

**Indiana University Kokomo
School of Business
Undergraduate Program
Assessment Report
Academic Year 2008-2009**

I. BRIEF SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT PLAN

Highlights of the Assessment Plan

The School of Business established a set of program goals and learning outcomes and collects assessment data to measure student achievement of these outcomes. In 2008-2009, we started assessment of general education skills, after completing a three-year cycle of assessing outcomes related to knowledge and skills in areas of business. We focused on assessment of reading and writing outcomes and used course-embedded assessment techniques to gather data in three sections of core undergraduate courses. The faculty developed assessment forms and used benchmarks to evaluate individual student performance and establish whether the student learning in an outcome is Exemplary, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory.

The School also uses the ETS Major Field Test in Business to measure the knowledge and skills of all graduates. The results of this national standardized ETS test taken by the graduates provide external validation to our course-embedded assessment data. Overall, the School's graduates performed strongly on this national test in 2008-2009. There were 32 graduates taking the test in Spring 2009, and the mean performance for the cohort was at the 80th percentile compared to all institutions participating in the ETS testing nationally. A much smaller group of 9 graduates took the test in Fall 2008, and scored at the 40th percentile nationally. The mean score for all graduates for both Fall and Spring is at the 75th percentile nationally. This sample includes 564 institutions and 83,323 students in 2006-08.

The following are assessment highlights:

- Mission, Program Goals and Learning Outcomes are established and reviewed
- Course-embedded assessment data is collected every school year
- External standardized testing with the ETS Major Field Test for Business
- Assessment Committee oversees all assessment activities
- Assessment results reviewed by all faculty in regular faculty meetings
- Coverage of learning outcomes verified by periodic syllabi checks
- Other activities include periodic surveys of graduates

Goals and Outcomes Assessed in 2008-2009

The School assessed student performance on the following goals and outcomes in the 2008-2009 academic year. The focus was on the reading and writing skills.

Goal 1. Communicate effectively

- Outcome 1.1. Students will read critically
 - Component 1.1.1 Identify issues
 - Component 1.1.2 Identify and assess quality of supporting facts/evidence
 - Component 1.1.3 Evaluate implications and draw a conclusion
- Outcome 1.2. Students will write effectively

Component 1.2.1	Organization
Component 1.2.2	Spelling and Grammar
Component 1.2.3	Sufficiency and Quality of Research and Evidence

Assessment Benchmarks

Assessment of these outcomes was performed with course-embedded assessment measures described below in Section II of this Report. Assessing one general education goal in 2008-2009 allowed for detailed student-level data on achievement of the outcomes connected to the goal. The Assessment Committee developed rubrics for assessing student achievement of the outcomes. Please refer to Appendix B for the rubrics used to assess outcomes 1.1-1.2. The rubrics identify the performance levels in the following fashion – Level I (Exemplary achievement of the outcome), Level II (Satisfactory achievement of the outcome), Level III (Unsatisfactory achievement of the outcome). The benchmark is set for 85 percent of students that completed the course with a passing grade to achieve Level I or Level II performance.

Changes to Assessment Plan

Assessment activities in 2008-2009 were performed as specified in the Assessment Plan. There was one change, as the Assessment Committee decided to focus only on outcomes 1.1-1.2 during this academic year, and leave assessment of outcomes 1.3-1.4 for the following academic year.

II. ASSESSMENT METHODS

Course-embedded Assessment

The School used a combination of course-embedded assessment tools and an external nationally standardized test. For each outcome presented in Section I, a course-embedded system of assessment was used to collect data on student performance. The Curriculum Map presented in Appendix A demonstrates which specific courses are used for data collection for each of the outcomes. In particular, outcome 1.1 (Read critically) was assessed in L201, and outcome 1.2 (Write effectively) was assessed in E202. These are both required core courses. The course-embedded outcomes assessment mechanism involves the faculty incorporating assessment tasks in regular course assignments. These assessment data are recorded separately from student course grades, and are linked to the specific assessment outcomes and components listed in Section I.

The School's Assessment Committee developed assessment components and rubrics to evaluate outcomes 1.1-1.2. Appendix B presents the rubrics that identify the components and performance standards for outcomes 1.1-1.2. The rubrics identify the performance levels in the following fashion – Level I (Exemplary achievement of the outcome), Level II (Satisfactory achievement of the outcome), Level III (Unsatisfactory achievement of the outcome).

For each outcome assessed, the data were collected for all students in the course. The data were collected in one section of L201 with a total of 14 students and two sections of E202 with a total of 45 students. The Assessment Committee asked for participation of all faculty in the data collection and evaluation of student achievement of learning outcomes with rubrics. Four faculty members evaluated the performance of undergraduate students and ten faculty members evaluated the performance of graduate students. The summary of assessment results for each of the outcomes is presented in Appendix C – Course-embedded Assessment Results.

National Standardized Test

As a supplementary assessment tool, all graduates of the School were required to take the national standardized Educational Testing Service (ETS) Major Field Test in Business. This test focuses on the knowledge in the functional areas of Business and was scheduled in the capstone course (J401). This exam is listed as a requirement for completion of J401 and students are encouraged to do their best on the exam. The Assessment Committee and the faculty teaching in the different areas worked to link the assessment indicators provided by the ETS to the student learning outcomes. A grid summary of these links is available in the Assessment Plan. The Assessment Committee and the faculty review the ETS test data as an additional measure of achievement of the learning outcomes. The data of the ETS exam is also used to provide external validation to the course-embedded assessment data collected for the business area learning outcomes 6.1.1-6.8.4.

III. DESCRIPTION OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

The summary of the assessment results for 2008-2009 is presented in the appendices C and D. Appendix C presents a summary of the course-embedded assessment results. This summary shows the average student performance and the numbers of students that were evaluated as Level I (Exemplary achievement of the outcome), Level II (Satisfactory achievement of the outcome), and Level III (Unsatisfactory achievement of the outcome).

For outcome 1.1 – “Students will read critically” – the achievement of component 1 (Identify issues) was excellent, as all 14 students reached Level I. This component reaches the benchmark established for the outcome. For component 2 (Identify and assess quality of supporting facts/evidence) was lower, with 11 students reaching levels I or II, and 3 students reaching only level III. This outcome falls below the benchmark by one student. For component 3 (Evaluate implications and reach a conclusion), the benchmark is satisfied, as 12 students reach Levels I or II, and only 2 students stay at Level III.

For outcome 1.2 – “Students will write effectively” – all three components satisfy the benchmark levels. For component 1 (Organization of written work), 41 students reached Levels I or II and 4 students were at Level III. For outcome 2 (Spelling and Grammar), 44 students were at Levels I or II, and only 1 student was at Level III. For outcome 3 (Sufficiency and quality of research), 39 students were at Levels I and II, and 6 students were at Level III.

Overall, the results demonstrate that student performance reaches the level of the faculty’s expectations for most outcomes. Only one component is found lacking, and it misses the benchmark by one student. The outcomes were assessed in sophomore-level courses, and the achievement of these outcomes may improve as students progress through the program. This is one question that may be addressed with further assessment. The same outcomes are assessed for the second consecutive year in 2009-2010, and additional data will demonstrate whether achievement of these outcomes is consistent, and whether the reading outcome continues to be an area of concern. The Assessment Committee and the faculty considered the impact of these results on the curriculum and on the assessment process. These are discussed below in Section IV.

The results of the standardized ETS test taken by the graduates are presented in Appendix E. In particular, there were 32 graduates taking the test in Spring 2009, and the mean performance for the cohort was at the 80th percentile compared to all institutions participating in the ETS testing nationally. A much smaller group of 9 graduates took the test in Fall 2008, and scored at the 40th percentile nationally. The mean score for all graduates for both Fall and Spring is at the 75th percentile nationally. This sample includes 564 institutions and 83,323 students in 2006-08. This

means that the IU Kokomo School of Business graduates ranked in the top 25 percent in this national sample.

ETS test results are further linked to the program outcomes assessed. For instance, in Spring 2009 the ETS test assessment indicators for goals 6.5 – Management and 6.6 – Information Systems were at the 90th percentile nationally, while indicators for goals 6.2 – Economics, 6.3 – Finance, 6.4 – Legal and International Issues, and 6.7. – Marketing all rank at or above the 80th percentile nationally.

The ETS test allows us to get external validation of student performance, and to compare performance of our students with that of over 80,000 students at 564 other institutions. The ETS reports an overall mean score for the program in the nine areas of business, and individual student scores for the complete test. We expect our students to perform individually at better than the national average level. We also expect the program to have overall mean scores that are above the National average. The benchmark for Excellence for the program is to have 75 percent of the graduates exceed the national average scores individually. The benchmark for Satisfactory performance is to have 60 percent of students exceed the national average score.

In 2008-2009, the individual results reach the benchmark for satisfactory performance with 60 percent of the students performing at or above the national average, even with the weaker cohort of students graduating in Fall 2008. The overall mean score for the year is at the 75th percentile, which exceeds the benchmark for satisfactory performance.

IV. USING ASSESSMENT FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Program Improvement

The effort to close the loop and improve the program in response to the assessment results is an important feature of our assessment plan. If the benchmark level set for the course-embedded data is not reached for a particular outcome, the faculty investigate the reasons for the below target performance. Such revisions were common in the past years when we assessed the achievement of outcomes in the areas of business.

In 2008-2009, the course-embedded assessment results demonstrate that student achievement of several components may be improved, in particular the components that require evaluation of the quality of supporting evidence in critical reading and writing. The Assessment Committee recommended that the faculty members that require critical reading of case studies and writing of analytical papers make such components explicit parts of the overall assignment grade. This will allow faculty members to grade not only the business-related content, but also the critical reading and writing components of the students' work.

Continuous Improvement of Assessment Process

The School's Assessment Committee works to review the Assessment Plan based on the results collected. Academic year 2007-2008 completed a three-year cycle of data collection for the business area learning outcomes. This cycle was an effort to establish whether the satisfactory level of performance was sustained. Academic year 2008-2009 started the cycle of assessing general education outcomes. We attempt to assess each outcome more than once in order to establish the sustained achievement of outcome benchmarks. The assessment techniques are evaluated as the process continues.

For instance, the current data indicate that the benchmark for critical reading outcome missed by one student, as 3 students out of 14 were at Level III performance for component 2. The faculty

member teaching the course indicated that the students have trouble with this component in the early part of the semester, but demonstrate improvement as the semester progresses. The current results were collected in week 8 of the semester. In 2009-2010, this outcome will be assessed late in the semester to see whether the data supports improvement in student achievement of this outcome at the end of the semester.

The School's Assessment Committee also works to incorporate feedback from the IU Kokomo Center for Teaching, Learning and Assessment (CTLA) and the campus Assessment Council into the process. In particular, the School moved from assessing a large number of business-specific outcomes to a smaller number of general education outcomes in 2008-2009. This allowed to evaluate individual-level learning outcome data as opposed to section-level mean scores. This change was suggested by the CTLA.

V. DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS

The assessment results are being disseminated in a variety of ways. The Assessment Committee collects and reviews all assessment results. A summary of assessment activities were presented to the School's faculty and staff at the School of Business meetings. Assessment results for each semester were discussed by the faculty and staff members of the School in these regular meetings. In addition, a copy of this report is submitted to the IU Kokomo office of Academic Affairs. These copies are filed and are publicly available to all the stakeholders of the School, including web access through the university's web site.

The highlights of assessment activities were presented at the School's advisory board meeting that included the stakeholders from the community. The School also developed an assessment web site with complete information on the School's assessment activities. The information on this web site includes assessment highlights for the undergraduate Business program and the M.B.A. program, the list of learning outcomes for the undergraduate and M.B.A. programs, and the results of ETS testing of graduates. The School was one of the first on campus to develop a complete web summary of assessment. The current address of the School's assessment web page is:

<http://www.iuk.edu/~kobus/assessment/assessment.shtml>

Highlights of the assessment activities were also provided to CTLA for dissemination to stakeholders. This information is now available at:

<http://www.iuk.edu/~koctla/assessment/SumBus.shtml>

Please note that these web addresses may be changed as IU Kokomo goes through a web site re-development project in Fall 2009.

APPENDIX A. LEARNING OUTCOMES CURRICULUM MAP

		A201	A202	E201	E202	E270	D301	F301	K201	L201	M301	P301	S302	Z302	J401
Goal 1.	Communicate effectively														
Outcome 1.1.	Read critically									X					
Outcome 1.2.	Write effectively				X										
Outcome 1.3.	Speak effectively										X				X
Outcome 1.4.	Technology to support communication										X				X
Goal 2.	Use information effectively														
Outcome 2. 1.	Nature and extent of information needed												X		
Outcome 2. 2.	Access information effectively and efficiently												X		
Outcome 2. 3.	Evaluate information and its sources critically												X		
Outcome 2. 4.	Use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose												X		
Goal 3.	Demonstrate quantitative skills.														
Outcome 3.1.	Translate a verbal problem into mathematical notation					X									
Outcome 3.2.	Solve the mathematical problem that models verbal problem					X									
Outcome 3.3.	Use the solution to draw valid conclusions					X									
Outcome 3.4.	Use fundamental statistical information					X		X							
Goal 4.	Demonstrate effective critical thinking skills.														
Outcome 4. 1.	Recognize issues that have alternative interpretations				X		X								X
Outcome 4. 2.	Compare the perspectives of others to their own						X								X
Outcome 4. 3.	Assess the quality of supporting evidence						X								X
Outcome 4. 4.	Assess the implications that result from proposed conclusions				X		X								X
Goal 5.	Demonstrate skills with computers and information technology.														
Outcome 5.1.	Use word processing software.								X						
Outcome 5.2.	Use spreadsheet software.								X				X		
Outcome 5.3.	Use presentation software.								X						
Outcome 5.4.	Use database management software.								X				X		
Outcome 5.5.	Develop skills in web design.								X						

		A201	A202	E201	E202	E270	D301	F301	K201	L201	M301	P301	S302	Z302	J401
	ACCOUNTING														
6.1.1	Record accounting transactions.	X													
6.1.2	Phases of the accounting cycle.	X													
6.1.3	Major financial statements.	X													
6.1.4	Financial statements in decision making	X													
6.1.5	Overhead cost allocation.		X												
6.1.6	Cost behavior		X												
6.1.7	Variance analysis.		X												
6.1.8	Managerial accounting reports		X												
	ECONOMICS														
6.2.1	Supply and demand			X											
6.2.2	Cost measures			X											
6.2.3	Market structures			X											
6.2.4	Measures of inflation, unemployment and GDP				X										
6.2.5	Growth policy				X										
6.2.6	Fiscal and monetary policies				X										
6.2.7	Money and the Federal Reserve system.				X										
6.2.8	Gains to trade, barriers to trade			X											
	FINANCE														
6.3.1	The time value of money							X							
6.3.2	Valuation models							X							
6.3.3	Capital budgeting theory and its application							X							
6.3.4	Capital Asset Pricing Model.							X							
6.3.5	Capital structure							X							
	LEGAL, ETHICAL, SOCIAL, INTERNATIONAL ISSUES														
6.4.1	National, international and intercultural factors						X								
6.4.2	Theories of trade and investment						X								
6.4.3	Major trade and investment flows						X								
6.4.4	Multinational enterprises						X								
6.4.5	National competitiveness						X								
6.4.6	Concept of ethics									X					
6.4.7	Nature and sources of law									X					
6.4.8	Rules that bound business entities									X					
	MANAGEMENT														
6.5.1	Nature of an enterprise														X
6.5.1.1	Environment of enterprise														X
6.5.1.2	Stakeholders of enterprise														X
6.5.2	Analytical framework of enterprise														X
6.5.2.1	Competitive analysis														X
6.5.2.2	Internal analysis of an organization														X
6.5.3	Leadership and motivation													X	
	MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS														
6.6.1	Nature of IS												X		
6.6.2	Database, its design and use												X		
6.6.3	Impact of IS on organization												X		
6.6.4	Implications of telecommunications and e-business												X		
	MARKETING														
6.7.1	Eight universal functions of marketing.										X				
6.7.2	Marketing concept.										X				
6.7.3	Marketing opportunities.										X				
6.7.4	Segment product-markets / marketing mix										X				
6.7.5	Marketing management / strategic market planning										X				
	OPERATION MANAGEMENT														
6.8.1	Role of operation management in business strategy											X			
6.8.2	Interaction with other functions											X			
6.8.3	Quality and technology											X			
6.8.4	Selected OM concepts and techniques											X			

APPENDIX B. ASSESSMENT RUBRICS

Outcome: “Students will read critically”

Date: _____

Rater: _____

Course: _____

Student: _____

Instructions to the evaluator: For each of the components below, enter a score in the far right column that reflects your evaluation. You can use up to one decimal place (i.e. 2.3). All scores must fit into the range from 1.0 to 3.0.

RANGE:	1.0-1.5	1.51-2.49	2.5-3.0	
COMPONENT	Unacceptable = 1.0	Acceptable = 2.0	Exemplary = 3.0	Score
Identify issues	Student inaccurately identifies issue(s).	Student identifies the basic issue(s) with acceptable accuracy. Student makes few incorrect inferences.	Student fully identifies the issue(s) with complete accuracy. Student makes inferences that contribute to knowledge in a focused, specific manner.	
Identify and assess quality of supporting facts/evidence	Student fails to identify supporting facts/evidence or does so inarticulately.	Student is able to identify most of the relevant supporting facts/evidence.	Student completely identifies and assesses the importance and quality of all supporting facts/evidence.	
Evaluate implications and draw a conclusion	Student is unable to evaluate implications and conclusions from available data or does so inaccurately.	Student accurately evaluates implications and draws conclusions from the available data with a thorough summary.	Student accurately evaluates implications and draws conclusions from available data with fully developed explanations. Student provides analysis of alternative consequences.	

Outcome: “Students will write effectively”

Date: _____

Rater: _____

Course: _____

Student: _____

Instructions to the evaluator: For each of the four components, enter a score in the far right column that reflects your evaluation. You can use up to one decimal place (i.e. 2.3). All scores must fit into the range from 1.0 to 3.0.

COMPONENT	Unacceptable = 1.0	Acceptable = 2.0	Exemplary = 3.0	Score
Organization	Uneven and ineffective overall organization, unfocused introduction or conclusion.	Develops unified and coherent ideas within paragraphs with generally adequate transitions; clear overall organization relating most ideas together, good introduction and conclusion.	Develops ideas, organizes them logically with paragraphs and connects them with effective transitions. Goes beyond "average" in delivering a conclusion that is well documented and persuasive.	
Spelling and Grammar	Writing contains frequent spelling and grammar errors which interfere with comprehension	While there may be minor errors, the writing follows normal conventions of spelling and grammar throughout and has been carefully proofread.	The writing is essential error-free in terms of spelling and grammar.	
Sufficiency and Quality of Research and Evidence	Most ideas unsupported, confusion between personal and external evidence, reasoning flawed.	Presents ideas in general terms, support for ideas is present but may need clarification.	Supports most ideas with effective examples, references, and details, makes key distinctions	

APPENDIX C. COURSE-EMBEDDED ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Assessment of Undergraduate Critical Reading Skills in L201

AY 2008-2009	Number	Average	Count of		
Overall for the cohort:	14	(3.0 is Best)	Exemplary	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Identify issues	14	2.7	14	0	0
Identify and assess quality of supporting facts/evidence	14	2.2	5	6	3
Evaluate implications and draw a conclusion	14	2.4	9	3	2

Assessment of Undergraduate Writing Skills in E202					
AY 2008-2009	Number	Average	Count of		
Overall for the cohort	45	(3.0 is Best)	Exemplary	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Organization	45	2.4	24	17	4
Spelling and Grammar	45	2.4	22	22	1
Sufficiency and Quality of Research and Evidence	45	2.3	23	16	6

APPENDIX D. ETS MAJOR FIELD TEST RESULTS

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING THROUGH ETS MAJOR FIELD TEST

The data represents results of IU Kokomo Business students in Educational Testing Service's standardized field test. The numbers are percentile rank scores for all categories and for each category separately for a given semester dating back to 2004. As the School was switching from paper-based to computer testing, there was no test given in Fall 2006.

The ETS test form changes every three years making the comparison across time susceptible to this structural change. The most recent test form changes occurred in 2003 and 2006. These percentile ranks for the IU Kokomo mean student score show how many of the ETS test takers nationally have scores below the IU Kokomo score. The 2006-08 comparative benchmarks from ETS are based on the sample of 83,323 students at 564 institutions. Information Systems knowledge is evaluated separately in the Major Field Test only from 2007.

	Spring 2004	Fall 2004	Spring 2005	Fall 2005	Spring 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009
Percentile scores										
Number of students tested	16	19	21	13	17	21	8	16	9	32
Overall IU Kokomo Percentile	85	95	95	95	85	90	95	95	40	80
Accounting	95	95	95	95	85	90	90	95	45	65
Economics	60	85	80	95	80	85	95	95	65	85
Mgmt	85	90	75	70	65	90	95	70	30	90
Quantitative Analysis	80	95	90	75	70	95	85	95	15	55
Finance	65	95	90	90	95	95	95	90	30	80
Marketing	80	85	95	75	95	80	95	95	20	80
Legal/Social Environ.	80	95	95	75	80	85	95	95	50	85
Information Systems						85	85	95	40	90
International Issues	80	95	85	95	90	85	95	95	75	75