **Closing the Loop:** Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report.  **2.** **Learning Improvement Recommendations**:  The instructor in the class (Pam) thinks the biggest weakness with student research is that they find something they think is relevant and stop looking, possibly because there is so much information available. The CCH database used for tax research in this class is a sophisticated tool that allows for a variety of ways to search (e.g., within results, excluding terms, Boolean) and the students don’t really know how to do that.  She proposes that the professor demonstrate a CCH Tip of the Week each week of class during which the students will learn to be more sophisticated searchers and see demonstrations of not stopping with the first result.  **3. System Improvement Recommendations:**  The improvement team makes one recommendation: change the rubric somewhat. The current rubric is not clear nor specific enough with respect to the categories covered. This causes some students to be evaluated in a category above where they should be. For example, here is the first item and one category:  #1: The references are timely  0-Unacceptable: the references are out of date  It is hard to quantify what is out of date, and it does not capture all that students can do. The change would be this:  0-Unacceptable: The references are mostly out of date or no longer applicable.    All four of the items in this rubric have some recommended changes. |
| Disposition: | The Accounting Department met to discuss this 1/13/2016. Much of their discussion revolved around redesigning the assessment plan for the MAcc. They recommend reducing the number of objectives being assessed. This includes eliminating 3b (DB structure and development) and 7a (speaking extemporaneously) and combining and reordering other objectives. This would combine this objective (3a) with four other current objectives into a new objective (1a).  The department endorsed the idea of a Tip of the Week for use with the CCH database. It is hoped that this improvement will help students learn and retain the material.  The department did not discuss changing the rubric, because a new rubric is proposed (see proposal for the new objectives below).  CAC met 3/7/2016 and recommended approval for each of the recommendations presented. The Executive Committee met 4/13/2016; they concurred with CAC recommendations. The Dean approved the following:  1. Reduce the number of objectives in the MAcc from 13 to 7, noting that this actually eliminates only two objectives and combines others. This objective will be incorporated into a revised 1a (Apply accounting standards)  2. Revised rubric for new objective 1a (Apply accounting standards).  3. Use a benchmark of 80% for this new objective. In Fall 2016 a sub-group of faculty will meet to examine the issue of benchmarking, including types of benchmarks, rubric labels and standards. This group shall make recommendations to appropriate departments, the college CAC and Dean for review and approval.  4. Add the CCH Tip of the Week to the curriculum. |

**MAcc 4a Written Communications (new objective 3a)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MAcc Objective 4a (new objective 3a) | |
| Goal: | Our graduates shall be able to communicate effectively. |
| Objective: | Students will be able to communicate effectively in writing. |
| Course(s): | ACCT 6310 |
| Measure: | Students will write a research paper on a financial accounting issues. |
| Benchmark: | 80% of students will score > 11 out of 14 on rubric. |
| Program Placement: | The MAcc program may be started and completed in any semester, so there is no course sequencing. However, this is a required course, so all MAcc students will be assessed during completion of the program. |
| Data Collection: | Data were collected over four semesters Fall 2011-Fall 2014. |
| Notes on Data: | Data were collected each fall for four years. The first three assessments all failed. Numerous improvements were made to enhance learning and writing skills. These included stressing proper techniques, changing the admissions standards to the MAcc, and requiring students to get input from the UCA Writing Center. The fourth assessment (Fall 2014), this objective passed, suggesting that one or more of these improvements worked. Information provided in previous Annual Reports. The data have been stored as aggregate data, so information is not available to pinpoint weak areas (to be corrected next time). |
| Improvement Team Recommendations: | **1.** **Closing the Loop:** While there was no official improvement cycle, there were many improvements made over the last four years to enhance writing ability (noted in Notes above and in previous Annual Reports). These included stressing proper techniques, changing the admissions standards to the MAcc, and requiring students to get input from the UCA Writing Center. The fourth assessment (Fall 2014), this objective passed, suggesting that one or more of these improvements worked.  **2.** **Learning Improvement Recommendations**:  There were no recommendations to directly improve student learning, because at this point we have only aggregate data. The learning improvements of the past have already been discussed.  **3. System Improvement Recommendations:**  The improvement team makes the following system improvement recommendations:  1. **Rubric**: keep the same rubric.  2. **Benchmark**: the current benchmark is 80% of students will score at least 11 of 14 points (78.6%); 80% will get no zeros. This seems low. If 80% of students score the minimum (78.6%) and the other 20% score zero, this objective could pass with an overall score of 62.9%. The team had a lively discussion of benchmarks, not only for the BBA, but for MBA and MAcc as well. The team recommended the following benchmarks for the rubric:  BBA (all are upper-division courses): 10.5 of 14 (75%)  MACC: 11.2 of 14 (80%); 80% will receive no zeros on rubric items  MBA: 11.2 of 14 (80%); 80% will receive no zeros on rubric items  The team recommends eliminating the “double” benchmark (80% will score 78.6%) and go with a simple 80%. The team also recommends keeping the stipulation that 80% will get no zeros. |
| Disposition: | No other body has met yet. |

# VI. Assurance of Learning in the MBA (AACSB/HLC)

There were four objectives which were formally examined by Improvement Teams in this past year. Two of them were examined in Fall 2015, and finalized in Spring 2016. Two were examined in Spring 2016 and will not be finalized until next fall. The MBA Assessment Plan was altered in the past year. This included some systematic changes, including using a rubric instead of the GLO-BUS Strategy Simulation for 2a Ethical Reasoning. The updated MBA Assessment Plan is provided first, followed by the four objectives.

**Master of Business Administration (MBA) Assessment Plan**

| **Goals (*Our graduates shall possess)*** | **Learning Objectives  (*Students will be able to)*** | **Measure (*Students will)*** | **Course** | **Benchmark** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Dynamic thinking skills in a global environment | 1a. Provide organizations with effective executive management through decision making in uncertain, dynamic, global business situations | Students will compete in global organizations, under conditions of uncertainty requiring adaptation and innovation, in the GLO-BUS Strategy Simulation—a strategy simulation designed around a global industry setting in which student teams from many nations compete head-to-head—in MBA 6320. Assessment will be based upon the Learning Assurance Report data on “Best Company,” “All Companies,” and “Worst Company” overall score. | MBA 6320 | The institutional score for “all companies” shall be equal to or greater than the GLO-BUS “all companies” score for the appropriate time frame |
| 1. Ethical reasoning abilities | 2a. Provide organizations with effective executive management by choosing ethical courses of action and by articulating the manner by which they arrived at their decision | Complete an assignment (business case or other writing assignment) dealing with ethical decision making | MBA 6320 | Students shall attain a score of at least 80% (20 of 25 points) on the rubric |
| 1. Effective communication abilities | 3a. Provide organizations with effective executive management through their professional written communication skills | Students will prepare a report, paper, or case analysis on a business topic. The assignment will be assessed with the Written Communication Skills Rubric. | MBA 6308 | Seventy-five percent of students assessed with the rubric will score 70% or above |
| 3b. Provide organizations with effective executive management through their professional oral communication skills | Students will give an oral presentation of a report, paper, or case analysis on a business topic. The assignment will be assessed with the Oral Presentation Rubric. | MBA 6308 | Students will score at least an 80% (44 or 55 points) on the rubric. |
| 1. Effective information management abilities | 4a. Comprehend the strategic role of information systems in support of business activities | Demonstrate sound, and well-informed decision making, on a written assignment (business case or other writing assignment) that reflects the ability to effectively collect and appropriately use information to make business decisions | MBA 6301 | Seventy percent of students will earn at least 70% or more of the possible points on the assignment |
| 1. Effective leadership/followership abilities | 5a. Provide organizations with effective executive leadership under conditions of uncertainty requiring adaptation and innovation | Demonstrate leadership skills in global organizations, under conditions of uncertainty requiring adaptation and innovation. The basis for assessment will be the leadership percentile score from GLO-BUS Simulations | MBA 6320 | The mean score of all students will exceed the 50th percentile |
| 5b. Provide organizations with effective executive management by acting as team members and collaborators | Demonstrate collaboration skills in global organizations, under conditions of uncertainty requiring adaptation and innovation. The basis for assessment will be the collaboration and teamwork percentile score from GLO-BUS Simulations | MBA 6320 | The mean score of all students will exceed the 50th percentile |

**MBA 2a Ethical Issues**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MBA Objective 1b | |
| Goal: | Our graduates shall possess ethical reasoning abilities. |
| Objective: | Provide organizations with effective executive management by choosing ethical courses of action and by articulating the manner by which they arrived at their decision |
| Course(s): | MBA 6320 |
| Measure: | Complete an assignment (business case or other writing assignment) dealing with ethical decision making |
| Benchmark: | Students shall attain a score of at least 80% (20 of 25 points) on the rubric |
| Program Placement: | The MBA program may be started and completed in any semester, so there is no course sequencing. However, this is a required course, so all MBA students will be assessed during completion of the program. |
| Data Collection: | Data were collected over four semesters Spring 2012-Spring 2015. |
| Notes on Data: | The data collected the past four spring semesters improved each semester. The last semester (Spring 2015) the benchmark was actually surpassed. But as covered in the annual reports, there were multiple issues (see the 2014-2015 Annual Report for a detailed rendition). In particular, the use of GLO-BUS simulation to assess individual ethical decision making is questionable at best. Using the Corporate Social Responsibility score of the simulation does not seem appropriate. In addition, there is a negative correlation between overall performance and Corporate Social Responsibility, which makes its use even more problematic. |
| Improvement Team Recommendations: | **1.** **Closing the Loop:** Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report.  **2.** **Learning Improvement Recommendations**:  In consideration of the details mentioned in the Notes, the team recommends (unanimously) to end the use of GLO-BUS to measure ethical reasoning (the MBA Director, present, concurred with this recommendation). This is probably not a direct Learning Improvement, but will set a foundation for more accurately determining what learning should be improved.  **3. System Improvement Recommendations:**  1**. Change Assessment Tool to a** **Rubric**. See Learning Improvement Recommendations above. Using several model rubrics (including the BBA and University Core ethical reasoning ones), a new rubric was developed for the MBA program.  **Benchmark**. The current benchmark uses the GLO-BUS simulation, and so must be changed. By moving to a rubric to measure this objective, the benchmark must include each rubric item as well as an aggregate. The team recommends the following benchmark:  Students shall attain a score of at least 80% on each of the five individual items in the rubric; this equates to a minimum score of 4.0 for each item (anchors are from 0 – 5). Students shall attain an aggregate score of 20 out of the 25 available points (80%). |
| Disposition: | Departments met between 1/13/2016 and 2/10/2016. In general, they agreed with Improvement Team recommendations. CAC met 4/4/2016 and the Executive Committee met 4/4/2016. Both agreed with the recommendation to use a rubric instead of GLO-BUS. Both recommended some group examine benchmarking in Fall 2016. The Dean approved the following:  1. Discontinue using GLO-BUS to assess this objective. Use the proposed rubric for measuring ethical reasoning.  2. Use a benchmark of 80% for this new objective. In Fall 2016 a sub-group of faculty will meet to examine the issue of benchmarking, including types of benchmarks, rubric labels and standards. This group shall make recommendations to appropriate departments, the college CAC and Dean for review and approval. |

**MBA 3b Oral Communications**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MBA Objective 3b Oral Communications | |
| Goal: | Our graduates shall have effective communication abilities. |
| Objective: | Students will be able to provide organizations with effective executive management through their professional oral communication skills |
| Course(s): | MBA 6308 |
| Measure: | Students will give an oral presentation of a report, paper, or case analysis on a business topic. The assignment will be assessed with the Oral Presentation Rubric. |
| Benchmark: | Students will score at least an 80% (44 or 55 points) on the rubric. |
| Program Placement: | The MBA program may be started and completed in any semester, so there is no course sequencing. However, this is a required course, so all MBA students will be assessed during completion of the program. |
| Data Collection: | Data were collected over four semesters, Fall 2011-Fall 2014. |
| Notes on Data: | In Fall 2011 the benchmark was met; the following three semesters it was not. Unfortunately, only aggregate scores are now available, so the improvement team was not able to exam specific items which were problematic.  The improvement team examined this objective along with MBA 3b Oral Communications. The discussion for both were similar. |
| Improvement Team Recommendations: | **1.** **Closing the Loop:** Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report.  **2.** **Learning Improvement Recommendations**:  The team considered it more important to concentrate on system improvements for this round, because there are some significant ones that will set the stage for learning in the future.  **3. System Improvement Recommendations:**  **Rubric and Benchmark Change:** the Improvement Team recommends no change in the rubric as it is now, but raised two issues that has and will have an effect on all rubrics and benchmarks for BBA, BS-IS, MBA and MAcc. The two issues concerned rubric labels/scale and benchmarking:  **Rubric labels/scale**: currently rubrics used in the COB consist of three to four columns (usually three), with different labels and different scales. This probably causes faculty confusion and leads to some degree of measurement error in the data. Here are the labels and scales in the current MBA Oral Communication rubric:  *Did not meet expectations (0-1)*  *Met expectations (or Mostly met expectations) (2-3)*  *Exceeded expectations (or Mostly exceeded expectations (4-5)*  Others (in BBA, MBA and MAcc) use the same labels, but include a scale of 0, 1, 2. Some use other labels:  *Unacceptable (0-1) Acceptable (2-3) Outstanding (4-5)*  *Below Average (0-1) Average (2-3) Above Average (4-5)*  The current MBA label (above) is particularly troublesome, because it suggests the exactly meeting expectations occurs somewhere in between the scale of 3-4.  **Benchmarking**. Rubrics provide for some minimum level of acceptable performance or skill level. It could be called “Acceptable” or “Met expectations” or “Average” or something similar. Typically this minimum level is set by faculty members and departments, in some kind of common understanding of the goals and objectives of the learning desired. In the scales, this may be represented by a 1 (in the 0-2) scales or a 2 (or 3) in the 0-5 scales. Given this, the question is where do we want to set the benchmark? The Improvement Team thinks that we should set a benchmark above the minimum, because the COB should strive for more than the minimum. The team also notes a difference between undergraduate and graduate education. Shouldn’t graduate students be expected to perform at a higher level than undergraduates, assuming they are being assessed for similar objectives (like oral and written communications)? While it is not imperative that all undergraduate benchmarks be the same (or all graduate benchmarks), it can create uncertainty and confusion if they are different.  **Team Recommendations**  The team recommends that some COB body examine both rubrics and benchmarks to standardize the labels, scales and benchmarks. As such, it is difficult to make a solid recommendation as to changes in this particular rubric or benchmark. As an initial start point, the team suggests that rubric benchmarks for undergraduate rubrics be set at about 70% (which would be a 3.5 for items on the 0-5 scale) and about 85% for graduate rubrics (4.25 of 5).  **MBA recommendations**: for this particular objective, and with an understanding that both labels and benchmarks could be altered by some COB body, in the interim the team recommends the labels and scale stay the same for the MBA 3b Oral Communications rubric:  *Did not meet expectations (0-1) Met expectations (2-3) Exceeded expectations*  Further, the team recommends the following benchmark:  Students shall attain a score of at least 85% on each of the individual items in the rubric; this equates to a minimum score of 4.25 for each item (anchors are from 0 – 5). Students shall attain an aggregate score of 46.75 if the 55 available points (85%).  Note on MBA benchmarks: currently there are three rubrics in the MBA; all of them have a double benchmark (for example for this objective, it is: 75% of students assessed with this rubric will score 70% or above). The team recommends going with a single benchmark. |
| Disposition: | Departments met between 1/13/2016 and 2/10/2016. In general, they agreed with Improvement Team recommendations, except using benchmarks for individual rubric items. CAC met 4/4/2016 and the Executive Committee met 4/4/2016. Both agreed with the recommendation put forth. The Dean approved the following:  1. Use a benchmark of 80% for this new objective. In Fall 2016 a sub-group of faculty will meet to examine the issue of benchmarking, including types of benchmarks, rubric labels and standards. This group shall make recommendations to appropriate departments, the college CAC and Dean for review and approval. |

**MBA 1a Global Issues**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MBA Objective 3b Global Issues | |
| Goal: | Dynamic thinking skills in a global environment. |
| Objective: | Provide organizations with effective executive management through decision making in uncertain, dynamic, global business situations. |
| Course(s): | MBA 6320 |
| Measure: | Students will compete in global organizations, under conditions of uncertainty requiring adaptation and innovation, in the GLO-BUS Strategy Simulation—a strategy simulation designed around a global industry setting in which student teams from many nations compete head-to-head—in MBA 6320. Assessment will be based upon the Learning Assurance Report data on “Best Company,” “All Companies,” and “Worst Company” overall score. |
| Benchmark: | The institutional score for “all companies” shall be equal to or greater than the GLO-BUS “all companies” score for the appropriate time frame. |
| Program Placement: | The MBA program may be started and completed in any semester, so there is no course sequencing. However, this is a required course, so all MBA students will be assessed during completion of the program. |
| Data Collection: | Data were collected over four semesters, Spring 2012-Spring 2015. |
| Notes on Data: | This objective is assessed using the GLO-BUS Strategy Simulation. It compares the “all companies” score from UCA teams to teams from around the world; the benchmark is that the average score of all UCA teams will be at or higher than the average score for all other global teams. This has been assessed each spring for four years. In each case, we did not meet the benchmark. The global average has been 84-86; in the four assessed semesters, UCA’s average was 69, 76, 61 and 66.  The real question is whether to continue to use GLO-BUS as the assessment tool. There are pros and cons. This objective really consists of two areas: dynamic decision making and global business issues. The simulation seems to measure this. On the downside, we have no way of knowing the composition of the thousands of other global teams with whom we are benchmarked against. |
| Improvement Team Recommendations: | **1.** **Closing the Loop:** Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report.  **2.** **Learning Improvement Recommendations**:  The team noted that some improvements have been made previously. For example, one of the weak areas was reading financial statements, and an assignment was added to the course that incorporates this. Indeed, this particular area, which contributes to the overall UCA average, increased. The team recommends this assignment be maintained. The real issue, though, is determining how to proceed with respect to how we assess.  **3. System Improvement Recommendations:**  The Improvement Team recognizes the functionality of using GLO-BUS as an assessment tool. It seems to measure both dynamic decision-making and global issues inherent in business decisions. There is also something positive about using an external benchmark. The problem, however, is using the current benchmark. The team recommends changing the benchmark. Instead of comparing UCA’s average to that of all the other teams, it recommends using historical trends benchmarking to examine and analyze UCA team’s performance over time, in the “all companies” average. Given the previous four years of data, with an average of 67.5, the team recommends a score of 70% as a starting point. The team also recommends examining each of the eight areas that comprise the simulation. The class average for these eight areas should be above 50%. The revised benchmark:  *The institutional score for “all companies” shall be greater than 70%; the average scores for the eight areas shall be greater than 50%.* |
| Disposition: | No other body has met yet. |

**MBA 3a Written Communications**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MBA Objective 3a Written Communications | |
| Goal: | Our graduates shall have effective communication abilities. |
| Objective: | Provide organizations with effective executive management through their professional written communication skills |
| Course(s): | MBA 6308 |
| Measure: | Students will prepare a report, paper, or case analysis on a business topic. |
| Benchmark: | Seventy-five percent of students assessed with the rubric will score 70% or above. |
| Program Placement: | The MBA program may be started and completed in any semester, so there is no course sequencing. However, this is a required course, so all MBA students will be assessed during completion of the program. |
| Data Collection: | Data were collected over four semesters, Fall 2011-Fall 2014. |
| Notes on Data: | Data were collected each fall for four years. The first year the objective passed. The next two years it did not, but it was close (71.4 with a 75 benchmark). The last semester it failed by a wider margin (65.2). The major problem is that the data have been stored as aggregate data, so information is not available to pinpoint weak areas (to be corrected next time). We do not know what to really improve. |
| Improvement Team Recommendations: | **1.** **Closing the Loop:** Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report.  **2.** **Learning Improvement Recommendations**:  There were no recommendations to directly improve student learning, because at this point we have only aggregate data.  **3. System Improvement Recommendations:**  Specific system improvement recommendations follow:  1. **Rubric**: keep the same rubric.  2. **Benchmark**: the current benchmark is 75% of students will score at least 70% on the rubric (9.8 of 14 points. This seems low. If 75% of students score the minimum (70%) and the other 20% score zero, this objective could pass with an overall score of 52.5%. The team had a lively discussion of benchmarks, not only for the BBA, but for MBA and MAcc as well. The team recommended the following benchmarks for the rubric:  BBA (all are upper-division courses): 10.5 of 14 (75%)  MACC: 11.2 of 14 (80%); 80% will receive no zeros on rubric items  MBA: 11.2 of 14 (80%); 80% will receive no zeros on rubric items  The team recommends eliminating the “double” benchmark (75% will score 70%) and go with a simple 80%. The team also recommends adopting the 80% will get no zeros. |
| Disposition: | No other body has met yet. |

# VII. Assurance of Learning in Majors (HLC #8)

**A. Program Goals, Objectives, Measure, and Benchmarks**

AACSB assesses by program (BBA, BS, MBA, MAcc). HLC assesses by major. The learning goals and objectives for both are exactly the same, except for one discipline-specific goal (i.e., major). This goal, associated with each of the majors, we label HLC #8. It examines the depth of one’s knowledge and is assessed summatively (at the end of one’s program). The list below includes all BBA goals, including the discipline-specific one, #8:

***Our graduates shall possess:***

1. Critical Thinking & Analytical Thinking Skills;

2. Awareness of the Global Business Environment;

3. Ethical Reasoning Abilities;

4. Effective Communication Abilities;

5. Effective Collaborative Skills;

6. Effective Information Management Skills;

7. Understanding of a Broad Range of Business Disciplines.

8. Knowledge Appropriate to the Practice of their Major Discipline.

For each Learning Goal, the COB has defined at least one corresponding Learning Objective. Goal 8 is summarized on the following page. (Summaries of goals 1 through 7 are found in Section IV.)

**B. Rotation of Goals**

Goal 8 is rotated as described in Section II, that is, it is assessed twice each five year period, with an improvement cycle in between. Like the MAcc, some assessments occur across two semesters, depending on class size.

## C. Assessment Results

The table below lists each discipline’s objective associated with Learning Goal #8, including the objective, benchmark, assessment method, followed by those objectives that were improved the past year.

**Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) Assessment Plan: Discipline Specific Goal 8**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goals** | **Learning Objectives** | **Measure** | **Course** | **Benchmark** |
| 8. Our graduates shall possess knowledge appropriate to the practice of their major discipline. | 8a. Accounting graduates will demonstrate an understanding of accounting topics in the areas of financial, cost, tax, government/nonprofit, accounting information systems, and auditing. | Each student must pass a comprehensive accounting exam comprised of questions written by the accounting faculty. The exam covers the 6 major topics in accounting. | ACCT 4312 | 70% of all students who have completed or are concurrently enrolled in all other major required Accounting classes will score seventy percent or above. |
| 8a. Finance graduates will be able to value financial assets, analyze and manage financial risks in a business environment, and apply financial analysis techniques to diverse business situations, demonstrating a thorough knowledge of financial decision-making skills and financial markets. | Each student must pass a comprehensive finance exam comprised of questions written by the finance faculty. The exam covers the major topics in valuation, financial modeling, and financial decision-making aptitudes. | FINA 4336 | 70% of all students who have completed all other Finance classes will score seventy percent or above. |
| 8a. Insurance & Risk Management graduates will possess the skills and knowledge base necessary to effectively counsel clients about insurance and risk management strategies and products. | Students will take the UACIC Life and Health Exam as a final in INSU 3315. This exam is the first of two parts of obtaining the nationally recognized UAcIC (Undergraduate Associate Certified Insurance Counselor) designation. | INSU 3315 | UCA’s student median grade will equal the national median grade. |
| 8a. Management graduates will demonstrate the decision-making, organizing, and interaction knowledge and skills needed in the global business environment. | Management majors will prepare a research project on a management topic, which will embellish their knowledge and skills in a large number of skill areas. | MGMT 4348 | Mean score of students assessed will be 8.4 out of 12 or above on the MGMT 4348 Rubric. |
| 8a. Marketing graduates will demonstrate the promotion, retailing, sales, and marketing management knowledge and skill sets necessary to meet the requirements of the global business environment. | Students will prepare a research project on a marketing topic, which will assess their knowledge and skills in a large number of skill areas. | MKTG 4355 | Mean score of students assessed will be 75% (9.6 out of 12) or above on the MKTG 4355 Rubric. |
| 8a. Innovation & Entrepreneurship graduates will possess the interdisciplinary skills needed to start and operate a small business. | Students will create and present a thorough convincing business plan. | MGMT 4376 | The mean score of students assessed will be 140 out of 200 or above on the MGMT 4376 Rubric. |
| 8a. Economics graduates will possess the analytical skills to formulate an appropriate, discipline-specific question, research possible solutions, and provide accurate analysis. | Economics students will prepare a research paper demonstrating the analytical skills to formulate an appropriate, discipline-specific question, research possible solutions, and provide accurate analysis. | ECON 4380 | The mean of students’ points will be 7 (of 12) or greater on the ECON 4380 Discipline Specific Assessment Rubric. |
| 8a. Management Information Systems graduates will understand the key competencies that comprise the planning, analysis, design, and implementation of high-quality organization information systems. | Each student must pass appropriate questions in exams comprised of questions written by the MIS faculty. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the systems development life cycle and be able to apply the most appropriate methodologies and tools to resolve organization information systems issues and be able to effectively communicate appropriate solutions. | MIS 3328 | The mean score of students assessed will be 70 percent or higher on the assessment exam questions. |
| 7a. Information System graduates will effectively manage the process of information systems development, from requirements planning to system delivery. | Students will demonstrate sufficient understanding through objective responses to questions. | MIS 4355 | Mean score of students will be 75% or above. |

**HLC 8 Marketing**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| HLC 8 Marketing | |
| Goal: | Our graduates shall possess knowledge appropriate to the practice of their major discipline. |
| Objective: | Marketing graduates will demonstrate the promotion, retailing, sales, and marketing management knowledge and skill sets necessary to meet the requirements of the global business environment. |
| Course: | MKTG 4355 |
| Measure: | Students will prepare a research project on a marketing topic, which will assess their knowledge and skills in a large number of skill areas. |
| Benchmark: | Mean score of students assessed will be 75% (9.6 out of 12) or above on the MKTG 4355 Rubric. |
| Program Placement: | MKTG 4355 is typically taken in the last year of the major. |
| Data Collection: | Data were collected each semester from Fall 2013 - Spring 2015 |
| Notes on Data: | There are issues with all of the currently available data. When looking back at the 2013 submissions, the instructor noticed that some of the scores were a 16 even though the top score on the current rubric was 14. This indicates that he may have been using a different rubric. There is the possibility of a data entry issue on the later data. In addition, because the assignments currently used to assess this objective do not require references, all students received a 0/2 for references. It is possible that this, combined with the use of the incorrect rubric used in the Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 semester leave us without a clear picture of the pattern in the data and significant measurement error. In addition, the first three data collections only have aggregate data, not item by item data. |
| Improvement Team Recommendations: | **1.** **Closing the Loop:** Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report.  **2.** **Learning Improvement Recommendations**:  Because of the data, it is not possible to make specific recommendations for learning improvements at this time. Our team does acknowledge that the measure for this objective needs to be updated. The instructor no longer uses a research project to measure the learning objective. Instead, he uses a series of assignments throughout the semester evaluating the skills listed in the objective (promotion, retailing, sales, marketing management). The rubric is then used to evaluate students’ performance on the set of assignments as a whole. Thus, the following is recommended:  Measure: Students will complete a set of assignments which will demonstrate their knowledge and skills in a large number of marketing areas.  **3. System Improvement Recommendations:**  After reviewing the materials, there are some specific issues that need to be addressed with the rubric:   1. As the assignments do not require references, this category is unnecessary. 2. The 0-2 scoring used on the rubric does not allow the instructor to assign any points in situations where students could have earned partial credit. In addition, the instructor had been using .5 to rate the students’ work in order to allow more flexibility to assigning points.   With those issues, our team recommends eliminating the references category and changing the scoring. The current score of 2 will now equal 4-5, the current score of 1 will now read 2-3, and the current score labeled 0 will be changed to 0-1. This will leave 5 evaluation areas with 5 possible points for a total of 25 available points.  Additionally, we recommend that the benchmark for each of the 5 areas should be 3.5/5.0 with a benchmark for the overall assignment score at 17.5/25.0.  Our team is happy with the areas of the rubric. While these areas do not recognize the specific marketing competencies that are listed in the objective, we do not feel that it is necessary for the learning instrument to do so. This is especially true since it is a compilation of individual assignments that is used to access the students’ overall understanding of the content along with ability to identify and support those competencies in a professional manner. |
| Disposition: | The Marketing Department recommends approval of the recommendations made by the Improvement Team. Using a series of written assignments is an effective method of assessing student knowledge and skills. With respect to the rubric, the reference category is not necessary. Also, changing the scoring on the rubric as recommended would generate a more precise assessment of student’s knowledge and skills. CAC met on 4/4/2016 and the Executive Committee met 4/13/2016. Both concurred with the Improvement Team and departmental recommendations, except both recommended that the benchmark not include individual rubric items. The Dean approved the following:  1. Use the revised rubric.  2. Use a benchmark of 75% for this new objective. In Fall 2016 a sub-group of faculty will meet to examine the issue of benchmarking, including types of benchmarks, rubric labels and standards. This group shall make recommendations to appropriate departments, the college CAC and Dean for review and approval. |

**HLC 8 Accounting**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| HLC 8 Accounting | |
| Goal: | Our graduates shall possess knowledge appropriate to the practice of their major discipline. |
| Objective: | Accounting graduates will demonstrate an understanding of accounting topics in the areas of financial, cost, tax, government/nonprofit, accounting information systems, and auditing. |
| Course: | ACCT 4312 |
| Measure: | Each student must pass a comprehensive accounting exam comprised of questions written by the accounting faculty. The exam covers the 6 major topics in accounting. |
| Benchmark: | Seventy percent of all students who have completed or are concurrently enrolled in all other major required Accounting classes will score seventy percent or above. |
| Program Placement: | Student may take ACCT 4312 as soon as they have finished ACCT 2310, 2311, 3311, and 3312 (the latter two with a C or better). For most accounting majors, ACCT 4312 is taken in their last or next to last semester in their undergraduate studies. |
| Data Collection: | Data were collected over four semesters, Fall 2013-Spring 2015. |
| Notes on Data: | For all four data collections/assessments, the benchmark failed by a wide margin. The benchmark is 70% of students will score a 70% or higher on the exam. The percentage of students who scored a 70% were 7%, 5%, 16% and 12%. The questions for this test are based on the content of ten upper division accounting courses. There seem to be multiple problems. Students have little incentive to do well, since this is an “extra” exam which counts nothing but a few bonus points. In addition, we have no information on which areas are weak. We don’t have average test scores (only the percentage who scored above 70%). |
| Improvement Team Recommendations: | **1.** **Closing the Loop:** Given that there was no improvement cycle, there are no closing the loop activities to report.  **2.** **Learning Improvement Recommendations**:  The team recommends that students are provided review materials. Since the test questions come from material in ten (mostly) previous classes, having review material from these classes should aid students in preparing. This is what is done for the CPA Exam, so it is a common and proven best practice.  **3. System Improvement Recommendations:**  There is not enough incentive for students to do well. It was resolved to make this worth a full test grade, to add incentive.  2. The benchmark is too high. Only 50% of students taking CPA exam sections pass with a 75% or higher, so the team recommends lowering the benchmark to "50% of students will score 70% or higher.  3. Expand the question pool; it currently consists of four questions from each of the ten upper division Accounting courses. Increase this to 15 questions. Still, in the exam, students would answer only four questions. |
| Disposition: | No other body has met yet. |

# VIII. Assurance of Learning in the BS/BA in Economics (HLC)

**A. Program Goals, Objectives, Measure, and Benchmarks**

There are three goals in the BS/BA in Economics Assurance of Learning program.

***Our graduates shall possess:***

1. A knowledge base that helps students ask more informed questions and analyze complex situations

2. Effective communication abilities

3. Ethical reasoning abilities

For each Learning Goal, the COB has defined at least one corresponding Learning Objective. The result is 4 objectives assessed in 1 class (all summative measures). The program is summarized below.

## Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Science in Economics (BA/BS) Assurance of Learning Plan

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal: Our graduates shall possess** | **Objectives: Students will be able to** | **Measure: Students Will** | **Course** | **Benchmark** |
| 1. Knowledge base that helps students ask more informed questions and analyze complex situations | 1a.Students will be able to formulate an appropriate, discipline-specific question, research possible solutions, and provide accurate analysis | Students will prepare a research paper or other assignment on a discipline-specific topic | ECON 4380 | The mean of students’ points will be 8 (of 12) or greater on the UCA Critical Inquiry Rubric. |
| 2. Effective communication abilities. | 2a. Students will be able to produce professional quality research documents. | Students will prepare a report, paper, or case analysis on a discipline-specific topic in the writing-intensive course designated in their majors | ECON 4380 | Mean score of students assessed with the rubric will be eleven (11) points, or greater, out of sixteen (16) available on the UCA Communication-Written Rubric. |
| 2b. Students will be able to produce professional quality research presentations. | Students will present in class an analysis of a major research publication assigned by the instructor. | ECON 4380 | Mean score of students assessed with the rubric will be eleven (11) points, or greater, out of sixteen (16) available points on the UCA Communication-Oral Rubric. |
| 3. Ethical reasoning abilities. | 3a. Students will be aware of ethical issues inherent in decisions and articulate the manner in which they arrived at an ethical decision | Students will complete an assignment (business case or other writing assignment) dealing with ethical decision making or the social responsibility of business. | ECON 4380 | Mean score of students assessed with the rubric will be six (6) points, or greater, out of the available eight (8) points on the UCA Responsible Living Rubric (Goal 1 only). |

**B. Rotation of Goals**

Goals in the BS/BA in Economics are assessed twice in a five year period with an improvement cycle in between. Because the objectives are all measured in the capstone course, and it is only taught in the spring, two assessments in consecutive spring terms are combined to form a single assessment (similar to the MAcc). This increases the sample size for the Improvement Teams.

## C. Assessment Results

In Spring 2016 data were gathered, but will be combined with data in Spring 2017. No Improvement Team met in the past year.

# IX. Assurance of Learning in the UCA Core (HLC)

Currently there are no data to report. Assessment in the UCA Core is in the beginning stages. In Fall 2015, all lower division courses in the Core were assessed and data submitted to the assessment office. In Spring 2016, only the rubric that measures First Year Seminars’ Core knowledge was gathered (this included no COB courses). To date, the data are being processed. What becomes of it and how it is used is still being discussed. Next academic year, the plan is to assess all Responsible Living Core courses.