

Figure 4.2

Measurement and Analysis of Student Learning and Performance

Analysis of Results , AY2018-19																										
Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Assessment Instrument/ Achievement Target	Results	Analysis	Actions	Trends																					
<b>Program: Bachelor of Business Administration (B.B.A.)--All Majors</b>																										
<p><b>1. Common Body of Knowledge</b> Students will demonstrate knowledge of the core principles of the major functional areas of Business Administration.</p>	<p><b>ETS Major Field Test in Business-- Composite score.</b> (Direct, External, Summative, Comparative)  LCU Composite Mean (<math>\mu_{LCU}</math>) score no lower than one standard deviation below the mean score for a faculty-selected peer group of ACBSP/AACSB accredited institutions. (Target= <math>\mu_{peer}-\sigma_{peer}</math>)</p>	<p><b>AY2018-19:</b> <math>\mu_{peer} = 151.7</math>; <math>\sigma_{peer} = 3.0</math> <b>Target: 151.7-3.0 = 148.7.</b> <math>\mu_{LCU}</math> (all majors, N=45) = 149 &gt; 148.7; <b>target met.</b></p> <hr/> <p>Three year (AY2016-19) mean for which the current version of the MFT in Business has been in force: All majors (N)=117: 149.6; target met.  ACC (N=31): 150.2; target met; BADM (N=62): 147.0; target not met. FIN (N=24): 153.8; target met. ECO and ISM: n/a (insufficient data)</p>	<p>For AY 2018-19, and for AY2016-19 mean, target was met for all majors combined; by major, target met for ACC and FIN, not met for BADM. This accords with past evidence: BADM consistently exhibits the greatest weakness on the MFT. Some of this is a selection issue: The strongest students tend to choose ACC and FIN. However, when broken down by assessment indicator, for the mean scores over the period AY2016-19, the only 2 indicators that fell short of target for each major and all majors combined were Management and Marketing (two areas of emphasis in the BADM major).</p>	<p>Faculty will investigate potential reasons for the relative weaknesses in Management and Marketing assessment indicator scores, and consider changes to courses and/or curricula. In addition, because moving to a stand-alone MGT major is feasible in the near-future, "Management" is being added as an outcome School of Business's current assessment cycle (SLO2), replacing "Information Systems" (for which the loop was closed last year). This will provide data assistance in the determination of whether and how to create a stand-alone major.</p>	<table border="1"> <caption>MFT--Composite Mean All Majors</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Mean Percent Correct (Major=All Majors)</th> <th>Achievement Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2013-14</td> <td>148</td> <td>148.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014-15</td> <td>147</td> <td>148.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015-16</td> <td>150</td> <td>148.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016-17</td> <td>151</td> <td>148.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2017-18</td> <td>149</td> <td>148.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2018-19</td> <td>148.7</td> <td>148.7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Mean Percent Correct (Major=All Majors)	Achievement Target	2013-14	148	148.7	2014-15	147	148.7	2015-16	150	148.7	2016-17	151	148.7	2017-18	149	148.7	2018-19	148.7	148.7
Year	Mean Percent Correct (Major=All Majors)	Achievement Target																								
2013-14	148	148.7																								
2014-15	147	148.7																								
2015-16	150	148.7																								
2016-17	151	148.7																								
2017-18	149	148.7																								
2018-19	148.7	148.7																								
<p><b>2. Management</b> Students will demonstrate knowledge in the principles of management.</p>	<p><b>ETS Major Field Test in Business-- Assessment Indicator 3: Management.</b> (Direct, External, Summative, Comparative)  LCU Management mean (<math>\mu_{LCU}</math>) score no lower than one standard deviation below the mean score for a faculty-selected peer group of ACBSP/AACSB accredited institutions. (Target= <math>\mu_{peer}-\sigma_{peer}</math>)</p>	<p><b>AY2018-19:</b> <math>\mu_{peer} = 63.6</math>; <math>\sigma_{peer} = 3.3</math> <b>Target: 63.6-3.3 = 60.6.</b> <math>\mu_{LCU}</math> (all majors, N=45) = 59 &lt; 60.6; <b>target not met.</b></p> <hr/> <p>Three year (AY2016-19) mean for which the current version of the MFT in Business has been in force: All majors (N)=117: 59.2 &lt; 60.6; target not met.  ACC (N=31): 58.0 &lt; 60.6; target not met. BADM (N=62): 59.9 &lt; 60.6; target not met. FIN (N=24): 57.0 &lt; 60.6; target not met.</p>	<p>Management principles was identified as an area of focus, beginning AY2018-19, based upon (a) relative weakness in MFT scores on the Management Assessment Indicator: Management over periods AY2014-16 and AY 2016-19, and (b) because the School of Business is examining the possibility of moving MGT from an emphasis within Business Administration (BADM) to a stand-alone major. This will provide data assistance in the determination of whether and how to create a stand-alone major.</p>	<p>Faculty will investigate potential reasons for the relative weakness in MGT scores. One potential area of inquiry is course delivery. A relatively high proportion of the principles class, MGT 3300, is offered online. Is there a difference between rigor/content/learning due to mode of delivery? In addition, most School of Business online courses are offered in 8-week (A/B) terms. Are A/B terms too accelerated? Should online MGT 3300 be offered in regular 16 week terms?</p>	<table border="1"> <caption>MFT Subscore--Management All Majors</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Mean Percent Correct (Major=All Majors)</th> <th>Achievement Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2013-14</td> <td>51</td> <td>60.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014-15</td> <td>47</td> <td>60.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015-16</td> <td>47</td> <td>60.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016-17</td> <td>61</td> <td>60.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2017-18</td> <td>58</td> <td>60.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2018-19</td> <td>59</td> <td>60.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Mean Percent Correct (Major=All Majors)	Achievement Target	2013-14	51	60.6	2014-15	47	60.6	2015-16	47	60.6	2016-17	61	60.6	2017-18	58	60.6	2018-19	59	60.6
Year	Mean Percent Correct (Major=All Majors)	Achievement Target																								
2013-14	51	60.6																								
2014-15	47	60.6																								
2015-16	47	60.6																								
2016-17	61	60.6																								
2017-18	58	60.6																								
2018-19	59	60.6																								

Figure 4.2

Measurement and Analysis of Student Learning and Performance

Analysis of Results , AY2018-19																										
Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Assessment Instrument/Achievement Target	Results	Analysis	Actions	Trends																					
<b>Program: Bachelor of Business Administration (B.B.A.)--All Majors (continued)</b>																										
<p><b>3. Personal Financial Literacy</b> Students will demonstrate knowledge of fundamental principles of financial literacy and stewardship.</p>	<p><b>Personal Financial Literacy Test</b> - 50 question exam from the test bank for the widely-used textbook "Personal Finance" by Jeff Madura (4th ed., 2011). (Direct, Internal, Summative)  Mean score at or above 70%.</p>	<p><b>AY2018-19:</b> <b>Total (all majors, N=50):</b> <b>Mean % correct = 64.4% &lt; 70%; target not met.</b></p> <p><b>Percent correct by category:</b> I-Tools for Financial Planning: 69.6; II-Managing Your Liquidity: 66.4; III-Personal Financing: 58.8; IV-Protecting Your Wealth: 69.4; V-Personal Investing: 62.6.</p> <p><b>Percent correct by major:</b> ACC (N=15): 69.5; target not met; I-Tools for Financial Planning: 78.7; II-Managing Your Liquidity: 67.3; III-Personal Financing: 61.3; IV-Protecting Your Wealth: 68.0; V-Personal Investing: 72.0</p> <p>BADM (N=18): 58.1; target not met. I-Tools for Financial Planning: 60.0; II-Managing Your Liquidity: 59.4; III-Personal Financing: 51.7; IV-Protecting Your Wealth: 64.4; V-Personal Investing: 55.0.</p> <p>FIN (N=17): 70.6% &gt; target met. I-Tools for Financial Planning: 73.5; II-Managing Your Liquidity: 68.2; III-Personal Financing: 64.7; IV-Protecting Your Wealth: 71.8; V-Personal Investing: 74.7.</p> <p>ECO, ISM: n/a</p>	<p><b>AY2018-19:</b> Overall mean for all majors fell short of target, and was down slightly from the previous year (66.4%, N=27). Since the test is an internally-generated instrument, its value derives from internal comparisons between majors and categories and over time: <b>-Major.</b> FIN majors exceeded target, and accounting majors barely fell short (69.5%). As is typically the case, the BADM score fell well short (58.1%, N=18). Scores for BADM majors have been consistently low relative to ACC, ECO, and FIN majors over the period in which this exam has been used as an assessment instrument. While this is understandable, in that ACC, ECO, and FIN majors have more exposure to finance and financial management topics, the gap is too wide. <b>-Category.</b> As first noted last year, Part III-Personal Financing has emerged as the category whose scores fall noticeably and consistently below the others. The major topic in Part III is home buying. <b>-Time.</b> This was the sixth year of administration of the PF exam. No distinct trend has emerged. For instance, the total (weighted) mean for all majors over all six years was 65.0; the most recent three years (AY2016-19) averaged 65.13, barely higher than the 64.84 average over the first three years (AY 2013-16).</p>	<p>In response to the shortfall of BADM scores relative to ACC and FIN, effective AY2017-18 FIN 4315 Financial Statement Analysis was added as a required course in the BADM curriculum to "[increase] exposure to financial tools such as income statements, balance sheets, and ratio analysis [which] have application to personal financial understanding and decisionmaking and thereby improve their personal financial literacy." It will take some time for this change to filter into the exam results; for AY 2018-19, only 22% of all examinees had credit for FIN 4315 and of BADM majors, only 11%.</p> <p>Faculty teaching FIN 2301 will continue to note and emphasize the home buying experience. As with the introduction of FIN 4315 into the BADM curriculum, it will take some time to assess the impact of this action.</p> <p>Fall 2019: One of the PF faculty members will administer the PF Exam as a pre-test/post-test in a section of FIN 2301 to see if additional information is ascertainable using this assessment instrument.</p>	<table border="1"> <caption>Personal Financial Literacy Exam Data</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Mean Percent Correct (All Majors)</th> <th>Achievement Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2013-14</td> <td>64.9</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014-15</td> <td>62.8</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015-16</td> <td>66.8</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016-17</td> <td>63.8</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2017-18</td> <td>66.4</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2018-19</td> <td>65.4</td> <td>70</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Mean Percent Correct (All Majors)	Achievement Target	2013-14	64.9	70	2014-15	62.8	70	2015-16	66.8	70	2016-17	63.8	70	2017-18	66.4	70	2018-19	65.4	70
Year	Mean Percent Correct (All Majors)	Achievement Target																								
2013-14	64.9	70																								
2014-15	62.8	70																								
2015-16	66.8	70																								
2016-17	63.8	70																								
2017-18	66.4	70																								
2018-19	65.4	70																								