

**Indiana University Kokomo
School of Business
Undergraduate Program
Assessment Report
Academic Year 2010-2011**

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 continues to collect assessment data each school year to measure student achievement of these outcomes. In 2010-2011, the School assessed general education skills. In the undergraduate program, we focused on the assessment of critical thinking, quantitative, information, and computer skills. We 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 Excellent, Acceptable, or Needs Improvement.

The School also used 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 2010-2011. There were 16 graduates taking the test in Spring 2011, and the mean performance for this cohort was at the 85th percentile compared to all institutions participating in the ETS Major Field Test internationally. This worldwide sample includes 618 institutions and 132,647 students.

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 were reviewed by all faculty in regular faculty meetings
- Assessment process was reviewed in Fall 2010 by the accreditation maintenance team from AACSB (Association for Advancement of Collegiate Schools of Business)
- Other activities include periodic surveys of students and graduates

Goals and Outcomes Assessed in 2010-2011

The School assessed student performance on the following goals and outcomes in the 2010-2011 academic year. The focus was on critical thinking, quantitative, information, and computer skills.

Goal 2. Use information effectively

- Outcome 2. 1. Students will determine the nature and extent of information needed
- Outcome 2. 2. Students will access the needed information effectively and efficiently
- Outcome 2. 3. Students will evaluate information and its sources critically
- Outcome 2. 4. Students will use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose

Goal 3. Demonstrate quantitative skills.

- Outcome 3.1. Students will translate a verbal problem into mathematical notation
- Outcome 3.2. Students will solve the mathematical problem that models verbal problem
- Outcome 3.3. Students will use the solution of the mathematical problem to draw valid conclusions about the verbal problem

Goal 4. Demonstrate effective critical thinking skills.

- Outcome 4. 1. Students will recognize issues that have alternative interpretations
- Outcome 4. 2. Students will compare the perspectives of others to their own
- Outcome 4. 3. Students will assess the quality of supporting evidence
- Outcome 4. 4. Students will assess the implications and consequences that result from proposed conclusions

Goal 5. Demonstrate skills with computers and information technology.

- Outcome 5.1 - Students will use word processing software.
- Outcome 5.2 - Students will use spreadsheet software.
- Outcome 5.3 - Students will use presentation software.
- Outcome 5.4 - Students will use database management software.
- Outcome 5.5 - Students will demonstrate skills in web design.

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 2009-2011. Not all outcomes are assessed every year. As discussed in Section I, the assessment efforts in 2010-2011 focused on outcomes related to Goals 2-5 (critical thinking, quantitative, information, and computer skills).

In particular, in 2010-2011, outcomes 2.1-2.4 (Information use) were assessed in S302, outcomes 3.1-3.3 (Quantitative skills) were assessed in A202, outcomes 4.1-4.4 (Critical thinking) were assessed in E202, and outcomes 5.1-5.5 (Computer skills) were assessed in K201 and S302. These courses are all 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 forms to evaluate the outcomes assessed in 2010-2011. Please refer to Appendix B for the forms used to assess the outcomes in 2010-2011. The forms identify the performance levels in the following fashion – Level I (Excellent achievement of the outcome), Level II (Acceptable achievement of the outcome), Level III (Achievement of the outcome Needs Improvement).

For each outcome assessed, the data were collected for all students in a course section. For instance, the data collected in E202 were based on a sample of 29 students enrolled in that section. Multiple faculty members were involved in the collection and evaluation of assessment data. The committee reviewed all assessment results in preparation of this report. The summary of assessment results for each of the outcomes is presented in Appendix B.

National Standardized Test

As a supplementary assessment tool, all graduates in Spring 2011 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 a required part of the capstone course (J401). 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 from the ETS exam are also used to provide external validation to the course-embedded assessment data.

III. DESCRIPTION OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Assessment results for 2010-11 are summarized in Table 1. This summary shows the mean student performance for each outcome assessed this school year. The course-level assessment results are presented in appendix B, while ETS test results are summarized in Appendix C.

For outcome 2.1 – “Students will determine the nature and extent of information needed” – the mean performance was at 94.6%. For outcome 2.2 – “Students will access the needed information effectively and efficiently” the mean performance was at 94.9%. For outcome 2.3 – “Students will evaluate information and its sources critically” the mean performance was at 91.3%. For outcome 2.4 – “Students will use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose” the mean performance was at 86.4%. The data were collected in course projects, for instance, outcome 2.2 was assessed with an internet research project, while outcomes 2.1, 2.3 and 2.4 were assessed with three different case study analysis assignments in the S302 course.

For outcome 3.1 – “Students will translate a verbal problem into mathematical notation” – the mean performance was at 74.5%. For outcome 3.2 – “Students will solve the mathematical problem that models verbal problem” the mean performance was at 84.0%. For outcome 3.3 – “Students will use the solution of the mathematical problem to draw valid conclusions about the verbal problem” the mean performance was at 71.8%. The data were collected in specific exam problem linked to these outcomes in the A202 course. Dr. Cox who performed this assessment concluded: “Sometimes students set up a problem up incorrectly but then solve the incorrect setup correctly... In general, students can solve mathematical models/equations if they set them up correctly (or if they are setup for them). Setting up the model/using the right tool is more of a challenge; even more challenging is the interpretation of the solution. Sometimes there are subtle implications beyond the more obvious conclusions. It is probably too much to expect that the majority of the students master these skills at the sophomore level. Still, I like to expose the students to these situations. Better students enjoy the challenge while less advanced students benefit from exposure to scenarios that call for critical thinking.”

Table 1. Summary of Course-embedded Assessment Results

Outcome	Score	Evaluation		
		Excellent	Acceptable	Needs Improvement
Goal 2. Use information effectively				
Students will determine the nature and extent of information needed	94.6% (n=22)	X		
Students will access the needed information effectively and efficiently	94.9% (n=23)	X		
Students will evaluate information and its sources critically	91.3% (n=23)	X		
Students will use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose	86.4% (n=22)		X	
Goal 3. Demonstrate quantitative skills.				
Students will translate a verbal problem into mathematical notation	74.5%		X	
Students will solve the mathematical problem that models verbal problem	84.0%		X	
Students will use the solution of the mathematical problem to draw valid conclusions about the verbal problem	71.8%		X	
Goal 4. Demonstrate effective critical thinking skills.				
Students will recognize issues that have alternative interpretations.	2.50	X		
Students will compare the perspectives of others to their own.	2.39		X	
Students will assess the quality of supporting evidence.	2.43		X	
Students will assess the implications and consequences that result from proposed conclusions.	2.42		X	
Goal 5. Demonstrate skills with computers and information technology.				
Students will use word processing software	91%	X		
Students will use presentation software	95%	X		
Students will use spreadsheet software	85.0%		X	
Students will use database management software	94.7%	X		
Students will demonstrate skills in web design	89%		X	

For the critical thinking outcomes, the assessment was performed with individual essays in the E202 course. Student achievement of each of the outcomes was scored with a rubric. For outcome 4.1 – “Students will recognize issues that have alternative interpretations” – 16 students achieved the Exemplary level, while 13 were at the Acceptable level. For outcome 4.2 – “Students will compare the perspectives of others to their own” – 12 students achieved the Exemplary level, while 17 were at the Acceptable level. For outcome 4.3 – “Students will assess the quality of supporting evidence” – 14 students achieved the Exemplary level, while 15 were at the Acceptable level. For outcome 4.4 – “Students will assess the implications and consequences that result from proposed conclusions” – 17 students achieved the Exemplary level, while 12 were at the Acceptable level. Overall, the performance met the expectations, and no students were at a level that needed improvement in Spring 2011.

Finally, assessment results for computer skills demonstrate that for outcome 5.1 – “Students will use word processing software” – the mean performance was at 91%. For outcome 5.2 – “Students will use spreadsheet software” the mean performance was at 85%. For outcome 5.3 – “Students will use presentation software” the mean performance was at 95%. For outcome 5.4 – “Students will use database management software” the mean performance was at 94.7%. For outcome 5.5 – “Students will demonstrate skills in web design” the mean performance was at 89%. The data were collected in individual computer projects in the K201 and S302 courses.

Overall, the results demonstrate that student performance reaches the level of the faculty’s expectations. Out of sixteen outcomes assessed in 2010-2011, seven reach the level of Excellent, while nine are at the Acceptable level.

The results of the standardized ETS test taken by the graduates are presented in Appendix C. In particular, there were 16 graduates taking the test in Spring 2011. The mean performance of this cohort was at the 85th percentile compared to all institutions participating in the ETS testing nationally. This sample includes 618 institutions and 132,647 students. This means that the IU Kokomo School of Business graduates ranked in the top 15 percent in this large national sample.

ETS test results are further linked to the program outcomes assessed. For instance, in Spring 2011 the ETS test assessment indicators in the areas of Management, Marketing, Legal and International Issues all rank at or above the 85th percentile nationally. The weakest areas this year were Quantitative Analysis and Information Systems. Note however that the ETS test has only 60 questions to cover all of these areas, and has to deal with issues connected to small sample size. Information Systems became a part of the test only in 2007, and according to faculty analysis has the smallest representation in the test. Thus, the focus of our assessment is not on yearly data, but on the overall trend in the results. Both of these areas (Quantitative Analysis and Information Systems) ranked in the 90th percentile recently, and the observed decline may be temporary. The faculty will monitor the performance in these areas.

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 2010-11, the individual results reach the benchmark for Excellent performance with 81 percent of the students performing at or above the national average. The overall mean score for the year is at the 85th percentile, which exceeds the program-level benchmark for Excellent 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 2010-2011, the Assessment Committee did not find any outcomes that required action, however our assessment plan includes a process for such curriculum changes.

An example of one recent change that continues in 2010-11 is the effort to improve placement skills of students. In 2009-10, the School established mock interviews and resume critique as part of the required M301 course at the junior level. A placement councilor works with students at this level in order to prepare them for the job market during their senior year. This project was 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 2010-11 completed a five-year cycle of data collection for the business area learning outcomes. During this cycle each program-level goal and outcome was assessed at least once in various points in the program according to the curriculum map. This cycle was an effort to establish whether the satisfactory level of performance was sustained. We assessed both knowledge in the areas of Business and general education outcomes.

As part of the Accreditation Maintenance visit from the School’s accrediting body, the AACSB (Association for Advancement of Collegiate School of Business) in Fall 2010, the Assessment Committee of the School met with the members of the accreditation team and reviewed the assessment plan and assessment results. A number of suggestions were provided by the accreditation team. The Assessment Committee will work to incorporate these suggestions into the assessment process in 2011-12. For instance, the accreditation team suggested that the School consider reducing the number of goals and outcomes assessed, and shorten the time of the assessment cycle. The current assessment cycle takes five years for the School to assess each and every goal and outcome. The committee has the review of goals and outcomes on its agenda for 2011-12 and will consider a restructuring of the assessment cycle in an attempt to shorten it.

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 School of Business 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 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 and continues to enhance the web availability of assessment documents. The current address of the School's assessment web page is:

<http://www.iuk.edu/academics/majors/business/resources/assessment.shtml>

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://iuk.edu/academics/ctla/assessment/results/index.shtml>

APPENDIX A. LEARNING OUTCOMES CURRICULUM MAP

		A201	A202	E201	E202	E270	D301	F301	K201	L201	M301/ M450	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
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
Goal 5.	Demonstrate skills with computers and information technology.														
Outcome 5.1.	Use word processing software.								X						
Outcome 5.2.	Use spreadsheet software.												X		
Outcome 5.3.	Use presentation software.												X		
Outcome 5.4.	Use database management software.								X						
Outcome 5.5.	Develop skills in web design.								X						

		A201	A202	E201	E202	E270	D301	F301	K201	L201	M301/ M450	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. COURSE-EMBEDDED ASSESSMENT RESULTS

IU Kokomo School of Business Assessment Data Form

Course: S302

Semester: Fall 2010

Faculty: CHULKOV

Please include your evaluation of the aggregate student performance measured for the assessment outcomes in the course. If you use a numerical measure in your assessment (for example, the percentage of correct answers on a test) include it under "Score". Also include your evaluation by placing a checkmark in the appropriate area.

Goal	Score	Evaluation		
		Excellent	Acceptable	Needs Improvement
Students will determine the nature and extent of information needed	94.6% (n=22)	X		
Students will access the needed information effectively and efficiently	94.9% (n=23)	X		
Students will evaluate information and its sources critically	91.3% (n=23)	X		
Students will use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose	86.4% (n=22)		X	
Students will use spreadsheet software	85.0% (n=23)		X	
Students will use database management software	94.7% (n=23)	X		
Instruments used to collect data (exam, quiz, etc.): Outcome 2 is assessed with an internet research project. Outcomes 1, 3 and 4 are assessed with case study analysis assignments. The final two outcomes are assessed with individual computer projects.				

Comments: (attach additional material if necessary)

IU Kokomo School of Business Assessment Data Form

Course: A202

Semester: Fall 2010

Faculty: Cox

Please return this form to Dmitriy Chulkov.

Please include your evaluation of the aggregate student performance measured for the assessment outcomes in the course. If you use a numerical measure in your assessment (for example, the percentage of correct answers on a test) include it under "Score". Also include your evaluation by placing a checkmark in the appropriate area.

Goal	Score	Evaluation		
		Excellent	Acceptable	Needs Improvement
Students will translate a verbal problem into mathematical notation ^a	74.5%		X	
Students will solve the mathematical problem that models verbal problem ^b	84.0%		X	
Students will use the solution of the mathematical problem to draw valid conclusions about the verbal problem ^c	71.8%		X	
Instruments used to collect data (exam, quiz, etc.):				
^a Based on problems 13 and 14 from Exam 2 and problems 13, 18, 20a, 20b, and 22b from Exam 3				
^b based on problems 12 and 15 from Exam 2 and problem 19 from Exam 3				
^c based on problems 23 and 24 from Exam 2 and problems 12, 20c, and 22b from Exam 3				

Comments: (attach additional material if necessary)

These results represent the performance of 19 students from one section of *Introduction to Managerial Accounting*. It is a little difficult to separate the first two goals. Sometimes students set up a problem up incorrectly but then solve the incorrect setup correctly. The scores above reflect my preconceived ranking of the challenges in A202. In general, students can solve mathematical models/equations if they set them up correctly (or if they are setup for them). Setting up the model/using the right tool is more of a challenge; even more challenging is the interpretation of the solution. Sometimes there are subtle implications beyond the more obvious conclusions. It is probably too much to expect that the majority of the students master these skills at the sophomore level. Still, I like to expose the students to these situations. Better students enjoy the challenge while less advanced students benefit from exposure to scenarios that call for critical thinking.

IU Kokomo School of Business Assessment Data Form

Course: E202

Semester: Spring 2011

Faculty: CHULKOV

This form shows the overall mean assessment scores for critical thinking assessment in E202. The assessment was based on the evaluation of components in an essay assignment.

Goal	Score (1.0 is lowest, 3.0 is highest)	Evaluation		
		Excellent	Acceptable	Needs Improvement
Students will recognize issues that have alternative interpretations.	2.50	X		
Students will compare the perspectives of others to their own.	2.39		X	
Students will assess the quality of supporting evidence.	2.43		X	
Students will assess the implications and consequences that result from proposed conclusions.	2.42		X	
Instruments used to collect data (exam, quiz, etc.): Term Paper / Essay				

Comments: (what methods were used in evaluation, attach additional material if necessary)

The data were collected from all students enrolled in a course section. The total number participating in this assessment was 29 students.

Assessment of Undergraduate Critical Thinking Skills in E202

AY 2010-2011	Number	Average	Count of		
Overall for the cohort		(3.0 is Best)	Exemplary	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Interpret issues	29	2.5	16	13	0
Compare perspectives of others	29	2.4	12	17	0
Assess quality of evidence	29	2.4	14	15	0
Assess implications of conclusions	29	2.4	17	12	0

IU Kokomo School of Business Assessment Data Form

Course: K201

Semester: Spring 2011

Faculty: CHULKOV

Goal	Score	Evaluation		
		Excellent	Acceptable	Needs Improvement
Students will use word processing software	91%	X		
Students will use presentation software	95%	X		
Students will demonstrate skills in web design	89%		X	
Instruments used to collect data (exam, quiz, etc.): Hands-on individual computer projects				

Comments: (attach additional material if necessary)

Outcome 1 assessed based on 3 individual assignments

Outcome 2 assessed based on PowerPoint presentation individual project.

Outcome 3 assessed based on a FrontPage web design individual project.

APPENDIX C. 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.

	Fall 2004	Spring 2005	Fall 2005	Spring 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	Fall 2009	Spring 2010	Spring 2011
Percentile scores												
Number of students tested	19	21	13	17	21	8	16	9	32	24	20	16
Overall IU Kokomo Percentile	95	95	95	85	90	95	95	40	80	75	75	85
Accounting	95	95	95	85	90	90	95	45	65	55	90	75
Economics	85	80	95	80	85	95	95	65	85	80	95	80
Mgmt	90	75	70	65	90	95	70	30	90	95	85	85
Quantitative Analysis	95	90	75	70	95	85	95	15	55	70	95	30
Finance	95	90	90	95	95	95	90	30	80	75	95	45
Marketing	85	95	75	95	80	95	95	20	80	80	85	95
Legal/Social Environ.	95	95	75	80	85	95	95	50	85	50	95	95
Information Systems					85	85	95	40	90	65	60	55
International Issues	95	85	95	90	85	95	95	75	75	90	95	85