

# **Report of Outcomes Assessment Results**

Institution	Dakota Wesleyan University
Academic Business Unit	Business Department
Academic Year	2014-2015
<del>-</del>	

# **Outcomes Assessment Plan**

The outcomes assessment	olan that we have previo	usiy subiliitted is still	current.	
Changes have been made a	nd the revised plan is at	tached.		
We have made changes and	the revised plan will be	sent to the IACBE by:		

## **Outcomes Assessment Results**

Student Learning Assessment for: Finance

For Academic Year: 2014-2015

## **Section I: Student Learning Assessment**

Program Intended Student Le	arning Outcomes (Program ISLOs)
1. Students will be able to analyze and evaluate financial accounting da	ta
2. Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to forecast quantitat	ive values
3. Students will be able to articulate the legal and ethical dimensions of	accounting
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:
1. Comprehensive Exam	75% of students in the BS Accounting program will score at least 70% on
Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 1,2	all 6 content areas on the Peregrine Academic Services comprehensive business exam (CBE).
2. Direct Measure 2	75% of students in the BS Accounting program will score at least 80% on
Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 3	the Accounting/Finance section of the capstone senior project and at least 70% on the other 4 sections.
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Indirect Measures:
1. Senior exit surveys	On the senior exit survey forms for the BS Accounting program courses,
Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 2	the weighted average rate on the item(s) dealing with the degree of student success in achieving course learning objectives will be a 3.5 or higher (bases on a 5.0 scale)
2. Performance Electronic Portfolio (PEP)	On the PEP for the BS Accounting program, the weighted average rate on
Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: 1,2,3	the item(s) dealing with the degree of student success in achieving course learning objectives will be a 3.0 or higher (based on a 4.0 scale))
Learning Assessr	ment Results: Finance

#### **Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:**

- 1. Based on the criteria set, only 21.7% of students met the criteria which means it was not met. However, 78.2% of students earned an "average" rating or higher on exam.
- 2. Management section 12/13 students (92.3%) finished with a grade score higher than 70%; Marketing section 13/13 students (100%) finished with a grade score higher than 70%; Operations section 13/13 students (100%) finished with a grade score higher than 80% Finance section 12/13 students (92.3%) finished with a grade score higher than 70%

#### **Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:**

- 1. Of the 16 students who participated in the survey 100% were in agreement that the program prepared them and the average score of 4.56 out 5.
- 2. Based on the criteria set, students scored a 3.0 out of 4.0 scale.

#### **Intended Student Learning Outcomes**

	<b>6</b>								
	Dun over un ICI On	Direct Measure 1	Direct Measure 2	Direct Measure 3	Indirect Measure 4	Indirect Measure 1	Indirect Measure 2	Indirect Measure 3	Indirect Measure 4
	Program ISLOs	Performance Target Was							
1.	Students will be able to analyze and evaluate financial accounting data	Not met					Met		
2.	Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to forecast quantitative values	Not met				Met	Met		
3.	Students will be able to articulate the legal and ethical dimensions of accounting		Met				Met		

### **Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Learning Outcomes for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:**

- 1. Need to reevaluate the criterion to better match the output data provided by the Peregrine Academic
- 2. Rubrics for the senior project need to be redeveloped in order to have the tool as a measurement for the outcomes
- 3. The PEP tool needs to be a requirement that is enforced more regularly
- 4. PEP criterion will need to be reviewed to determine if it is too low.

<ol><li>The use of the university sen the program outcomes.</li></ol>	nior exit survey may not be the best too	ol. The department will develop a more specific exit survey that bette	er matche:

