

**Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2017-18**

*Completed reports due from the dean to the Assessment Office via Blackboard by October 15. Deans, assessment coordinators, and/or department chairs set their own internal deadlines for material review and request for refinement if not suitably addressing questions.*

**Unit/Program Name:** Insurance

**Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Melony A. Sacopulos; melony.sacopulos@indstate.edu

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary. Templates are available on the [assessment website](#).

**Part 1a: Summary of Assessment Activities**

<p><b>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</b></p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the <a href="#">Graduate Student Learning Outcome</a> each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p><b>b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</b></p>	<p><b>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</b></p>	<p><b>d. What were the actual data/results?</b></p>	<p><b>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report?</b></p>
<p><b>Outcome 2.1:</b> Students are able to analyze information to determine if a loss exposure may be covered by property insurance contract(s).</p>	<p>Final exam questions in INS 343, Fall 2017</p>	<p>70% of students will achieve 75% or better in the course. (A score &gt;= 85% is superior, between 70 and 85% is satisfactory, 55-70% is developing, a score below 55% is deficient).</p>	<p>Target exceeded – 88.9% of IRM majors scored 70% or better, and 75% of non-IRM majors scored 70% or better.</p>	<p>This assessment method will be used without a change.</p>
<p><b>Outcome 2.5:</b> Students are able to analyze information to determine if a loss exposure may be covered by liability insurance contract(s).</p>	<p>Exam questions in INS 344, Fall 2017 &amp; Spring 2018</p>	<p>70% of the accounting majors will achieve 75% or better in the course (same scale as above).</p>	<p>Target not met – 60% of IRM majors scored 70% or better in Fall 2017; 50% of IRM majors scored 70% or greater in Spring 2018. Of all students, 41.7% scored 70% or greater.</p>	<p>Since the majority of IRM students failed to demonstrate mastery of no-fault coverage and liability losses covered by some specialty policies, including CGL and Employment Practice liability, we need to do instructional adjustments as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To reinforce how each policy covers losses</li> <li>• To spend additional class time to revisit no-fault laws and</li> </ul>

				<p>their relevancy to liability insurance policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To do more case analyses to consider various policies to manage risks faced by organization. To establish a better communication channel for an online section using Blackboard and other social media networks</li> </ul> <p>In the future assessment this learning goal, we will use the same set of questions to assess the mastery of the learning goal.</p>
<b>Outcome 3.1:</b> <i>Students are able to describe the insurance market, market participants, and roles of market participants.</i>	Exam questions in INS 430, Spring 2018	70% of the accounting majors will achieve 75% or better in the course (same scale as above).	This outcome was not assessed Spring 2018.	This outcome will be assessed Spring 2019.
<b>Outcome 3.4:</b> <i>Students can demonstrate their knowledge of the three critical functions of an insurer: marketing, underwriting, and claim settlement.</i>	Exam questions in INS 430, Spring 2018	70% of the accounting majors will achieve 75% or better in the course (same scale as above).	This outcome was not assessed Spring 2018.	This outcome will be assessed Spring 2019.

Note: If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit "tab" to add a new row.

#### Notes

- Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- Each outcome must be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program's outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.

- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.”
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., “85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark”).

**Part 1b: Continuous Quality Improvement**

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about student learning (a. What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? b. What evidence can you provide that learning is improving?); 2) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year; and 3) how will this information be shared with other stakeholders?

Outcome 2.5: Since the majority of IRM students failed to demonstrate mastery of no-fault coverage and liability losses covered by some specialty polices, including CGL and Employment Practice liability, we need to do instructional adjustments as follows:

- To reinforce how each policy covers losses
- To spend additional class time to revisit no-fault laws and their relevancy to liability insurance policies
- To do more case analyses to consider various policies to manage risks faced by organization. To establish a better communication channel for an online section using Blackboard and other social media networks

In the future assessment this learning goal, we will use the same set of questions to assess the mastery of the learning goal.

1. In accordance with the comprehensive assessment plan (AY 2011-12 – 2019-20), Outcomes 1.1 and 1.2 will be assessed Spring 2019 in INS 430. Outcome 2.2 will be assessed Fall 2018 in INS 341. Outcome 2.3 will be assessed Spring 2019 in INS 430. Outcome 2.4 will be assessed Fall 2018 in INS 344.
2. Assessment plans for the coming year will be shared via faculty meetings and direct emails. One-on-one meetings will be held to answer questions that arise from those performing assessment activities.

**Part 2a: Summary of Student Success Activities**

Based on the results of your assessment of student learning outcomes from Part 1 above, reflect on how this data will impact student success within your unit/program.

a. What goals/objectives were established this past year to aid student performance, retention, persistence, and completion?	b. What primary action steps were taken to make progress on each goal and who was responsible?	c. What data informs progress on each goal?	d. What were some accomplishments or achievements for each goal and/or challenges confronted?	e. Please indicate goals that are continuing and any goals that will replace a previous goal. Any additional goals can also be added on a new line.
1. 1. <b>Goal specific to the SCoB as an entire unit.</b> The Scott College is investigating the removal of barriers to graduation.	The College CAAC body is attempting to streamline curriculum through review of core and required courses	The CAAC body will have concrete proposals concerning the reduction of hours required in the common core	There is reasonable conflict about the rational for combining the two Economics courses (Micro and Macro) into one course. Other	This is a new goal

			alternatives are being investigated as well.	
<p><b>2. Goal specific to the AFIRM department as an entire unit.</b> The AFIRM department will continue working with the MEIS Center to develop personal accountability and effective work habits in its graduates as well as teamwork combined with professionalism .</p>	<p>AFIRM faculty are encouraging students via the use of extra credit to attend a series of professional development workshops and events hosted by the MEIS Student Development Center. Some courses require students to attend workshops.</p>	<p>The MEIS Center keeps extensive records concerning the attendance of workshops.</p>	<p>The challenges confronted were to obtain the cooperation of the faculty in two domains; having them encourage or require students to attend the workshops, and getting faculty to participate in presenting the workshops. Release time has been given some faculty.</p>	<p>This is a continuing goal</p>
<p><b>3.Goal specific to the Insurance and Risk Management Major.</b> The IRM faculty want to reduce the length of the major down from 27 to 24 specific hours required for the major to make the major more attractive to students.</p>	<p>It was politically necessary for one professor to become more flexible in so far as the ability to teach a variety of courses. That has been achieved.</p>	<p>The faculty member in question is preparing to teach the new preparation this spring. The shortened curriculum will have to more through CAAC of the SCoB.</p>	<p>The challenge confronted was overcoming the mental inertia associated with teaching a new preparation, and trying to find the right fit.</p>	<p>This is a continuing goal.</p>

Notes

- a. These goals could be program/department wide but may also be focused on specific sub-populations of interest (e.g., service course student performance, transfer students, part-time students, students of a particular class year, students of color, etc.).
- c. Retention and completion data, D/F/drop rates, credit hour productivity (defined as credit hour enrollment at start of term versus credit hours earned at end of term) are common data examples. See [Blue Reports](#) database (access from Linda Ferguson in Institutional Research) or the [Office of Institutional Research](#) for ideas.

**Part 2b: Continuous Quality Improvement**

**In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries that attention to student performance, retention, persistence, and completion has enabled you to make about program/department systems, processes, and norms as it effects students; and 2) how this will positively impact student success, including with regard to the readiness of students for graduate study or a career?**

*Please prepare this report as a Word document. Do not include any attachments. Instead, provide links to important supporting materials (e.g., detailed—but not student-specific—assessment results; rubrics; minutes; etc.), or upload them to the college’s assessment site in Blackboard.*

**A) The Scott College of Business would like to be able to expand its course requirements associated with several of its majors. Several of the majors feel that in order to properly prepare students for employment , they should have greater exposure to subject matter specific to their discipline. However, the foundation course requirements at this institution seems to be quite extensive as compared to the**

requirements at other similar institutions which reduces the ability of our disciplines to lengthen the set of courses specific to the major. Our Scott College of Business CAAC committee is investigating alternatives. One alternative is to shorten the core courses (those specific courses required by all our majors) within the SCoB by combining both the Micro and Macro Economics core courses (of six hours credit) into one three hour course. Another alternative would be to make the Macro course a foundations course that would be required by Business majors and then to continue to have the Micro economics course within our common SCoB core. Both alternatives would effectively reduce the entire length of the required curriculum in every SCoB major by 3 hours. There is concern that the subject matter that exist within Micro and Macro could not be adequately covered in three hours which argues for the second alternative. However, the politics involved in accomplishing the second alternative would to a greater extent involve the University which argues for the first alternative. The SCoB body is at this point determining the subject matter in both Micro and Macro that is essential to our students and then will be working with the Economics department to determine the most efficient way of delivering this material.

- B) AFIRM faculty encourage students , through the use of extra credit, to attend a series of professional development workshops and events hosted by the MEIS Student Development Center (required in courses that are CATAPULT partners). MEIS Center utilization, programming and student contacts has been steadily increasing, and the vast majority of our undergraduate business students have some contact with the center during the year. The CATAPULT program continues to grow, with a majority of the AFIRM faculty members requiring students classes to participate in professional development events through the MEIS Center. The Chair working with the MEIS Center continues to attempt to move from the use of extra credit to get students to take advantage of the offerings of the MEIS Center to requiring interaction with the MEIS Center through course assignment.**
- C) Reduce the length of the Insurance Major beyond the core from 9 three hour courses, down to 8 three hour courses. The primary person responsible is the program leader, Jin Park. Dr. Park has made progress overcoming some of the political obstacles. A specific faculty member has achieved a broader range of course offerings that he may bring to students. This was a necessary accomplishment. The expected date of completion remains May, 2019. This reduction in the length of the major is felt necessary to come into line with other programs, and the quality of the program is not being diminished. The hope is that this reduction will increase the popularity of the program and help with retention.**

Dear Melony,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2017-18 with the Assessment and Student Success Councils. You will find a comprehensive synthesis of the feedback compiled by both groups below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but that are not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President's Office and the Provost's team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

<b>Program: Insurance &amp; Risk Management</b>	
<b>Assessment Practice Overall Rating:</b> Mature (2.75/3.00) <b>Student Success Practice Overall Rating:</b> Mature (2.00/3.00) <i>*see second rubric below</i>	
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Learning outcomes are very clear, specific, and measurable.</li><li>• Excellent assessment plan with good use of data points from various points across the curriculum.</li><li>• Good analysis of available findings, with excellent action plans regarding student underperformance, ways to improve, and future assessment consistency to demonstrate improvement.</li><li>• Good description of next assessment cycle and sharing of assessment planning.</li><li>• <b>Good, concrete strategy to reduce major credit hours.</b></li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Not an issue, as enough outcomes were assessed, but it may be helpful to make a note of why 3.1 and 3.4 weren't assessed for future reference.</li><li>• Adding a note about any rubric development for evaluating written work or pilot testing done with tests and/or surveys or how those have been adjusted from past use based on issues would be a good way to demonstrate instrument validity/reliability when applicable.</li><li>• Ensure that sharing with faculty about assessment goes beyond sharing the plan and their responsibilities to include the results of assessments and discussions regarding decisions/action stemming from what was learned.</li><li>• <b>Did not directly address student success.</b></li></ul>

Scoring Rubric is included below.

Score was calculated on a 0 (undeveloped), 1 (developing), 2 (mature), 3 (exemplary) scale.

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
<p><b>Student Learning Outcomes</b></p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.) based on issues</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.</p>	<p>No learning outcomes are identified for assessment or the outcomes that are identified are not linked to program outcomes aligned with program coursework (e.g. – curriculum map) or are not measurable.</p>
<p><b>Performance Goals &amp; Measures</b></p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools used to measure student performance are described and were reviewed for validity or trustworthiness prior to use (note this in the report; attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome.</p> <p>Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

<b>Analysis &amp; Results</b>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p> <p>Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with little description of analysis.</p>	<p>No data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided.</p>
<b>Sharing &amp; Use of Results for Continuous Improvement</b>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.</p>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p>	<p>Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn)</p>
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped



**Student Success Activities Report Rubric (Part 2 of Student Outcomes Assessment Report)Unit/Program:**

**Office of Student Success/Office of Assessment & AccreditationEvaluation Date:**

Evaluation Criteria	0 Undeveloped	1 Developing	2 Mature	3 Exemplary
<b>Goals/ Objectives</b>	No goals/objectives are identified.	Goals/objectives are poorly suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion.  Goals/objectives may also be modest at best such that little effort is required.	Goals/objectives are generally clear and reasonably well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion.  Goals/objectives are also generally at least moderately aggressive such that appropriate effort is required.	Goals/objectives are all clear and well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion.  Goals/objectives are also at least moderately aggressive in all cases such that appropriate effort is required.
<b>Action Steps</b>	No action steps are identified.	Action steps are weak, underdeveloped, and/or poorly suited to making progress on goals/objectives.  No person(s) or group(s) indicated who will be responsible for the actions.	Action steps are generally clear and reasonably well suited to making progress on goals/objectives.  Person(s) or group(s) responsible for the actions are indicated in most cases.	Action steps are all clear and well suited to making progress on goals/objectives  Person(s) or group(s) responsible for each action are indicated, ideally with a timeline.
<b>Data that Informs Progress on Each Goal/Objective</b>	No data, quantitative or qualitative, is identified.	Data to inform progress are poorly suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are generally well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are all well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.
<b>Assessment of Outcomes and Continuous Improvement</b>	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, no reflection provided on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.  No reflection on outcome assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, modest at best reflection provided (and/or is vague or of questionable connection to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.  Modest at best reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, generally appropriate reflection provided (and is reasonably well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.  Reasonable reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, strong reflection is provided in all cases (and is well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.  Well-developed reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Undeveloped</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Developing</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Mature</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Exemplary</b>