



Accounting| 2015-2016 Assessment Report

1. Please give a brief overview of the assessment data you collected this year.

PLLG 1 (Interdisciplinary Perspective)

PLLG 1 was assessed in Fall 2015 by selecting 20 papers from the two sections of Marketing Research (BUS ADM 424) and 10 papers from the two face-to-face sections of Strategic Management (BUS ADM 482). The team of reviewers included two Marketing instructors reading the Strategic Management assignment and one instructor from Marketing and one from Management Information Systems reading the Marketing Research assignment.

The results were as follows:

Trait 1: Usage of concepts and principles from at least two disciplines in the work

Trait1mean

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.5	1	3.3	3.3	3.3
	3	9	30.0	30.0	33.3
	3.5	8	26.7	26.7	60.0
	4	12	40.0	40.0	100.0
	Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Results indicate that, in Trait 1, 96.7% of the students have scores of “Satisfactory” or “Exemplary,” far exceeding the 75% benchmark.

Trait 2: Does the student use disciplinary knowledge accurately and effectively

trait2mean

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	2	6.7	6.7	6.7
	2.5	2	6.7	6.7	13.3
	3	16	53.3	53.3	66.7
	3.5	6	20.0	20.0	86.7
	4	4	13.3	13.3	100.0
	Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Results indicate that 86.7% have scores of “Satisfactory” or “Exemplary,” while 13.3% have scores below “Satisfactory.”

Trait 3: Understanding has been advanced by the integration of disciplinary views

trait3mean					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	2	6.7	6.7	6.7
	2.5	4	13.3	13.3	20.0
	3	17	56.7	56.7	76.7
	3.5	5	16.7	16.7	93.3
	4	2	6.7	6.7	100.0
	Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Results indicate that 20% of the students scored less than “Satisfactory,” while 80% have “Satisfactory” or “Exemplary” scores.

Comparison of Fall 2014 and Fall 2015 assessment results:

	Fall 2014		Fall 2015	
	Below Threshold	Above Threshold	Below Threshold	Above Threshold
Trait 1	40.0%	60.0%	3.3%	96.7%
Trait 2	46.7%	53.3%	13.3%	86.7%
Trait 3	46.7%	53.3%	20.0%	80.0%

Compared to Fall 2014, all three traits show significant improvement and exceed the AoL Committee’s 75% benchmark.

PLLG 2 (Problem Solving)

PLLG 2 was assessed in the online and face-to-face sections of Principles of Investment (BUS ADM 442). In the assignment, the students had to compare the performance of their investment portfolios to several benchmarks such as the S&P 500. They were required to discuss why they outperformed or underperformed the benchmarks and what they would do differently the next time they would manage an investment portfolio.

The papers were read by a team of five reviewers, including two instructors in Management, one instructor in Finance, an investment manager and a retirement planner. Results were as follows:

Trait 1: Defining the issue

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.50	4	13.8	13.8	13.8
	2.00	9	31.0	31.0	44.8
	2.50	7	24.1	24.1	69.0
	3.00	4	13.8	13.8	82.8
	3.50	5	17.2	17.2	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Results indicated that 69% of the students performed below “Satisfactory,” while 31% performed at the “Satisfactory” or “Exemplary” levels.

Trait 2: Considers Multiple perspectives

trait2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.50	1	3.4	3.4	3.4
	2.00	8	27.6	27.6	31.0
	2.50	10	34.5	34.5	65.5
	3.00	7	24.1	24.1	89.7
	3.50	3	10.3	10.3	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Results indicated that 65.5% of the students performed below “Satisfactory,” while only 34.5% performed at the “Satisfactory” or “Exemplary” levels.

Trait 3: Evaluates evidence

trait3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.50	1	3.4	3.4	3.4
	2.00	8	27.6	27.6	31.0
	2.50	8	27.6	27.6	58.6
	3.00	11	37.9	37.9	96.6
	3.50	1	3.4	3.4	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Results indicated that 58.6% of the students performed below “Satisfactory,” while only 41.4% performed at the “Satisfactory” or “Exemplary” levels.

Trait 4: Procedure/ Process

trait4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.50	4	13.8	13.8	13.8
	2.00	7	24.1	24.1	37.9
	2.50	7	24.1	24.1	62.1
	3.00	8	27.6	27.6	89.7
	3.50	3	10.3	10.3	100.0
	Total	29	100.0	100.0	

Results indicated that 62.1% of the students performed below “Satisfactory,” while only 37.9% performed at the “Satisfactory” or “Exemplary” levels.

No significant differences were found between the online and face-to-face classes in any of the traits.

Average total for a composite average of each trait were as follows:

		Statistics						Mean of all traits
		online	trait1	trait2	trait3	trait4	total	
N	Valid	29	29	29	29	29	29	29
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		.52	2.4483	2.5517	2.5517	2.4828	10.0345	2.5086
Median		1.00	2.5000	2.5000	2.5000	2.5000	10.0000	2.5000
Mode		1	2.00	2.50	3.00	3.00	12.00	3.00
Std. Deviation		.509	.65934	.52346	.48816	.61937	1.92693	.48173
Sum		15	71.00	74.00	74.00	72.00	291.00	72.75

PLLG 4 (Corporate Social Responsibility)

Thirty assignments were collected randomly from two sections of Introductory Marketing (BUS ADM 322) taught by Professor Ranganathan and Associate Lecturer Kar. The two sections were assigned a case study involving Coca Cola’s efforts in addressing the obesity epidemic in the U.S. The reviewers were three UWGB professors in Management Information Systems, Supply Chain Management and Marketing.

Trait 1: Identify Underlying Ethical Issues

Descriptive statistics show that 23.3% of the students were rated below “Satisfactory” and 76.7% were rated either “Satisfactory” or “Exemplary.” Ten percent were in the exemplary category. The 76.7% level is above the 75% threshold set by the AoL Committee

		Trait 1			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.50	7	23.3	23.3	23.3
	3.00	13	43.3	43.3	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: Understand importance of ethical/moral standards and behavior in decision making

Descriptive statistics show that 20% of the students are below the “Satisfactory” level in Trait 2. Eighty percent were rated “Satisfactory” or “Exemplary,” which exceeds the 75% benchmark.

Trait 2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.50	6	20.0	20.0	20.0
	3.00	9	30.0	30.0	50.0
	3.50	11	36.7	36.7	86.7
	4.00	4	13.3	13.3	100.0
	Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Trait 3: Application of social responsibility concepts in decision making

Descriptive statistics show that 23.3% of the students are below the “Satisfactory” level, while 76.7% were rated as “Satisfactory” or “Exemplary.” Their performance exceeds the 75% benchmark.

Trait 3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.17	1	3.3	3.3	3.3
	2.33	2	6.7	6.7	10.0
	2.50	3	10.0	10.0	20.0
	2.67	1	3.3	3.3	23.3
	3.00	4	13.3	13.3	36.7
	3.17	1	3.3	3.3	40.0
	3.33	3	10.0	10.0	50.0
	3.50	5	16.7	16.7	66.7
	3.67	5	16.7	16.7	83.3
	3.83	2	6.7	6.7	90.0
	4.00	3	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Overall Statistics

		Mean trait1	Mean trait2	Mean trait3
N	Valid	30	30	30
	Missing	0	0	0
Mean		3.1000	3.2167	3.2556
Std. Error of Mean		.08442	.08868	.10004
Median		3.0000	3.2500	3.4167
Mode		3.00	3.50	3.50 ^a
Std. Deviation		.46238	.48572	.54796
Range		1.50	1.50	1.83
Minimum		2.50	2.50	2.17
Maximum		4.00	4.00	4.00

Overall statistics indicate that all traits have a mean, median and mode score above 3. This indicates the average student has a rating of “Satisfactory” on all three CSR traits. Overall results and results by trait show that students have “Satisfactory” ratings on all three traits and are slightly above the 75% benchmark.

Intervention

While the PLLG 2 Team and the AoL Committee identified factors which may have led to scores being artificially low in the assessment of the student’s problem solving skills (PLLG 2) demonstrated in the BUS ADM 442 assignment, the Team and the Committee determined that some changes in delivery of the curriculum were warranted. Accordingly, the Team and Committee proposed that instructors in five upper level courses, namely, Introductory Accounting (ACCTG 300), Managerial Accounting (ACCTG 302), Corporation Finance (BUS ADM 343), Organizational Behavior (BUS ADM 389) and Introductory Marketing (BUS ADM 322), have the students prepare a case or similar exercise which could be worked on, individually or in groups, and either during or outside class, that would require the students to employ their problem solving skills. Then after the case or exercise was completed, the instructors were asked to hold a de-briefing session in which the instructor went over the case/exercise with the students, illustrating how it would have been completed if the approach incorporated in the rubric had been employed.

In making this proposal, the committee felt that, while the students have better problem solving skills than indicated by the assessment, the students have not been provided with a framework for analyzing the multi-faceted problems they will encounter in the business world. By applying the rubric with the students, instructors are providing them with a framework that can be used in their education and in their careers. The Committee chose the five courses as they are required of all Business and Accounting majors, so that all students would benefit from the proposal. In addition, if practice makes perfect, then exposure in five different courses should enable students to develop solid problem solving skills.

The proposed intervention was to be incorporated into each of these courses each semester starting in Spring 2016. The Curriculum Committee approved the proposed intervention. The PLLG 2 Team and AoL Committee also determined that the first assessment of the effectiveness of this intervention would occur in Spring 2016 when written case assignments from all sections of Corporation Finance would be collected. The assignments were submitted by the students at the end of April 2016 and will be evaluated in September 2016.

Plans for 2016-2017

Due to the significant turnover in faculty in the past two years (largely due to retirements), the AoL Committee is also planning a re-mapping of the four PLLGs to the curriculum to be completed in Summer 2016. In addition, instructors will be asked to submit assignments to the Committee that illustrate the PLLG(s) that are emphasized in each of their courses. These assignments will assist the Committee in selecting the courses in which the PLLGs are evaluated each semester.

Finally, the Committee is encouraged by the initial success of the interventions to enhance students' performance with respect to PLLG 1 (interdisciplinary perspective) and PLLG 4 (corporate social responsibility). It appears that including modules on these topics also provided students with frameworks to apply these skills. These PLLGs will be assessed in other courses apart from Introductory Marketing and Strategic Management in Fall 2016. The decision as to which courses will be made after the Committee receives the assignments discussed in the preceding paragraph.