

## 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: Insurance

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

## Part One: Summary of Assessment Activities

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?	b. (1) Assignments or activities used. (2) Course	c. What were your expectations for student performance?	d. What were the actual results?	e. (1) Person responsible.(2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?
<b>Outcome 2.5</b> <i>Students are able to analyze information to determine if a loss exposure may be covered by liability insurance contract(s).</i>	Six multiple choice exam questions and 4 open-ended questions in INS 344 (Fall 2016).	A score of 70% or better will be achieved by at least 75% of the students.	The one IRM major in the class (100%) met the targeted achievement. When the all five students are considered, however, two of five students (40%) achieved the score equal to or higher than 70%.	(1) Jin Park. (2) Faculty discuss assessment informally throughout the year. Formal discussion occurs at Fall AFIRM Dept. meeting.
<b>Outcome 3.3</b> <i>Students are able to evaluate the methods utilized by insurance carriers to manage their underwriting risk.</i>	Seven multiple choice exam questions in INS 437.	A score of 70% or better will be achieved by at least 75% of the students.	100 percent of the 11 students (all are insurance major) achieved higher than the target of 70%	(1) Zhiyong (John) Liu. (2) Faculty discuss assessment informally throughout the year. Formal discussion occurs at Fall AFIRM Dept. meeting.
<b>Outcome 3.5</b> <i>Students are able to explain the purpose, structure, and functions of insurance regulation in the United States.</i>	Exam questions in INS 437.	A score of 70% or better will be achieved by at least 75% of the students.	91% (10 out of 11) students achieved higher than the target of 70%	(1) Zhiyong (John) Liu. (2) Faculty discuss assessment informally throughout the year. Formal discussion occurs at Fall AFIRM Dept. meeting.
<b>All Outcomes</b> (1.1, 1.2, 2.1 – 2.5, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5)	Qualtrics survey to IRM alumni from 1996-2016 and students in Spring 2017, INS 343, INS 344, INS 430, or INS 432 classes.	On average, students will at least somewhat agree they have achieved the outcomes addressed by the survey.	10-point Likert scale (1-strongly disagree, 5-neutral, 10-strongly agree. Overall alumni and current students reported they somewhat agreed or agreed that they had achieved the outcomes addressed by the survey.	(1) All IRM faculty. (2) Faculty discuss assessment informally throughout the year. Formal discussion occurs at Fall AFIRM Dept. meeting.

## Part Two: Engagement and Improvement

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

- **Outcomes Mapped to Foundational Studies.** Completed on posted in Blackboard.
- **Curriculum Map Updated:** The curriculum map was reviewed by the faculty and updated.
- **AY 2015/2016 Measures and Results.** All required supporting information was contained within each multi-page outcome findings file posted online. Data analysis per student and the specific exam questions are included. When a case is used, how the case was graded is detailed. Exam question development was a joint effort by the IRM faculty.
- **Outcome 2.5.** While targets were met by the one IRM major in the class, non-majors did not meet targets. As a result, more time will be spent, including holding review sessions, on interpreting and applying policy language and provisions to a claim. Outcome 2.5 has been measured IN AY 2015/2016, AY 2014/2015, and AY 2013/2014. Results have declined from year to year for majors and non-majors despite attempts to improve student learning, which the exception of the current year in which only 1 major was enrolled in the Fall online class.
- **Outcome 3.2** no longer exists as it pertained to an INS special topics course only. Due to the nature of Task Stream and its required consistency in the numbering of outcomes, outcome 3.2 was marked obsolete rather than deleted in 2013. As a result, outcome 3.2 does not exist and the remaining outcomes (3.3, 3.4, and 3.5) were not renumbered.
- **Outcome 3.3** – While targets were exceeded, four of the eleven students in the class achieved 71%, barely above the 70% target. Interim grade performance will be used to identify students who need additional help learning this particular block of knowledge.
- **Outcome 3.5** – While targets were exceeded, interim grade performance will be used to identify students in need of additional help to learn this particular block of knowledge. Consumer protection and the role and motivations of insurance regulation are concepts requiring additional emphasis to reinforce the students’ learning.
- **Program Survey** - Surveying the students and alumni provides evidence of the effectiveness of the IRM program’s curriculum in helping majors acquire substantive knowledge, analytical skills, and preparation for their career. Outcomes 1.1, 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 3.1, 3.4, and 3.5 were rated by current students above an 8 on the 10 point scale. The remaining outcomes were rated between 7.1 to 7.9. While the rating from alumni are not as positive for some of the outcomes as current majors, results may be due to curriculum and content changes that have occurred since they were enrolled in the program.
- **Engagement** - The proximity of faculty offices to each other facilitates informal discussions of assessment activities and results rather than having several documented formal program meetings throughout the year.

#### 2017/2018 Program Focus:

- Outcomes 2.1 (INS 343), 2.5 (INS 344), 3.1 (INS 342), 3.4 (INS 342) and program survey. In an attempt to increase the sample size of Insurance majors for Outcome 2.5, assessment data will be collected in INS 344 during both Fall 2017 and Spring 2018.
- The Insurance and Risk Management Program’s supporting materials are located at:  
[https://blackboard.indstate.edu/webapps/blackboard/content/listContentEditable.jsp?content\\_id= 3131873\\_1&course\\_id= 88724\\_1](https://blackboard.indstate.edu/webapps/blackboard/content/listContentEditable.jsp?content_id= 3131873_1&course_id= 88724_1)

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

Degree Program: BS in Insurance and Risk Management    Date: 01.22.18

	<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 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. <b>In the library, not in this report</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization).  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.)  <input 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

				<p>have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.</p>
<p><b>2. Measures &amp; Performance Goals</b></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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.</p> <p><input checked="" 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"/> Multiple measures were employed, and most are direct.</p> <p><input 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 <a href="#">high impact practices</a> (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 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 type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.</p>

				<input 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 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.
<b>3. Results</b>	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	<input 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 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.
<b>4. Engagement &amp; Improvement</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and	<input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in

	<p>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>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 connect to the results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.</p>	<p>analyzing results.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.</p>	<p>collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input 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> <p><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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.</p>
<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>

Part One identifies three clear and measurable outcomes and their associated assessment measures (exams and student/alumni survey). A case study required for outcome #2.2 (not assessed this year) ensures that more authentic assessment is occurring. Majors routinely achieve performance standards (which may mean it's time to consider raising them!) Part Two analyzes results and summarizes recent assessment-related changes, including updating the curriculum map and implementing a student/alumni survey. Future plans related specifically to reported results include holding review sessions and monitoring grade performance. Thank you!