Indiana University Kokomo
School of Business
Undergraduate Program
Assessment Report
Academic Year 2009-2010

I. BRIEF SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT PLAN

Highlights of the Assessment Plan

The School of Business has developed a set of program goals and learning outcomes and collects assessment data to measure student achievement of these outcomes. In 2009-2010, the School continues assessment of general education skills. In the undergraduate program, we focused on the assessment of reading and writing outcomes and used course-embedded assessment techniques to gather data on the achievement of these outcomes in 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 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 2009-2010. There were 44 graduates taking the test in Fall 2009 and Spring 2010, and the mean performance for the cohort was at the 75th percentile compared to all institutions participating in the ETS testing internationally. This sample includes 618 institutions and 132,647 students in 2006-2009.

The School worked to improve placement skills of students, and established mock interviews and resume critique as part of a required course. A survey was taken by all students participating in this course in Fall 2009 and Spring 2010. The results of the survey are used to evaluate the effectiveness of career and placement training.

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 students and graduates

Goals and Outcomes Assessed in 2009-2010

The School assessed student performance on the following goals and outcomes in the 2009-2010 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 2009-2010
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 and 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. This was the second year in a row that these
outcomes were assessed. A comparison of results for these outcomes helps establish whether the
benchmarks are attained in a consistent fashion.

Changes to Assessment Plan

Assessment activities in 2008-2009 were performed as specified in the Assessment Plan. There was
one change, as the School worked to improve placement skills of students, and established mock
interviews and resume critique as part of a required course. There was a survey taken by all
students participating in this course in Fall 2009 and Spring 2010. This was a new assessment
measure not discussed in the assessment plan for this year. The results of the survey are used to
evaluate the effectiveness of career and placement training.

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 is provided in
Appendix A in order to demonstrate which specific courses are used for data collection for each of
the outcomes. Please note that the complete discussion of the School's assessment methods is
provided in the two-year Assessment Plan for 2008-2010. In particular, in 2009-2010, 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 the assessment components and rubrics to evaluate
outcomes 1.1 and 1.2. The rubrics that identify the components and performance standards for
outcomes 1.1 and 1.2 are shown in Appendix B. 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 a course section. The data were collected in one section of L201 with a total of 23 students and one section of E202 with a total of 20 students. The Assessment Committee asked for participation of all faculty in the data collection and evaluation of student achievement of learning outcomes with rubrics. Multiple faculty members were involved in the evaluation of assessment data with the rubrics provided. 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 in the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 semesters were required to take the national standardized 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

Assessment results for 2009-10 are summarized 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 Satisfactory, as 15 students reached Level I, and 7 students reached Level II. Thus 22 of 23 students (96%) reached the Satisfactory level. This component reaches the benchmark established for the outcome. For component 2 (Identify and assess quality of supporting facts/evidence) the achievement level was lower, with 20 students (87%) reaching levels I or II, and 3 students (13%) reaching only level III. 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. This benchmark was satisfied. For component 3 (Evaluate implications and reach a conclusion), the benchmark is also satisfied, as 21 students (91.5%) 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), all 20 students reached Levels I or II. For outcome 2 (Spelling and Grammar), again all 20 students were at Levels I or II with 17 of them reaching the highest level. For outcome 3 (Sufficiency and quality of research), 19 students were at Levels I and II, and only 1 student was at Level III.

Overall, the results demonstrate that student performance reaches the level of the faculty's expectations. The weakest performance was in outcome 1.1.2 (Identify and assess quality of supporting facts/evidence). This performance, however slightly improved from 2008-09. In general, 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. These same outcomes are assessed for the second consecutive year in 2009-2010, and the results demonstrate that the achievement of these outcomes is consistent.

The results of the standardized ETS test taken by the graduates are presented in Appendix D. In particular, there were 20 graduates taking the test in Fall 2009 and 24 graduates taking the test in Spring 2010. The mean performance of both cohorts was at the 75th percentile compared to all institutions participating in the ETS testing nationally. This sample includes 618 institutions and 132,647 students in 2006-09. This means that the IU Kokomo School of Business graduates ranked in the top 25 percent in this large 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 6.1 – Accounting, 6.2 – Economics, 6.3 – Finance, 6.4 – Legal and International Issues all rank at or above the 90th percentile nationally. The weakest area this year was Information Systems, however this area ranked in the 90th percentile in Spring 2009, and the decline may be temporary. The faculty will monitor the performance in this area.

The ETS test allows us to get external validation of student performance, and to compare performance of our students with that of over 132,000 students at 618 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 2009-10, the individual results reach the benchmark for satisfactory performance with 64 percent of the students performing at or above the national average. The overall mean score for the year is at the 75th percentile, which exceeds the program-level benchmark for satisfactory performance.

IV. USING ASSESSMENT FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Program Improvement

An important feature of our assessment plan is the presence of procedures aimed at "closing the loop" and improving the program in response to the assessment results. 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. The faculty then adjust the curriculum in order to ensure the targets are met. Such revisions were common in the past years when we assessed the achievement of outcomes in the areas of business. In 2008-2009, 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. As a result, the L201 course, in particular, emphasized the use of IRAC methodology for case analysis. We repeated the assessment of critical reading skills in 2009-2010, and the results indicate an improvement, as the benchmark for component 2 (Identify and assess quality of supporting facts/evidence) is now met. Faculty will continue monitoring this outcome to ensure that student performance is sustained.

In 2009-2010, the School worked to improve placement skills of students, and established mock interviews and resume critique as part of the required M301 course at the junior level. A placement councilor worked with the students at this level in order to prepare them for the job market during their senior year. There was a survey taken by all students participating in this course in Fall 2009 and Spring 2010. Appendix E presents the summary of survey results from the Spring 2010 M301 students' evaluations of the placement councilor (Tracy Springer) assistance with resume review

and mock interview feedback. We sent two follow-up mailings and received a total of 16 replies out of a possible 26 participants, which is a 62% response rate. The overall and specific ratings speak to the outstanding job the placement councilor (Tracy Springer) has done for business students in the important areas of resume and mock interview evaluation. This project will be continued in 2010-2011 with the cooperation of Tracy Springer and the M301 instructor Dr. Rink.

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, so the reading and writing outcomes were assessed for a second time in 2009-2010.

The assessment techniques are evaluated as the process continues. For instance, the faculty member teaching the course where the critical reading outcomes were assessed changed the timing of assessment to the late part of the semester in order to ensure that the students are sufficiently familiar with the IRAC case study analysis methodology used in the assessment of reading. In another example mentioned above, the faculty member responsible for M301 mock interview survey worked to send survey follow-up mailings to bring the response rate on the survey to 62%.

V. DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS

The assessment results are being disseminated in a variety of ways. The Assessment Committee collects and reviews all assessment results. The Chair of the Assessment Committee presented a summary of assessment activities 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 School also maintains 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.indiana.edu/~kowcms/academics/schools/business/programs/assessment/index.html
Highlights of the assessment activities were also provided to the campus Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (CTLA) for dissemination to stakeholders. This information is now available at the CTLA web site:
http://www.indiana.edu/~kowcms/academics/ctla/assessment/results/index.html

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 2009-2010	Number	Average	Count of		
Overall for the cohort:	23	(3.0 is Best)	Exemplary	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Identify issues	23	2.5	15	7	1
Identify and assess quality of supporting facts/evidence	23	2.3	10	10	3
Evaluate implications and draw a conclusion	23	2.5	15	6	2

Assessment of Undergraduate Writing Skills in E202					
AY 2009-2010	Number	Average	Count of		
Overall for the cohort		(3.0 is Best)	Exemplary	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Organization	20	2.5	9	11	0
Spelling and Grammar	20	2.7	17	3	0
Sufficiency and Quality of Research and Evidence	20	2.4	10	9	1

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 2006-09 comparative benchmarks from ETS are based on the sample of 132,647 students at 618 institutions. Information Systems knowledge is evaluated separately in the Major Field Test only from 2007.

Percentile scores	Spring 2004	Fall 2004	Spring 2005	Fall 2005	Spring 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	Fall 2009	Spring 2010
Number of students tested	16	19	21	13	17	21	8	16	9	32	24	20
Overall IU Kokomo Percentile	**85**	**95**	**95**	**95**	**85**	**90**	**95**	**95**	**40**	**80**	**75**	**75**
Accounting	95	95	95	95	85	90	90	95	45	65	55	90
Economics	60	85	80	95	80	85	95	95	65	85	80	95
Mgmt	85	90	75	70	65	90	95	70	30	90	95	85
Quantitative Analysis	80	95	90	75	70	95	85	95	15	55	70	95
Finance	65	95	90	90	95	95	95	90	30	80	75	95
Marketing	80	85	95	75	95	80	95	95	20	80	80	85
Legal/Social Environ.	80	95	95	75	80	85	95	95	50	85	50	95
Information Systems						85	85	95	40	90	65	60
International Issues	80	95	85	95	90	85	95	95	75	75	90	95

APPENDIX E. SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW AND RESUME SURVEY

Assessment Survey Results - Mock Interviews in M301 Course

Interview advisor (Tracy) provided informative handouts that were very helpful.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	66.7%	14
Agree	33.3%	7
Slightly Agree	0.0%	0
Slightly Disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Not Applicable	0.0%	0

Interview advisor (Tracy) provided helpful suggestions for improving my interviewing skills.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	52.4%	11
Agree	42.9%	9
Slightly Agree	0.0%	0
Slightly Disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Not Applicable	4.8%	1

Interview advisor (Tracy) provided helpful suggestions for improving my nonverval communication (e.g. gestures) during an interview.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	30.0%	6
Agree	30.0%	6
Slightly Agree	10.0%	2
Slightly Disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Not Applicable	30.0%	6
answered question		20
skipped question		1

Assessment Survey Results - Mock Interviews in M301 Course

Interview advisor (Tracy) provided helpful suggestions for preparing my cover letter.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	33.3%	7
Agree	61.9%	13
Slightly Agree	4.8%	1
Slightly Disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Not Applicable	0.0%	0

Interview advisor (Tracy) provided informative handouts that were very helpful.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	66.7%	14
Agree	33.3%	7
Slightly Agree	0.0%	0
Slightly Disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Not Applicable	0.0%	0

What specific suggestions do you have for improving résumé, mock interview, evaluation of interviewing skills, handouts, etc.?

Answer Options	Response Count
	4

I think it was a smooth process, and it really made me think about different things to say and how to portray myself to the employer(s). I do think that the phone interview should stay in place, because that really helped me out with my tight schedule. I appreciated her being able to work around

I suggest a book for students to read call 60 seconds and you are hired. It helped me tremendously improve my interview skills, avoid tricky questions, and even negotiate salary and benefits.