

Degree Program Name: Accounting

Contact Name(s) and Email(s) Susan Moncada (Susan.Moncada@indstate.edu)

Part One: Summary of Assessment Activities

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?	b. (1) What assignments or activities used. (2) Course.	c. What were your expectations for student performance?	d. What were the actual results?	e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?
Outcome 1.1: Students are able to describe the language and procedures associated with financial accounting.	Twenty final exam questions in ACCT 302, Spring 2017	70% of the students will earn a score of 75% or better and 80% will perform at or above the developing level. (A score >= 85% is superior, between 70 and 85% is satisfactory, 55-70% is developing, a score below 55% is deficient).	Targets met - 73.68% of the students (14 of 19) earned a score of 75% or greater.	J. Sanders. (2) Faculty discuss assessment informally via email with a formal discussion held at the fall program meeting. Assessment materials are posted on the Department Assessment website.
Outcome 1.3: Students are able to define the terminology of tax accounting.	Twenty quiz questions in ACCT 404, Fall 2016	Eighty percent of the students will perform at or above the developing level of achievement (same scale as above)	Targets not met – 60% of the students (15 of 25) performed at or above the developing level of performance with 28% superior, and 16 percent satisfactory.	M. Harmon (2) Same as above.
Outcome 2.1: Students are able to analyze, evaluate, and synthesize information for financial reporting.	Twenty final exam questions in ACCT 301, Fall 2016.	70% of the students will earn a score of 75% or better and 80% will perform at or above the developing level (same scale as above).	Targets exceeded – 83.33% of the students (20 of 24) earned a score of 75% or greater.	J. Sanders (2) Same as above.
Outcome 2.3: Students are able to analyze information and apply tax principles to solve taxation problems.	1040 Tax return project in ACCT 404 assessed using a grading rubric.	Eighty percent of the students will perform at or above the developing level of achievement (same scale as above).	Targets exceeded. 96% of the students (24 of 25) performed at or above the developing level of achievement with 72% (18 of 25) superior, and 20% (5 of 20) satisfactory.	M. Harmon (2) Same as above.
Outcomes 1.1 – 3.3	Student survey in ACCT 415.	70% of the students will rate their abilities as good or better (5 point Likert scale).	Students rated their ability as between good and very good for all but one outcome.	M. Cohen & S. Moncada (2) Same as above.

PART TWO: ENGAGEMENT AND IMPROVEMENT

2016/2017 Achievements and Responses to 2015/2016 University Assessment Director's Comments

- **Assessment Award:** Received Provost's Award for Excellence in Student Learning Assessment and Improvement. Per student feedback, the award is being used to hire learning coaches for ACCT 301, 302, and 404. Learning Coach arrangements have been made through the Meis Center for Student Development.
- **Outcome Revision:** The appropriateness of all outcomes was reviewed by the faculty. Outcome 1.2 was revised as suggested by the University's Director of Assessment. Outcome 2.4 was reworded to reflect what students can do. Outcome 3.1 was reframed more succinctly. Outcomes 3.2 and 3.3 were merged and broadened so that when

technologies become obsolete and new ones are adopted, the outcome does not have to be revised. Outcomes 3.4 was renumbered as 3.3 and outcome 3.5 was renumbered as 3.4. All documents referring to the outcomes have been updated and posted in Blackboard.

- **Curriculum Map Updated:** The curriculum map was reviewed by the faculty and updated.
- **Outcomes Mapped to Foundational Studies.** Completed on posted in Blackboard.
- **Targets:** With consultation from the University Directory of Assessment, revised targets were developed and applied to Outcomes 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3.
- **Indirect Measure:** A comprehensive student survey was implemented in ACCT 415 for the first time. The survey assessed students' perceptions regarding outcomes 1.1 through 3.3, accounting related work experience, certifications to be pursued, aspects students' liked best, and suggestions for improvement. A 5-point Likert scale was used (1 = poor to 5 = excellent). Survey results appear in Blackboard along with a summary of the findings. In terms of student learning, the Accounting Program appears to be accomplishing its objectives. The lower score for outcome 2.3 may be in part due to the fact that the students who completed the survey took ACCT 404 prior to the Fall 2016 intervention which appears to have greatly enhanced learning. Supportive professors and the degree of professional preparation were features liked best. Based on student improvement feedback, the timing of the ACCT 415 on campus class has been moved to the Spring semester, when most on-campus students tend to enroll in the course. Students suggested more real-world, hands-on activities and Excel usage be added to the curriculum.
- **Outcome 1.1** - When compared to Spring 2015 and Spring 2016 results, students performance continued to improve with targets finally being exceeded. The switch to the Wiley textbook and Orion adaptive learning system appear to have helped improve student learning.
- **Outcome 1.3** - A specific quiz assessing tax terminology was implemented. Improvements were made on a question by question basis in that 16 of 20 questions (80%) were answered at the developing or above level when compared to 14 of 20 (70%) questions answered at the developing or above level by the Fall 2015 class. The definitions of these terms will be addressed four additional times beginning Fall 2017 in an attempt to help students internalize terminology.
- **Outcome 2.1** - When compared to the results from Spring 2016, a significant improvement in performance was achieved. The additional coverage of troublesome concepts appears to have been beneficial, as well as switching to the Wiley textbook and Orion adaptive learning system.
- **Outcome 2.3** – Changing measures to experientially preparing a tax return provided significantly improved results when compared to exam performance utilized during previous terms.
- **ACCT 311** – transition to flipped class ongoing.

2017/2018 Program Focus:

- Outcomes 1.3 (ACCT 404); 1.4, 2.4 and survey (ACCT 415), 2.2 (ACCT 311), 3.2, and 3.3 (ACCT 313).
- Annual administration of student program survey in ACCT 415.
- Consideration to be made as to how additional real-world, hands-on activities and Excel usage might be incorporated into the curriculum.

Supporting materials located at:

https://blackboard.indstate.edu/webapps/blackboard/content/listContentEditable.jsp?content_id= 3131866_1&course_id= 88724_1&mode=reset

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
<p>1. Student Learning Outcomes</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes were identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are important, specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. In the library, not the SLSR</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization).</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders.</p> <p><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.</p>

<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were provided.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were employed, and most are direct.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)</p> <p><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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate that this is appropriate.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were summarized as well as provided to demonstrate that the measure provides specific evidence of what students</p>
---	--	---	--	---

				<p>know/can do.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>
3. Results	<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 and 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 and meaningful.</p> <p><input 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 and usefulness of the assessment process.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well.</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>
4. Engagement & Improvement	<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</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 not specific and/or do not clearly</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</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 goals and implement plans to adjust activities, expectations, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines.</p>

	about previous results or plans.	connect to the results. <input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

The faculty have made several improvements to the assessment plan (revised outcomes, standards, and a new survey that substantiates the program's quality and provides viable suggestions for improvement). And of course, it already was quite good, so good that the program earned the undergraduate assessment award last year. (I was pleased to see that you used the funds to hire student coaches.) Outcomes are clear and measurable and span multiple learning domains. With the addition of the survey, each outcome is assessed by multiple measures. Standards are clear and appropriate, and though they are tied to grades/scores, excellent detail was provided in attachments to demonstrate that assessment, not just grading, is occurring.

The discussion included in Part Two (in conjunction with the attachments) depicts a program and faculty committed to reflecting on student learning over the long haul and taking proactive steps to continuously improve it. I truly appreciate your work.