Learning Goal 1: Our students will be able to integrate discipline-specific knowledge across functional areas and utilize leadership and team skills to accomplish group tasks.

(Updated November 2010)

October 2010

Leadership Assessments
Students do leadership self-assessments using a scoring rubric. In October 2009, the Management Department received the updated results including spring and summer 2010 assessments.
**Action Taken:**
The management faculty met, reviewed data and concluded: Students rate leadership and teamwork with higher performance—professors have rated integration and oral communication performance as mid-range. The Department considered changes 1) standardize peer evaluation (tied to grades) to show differentiation of student performance, 2) considered curricular or pedagogical improvements: 1 hour strategy lab (for integration)—long-term solution or 1 hours class along with 455 (to run simulation and collect rubric data from a captive audience)

---

**Teamwork Assessments**
Students do team self-assessments using a scoring rubric. In October 2010, the Management Department received the updated results including spring and summer 2010 assessments.
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Action Taken:
The management faculty met, reviewed data and concluded: Students rate leadership and teamwork with higher performance—professors have rated integration and oral communication performance as mid-range. The Department considered changes 1) standardize peer evaluation (tied to grades) to show differentiation of student performance, 2) considered curricular or pedagogical improvements: 1 hour strategy lab (for integration)—long-term solution or 1 hours class along with 455 (to run simulation and collect rubric data from a captive audience)

Integration Assessments
MGT 455 professors do integration assessments of their students using a scoring rubric. In October 2010, the Management Department received the updated results including spring and summer 2010 assessments.
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**Action Taken:**
The management faculty met, reviewed data and concluded: Students rate leadership and teamwork with higher performance—professors have rated integration and oral communication performance as mid-range. The Department considered changes 1) standardize peer evaluation (tied to grades) to show differentiation of student performance, 2) considered curricular or pedagogical improvements: 1 hour strategy lab (for integration)—long-term solution or 1 hour class along with 455 (to run simulation and collect rubric data from a captive audience).

---

**Content-Knowledge Assessments**
**October 2010**

The multiple-choice assessment has been conducted in spring 2008, summer II 2008, fall 2008, spring 2009, summer 2009, fall 2009, spring 2010, and summer 2010. In the spring 2008 rollout of the assessment, students answered 48 questions (4 for each discipline) plus one demographic question. In the following terms, the assessment consisted of 60 questions (5 for each discipline) and one demographic question.
The AOL Committee reviews the content-knowledge assessment results for those terms broken down by discipline. Departments are also asked to review their own results.

![Average Percentage by Semester](image)

**Average Percentage by Semester**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Mean (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 08 (N=95)</td>
<td>58.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 09 (N=78)</td>
<td>61.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 09 (N=25)</td>
<td>64.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 10 (N=25)</td>
<td>68.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action Taken:**

Based on AACSB recommendation, the CSB faculty voted in fall 2010 to require a student to make at least 60% on the assessment to be able to pre-register for MGT 455. Additionally, some questions have been changed; syllabi and course content material have been changed to improve student learning in MKT340, FIN335, ECN221, ACG203, BLA361, and QMM 280 based on the data.
Actions Taken:

Date of Meeting or Discussion: 10/25/10 – 11/2/10

Program or Department: Accountancy & Business Law

Learning Goal:
Review of ACG 201 AOL Multiple Choice Questions

What results did you review?
Content Knowledge Assessment: Spring, 2008, through Summer, 2010

Discussion Notes:
Richard Roscher met individually with all instructors teaching ACG 201 in the Fall, 2010, semester: James Whitworth, Joseph Betts, David Jessen, and Dan Ivancevich. All felt the Content Knowledge Assessment results were reasonable, considering the difficulty level of each question. And all felt the questions themselves were reasonable and representative of the material covered in the course.

Department or Program Action:
Everyone agreed to change the last three words in Question #3 from “income tax expense” to “reported net income;” the same change would be made in Answer “D” to Question #3. This removes the “tax” issue from the question, which students may have found confusing, without changing the general thrust of the question.

Curricular or Pedagogical Improvements:
None were recommended by the participants.

When should we look for results from changes made?
Results of these changes to Question #3 should be apparent immediately after the question’s wording is changed.

_____________________________________________
Actions Taken:
Date of Meeting or Discussion:
November 3, 2010

Program or Department:
Department of Accountancy and Business Law-Managerial Accounting Committee.

Learning Goal:
To help students understand management accounting topics and issues from the perspective of a business manager, and be able to employ accounting information in the context of decision-making in a business environment.

What results did you review?
The committee reviewed the assessment of the Assurance of Learning Data from spring 2008 through summer 2010.

Discussion Notes:
On average, students scored over 80 percent on all questions. The committee believes this is a strong indication of providing an appropriate learning environment for students and using suitable pedagogical techniques.

The committee also discussed two other related issues: 1) the scheme for coordinating and administering the test and, 2) the results of the tests which are disseminated to faculty for further analyses. Regarding the first issue, the committee is concerned about the declining number of students taking the test from Spring 2008 (149 students) to Spring 2010 (25 students). While the results do not appear to change over time, there was a dramatic decrease in the number of students who took the test. However, we are aware that currently there is a new process underway to address this issue; we will have to wait until the next academic year to see the results of the new procedure.
Regarding the second issue, the committee suggested that it would be beneficial if the results of the students' tests could be distributed with information related to the number of students who took the test by discipline. This would facilitate a better understanding of the composition of students' fields of study and comparison over various academic years.

Department or Program Action:
The committee will review and examine the questions on timely bases to ensure their relevancy to learning objectives.

Curricular or Pedagogical Improvements:
Based on the results of Assurance of Learning Data, the committee decided to continue using our current teaching techniques for learning objectives.

When should we look for results from changes made?
Not applicable at this time.

---

**Actions Taken:**
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Note: Qs revised before Fall 2009.
Note: Q1 revised before Spring 2009.

Actions Taken:

Actions Taken:
FIN 335

Actions Taken:

Note: Q1 revised before Spring 2009.

INB 300

Actions Taken:
**MGT 350**

Note: Q1 answers corrected before Spring 2009.

**Actions Taken:**

**MIS 213**

Note: Q5 tweaked before Spring 2009.

**Actions Taken:**
MKT 340

Actions Taken:
Actions Taken: