

## Program Assessment: *Annual Report*

Program: Master of Accounting Program

Department: Accounting

College/School: Chaifetz School of Business

Date: Aug 2020

Primary Assessment Contact: Neil Jansen

*(annual report prepared by Assoc. Dean based on assessment plan submitted by N. Jansen, May 2020; includes most recent round of assessment data and condensed description of activities for each Learning Outcome)*

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

All learning outcomes

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

1. LO1a: ACCT6110 (F19) – completion of a comprehensive homework assignment  
LO1b: ACCT6340 (F19) – Completion of partnership tax return form 1065  
LO1c: MGT4500(S19) – exam questions (multiple-choice, essay questions, and individual presentations)  
LO1d: ACCT6440(F18) – First module of Valley Publishing Audit Case
2. LO2a: ACCT6110(F19) – Complex problem relative to governmental accounting to demonstrate difference between financial and government accounting ]also assessed ACCT6450(F19) – evaluation of in-class presentations on roles and responsibilities of specific member of the Financial Reporting Supply Chain  
LO2b: ACCT6190(F18) – 2 separate projects (Financial Fraud; Comprehensive Financial Statement)  
LO2c: ACCT 6110 and ACCT6450 (F19) – assessed from students answering series of detailed questions relating to governmental and not-for-profit accounting; oral communication assessed via answering directed questions and evaluation of in-class presentations
3. LO3a: ACCT5910(S18) – Intern Performance Evaluation completed by internship site supervisor
4. LO4a: ACCT 6340 and ACCT6450 (F19) – examined cases for ethical implications related to Standards on Tax Practice (AICPA); read and analyze an SEC investigation/enforcement matter and actors in Financial Reporting Supply Chain who properly or improperly discharges their duties  
LO4b: ACCT6450(F19) – Prepare a paper based on reading The Smartest Guys in the Room: The Amazing Rise and Scandalous Fall of Enron

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?

**NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.**

For most assessments, scoring was performed by the course instructor. In the case of embedded exam question or projects being used for assessments, course grades are assigned to determine grade in course,

while rubrics are used to provide a determine the percentage of students of met expectations or need improvement. In a few instances, outside experts provide feedback on student (i.e., internship supervisors). Data is gathered by course instructor, delivered to MACC Program director, and a copy is provided to Associate Dean for archival purposes.

4. What did you learn from the data? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.

**NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.**

LO1 (a – d):

ACCT 6110: The students demonstrated a very solid understanding of recording the entries necessary to complete a complex business combination. 90% of the students scored  $\geq 75\%$  on the comprehensive problem, while the average score for the problem was 88%. Given the problem covered the most complex transaction that was discussed in class, the instructor believes that the assessment is appropriate and will be used in future assessment.

ACCT 6340: The instructor determined that the students clearly understood the information necessary to complete Form 1065, as evidenced by the accuracy of their responses. Page 1 of the return was completed with 100% accuracy by all students, while pages 2 through 5 had accuracy averages of 86% - 88%. In future offerings of the course, the instructor will continue to focus on the material relative to Form 1065 to insure students continue to grasp the material in the same manner.

MGT 4500: Students met or exceeded expectations on six of the eight multiple choice questions embedded on the exams. A success rate of 75% or greater was used to deem success on the individual questions, given this is the percentage required to successfully complete the CPA examination.

ACCT 6440: 100% of teams scored 75% or better on both completing the analytical review as well as creating an appropriate summary memo of their findings.

LO2 (a -c):

ACCT 6110: The students performed very well on a complex problem which required them to create journal entries on an accrual or modified accrual basis by analyzing trial balance activity, effectively working backwards from how they would handle the situation in a real world environment.

ACCT 6190: Regarding the Financial fraud project, overall, the students did a good job in both reports and presentation. In particular, the reports showed that the students had a good understanding of the related course topics.

ACCT 6450: Each student team demonstrated team collaboration skills in compiling material for their presentation and exhibited good presentation skills in the presentation itself.

LO3a:

See notes below (Section 6)

LO4 (a – b):

ACCT 6340: The instructor determined through classroom discussions that the students as a

whole were able to identify ethical issues and determine appropriate responses.

ACCT 6450: The assessment results were very positive. The students demonstrated the ability to isolate those members of the Financial Reporting Supply Chain who failed in the discharge of their specific roles and responsibilities in each specific SEC investigation / enforcement case and to identify what steps might have prevented the specific fraud from occurring.

ACCT 6450: The students were very engaged in this project and their interest in it was evident in the comments made in class during the discussion of this book. The students' enthusiasm for this book, by their own admission, engaged them and made the learning process more interesting.

5. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

In courses that include a writing assessment, students will be required to submit a first draft of the requirements one week prior to the final assignment being due in hopes of stemming some of the writing issues that have occurred in past assessments.

Special attention will be given in future classes to increase the difficulty of the questions regarding the tax return to ensure we are being appropriately rigorous in determining meeting expectations.

ACCT 6340: The instructor determined through classroom discussions that the students as a whole were able to identify ethical issues and determine appropriate responses. The instructor plans to develop a rubric to measure learning in these areas of covering ethical issues and codes of conduct for future course offerings.

For the Smartest Guys paper, one change that will be made for next year is to require the students to approach the semester paper from the perspective of assigning a grade to each member of the Financial Reporting Supply Chain for its discharge of its roles responsibilities in the Enron fraud.

6. Did you follow up ("close the loop") on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? (*For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?*)

ACCT 5910: To insure employers continue to desire SLU students for internships and professional positions, we will continue to insure that both technical skills and soft skills are stressed in graduate accounting courses prior to students completing internships. Essentially, this will be determined by insuring we are consistently meeting assessment goals in courses completed prior to the internship. The current assessment procedures will continue to be used going forward.

Providing a presentation rubric ahead of time to students seemed to provide a good foundation for presentations, so that practice will be continued going forward.

MGT4500: The two questions that did not meet the 75% benchmark were slightly below the requirement, at 67% and 69%. As such, the instructor is satisfied with the results of the assessment; however, future monitoring will determine whether a different pedagogical approach needs to be used for these topics.

ACCT6440: While working on the detailed review, students too often relied on prior year comments to form their judgments and therefore weren't prepared/confident enough to address new and unusual circumstances. The importance of critical thinking beyond the numerical analysis will be particularly stressed in future course offerings. Future project results will be compared to previous results to insure the items given additional detail are indeed presented correctly by groups in their formal presentations and memos.

Using the written communication rubric, it was determined that the students met or exceeded expectations in all assessed attributes. The percentage of students that did not meet expectations was 15% or less for all assessed attributes. The primary reason for those not meeting expectations was that these students were non-native speakers of the English language. Special attention will be given to identifying remedies for this going forward.

***IMPORTANT: Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.***