

Student Learning Summary Form AY2016-17

Due to your dean by the college deadline; due from the dean to the Assessment Office via Blackboard by Sept. 1

Degree Program Name: Financial Services **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** __ Susan Moncada (Assessment Coordinator) susan.moncada@instate.edu
 Matt Cohen (Program Coordinator)

Part One: Summary of Assessment Activities

a. Learning outcomes did you assess this year.	b. (1) Assignments or activities used. (2) Course or other required experience in which assessment occurred.	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?
1.1 Students will identify the operations and structure of different financial institutions.	In total, a combination of 40 questions from quiz 2, exam 1, exam 2, and exam 3 in FIN 440, Fall 2016	70% of the students will earn a score of 75% or better.	100% of the Financial Services majors (4) enrolled in the class met or exceeded the 75% performance target. When the Finance majors also enrolled in the class are considered, 96.77% of the students (30 of 31) met or exceeded the 75% performance target.	M. Haque. (2) Findings are posted on the AFIRM Department assessment website. The Summary Report was emailed to program faculty for review and the results were scheduled to be discussed at the Fall 2017 beginning of semester program meeting.
2.1 Students will be able to apply time value of money techniques in the valuation of securities	Survey in FIN 333, Spring 2017	70% of the students will express agreement or rate their abilities as good or better.	Approximately 95% of the 22 Financial Services majors agreed or strongly agreed that learning present and future value concepts helped them understand the valuation of financial securities. Finally 86.36% of the majors rated their ability to apply time value of money techniques to value financial securities from good to excellent.	T. Zaher. (2) Same as above.
2.2 Students will be able to perform financial statement analysis	Survey in FIN 333, Spring 2017	70% of the students will rate their abilities as good or better.	In terms of assessing the firm's strengths and weaknesses, 63% of the 22 majors judged their ability as good to excellent. In terms of identifying stocks to add to the firm's investment portfolio, 77.3% of these students judged their ability as good to excellent. Finally, when both skills were considered together, 77.2% of these students also judged their ability as good to excellent.	T. Zaher. 2) Same as above.
3.1 Students are able to identify the factors that affect interest rates and evaluate relationships between the prices of securities and interest rates.	In total, a combination of 40 questions from quiz 1, exam 1 and exam 3 in FIN 440, Fall 2016	70% of the students will earn a score of 75% or better.	100% of the Financial Services majors (4) enrolled in the class met or exceeded the 75% performance target. When the Finance majors also enrolled in the class are considered, 96.77% of the students (30 of 31) met or exceeded the 75% performance target.	M. Haque. 2) Same as above.
3.2 Students will have an	Combination of 50	70% of the students will	Only 3 Financial Services majors were	W. Wilhelm.

understanding of ethical issues and ethical decision making as it applies to managing organizations.	true/false and multiple choice exam questions and 2 short cases in MGT 370 (distance class) Spring 2017.	earn a score of 70% or better.	enrolled in MGT 370. Two of the three students (66%) met the target performance level. When the performance of non-majors is also considered, case results met target, but exam results worsened.	2) Same as above.
--	--	--------------------------------	---	-------------------

Part Two: Engagement and 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) the changes you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator's feedback; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

2016/2017 Achievements and Responses to 2015/2106 University Assessment Director's Comments:

- **Outcome revision.** The wording of Outcome 1.1 was revised as suggested by the University's Assessment Director. As a result, the program's learning goals, curriculum map, and multi-year assessment plan documents have been updated and posted on the Financial Services Assessment website.
- **Program outcomes mapped to the Foundational Studies goals.** Completed with document posted on the Financial Services Assessment website.
- **Indirect measure.** An indirect measure (survey) was implemented for Outcomes 2.1 and 2.2.
 1. **Outcome 2.1:** During the 2015/2016 assessment cycle, one Financial Services major was enrolled in FIN 333 and this student exceeded the direct measure performance target. While the former small sample size makes conclusions somewhat tenuous, the AY 2016/17 self-reflection survey results appear to suggest students feel confident they can apply the concepts addressed by this outcome.
 2. **Outcome 2.2:** During the AY 2014/2015 assessment cycle, direct measure targets were exceeded by all four Financial Services majors enrolled in FIN 333. While the former small sample size makes conclusions tenuous, the AY 2016/17 self-reflection survey results appear to suggest students feel confident they can apply the concepts addressed by this outcome.
- **Response to Outcome 1.3 questions.** Both FIN 320 and INS 340 are introductory courses. Given the nature of the required courses in the Financial Services major, students do not take a higher level course in which these concepts are practiced. The file for outcome 1.3, assessed AY15/16, contained three worksheets. The first worksheet provided a summary of the results. The second worksheet provided the data analysis, and the third work sheet linked the data to the concepts assessed. For outcome 2.1, linking the exam questions to specific concepts was inadvertently omitted.
- **Response to non-major question.** Past findings did not include non-majors. Inclusion was optional per the prior University Assessment Director. Non-major results have been included this year. Data analysis either appears within the Financial Services outcome files or can be found by following location instructions posted on the face of the Outcome Item in Blackboard.
- **Outcome 1.1:** Student performance improved when compared to the fall 2013 assessment results in which 80% of the Financial Services majors (8/10) met or exceeded targets. The number of questions included in the AY 16/17 measure was expanded from 16 to 40.

- **Outcome 3.1:** Student performance improved when compared to the fall 2013 assessment results in which 80% of the Financial Services majors (8/10) met or exceeded targets. The number of questions included in the AY 16/17 measure was expanded from 24 to 40.
- **Outcome 3.2:** Findings from the Spring of 2014 (2 students) and Spring of 2015 (4 students) assessments showed performance targets were exceeded both times. While the number of Financial Services majors remains low, the performance of the class as a whole is perhaps more indicative that some type of intervention is warranted to improve student learning. The individual who has been teaching MGT 370 has retired. Dr. Herschel Chait is expected to teach MGT 370 in the future.
- Matt Cohen has been appointed program coordinator for the major

2017/2018 Program Focus:

- Outcomes 1.2 (INS 340), 2.2 (FIN 333), and 2.3 (FIN 333) to be assessed during AY 2017/2018.
- Assessment results for Outcome 3.2 have be shared with Dr. Chait for MGT 370. The focus of MGT 370 has changed with considerably less emphasis on ethics. Assessment will be delayed until Spring 2019 at the earliest pending program faculty resolving issues associated with the changed focus of the course.
- Five priorities for the year are: 1) encouraging faculty to involve students and stakeholders in discussions of student learning, 2) soliciting input from these two groups regarding ways to improve student learning, 3) providing more thorough case or project grading rubrics, 4) identifying exam concepts covered by specific exam questions, and 5) resolving assessment issue resulting from new focus of MGT 370.

The Financial Services Assessment Materials are located at:

[https://blackboard.indstate.edu/webapps/blackboard/content/listContentEditable.jsp?content_id= 3131872_1&course_id= 88724_1&mode=reset](https://blackboard.indstate.edu/webapps/blackboard/content/listContentEditable.jsp?content_id=3131872_1&course_id=88724_1&mode=reset)

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

Degree Program: BS in Financial Services Date: 01.22.18

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support 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 type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are important, specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. In the library, not in this report <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
2. Measures & Performance Goals	<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"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate. <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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. <input type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified. <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. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were employed, and most are direct. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) <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"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. <input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate that this is appropriate. <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. <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 know/can do. <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.
3. Results	<input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected. <input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process. <input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed. <input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed. <input type="checkbox"/> Results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful. <input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	<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. <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. <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.
4. Engagement & Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. <input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. <input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <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

	<input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results. <input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	established timelines. <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 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

COMMENTS

Outcomes are clear and measurable, though #3.2 would benefit from being recast (Students will apply ethical decision making in ...). Measures primarily are direct (quizzes, exam, two short cases), though they now include an indirect measure (survey). It will be interesting to see if students' estimations of their abilities correspond to what direct evidence shows. Multiple members of the faculty collected and analyzed assessment data, though one of the recommendations noted in part two is to expand participation in discussions of student learning. Results consistently exceed expectations. Is it time to re-evaluate performance standards—are they too low?

This program has a robust assessment plan in place and takes proactive steps to improve student learning and assessment itself. Thank you!