



## Annual Report – Accredited Member

---

<b>Institution:</b>	Southwestern Adventist University
<b>Academic Business Unit:</b>	Department of Business
<b>Academic Year:</b>	2014-15

---

International Assembly for Collegiate Business Education  
11374 Strang Line Road  
Lenexa, Kansas 66215  
USA

**IACBE ANNUAL REPORT**  
For Academic Year: 2014-15

This annual report should be completed for your academic business unit and submitted to the IACBE by November 1 of each year.

**General Information**

Institution's Name: Southwestern Adventist University

Institution's Address: Department of Business Administration, 100 W. Hillcrest Street

City and State or Country: Keene, Texas Zip or Postal Code 76059

Name of Submitter: Dr. Aaron R. Moses

Title: Adventist Health System Endowed Chair of Business Administration

Your Email Address: mosesa@swau.edu

Telephone (with country code if outside of the United States): 817 202-6771

Type of Institution: \_\_\_\_\_ Public  Private Nonprofit \_\_\_\_\_ Private For-Profit \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Submission: November, 2015

Total Headcount Enrollment of the Institution for 2014-15: 800

**Administrative Information**

1. Provide the following information pertaining to the current president/chief executive officer of your institution:

Name: Dr. Ken Shaw

Title: President

Highest Earned Degree: Ed.D. Email: kshaw@swau.edu

Telephone (with country code if outside of the United States): 817-202-6201 Fax (with country code if outside of the United States): 817 202-6744

Check here if this represents a change from the previous year.

2. Provide the following information pertaining to the current chief academic officer of your institution:

Name: Dr. Amy Rosenthal

Title: Vice President for Academic Administration

Highest Earned Degree: Ph.D. Email: arosenhal@swau.edu

Telephone (with country code if outside of the United States): 817-202-6711 Fax (with country code if outside of the United States): 817 202-6744

\_\_\_\_\_ Check here if this represents a change from the previous year.

3. Provide the following information pertaining to the current head of your academic business unit:

Name: Dr. Aaron R. Moses

Title: Adventist Health System Endowed Chair of Business Administration

Highest Earned Degree: Ph.D. Email: [mosesa@swau.edu](mailto:mosesa@swau.edu)

Telephone (with country code if outside of the United States): 817-202-6771 Fax (with country code if outside of the United States): 817 202-6744

Check here if this represents a change from the previous year.

4. Provide the following information pertaining to your current primary representative to the IACBE, i.e., the person who is your primary contact for the IACBE and who votes on behalf of the academic business unit on IACBE matters (if not the same as the head of the academic business unit):

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Highest Earned Degree: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone (with country code if outside of the United States): \_\_\_\_\_ Fax (with country code if outside of the United States): \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Check here if this represents a change from the previous year.

5. Provide the following information pertaining to your current alternate representative to the IACBE:

Name: None at this time

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Highest Earned Degree: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone (with country code if outside of the United States): \_\_\_\_\_ Fax (with country code if outside of the United States): \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Check here if this represents a change from the previous year.

**Accreditation Information**

1. If applicable, when is your next institutional accreditation site visit? 2/23/1016 Year

2. When is your next reaffirmation of IACBE accreditation site visit? 2/28/2017 Year

3. Provide the website path to the page containing your public notification of accreditation by the IACBE:

**(Note:** Do not provide URL addresses. Beginning with the institution’s home page, describe the link on each page in the path on which someone would click in order to advance to the next page in the path.

For example:

- 1. Click on “Academics”
- 2. Click on “School of Business”
- 3. Click on “IACBE Accreditation” etc.)

- 1. www.swau.edu
- 2. Click on “programs”
- 3. Click on “Business Administration”
- 4. Click on “Accreditaton”
- 5. \_\_\_\_\_
- 6. \_\_\_\_\_
- 7. \_\_\_\_\_
- 8. \_\_\_\_\_
- 9. \_\_\_\_\_
- 10. \_\_\_\_\_

4. Provide the website path to the page containing your public disclosure of student learning assessment results:

**(Note:** Do not provide URL addresses. Beginning with the institution’s home page, describe the link on each page in the path on which someone would click in order to advance to the next page in the path.

For example:

- 1. Click on “Academics”
- 2. Click on “School of Business”
- 3. Click on “IACBE Accreditation” etc.)

- 1. www.swau.edu
- 2. Click on “programs”
- 3. Click on “Business Administration”
- 4. Click on IACBE reports
- 5. \_\_\_\_\_
- 6. \_\_\_\_\_
- 7. \_\_\_\_\_
- 8. \_\_\_\_\_
- 9. \_\_\_\_\_
- 10. \_\_\_\_\_

5. If your accreditation letter from the IACBE Board of Commissioners contained “notes” that identified issues that needed to be addressed, please list the number of the IACBE’s Accreditation Principle for each note in the table below. Indicate whether action has already been taken or that you have made plans to do so. (Insert additional rows as necessary.)

<b>Commissioners’ Notes</b>	<b>Action Already Taken</b>	<b>Action Planned</b>

**Programmatic Information**

1. For each of your IACBE-accredited business programs, provide the total headcount enrollment and the number of degrees conferred in the program (including each major, concentration, specialization, emphasis, option, or track) for 2014-15 (insert rows in the table as needed):

Program	Enrollment 2014-15	Number of Degrees Conferred 2014-15
MBA (Master of Business Administration)		
Accounting	0	0
Finance	1	1
Management/Leadership	2	1
General	2	0
BBA (Bachelor of Business Administration)		
Accounting	15	3
Finance	9	1
International Business	6	3
Management	14	2
Marketing	12	2
Dual Concentration	15	-
Accounting & Management	-	3
Accounting & International Business	-	1
Accounting & Finance	-	1
BS (Bachelor of Science)		
Business	4	1
Business & Computer Information Systems	1	0
Business & Kinesiology	0	0
<b>Totals for All Programs Combined</b>		19

2. Do you offer any of your IACBE-accredited business programs outside of your home country?

No.

Yes. If yes, please identify the programs and countries in the table below. In addition, if the programs are delivered in partnership with other institutions, please identify those institutions as well. (Insert rows in the table as needed.)

Program	Country or Countries	Partner Institution(s)

3. Did you terminate any IACBE-accredited business programs during the reporting year?

No.

Yes. If yes, please identify the terminated programs in the table below and provide a brief description of your termination plan (e.g., plan for teaching-out the program, when last graduates are expected, etc.). (Insert rows in the table as needed.)

Terminated Programs	Termination Plan
Business and Computer Information Systems degree	No students currently enrolled

4. Were changes made in any of your IACBE-accredited business programs during the reporting year? (**Note:** You do not have to identify course-level changes, e.g., changes in course names, course coding, course numbering, course content, etc.; identify only program-level changes, e.g., changes in program names, program curricula, etc.)

No.

Yes. If yes, please identify the changes on a separate page at the end of this report.

5. Were any new business programs (including new majors, concentrations, specializations, emphases, options, and/or tracks) established during the reporting year?

No.

Yes. If yes, please identify the new programs and the locations at which they are offered in the table below. (Insert rows in the table as needed.) Please also describe the curricular requirements for the programs on a separate page at the end of this report, and answer item 6 below.

New Programs	Locations

**Note:** Any new programs (including new majors, concentrations, specializations, emphases, options, and/or tracks) cannot be listed, identified, or advertised as being accredited by the IACBE until they have undergone an accreditation review and have been granted accreditation by the Board of Commissioners.

6. If applicable, was approval of your institutional accrediting body required for any of the new programs identified in item 5 above?

**Not Applicable**

No.

Yes. If yes, please attach a copy of the material that you sent to your institutional accrediting body.

7. Did you establish any new locations/instructional sites during the reporting year?

No.

\_\_\_\_ Yes. If yes, please identify the new locations/instructional sites and the IACBE-accredited programs offered at those locations/sites in the table below. Please also indicate whether you anticipate that any of the locations/sites will account for 25% or more of the total student credit hours (or contact hours as applicable) in business. (Insert rows in the table as needed.)

New Locations/Instructional Sites	Programs Offered	25% or More of Total SCH?

8. If applicable, was approval of your institutional accrediting body required for any of the new locations/instructional sites identified in item 7 above?

**Not Applicable**

\_\_\_\_ No.

\_\_\_\_ Yes. If yes, please attach a copy of the material that you sent to your institutional accrediting body.



### Outcomes Assessment

1. Do you offer any majors, concentrations, specializations, emphases, options, or tracks as part of your business programs?

Yes. If yes, proceed to item 2 below.

No. If no, proceed to item 4 below.

2. Do your majors, concentrations, specializations, emphases, options, or tracks appear on students' transcripts, diplomas, diploma supplements, or other official records of program completion?

Yes. If yes, proceed to item 3 below.

No. If no, proceed to item 4 below.

3. Does your current outcomes assessment plan include student learning assessment information for all majors, concentrations, specializations, emphases, options, and tracks contained within your business programs?

Yes. If yes, proceed to item 4 below.

No. If no, please submit a revised outcomes assessment plan with your annual report that addresses student learning assessment for all majors, concentrations, specializations, emphases, options, and tracks comprising any portion of your business programs. Information about this requirement can be found on the IACBE website at the following address: [www.iacbe.org/oa-key-areas.asp](http://www.iacbe.org/oa-key-areas.asp). (This was submitted November, 2015 to IACBE)

4. Is the outcomes assessment plan that you submitted to the IACBE still current or have you made changes?

The outcomes assessment plan that we have previously submitted is still current.

Changes have been made and the revised plan is attached.

We have made changes and the revised plan will be sent to the IACBE by: Was submitted November, 2015

5. Complete the Outcomes Assessment Results form below and include it with this annual report to the IACBE. **Note:** Section II of the form (Operational Assessment) needs to be completed only if you received first-time accreditation or reaffirmation of accreditation after January 1, 2011.

### Other Issues

Briefly comment on other issues pertaining to your academic business unit that you would like to share with the IACBE.

1. This reporting year was the first year that Dr. Aaron Moses was Chair of the Business Department
  - a. However, Dr. Aaron Moses was the one that filled out the report for 2013-2014 which was submitted in the Fall of 2014.
2. In the 2013-2014 reporting year, the Kinesiology department took over the Business and Kinesiology degree, it was removed from the bulletin. No students graduated from this program this reporting period so it is not being reported on and will not be reported on going forward.
3. During the current 2014-2015 reporting year it was voted to close the Business and Computer Information Systems degree due to a lack of enrollment in that degree. It is removed from the 2015-2016 bulletin. This is current report will be the last time that degree is reported. No students graduated from this program this reporting period so it is not being reported on and will not be reported on going forward.
4. Over the past year, many changes regarding assessment have been made. A new assessment plan was submitted to IACBE in November, 2015. Some of the assessments in that plan have been used for the current 2014-2015 reporting period, so the measures/results may not be consistent with the plan on file. This report will notate the measures we used during the reporting period for clarity.
5. Operational outcomes were not part of the assessment plan on file so is not being reported in this current 2014-2015 reporting school year. However, operational outcomes are part of the assessment plan that was submitted to IACBE November, 2015 and will be reported in the next reporting period.
6. The Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in this current reporting period were also part of the original assessment plan. All undergrad SLOs were revisited during the 2014-2015 school year and have been rewritten as part of the new assessment plan submitted to IACBE in November, 2015. The current report will be the last time that these current SLOs will be used.
7. The indirect measures reported previously were not available for this year, so we did our own survey as part of the Peregrine exit exam. The old indirect questions were: (1) *Rating quality of instruction methods used to teach business Courses at least 5.25 on the scale of 7*, (2) *Rating quality of library resources at least 5.25 on scale of 5*, and (3) *Rating content of classes in major area at least 5.25 on scale of 7*. The questions used on this report are similar but on a scale of 1-5 and are listed in the section below. A new set of indirect measures were submitted with the assessment plan in November, 2015 and will be used going forward beginning with the next assessment period.
8. We have adjusted the formatting of the form below to fit with the assessment plan that we were under for the current reporting year. Beginning next reporting period, we will be able to follow this new template since we submitted the new format assessment plan in November, 2015.
9. The graduate level MBA program went through a major overhaul last year. We are still offering the same basic classes, but we now accelerate them and only offer them one at a time in a cohort type program geared toward the working professional. New assessments were created and are part of the new assessment plan that was submitted to IACBE November, 2015.

## Outcomes Assessment Results

For Academic Year: 2014-15

### Section I: Student Learning Assessment

BBA/BS	
<b>Student Learning Assessment for BBA/BS</b>	
<b>General Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes (General Program ISLOs)</b>	
1. <i>To Determine student’s abilities in writing, group work, quantitative analysis, problem solving and community projects and service</i>	
2. <i>To determine whether students completing the baccalaureate business degree program will compare favorably in the business core subjects with those students completing a similar program nationally.</i>	
3. <i>To determine how students rate “quality of instruction methods used to teach business classes”</i>	
4. <i>To determine how students rate “quality of library resources available for their business classes and projects”</i>	
5. <i>To determine how students rate the “content of your classes that you took in your major”</i>	
6. <i>To determine how many juniors and seniors participated in Enactus. (formerly S.I.F.E.)</i>	
7. <i>To determine the adequacy of preparation of graduating business students to enter the job market.</i>	
<b>Intended Student Learning Outcomes: BBA/BS</b>	
1. <i>Not Applicable – See item’s 4, 5, and 6 under “other issues” on page 9</i>	
<b>Intended Student Learning Outcomes: BBA/BS</b>	
1. <i>Not Applicable – See item’s 4, 5, and 6 under “other issues” on page 9</i>	
Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Direct Measures:
<i>BBA/BS Program</i>	
1. <i>Peregrine Academic Services Common Professional Core Comprehensive Exam</i>	a) <i>Students will compare favorably (within 5%) when compared nationally to traditional/campus-based delivery mode students in each of the 12 sections of the exam.</i>  b) <i>Students in each concentration will score higher on average that domain than the total average of all SWAU business students score in that domain.</i>

<p>2. <i>Student Portfolio's</i>  General Program ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: <i>Outcomes List</i>  Major, Concentration, Specialization, Emphasis, Option, Track ISLOs Assessed by this Measure: <i>Outcomes List</i></p>	<p>80% scoring good or better on student portfolio</p>
<p><b>Assessment Instruments for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning:</b></p>	<p><b>Performance Objectives (Targets/Criteria) for Indirect Measures:</b></p>
<p>1. <i>Student Survey</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The courses I took in the business department were well taught</li> <li>b) My instructors were well qualified to teach within their field of study</li> <li>c) The content in my concentration classes was valuable.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Students respond on a 5 pt. Likert scale (1 – Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – Neutral, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree)</i>  <i>Students should average a mean of 3.5 or better.</i></p>
<p>2. <i>Contacting Graduated Students</i></p>	<p>80 % hired or accepted into graduate program 6 months after graduation</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assessment Results: BBA by concentration and BS</b></p>	
<p><b>Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:</b></p>	
<p>1. <i>17 business students took the Peregrine Academic Services Common Professional Core Comprehensive Exam in April, 2015. The aggregate mean score for all sections of the test was 46.91% compared to the national mean of 48.66%. There were 12 sections on the exam that were assessed. Following are the aggregate percentage scores for each section (in the parenthesis is the national average and the difference between SWAU and the national average): 1) Accounting 46.47 (50.76, -4.29), 2) Business Ethics 43.53 (54.42, -10.89), 3) Business Finance 45.29 (41.20, +4.09), 4) Business integration and strategic management 47.65 (50.29, -2.64), 5) Business Leadership 47.65 (50.86, -3.21), 6) Economics 46.47 (45.84, +0.63), 7) Global Dimensions of Business 42.35 (45.57, -3.22), 8) Information Management Systems 52.35 (61.03, -8.68), 9) Legal Environment of Business 50.59 (52.68, -2.09), 10) Management 48.24 (51.87, -3.63), 11) Marketing 45.88 (43.42, +2.46), 12) Quantitative Research Techniques and Statistics 46.47 (38.77, +7.70).</i></p> <p><u><i>Accounting: part a – partially met, part b - met</i></u></p> <p><i>The students in the Accounting concentration scored an average of 53.75 in the Accounting domain while the average of all students in the accounting domain was only 46.47. Overall, we did meet part 1 of this goal, we were within 5% of the national average of traditional/campus-based delivery mode students taking the exam. However, breaking down individual domains showed 2 areas (Ethics and Information Management Systems) which were not within the 5%, which is the reason for the "partially met" target score for the assessment. Part 2 of this assessment was met - students in the Accounting concentration scored 7.28% higher, on average, in the accounting domain than the total average of all SWAU business students scored in the Accounting domain.</i></p>	

Finance: part a – partially met, part b - met

The students in the Finance concentration scored an average of 65.00 in the Finance domain while the average of all students in the Finance domain was only 45.29. Overall, we did meet part 1 of this goal; we were within 5% of the national average of traditional/campus-based delivery mode students taking the exam. However, breaking down individual domains showed 2 areas (Ethics and Information Management Systems) which were not within the 5%, which is the reason for the "partially met" target score for the assessment. Part 2 of this assessment was met - students in the Finance concentration scored 19.71% higher, on average, in the Finance domain than the total average of all SWAU business students scored in the Finance domain.

International Business: part a– partially met, part b - met

The students in the International Business concentration scored an average of 47.50 in the International Business domain while the average of all students in the International Business domain was only 42.35. Overall, we did meet part 1 of this goal; we were within 5% of the national average of traditional/campus-based delivery mode students taking the exam. However, breaking down individual domains showed 2 areas (Ethics and Information Management Systems) which were not within the 5%, which is the reason for the "partially met" target score for the assessment. Part 2 of this assessment was met - students in the International Business concentration scored 5.15% higher, on average, in the International Business domain than the total average of all SWAU business students scored in the International Business domain.

Management: part a– partially met, part b - met

The students in the Management concentration scored an average of 52.00 in the Management domain while the average of all students in the Management domain was only 48.24. Overall, we did meet part 1 of this goal; we were within 5% of the national average of traditional/campus-based delivery mode students taking the exam. However, breaking down individual domains showed 2 areas (Ethics and Information Management Systems) which were not within the 5%, which is the reason for the "partially met" target score for the assessment. Part 2 of this assessment was met - students in the Management concentration scored 3.76% higher, on average, in the Management domain than the total average of all SWAU business students scored in the Management domain.

Marketing: part a– partially met, part b – not met

The students in the Marketing concentration scored an average of 35.0 in the Marketing domain while the average of all students in the Marketing domain was 45.88. Overall, we did meet part 1 of this goal; we were within 5% of the national average of traditional/campus-based delivery mode students taking the exam. However, breaking down individual domains showed 2 areas (Ethics and Information Management Systems) which were not within the 5%, which is the reason for the "partially met" target score for the assessment. Part 2 of this assessment was not met - students in the Marketing concentration scored 10.88% less, on average, in the Marketing domain than the total average of all SWAU business students scored in the Marketing domain. This result is not consistent with previous years and was based on only 2 Marketing students graduating this year.

B.S. in Business: part a– partially met, part b – not met

Overall, we did meet part 1 of this goal, we were within 5% of the national average of traditional/campus-based delivery mode students taking the exam. However, breaking down individual domains showed 2 areas (Ethics and Information Management Systems) which were not within the 5%, which is the reason for the "partially met" target score for the assessment. Additionally, The BS students scored an average of 60.83 overall on this exam, 13.92% better than the average of all SWAU students and 12.17% better than the national average.

2. 100% of Seniors scored “good” or better on the portfolio. All business students are to be given a copy of the rubric so that they clearly understand the business criteria.

- 8 accounting majors did a portfolio. On the 6-point scale, the average score for accounting was 5.47. – Goal Met
- 2 Finance majors did a portfolio. On the 6-point scale, the average score for Finance was 5.82. – Goal Met
- 4 International Business majors did a portfolio. On the 6-point scale, the average score for accounting was 5.50. – Goal Met
- 5 Management majors did a portfolio. On the 6-point scale, the average score for accounting was 5.40.
- 2 Marketing majors did a portfolio. On the 6-point scale, the average score for accounting was 5.06.
- 1 B.S. in Business major did a portfolio. On the 6-point scale, the average score for B.S. majors was 5.0. This student was finishing their degree via Distance Education.

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

1. 17 students answered the survey questions and all were above the 3.50 benchmark so this goal was met. The question averages are as follows:

- a) The courses I took in the business department were well taught – 3.71 mean
- b) My instructors were well qualified to teach within their field of study – 3.53 mean
- c) The content in my concentration classes was valuable – 4.12 mean

2. This goal was met. 17 students graduated. Of those, 1 student is enrolled in graduate school, 12 are actively employed, 2 are still looking for employment.

**Summary of Achievement of Intended Student Learning Outcomes:**

Intended Student Learning Outcomes	Learning Assessment Measures							
	Direct Measure 1	Direct Measure 2	Direct Measure 3	Direct Measure 4	Indirect Measure 1	Indirect Measure 2	Indirect Measure 3	Indirect Measure 4
General Program ISLOs	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...

This section is not applicable because we were still working under an old assessment plan that was not formatted for this information (see items 4, 5, & 6 on page 10). The new assessment plan was submitted in December and this format will be used going forward beginning with the next reporting period.

Under the old system, outcomes outcomes were assumed to be met based on reported results. Our results are reported in the “summary of

results" section.								
<b>Intended Student Learning Outcomes: Major, Concentration, Specialization, Emphasis, Option, or Track in Area 1</b>	<i>Direct Measure 1</i>	<i>Direct Measure 2</i>	<i>Direct Measure 3</i>	<i>Direct Measure 4</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 1</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 2</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 3</i>	<i>Indirect Measure 4</i>
	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...	Performance Target Was...

This section is also not applicable, see items 4, 5, & 6 on page 10.

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

1. Assessments showed that our Marketing students did not fair well compared to other universities in the Marketing area. However, this result is not consistent with previous years and was based on only 2 Marketing students graduating this year. Assesment showed also that we need to work on the areas of Ethics and in Information Systems management in addition to the marketing area.

An MIS course was developed last year to try and help with the lack of MIS knowledge. It will be 2-3 years before those students take the exit exams and we can measure whether or not this will be effective in raising the information systems management scores.

We are currently evaluating the Ethics courses we offer to try and determine whether the areas tested by Peregrine are actually being covered in the courses.

The low marketing scores we believe to be unreliable since there were only 2 students who graduated with a Marketing degree. We will be continuing to monitor the progress of the marketing students.

**MBA Graduate Program**

**Intended Student Outcomes for Graduate MBA Program**

1. *To determine M.B.A student's abilities achieved in each of the M.B.A. courses that they completed in order to graduate.*
2. *To determine the abilities of graduating M.B.A. students to analyze a comprehensive case study that requires them to be tested on all areas covered in the M.B.A. degree program.*
3. *To determine the adequacy of preparation for graduating M.B.A. students to enter the job market at a level appropriate to their academic achievements, and to determine the success of those who took the C.P.A. examinations.*
4. *To determine how M.B.A. students rate the curriculum.*
5. *To determine how M.B.A. students rate the quality of instruction they received.*
6. *To determine how M.B.A students rate learninf resources.*

Assessment Tools for Intended Students Learning Outcomes- Direct Measures of students learning:	Performance Targets/Criteria for Direct Measures:	
Graduate MBA Program		
1. 80% scoring "good" or "better" on graduate portfolio.	Individual Portfolio	
2. 75% score at least 70% on each four parts of a comprehensive case study analysis.	Comprehensive case study	
3. 80% success in C.P.A. exam within three years.	C.P.A exam results and student contact	
Assesment Tools for Intended Students Learning Outcomes- Indirect Measures of Student Learning:	Performance Target / Criteria for Indirect Measures:	
1. Rating curriculum at 3.75 or above on a scale of 5.	Graduate Student Survey	
2. Rating Instruction at 3.75 or above on a scale of 5.	Graduate Student Survey	
3. Rating learning resources at 3.75 or above on a scale of 5.	Graduate Student Survey	
4. 80% of students who graduated in May 2013 or December 2012 hired within 6 months of graduation.	Contacting graduate students	
Summary of results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning:		
Graduate MBA Program		
1. The information that should be in the portfolio should address and show mastering of specific objectives for each of the required M.B.A. courses. <b>Result for Direct Measure 1:</b> The average score of 100% has met the goal. 100% scoring "good" or "better" on graduating portfolio (note: this will not be an assessment measure in the next assessment period – See item's 1, 4 & 9, under "other issues" on page 9)		
2. 75% of students scoring at least 80% on each parts of the case analysis . <b>Results for Direct Measure 2:</b> A case analysis was not done for the MBA students in the capstone class this year. Instead they participated in the BSG simulation. These two students participated in this simulation the spring before and this was also reported in last years assessment. The average percentile ranking of the MBA students vs. all simulation player worldwide was 72.6% while the average undergraduate percentile ranking was only 48.8%. There were no graduating Seniors who took the capstone during the current period.		
3. 80% success in C.P.A. exam within three years <b>Result for Direct Measure 3:</b> No MBA students are graduated with MBA Accounting concentration. (note: this will not be an assessment measure in the next assessment period – See item's 1, 4 & 9, under "other issues" on page 9)		
Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning:		
Graduate MBA Program		



1. (Results for Indirect Measure 1)

Ratig Curriculum at 3.75 or above on a scale of 5.

**Results: This was not asked this year on the graduating student survey** (note: this will not be an assessment measure in the next assessment period – See item’s 1, 4 & 9, under “other issues” on page 9)

2. (Results for Indirect Measure 2)

**Results: This was not asked this year on the graduating student survey** (note: this will not be an assessment measure in the next assessment period – See item’s 1, 4 & 9, under “other issues” on page 9)

3. (Results for Indirect Measure 3)

**Results: This was not asked this year on the graduating student survey** (note: this will not be an assessment measure in the next assessment period – See item’s 1, 4 & 9, under “other issues” on page 9)

4. (Results for Indirect Measure 4)

100% of students who graduated in May 2013, or December 2012 were hired within 6 months of graduation.

Results: 2/2 (100%) are employed within 6 months.

Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Areas for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:

1. *The primary reason for any performance targets not being met and the lack of measures reported on is not due to the lack of student learning, although I am sure we can make changes to improve that. The primary reason is that there has been two changes in the Chair position over the last 4 years. The transfer of knowledge regarding what was required to do in order to maintain proper assessment documentation for accrediting bodies was not sufficient when Dr. Jerry Chi left. Thus, certain assessments that had been done in the past were not followed through with or were replaced by the interim chair that followed without proper research as to documentation needed for accrediting bodies. That particular chair has stepped down. The current chair is a permanent replacement, not an interim chair, and is taking the necessary steps to put back in place the necessary practices and documentation for the purpose of accreditation reporting as well as for improvement of our education processes. An entire new assessment plan was created over the 2014-2015 school year, was submitted to IACBE November 2015, is currently in effect now and will be used for reporting purposes in the next assessment period. For the current school year, we will be administering the measures that were previously used prior to the last chair’s tenure.*

**Section II: Operational Assessment (Note: Complete this section only if you received first-time accreditation or reaffirmation of accreditation after January 1, 2011.)**

Not applicable – We are still under the old assessment plan that did not include the Operationa Assessment. Last reaffirmation was befor January 1, 2011. We are currently in our self-study year and our reaffirmation site visit is scheduled for Feb 28 in 2017.