

Degree Program Name: Finance

Contact Name and Email: Susan Moncada [susan.moncada@indstate.edu](mailto:susan.moncada@indstate.edu)

**Part One**

a. Outcomes assessed this year.	b. Measure(s) and course(s)	c. Expectations established for achieving outcomes	d. Findings/Results	e. Responsible instructor/methods for sharing results.
Outcome 3.1: Students will be able to apply quantitative methods used in the analysis of the firm.	Eight exam questions from FIN 333, Fall 2015.	A score of 75% or better will be earned by 70% of the students.	Of the 18 students in the class, 14 (77.78%) earned the target score of 6 (75%) or better on the exam questions. Therefore, targets were met for this outcome and the current teaching strategies employed are achieving the desired results.	T. Zaher. Findings are posted on the AFIRM Department Blackboard Assessment site. Results emailed to program faculty and will be discussed at Fall 2016 Program faculty meeting.

**Part Two**

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students’ learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator’s feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

1. Since targets were met for Outcome 3.1, the current teaching strategies employed are achieving the desired results at this time.
2. During AY 2014/2015 Outcomes 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3.2, 3.3, and 5.1 were assessed. Targets were met or exceeded for all outcomes.
3. Typically the Finance Program assesses more than one outcome per academic year. Due to a faculty sabbatical, several outcome scheduled to be assessed during AY 2015/2106 were deferred to AY 2016/2017. However, given the university assessment cycle has moved to a four year rotation, the Finance Program plans to revise its assessment timeline. The Finance Program has been attempting to assess its outcomes every other year. As a result, tentatively, Outcomes 4.1, 4.2, and 5.2 will be assessed during AY 2016/2017.

**2016/2017 focus:**

- The Finance Program has revised its major, and this revision may require modification to its curriculum map and points of assessment for one or more outcomes.
- At the same time these revisions are made, the program outcomes will be mapped to the Foundational Studies learning goals, which was not a previous assessment requirement.
- In addition, an appropriate indirect measure of one or more of the outcomes will be determined and implemented. Having an indirect measure also was not previously an assessment requirement.

**Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University**

Degree Program: BS in Finance Date: 7.8.16

	<b>Level 0 – Undeveloped</b>	<b>Level 1 – Developing</b>	<b>Level 2 – Mature</b>	<b>Level 3 – Exemplary</b>
<b>1. Student Learning Outcomes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> An Outcomes Library was provided.  <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific and measurable.  <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are written in student-centered terms.  <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, and student-centered.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes support the Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals.  <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, student-centered, and span multiple learning domains. <b>Most are.</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals.  <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization).  <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.)  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.

				<input type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
<b>2. Measures &amp; Performance Goals</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.  <input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.  <input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are not specific.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.  <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.  <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.  <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some <a href="#">high impact practices</a> (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)  <input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided to demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what

				<p>students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.</p>
<p><b>3. Results</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity of the assessment process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.</p>
<p><b>4. Engagement &amp; Improvement</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are too vague to connect clearly to the results or to implement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific plans for improvement.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the</p>

		about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment. ?	<p>history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement.</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. Only in BB
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 0 – Undeveloped</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 1 - Developing</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 2 – Mature</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 3 – Exemplary</b>

Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.

Only in BB

Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning. ?

## COMMENTS

### Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

#### 1. Learning Outcomes

Owing to faculty sabbaticals, you reviewed just one outcome this past year (and plan to adjust your assessment cycle accordingly). This outcome is measurable, clear, and important, as are most of those in the outcomes library (the exceptions are 4.1 and 5.1, which use the vague verbs “know” and “understand”).

#### 2. Measures & Performance Goals

The exam used to assess students’ ability to apply quantitative methods is an appropriate measure. The performance goal seems reasonable: Students exceed it, but not by so much that it appears to need recalibrating.

#### 3. Results

You provided the results of the exam, which show both that the questions are calibrated to the outcome being assessed and that students are achieving the goal set for them. Were these results better, worse than, or comparable to previous results? You note that since targets were exceeded, teaching strategies appear to be working. But have you made any changes over the years that have led to such positive results? In general, I would like to know more about what the numbers mean—what exactly do students know/do well and less well?

#### 4. Engagement & Improvement

There was little activity this year, but it is clear that you have a solid plan for assessing and improving student learning, that you collect and review data annually, and that you share results. Do you involve students or external stakeholders in the assessment process? You note that curricular revisions may necessitate revisions to the curriculum map. Did assessment drive this curriculum revision in any way? Last, if you look back at results overall, would you say your students are achieving most of them? Are there any new teaching strategies in the works to ensure that students will continue to perform well?

Thanks you for sharing this information about your assessment program!