Accounting | 2014-2015 Assessment Report

1. Please give a brief overview of the assessment data you collected this year. This can be in any form you feel is appropriate, such as a table, a short narrative of results, statistical analysis, highlighting findings that were of particular interest, etc. You will, however, likely want to submit results for each learning outcome you assessed this year individually.

    Assessment in the Cofrin School of Business is managed by its "Assurance of Learning Committee" (or AOL Committee). In the 2014-15 school year, the Cofrin School collected data related to two of its four **Program Level Learning Goals** (or **PLLGs**):

    o **PLLG 1:** Approach business challenges from an interdisciplinary perspective.
    o **PLLG 2:** Evaluate business decisions in terms of how they impact corporate social responsibility.

    The procedures and data analysis for both learning outcomes during **2014-15** are summarized in the following:

    o **PLLG 1 Evaluation:** PLLG 1 (Interdisciplinary perspectives) was assessed by using the following courses that were offered in Fall 2014 semester:
    o BUS ADM 482- 800 Strategic management (online). Prof Caldie Thomas: Number of students- 28
    BUS ADM 482- Strategic management (Face-to-Face): Number of students- 23
    BUS ADM 424-001- Marketing Research: Number of students- 34
    BUS ADM 424-002- Marketing Research: Number of students- 30
    o 30 assignments were collected from the four courses. Ten assignments were from Strategic Management and twenty from Marketing Research. All assignments were chosen randomly by the instructors.
    o **The assessors were as follows:**
    Strategic management: Prof. David Radosevich and Prof. Sampath Ranganathan
    Marketing Research: Prof. Caldie Thomas and Prof. Lucy Arendt
    o **Procedure:**
    Each assessor read all assignments from the respective course and graded each assignment using the rubric. The rubric assessed the following traits:
    - Trait 1: Usage of concepts and principles from at least two disciplines in the work
    - Trait 2: Does the student use disciplinary knowledge accurately and effectively
    - Trait 3: Do the conclusions drawn from the work indicate that understanding has been advanced by the integration of disciplinary views?

    Each trait had 4 points namely unacceptable (1 pt), needs improvement (2 PT), acceptable (3 Pt) and exemplary (4 pt). Hence the maximum possible score on a rubric for any given assignment is 12 points and the minimum possible score was 3 points. The scores of each assessor was averaged for each assignment and the results are as follows:

Total assignments: 30

Results: Mean scores of the traits are as follows (average score of two assessors. Minimum possible average is 1, maximum is 4)

Trait 1:

MeanT1				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1.00	1	3.3	3.3	3.3
2.00	4	13.3	13.3	16.7
2.50	7	23.3	23.3	40.0
3.00	8	26.7	26.7	66.7
3.50	7	23.3	23.3	90.0
4.00	3	10.0	10.0	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Trait 2:

MeanT2				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1.50	1	3.3	3.3	3.3
2.00	4	13.3	13.3	16.7
2.50	9	30.0	30.0	46.7
3.00	8	26.7	26.7	73.3
3.50	7	23.3	23.3	96.7
4.00	1	3.3	3.3	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Trait 3:

MeanT3				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1.50	2	6.7	6.7	6.7
2.00	4	13.3	13.3	20.0
2.50	8	26.7	26.7	46.7
3.00	8	26.7	26.7	73.3
3.50	7	23.3	23.3	96.7
4.00	1	3.3	3.3	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Mean total (Minimum possible = 4, Maximum possible = 12)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 5.00	1	3.3	3.3	3.3
5.50	1	3.33	3.33	6.7
6.00	3	10.0	10.0	16.7
6.50	1	3.33	3.33	20.0
7.00	2	6.7	6.7	26.7
7.50	4	13.3	13.3	40.0
8.00	3	10.0	10.0	50.0
8.50	3	10.0	10.0	60.0
9.00	1	3.33	3.33	63.3
9.50	5	16.7	16.7	80.0
10.50	3	10.0	10.0	90.0
11.00	1	3.33	3.33	93.3
11.50	2	6.7	6.7	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Mean scores by courses

Group Statistics					
	Course	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MeanT1	Marketing Research	20	2.9500	.58264	.13028
	Strategic Management	10	2.8000	.91894	.29059
MeanT2	Marketing Research	20	2.8250	.56835	.12709
	Strategic Management	10	2.8000	.67495	.21344
MeanT3	Marketing Research	20	2.8500	.63037	.14096
	Strategic Management	10	2.6500	.66875	.21148
MeanTotal	Marketing Research	20	8.4000	1.74416	.39001
	Strategic Management	10	8.2500	2.00347	.63355

Tests for mean difference indicates that there is no significant mean differences between the two courses in all traits and total scores.

- o **Trait 1:** Usage of concepts and principles from at least two disciplines in the work
  Results indicate that 60% of students get a rating of "satisfactory" or "exemplary" (mean score 3 and above) in trait 1. But 40% of students get a rating of "unacceptable' or 'needs improvement'. This is way below the 75% threshold set by the AOL committee. So students are very weak in the trait of 'Usage of concepts and principles from at least two disciplines in the work' and this skill needs improvement
- o **Trait 2:** Does the student use disciplinary knowledge accurately and effectively
  Results indicate that 53.3% of students get a rating of "satisfactory" or "exemplary" (mean score 3 and above) in trait 2. But 46.7% of students get a rating of 'unacceptable' or 'needs improvement'. This is way below the 75% threshold set by the AOL committee. So students are not up to par in the trait of 'use disciplinary knowledge accurately and effectively' and this skill needs further improvement

- o **Trait 3:** Do the conclusions drawn from the work indicate that understanding has been advanced by the integration of disciplinary views?
  Results indicate that 53% of students get a rating of "satisfactory" or "exemplary" (mean score 3 and above) in trait 3. But 47% of students get a rating of 'unacceptable' or 'needs improvement'. This is way below the 75% threshold set by the AOL committee. So students are not up to par in the trait of 'understanding has been advanced by the integration of disciplinary views' and this skill needs further improvement.

Tests for mean difference indicates that there is no significant mean differences between the two courses in all traits and total scores. So we have no reason to believe that this is due to the course that was used for assessment. This indicates that interdisciplinary skills of students need to be improved. It appears that the students are better at recognizing the different disciplines that may come into play but utilizing their knowledge about all those disciplines to make conclusions is their weak point. They can't apply it all together.

PLLG 4 Evaluation: PLLG 4 (Evaluate business decisions in terms of how they impact corporate social responsibility) was assessed by using Prof. Ranganathan's BUS ADM 322 (Introductory Marketing) sections 1 and 3 in Fall 2014 semester. Total number of students enrolled in these courses were 91. All students were asked to write an essay question that critically examined Coca-Cola's response to the obesity crisis in US. 30 randomly selected assignments were evaluated by using PLLG 4 rubric on April 10th 2015 Friday.

The assessors were Prof. Steve Muzatko and Prof. Patricia Albers. Each assessor read all 30 assignments and graded each assignment by using the rubric. The rubric had the following traits:

- o Trait1: Identify underlying social/environmental issues
- o Trait2: Understand Importance of CSR in decision making
- o Trait3: Applications of social responsibility concepts in decision making

Each trait had 4 points namely unacceptable (1 pt) needs improvement (2 PT), acceptable (3 Pt) and exemplary (4 pt). Hence the maximum possible score on a rubric for any given assignment is 12 points and the minimum possible score was 3 points. The scores of each assessor was averaged for each assignment and the results are as follows:

Total assignments: 30

Frequencies for mean scores of each trait:

Trait 1:

Trait1 Patricia Albers				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Unacceptable	4	13.3	13.3	13.3
Needs Improvement	12	40.0	40.0	53.3
Acceptable	14	46.7	46.7	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Trait1 Steve Muzatko				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Unacceptable	8	26.7	26.7	26.7
Needs Improvement	9	30.0	30.0	56.7
Acceptable	7	23.3	23.3	80.0
Exemplary	6	20.0	20.0	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Frequencies for Mean of Trait 1

MeanT1				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1.00	3	10.0	10.0	10.0
1.50	4	13.3	13.3	23.3
2.00	8	26.7	26.7	50.0
2.50	5	16.7	16.7	66.7
3.00	4	13.3	13.3	80.0
3.50	6	20.0	20.0	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Mean: 2.35
Median: 2.25
Mode: 2.00
Standard Deviation: 0.81

Trait2 Patricia Albers				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Unacceptable	5	16.7	16.7	16.7
Needs Improvement	14	46.7	46.7	63.3
Acceptable	11	36.7	36.7	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	
Trait2 Steve Muzatko				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Unacceptable	5	16.7	16.7	16.7
Needs Improvement	8	26.7	26.7	43.3
Acceptable	13	43.3	43.3	86.7
Exemplary	4	13.3	13.3	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Frequencies for Mean of Trait 2

MeanT2				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1.00	1	3.3	3.3	3.3
1.50	7	23.3	23.3	26.7
2.00	4	13.3	13.3	40.0

2.50	8	26.7	26.7	66.7
3.00	7	23.3	23.3	90.0
3.50	3	10.0	10.0	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Mean: 2.36
Median: 2.50
Mode: 2.50
Standard Deviation: 0.7

Trait3 Patricia Albers				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Unacceptable	6	20.0	20.0	20.0
Needs Improvement	10	33.3	33.3	53.3
Acceptable	14	46.7	46.7	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	
Trait3 Steve Muzatko				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Unacceptable	7	23.3	23.3	23.3
Needs Improvement	12	40.0	40.0	63.3
Acceptable	9	30.0	30.0	93.3
Exemplary	2	6.7	6.7	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Frequencies for Mean of Trait 3

MeanT1				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1.00	2	6.7	6.7	6.7
1.50	6	20.0	20.0	26.7
2.00	7	23.3	23.3	50.0
2.50	8	26.7	26.7	76.7
3.00	5	16.7	16.7	93.3
3.50	2	6.7	6.7	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Mean: 2.23
Median: 2.25
Mode: 2.50
Standard Deviation: 0.67

Statistics for the total (Minimum = 3, Maximum = 12)

Mean: 6.95
Median: 7.00

Mode: 7.00
Standard Deviation: 1.89

Analysis:

Trait1: Identify underlying social/environmental issues

Results indicate that 66.7% of students get a rating of 'unacceptable' or 'needs improvement' " in trait 1. 33.3% of students get a rating of 'satisfactory' or 'exemplary'. This is way below the 75% threshold set by the AOL committee. The mean score is 2.35 and the mode is 2 (needs improvement).
So this indicates that students are not up to par in the trait of 'Identify underlying social/environmental issues' and this skill needs further improvement.

Trait2: Understand Importance of CSR in decision making

Results indicate that 66.7% of students get a rating of 'unacceptable' or 'needs improvement' in trait 1. 33.3% of students get a rating of 'satisfactory' or 'exemplary'. This is way below the 75% threshold set by the AOL committee. The mean score is 2.36 and the mode is 2.50. These two numbers are below the "satisfactory" level. So this indicates that students are not up to par in the trait of 'Understand the importance of CSR in decision making' and this skill needs further improvement.

Trait3: Applications of social responsibility concepts in decision making

Results indicate that 76.7% of students get a rating of 'unacceptable' or 'needs improvement' in trait 1. 23.3% of students get a rating of 'satisfactory' or 'exemplary'. This is way below the 75% threshold set by the AOL committee. The mean score is 2.23 and the mode is 2.50. These two numbers are below the "satisfactory" level. So this indicates that students are not up to par in the trait of 'Applications of social responsibility concepts in decision making' and this skill needs further improvement.

2. How will you use what you've learned from the data that was collected? Some examples are: particular improvements to the curriculum, incorporation of a different pedagogy, a change in assessment plan for the following year in order to obtain more specific feedback, better information or a better response rate, a determined need for faculty development in a particular area, better career alignment, a faculty retreat to discuss the data and how best to use it, etc.

The Cofrin School Assurance of Learning Committee's Annual Report for 2014-15—including plans for the coming school year:

Assurance of Learning Committee
Annual report 2014- 2015

Committee members:
Sampath Ranganathan (Chair)
Bill Lepley

David Radosevich
Ghadir Ishqaidef
James Loebl

In Fall 2014 AOL Committee decided to form PLLG teams and the following members were selected to head the PLLG teams.

- o PLLG 1 and 4: Sampath Ranganathan
- o PLLG 2: Jim Loebl
- o PLLG 3: Ghadir Ishqaidef

PLLG teams will decide respective courses, instruments to assess the given PLLG. PLLG teams are also expected to discuss the assessment data and provide feedback. Committee also decided that at least 75% students should get a score of satisfactory and above in rubrics. It was also decided to hold an assessment day to evaluate student assignments for the purpose of assessment. Two evaluators will be used per assignment.

In Fall 2014 semester PLLG 1 was assessed using assignments from Strategic Management (Professors Michael Knight and Thomas Caldie) and Marketing Research (Prof. Sampath Ranganathan). PLLG 4 was assessed using assignments from Introductory Marketing (Prof. Sampath Ranganathan). 30 assignments were collected from the four sections to assess PLLG1 and 30 assignments from Introductory marketing course were used to assess PLLG 4. All assignments were chosen randomly by the instructors. PLLG 2 and PLLG teams discussed assessment results and expressed satisfaction with student performance.
In Spring 2015 semester assessment day was held on 4/10/2015.

The assessors were as follows:

- o Strategic management: Prof. David Radosevich and Prof. Sampath Ranganathan
  Marketing Research: Prof. Caldie Thomas and Prof. Lucy Arendt
  Introductory Marketing: Steve Muzatko and Patricia Albers

Each assessor read all assignments from the respective course and graded each assignment by using the rubric. Based on the assessment results, the AOL committee found that students' performance is below satisfactory levels in PLLG 1 and PLLG 4.

Assessment results were presented in faculty meeting on May 8, 2015. A joint meeting was held with curriculum committee on May 8, 2015. It was tentatively decided to implement the following interventions to close the loop.

To identify courses in which corporate social responsibility can be incorporated in the syllabi. Instructors in these courses will discuss CSR and its importance in the relevant course. Students will be tested on their knowledge of CSR concepts and how they apply them in decision making

To identify courses in which Interdisciplinary skills can be successfully incorporated and integrated in the coursework. Curriculum committee and AOL committee will work on this in Fall 2015.

Plans for 2015- 2015:

An important task for AOL committee for the 2015- 2015 year will be to take make curriculum changes so that student performance in PLLG 1 and PLLG 4 can be improved. AOL committee will work with curriculum committee on this in Fall 2015. PLLG 2 and PLLG 3 will be assessed in Fall 2014 and PLLG 1 and PLLG 4 will be assessed in Spring 2016. We plan to close the loop by taking corrective actions in Fall 2015 semester and see the changes in Spring 2016 assessment.

Indirect assessment was conducted by an alumni survey. We plan to expand this and use more indirect measures of assessment (student survey, outgoing student survey) in 2015- 2016 year.