



Program Review Self-Study Template

Academic unit: Finance, Real Estate, and Decision Sciences

College: Business

Date of last review _____

Date of last accreditation report (if relevant) _____

List all degrees described in this report (add lines as necessary)

Degree: Bachelor - Finance CIP* code: 52.0801

Degree: Bachelor - MIS CIP code: 52.1201

Degree: _____ CIP code: _____

*To look up, go to: Classification of Instructional Programs Website, <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?v=55>

Faculty of the academic unit (add lines as necessary)

Name	Signature
Sue Abdinnour <u>on sabbatical</u>	_____
Mehmet Barut <u>Mehmet Barut</u>	<u>4/4/13</u>
Rodney Boehme <u>Rodney Boehme</u>	<u>4/3/13</u>
Timothy Craft <u>Timothy Craft</u>	<u>4/3/13</u>
Steve Helm <u>Steve Helm</u>	<u>4-3-13</u>
Stan Longhofer <u>Stan Longhofer</u>	<u>4/5/13</u>
Anthony May <u>Anthony May</u>	<u>4/3/13</u>
Achita Muthitacharoen <u>Achita Muthitacharoen</u>	<u>4/2/13</u>
Khawaja Saeed <u>on sabbatical</u>	_____
Larry Spurgeon <u>Larry Spurgeon</u>	<u>4/2/13</u>
Semih Tartaroglu <u>Semih Tartaroglu</u>	<u>4/8/13</u>
Peggy Ward <u>Peggy Ward</u>	<u>4-9-13</u>
David Xu <u>David Xu</u>	<u>4/3/13</u>
Submitted by: Rick LeCompte, Chair, FREDS Dept. <u>Rick LeCompte</u>	Date April 1, 2013

(name and title)

1. Departmental purpose and relationship to the University mission (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

a. University Mission:

Wichita State University is committed to providing comprehensive educational opportunities in an urban setting. Through teaching, scholarship and public service the University seeks to equip both students and the larger community with the educational and cultural tools they need to thrive in a complex world, and to achieve both individual responsibility in their own lives and effective citizenship in the local, national and global community.

b. Program Mission: Finance Degree

The primary mission of the finance program is to support and advance the mission of the Barton School of business through our research, teaching and service. Finance is one of the basic and fundamental business functions. Instructional and research capabilities in this area must exist if quality business degrees are to be offered at Wichita State University. Our faculty maintains a commitment to the delivery of a high quality, relevant finance degree program that provides our students with the knowledge and capability to succeed in a rapidly changing global business environment, or to further their education by seeking advanced degrees. We seek to prepare our students for principled and successful careers in the global entrepreneurial marketplace. Moreover, we are also committed to excellence in research that will develop new knowledge and provide for the development of new applications and the enhancement of existing finance practices. We also seek to provide positive impact on our discipline and our community through engagement in significant outreach and skill-based service activities.

Wichita is a key center of economic activity in Kansas, in both service and manufacturing industries. Our local institutions provide most of the employment opportunities for our past, present and future students. Thus, a major objective of the finance program is to establish and maintain contacts and joint projects with the major firms located in the Wichita area including internships and Co-Operative Education placements. This outreach will ensure that our program remains viable and that our students will continue to be in high demand and make significant contributions to the economic, professional, and cultural health of the Wichita metropolitan area, as well as the state and nation.

The finance program attempts to meet the above mission knowing that quality teaching, state-of-the-art research, and service to the community must be produced in order for our program to exert a significant positive impact on our multi-faceted constituencies. It is recognized that a necessary condition for high quality teaching is not only that the faculty members remain current in their areas of expertise, but they must also advance the field of knowledge by making intellectual contributions through published research.

c. The role of the program (s) and relationship to the University mission: Explain in 1-2 concise paragraphs.

The Finance program and its faculty complement the University and Barton School missions by providing our students with high quality education that is relevant to the challenges and opportunities they will face. The educational and research roles played by this program are central to meeting the aspirations set forth in the mission statements of Wichita State University and the Barton School of Business. The program in finance provides employers with able graduates who are ready to embark on careers in a variety of areas in finance: investments, financial institution management, risk management, real estate finance, corporate finance, derivative finance, entrepreneurial finance and international finance. These are skills that are highly valued in the local and global community. This flow of our graduates into finance careers is critical to the continued vitality of Wichita area employers as well as employers throughout Kansas and beyond.

Due to the interdependent nature of the different business disciplines, managers in the areas of marketing, accounting, production, engineering and many others benefit greatly from the understanding of finance and how to apply financial concepts that they learn in our core finance course required of all business majors.

In keeping with the goals of the university, the finance faculty is engaged in continuing scholarship that has resulted in numerous publications in our discipline's top-tier journals. Faculty members also provide their expertise through commentary on current financial issues in print media and on radio and television. They are also engaged in professional consulting activities and service on not-for-profit boards of directors. This diverse set of activities underscores the strong commitment of the finance program to do its part to fulfill its role in supporting the University and Barton School Missions.

- d. Has the mission of the Program (s) changed since last review? Yes No
 i. If yes, describe in 1-2 concise paragraphs. If no, is there a need to change?

The Finance faculty along with the WSU Foundation is currently engaged in fundraising for a Finance Trading Lab. The success of this effort will result in a somewhat different focus for our teaching and an alteration of some of the curriculum for our major. This will result in reformulation of our mission by adding a new dimension; one where we will more fully prepare our students for roles in financial trading and investment operations of local and national firms.

- e. Provide an overall description of your program (s) including a list of the measurable goals and objectives of the program (s) (both programmatic and learner centered). Have they changed since the last review? Yes No
 If yes, describe the changes in a concise manner.

The Finance Degree now requires the following in addition to completion of Barton School and WSU degree requirements: **** indicates changes since previous program review resulting from the assessment process.**

****For a Finance Major, FIN 340 must be completed with a grade of C+ (2.30) or better; previously it was 2.0 or better.**

In addition to FIN 340, the finance degree has four required courses and the student must complete five electives from a list of ten elective courses below.

Finance Degree Required Courses

****ACCT 310 – Financial Accounting and Reporting: Assets – New required course, added to enhance the skills of our majors, competitiveness and improve employer satisfaction.**

ECON 340 – Money and Banking

FIN 440 – Financial Management II

****FIN 620 – Investments – Now required, previously an elective.**

****FIN 660 - Cases in Finance was dropped as a required course and is retained as an elective. This was to meet standards and match curriculum at peer and aspirational schools.**

Finance Degree Elective Courses:

Choose 5 electives from the following list:

- FIN 450 – Applied Financial Analysis
- FIN 610 – Insurance and Risk Management
- FIN 611 – Real Estate Finance
- FIN 618 – Real Estate Investment Analysis
- FIN 622 – Futures and Options Markets
- FIN 625 – International Financial Management
- FIN 631 – Fixed Income and Securities Markets
- FIN 632 – Bank and Financial Institution Management
- **FIN 660 – Cases in Finance (**now an elective, not required course**)
- FIN 675 – Spreadsheet Modeling for Decision Making

In our introductory course, FIN 340, we assess general student performance across the three learning goals, and in our capstone class, FIN 660, six objectives are assessed for all finance majors. The results from these assessments have led to a substantial change in our curriculum and a change in our introductory textbook. We seek to increase the level of student achievement as measured by these assessments and to increase the number of our finance graduates placed in finance positions following graduation. We also seek to increase the number and quality of our internships and Co-Op placements.

b. Program Mission:

Management Information Systems (MIS) Degree

This Management Information Systems (MIS) Major is offered by the Department of Finance, Real Estate, and Decision Sciences (FREDS) and is committed to delivery of a high quality academic major that provides students the knowledge and ability to function and compete successfully in a rapidly changing business environment. The research mission includes the generation, integration and application of knowledge that enhances the ability of organizations to lead and prosper as they confront changes in technology. To implement this mission, the MIS Program contributes to a variety of educational and training opportunities for residents of the Wichita metropolitan area and the larger public, as it builds ties with the business community.

The (MIS) program is designed to combine knowledge of business processes with practical hands-on knowledge of building and maintaining information systems. With the dynamic nature of information technologies, our program additionally strives to promote self-learning ability in our students. Large and small businesses alike depend on the successful application of information technology (IT). Computers and communication networks allow critical business data to be accessed and used in real time applications. A business school curriculum must embrace and nurture the use of timely and relevant data for management decision-making. While computer science focuses on the creation of software, and electrical engineering tackles hardware, it is the province of the MIS field to integrate these assets and build solutions that meet the needs of users. Since its initiation in 1998, the MIS Major has provided direct support for the mission of the school and university in meeting the needs of various constituents. Graduates of this program should be able to successfully pursue any of the following goals:

- Start or join a computer computing company specializing in providing business systems to small business or organization units in large companies.
- Join the MIS or IT department of organizations serving any of the following roles: System Analyst, Telecommunication Analyst, Information Center Consultant, Database Administrator, Departmental MIS Manager, Application Programmer, Maintenance Programmer, Functional Area MIS Liaison, Network Administrator, Web Database Developer Database Designer, etc.
- Continue graduate studies in MIS or other related fields.

Teaching: The MIS major is designed to be flexible, allowing our students to pursue two different tracks including the technical-oriented and business-oriented. Depending on the students' goals, different elective courses will be recommended. Experienced instructors with doctoral degrees from prestigious schools teach most of our courses. Currently, we have 3 professors and one fulltime instructor in the program.

The quality of teaching in the MIS program at the Barton School of is demonstrated by continued recognition both from the school and university levels. Our instructors have consistently been nominated for the WSU's Academy and Effective Teaching awards and the Barton School's instructor of the year awards. One MIS professor was honored as the educator of the year by the Mortar Board organization.

Intellectual Activities: The MIS faculty are actively engaged in a variety of high-quality research activities. The goal is to produce research that can be theoretically meaningful and applicable for practitioners, especially those in an urban setting. We target both elite and high-quality publications as our research outlets with a high degree of success. Recent publications appear in the top-rated outlets including: *Management Information Systems Quarterly*, *Journal of Management Information Systems*, *Information & Management*, *Decision Sciences*, *Journal of Associations for Information Systems*, *Journal of Business Ethics*, the *Communications of the ACM* and *IEEE Transactions of Engineering Management*.

The MIS faculty additionally strives to promote visibility of the Barton School of Business and the Wichita State University by being involved in national and international academic conferences. In the past few years, our MIS faculty have served as track chairs, session chairs, and program co-chairs at several prestigious academic conferences, the Americas Conference on Information (AMCIS), the International Conferences on Information Systems, and the Global Information Technology Management Association Conference. We also have an active MIS Advisory Board that interacts with our faculty on a regular basis and serves as a sounding board and source of ideas. This directly supports the urban serving mission of our program. A significant ongoing scholarship program provided by one of our member firms is one of the outgrowths of this interaction.

Our research accomplishments are acknowledged both within as well as outside the Barton School of Business. During the evaluation period, one MIS faculty member was selected as the recipient of the Barton School's researcher and writer of the year and as a W. Frank Barton Fellow. The publications of our faculty's research in the best journals in their field provide external validation. All of our tenured or tenure-track professors are publishing in elite journals.

Service: The service mission of the MIS faculty includes providing state-of-art assistance and technical support to private, public, and non-profit organization with the goal of improving organizational productivity and effectiveness. Faculty members are encouraged to provide organizations with relevant expertise, especially when such activities can enhance their teaching and research activities. Over the past few years, the MIS faculty provided their services to several organizations in the Wichita area such as the Interfaith Ministry, YWCA, Big Brothers and Big Sisters of Kansas and the Meritrust Credit Union. One MIS faculty member has also served in as the member of editorial boards at the *Journal of Global Information Technology Management* and the *Journal of Information Technology Cases & Applications*.

c. The role of the program (s) and relationship to the University mission: Explain in 1-2 concise paragraphs.

The MIS program and its faculty complement the University and Barton School missions in many ways. The curriculum developed by the faculty addresses the complex nature of today's businesses and embraces how technologies can be used not only to grow local businesses to the global market, but also to connect people. In order to enhance our role, we solicit inputs from many important sources and revise our program accordingly. An example of this effort is the MIS advisory board that was formed in 2009. It is comprised of IT managers and executives from local companies and organizations, as well as our MIS faculty. We hold the advisory board meetings twice a year to gather information regarding their current and future need of IT skills and seeking input regarding the effectiveness of our curriculum. This activity helps us to connect with and add value to our stakeholders who are also potential employers for our graduates.

d. Has the mission of the Program (s) changed since last review? Yes No

i. If yes, describe in 1-2 concise paragraphs. If no, is there a need to change?

Our overall mission remains the same for the past few years mainly because our mission has already included the dynamic changes of technologies. Thus most changes that occurred to our program are mostly witnessed by our efforts to stay on top of information technologies and its applications such as new courses offered as electives to our students, new software used in our curriculum and etc.

e. Provide an overall description of your program (s) including a list of the measurable goals and objectives of the program (s) (both programmatic and learner centered). Have they changed since the last review?

Yes No

If yes, describe the changes in a concise manner.

The MIS faculty developed a plan to continuously improve our students' learning experiences through course assessments. The plan has four general objectives that we hope our students can accomplish. They are;

1. To demonstrate knowledge of basic and advanced MIS concepts and terminologies
2. To be able to intelligently discuss and use selected system development tools, techniques, and methodologies.
3. To be able to apply selected technologies to different business functions
4. To be able to intelligently discuss the management of information technology and systems in an organization.

Upon the completion of each MIS course, students are asked to complete exit questions. The questions are instruments to test whether they succeed in each objective. Depending upon the nature of course material, each MIS course incorporates different objectives. For instance, programming courses focus more on the first two objectives. At this point, we compiled the results of exit questions on regular basis and analyzed them. This has led us to make changes to the program accordingly, e.g., changing textbooks, realigning lecture materials and adding or adjusting content in each course.

2a. Describe the quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty in terms of SCH, majors, and graduates (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section). Complete a separate table for each program if appropriate.

FINANCE

Finance Last 3 Years	Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty (Number)	Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty with Terminal Degree (Number)	Instructional FTE (#):			Total SCH - Total SCH by FY from Su, Fl, Sp	Total Majors - From fall semester	Total Grads - by FY
			TTF = Tenure/Tenure Track	GTA = Grad teaching assist	O = Other instructional FTE			
			TTF	GTA	O			
Year 1 →	4.5	4.5	4.5	0	1.75	5028	241	79
Year 2 →	4.5	4.5	4.5	0	1.75	4913	234	78
Year 3 →	5.5	5.5	5.5	0	1.5	4489	232	77
Total Number Instructional (FTE) – TTF+GTA+O						SCH/ FTE	Majors/ FTE	Grads/ FTE
↓								
Year 1 →					6.25	804	38.6	12.6
Year 2 →					6.25	786	37.4	12.5
Year 3 →					7.0	641	33.1	11.0

Management Information Systems

Management Information Systems Last 3 Years	Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty (Number)	Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty with Terminal Degree (Number)	Instructional FTE (#):			Total SCH - Total SCH by FY from Su, Fl, Sp	Total Majors - From fall semester	Total Grads - by FY	
			TTF= Tenure/Tenure Track	GTA=Grad teaching assist	O=Other instructional FTE				
Year 1 →	2	2	2	0	1.25	2414	83	23	
Year 2 →	2	2	2	0	1.25	2030	80	21	
Year 3 →	3	3	3	0	1.25	1821	88	18	
Total Number Instructional (FTE) – TTF+GTA+O						SCH/ FTE	Majors/ FTE	Grads/ FTE	
Year 1 →						3.25	742	25.5	7.1
Year 2 →						3.25	625	24.6	6.5
Year 3 →						4.25	429	20.7	4.2

KBOR data minima for UG programs: Majors=25; Graduates=10; Faculty=3; KBOR data minima for master programs: Majors=20; Graduates=5; Faculty=3 additional; KBOR data minima for doctoral programs: Majors=5; Graduates=2; Faculty=2 additional.

2b. Describe the quality of the program as assessed by the scholarly productivity (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

FINANCE

Scholarly Productivity	Number Journal Articles		Number Presentations		Number Conference Proceedings		Performances			Number of Exhibits		Creative Work		No. Books	No. Book Chaps.	No. Grants Awarded or Submitted	\$ Grant Value
	Ref	Non-Ref	Ref	Non-Ref	Ref	Non-Ref	*	**	***	Juried	****	Juried	Non-Juried				
Year 1	1	0	0	4	1	3								0	1	0	0
Year 2	0	0	0	4	0	4								0	0	1	0
Year 3	6	0	1	1	0	1								0	2	1	18,000

* Winning by competitive audition. **Professional attainment (e.g., commercial recording). ***Principal role in a performance. ****Commissioned or included in a collection.

MIS

Scholarly Productivity	Number Journal Articles		Number Presentations		Number Conference Proceedings		Performances			Number of Exhibits		Creative Work		No. Books	No. Book Chaps.	No. Grants Awarded or Submitted	\$ Grant Value
	Ref	Non-Ref	Ref	Non-Ref	Ref	Non-Ref	*	**	***	Juried	****	Juried	Non-Juried				
Year 1	1	0	2	0	1	0								0	0	2	8,000
Year 2	6	0	2	0	2	0								0	1	1	0
Year 3	4	0	3	1	5	0								0	0	0	0

- a. Provide a brief assessment of the quality of the faculty/staff using the data from the tables in section 2 as well as any additional relevant data. Programs should comment on details in regard to productivity of the faculty (i.e., some departments may have a few faculty producing the majority of the scholarship), efforts to recruit/retain faculty, departmental succession plans, course evaluation data, etc.

Finance

The finance faculty currently consists of five full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty members and one full-time lecturer. This group has produced, on average, over 740 SCH per FTE over the past three years, but the SCH per FTE has been declining due to the addition of one new faculty member in the final year of this analysis and a decrease in SCH by about 5% per year over the last two years. The need for additional faculty was addressed in the last program review. And although the addition of one new highly productive faculty member has helped, more faculty are needed in this area. Even with the drop in SCH, the number of Finance graduates per year has only dipped by about 1% per year over the same time frame and the number of finance majors has dropped by roughly 2% per year. This is less than would be expected following a period of time when much of the news concerning finance consisted of scandal and the near collapse of financial markets in 2009. Notably, we have excellent teaching faculty in the department who score very well on SPTEs; two have received both the Barton School Instructor of the Year Award and the University's Excellence in Teaching Award, one was awarded the Academy of Effective Teaching award, one received the Barton School Graduate Instructor of the year award, two have received the Co-Operative Education Advisor of the Year award and a national professional conference designated one faculty member as its Educator of the Year. Large numbers of our students engage in the Co-Op program in finance with a good number actually finding their first post-graduation employment in this manner. In terms of research, despite its small size, the finance faculty has been extremely productive in terms of scholarly contributions, especially in terms of high quality journal publication, which is our focus. Four of our finance faculty members have had their research published in the top journals in our field. And in the time frame covered by this analysis, we have five publications in elite finance journals. Finance Faculty members have received both Barton Fellowships and the Barton School's Excellence in Research Awards over the past few years. Service to the community, profession and other constituencies has certainly exceeded expectations of such a small group. The finance faculty is not content to rest on its past achievements. The faculty is strongly committed to continued distinction in research, excellence in teaching and significant service to its constituents.

Management Information Systems (MIS)

The MIS faculty currently consists of three full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty members and one full-time lecturer. This group has produced, on average, almost 600 SCH per FTE over the past three years. The SCH per FTE has been declining due to the addition of one new faculty member in the final year of this analysis and a decrease in SCH by about 20% per year over the last two years. However, the number of MIS Majors is growing, but the number of graduates has dropped by about 10% per year. This program has suffered enrollment volatility from the time it was created in 1998 through the ups and downs of the dot-com era and the vast changes we still experience in the technology businesses. The faculty in this department have continuously changed their curriculum to adjust to the business landscape that faces their graduates and they have done well in mentoring their students through the program to good jobs in the local area. The Cooperative Education Program is another

way in which our faculty reaches out to the local community. Our MIS students engage in this program with a good number actually finding their first post-graduation employment in this manner. In terms of research, despite its small size, the MIS faculty has been extremely productive in terms of scholarly contributions, especially in terms of high quality journal publication, which is our department’s research focus. All of our MIS tenure-track faculty members have had their research published in the top journals in their field. MIS faculty members have received both Barton Fellowships and the Barton School’s Researcher/Writer of the Year Awards over the past few years. And in the time frame covered by this analysis, we have eight publications or acceptances in elite MIS journals. Service to the community, profession and other constituencies has certainly exceeded expectations of such a small group. The MIS faculty is not content to rest on its past achievements. The faculty is strongly committed to continued distinction in research, excellence in teaching and significant service to its constituents.

3. Academic Program: Analyze the quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students. Complete this section for each program (if more than one). Attach updated program assessment plan (s) as an appendix (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information).

a. For undergraduate programs, compare ACT scores of the majors with the University as a whole.

Last 3 Years	Total Majors - From fall semester		ACT – Fall Semester (mean for those reporting)		
			Finance	MIS	All University Students - FT
Year 1 →	241	83	23.1	22.2	22.96
Year 2 →	234	80	23.0	23.1	23.06
Year 3 →	232	88	23.5	22.3	23.11

KBOR data minima for UG programs: ACT<20 will trigger program.

b. For graduate programs, compare graduate GPAs of the majors with University graduate GPAs.*

Last 3 Years	Total Admitted - By FY	Average GPA (Admitted) – Domestic Students Only (60 hr GPA for those with ≥54 hr reported) By FY		
		GPA of those Admitted	College GPA	University GPA
Year 1 →	N/A			
Year 2 →				
Year 3 →				

*If your admission process uses another GPA calculation, revise table to suit program needs and enter your internally collected data.

c. Identify the principal learning outcomes (i.e., what skills does your Program expect students to graduate with). Provide aggregate data on how students are meeting those outcomes. Data should relate to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e. Provide an analysis and evaluation of the data by learner outcome with proposed actions based on the results.

In the following table provide program level information. You may add an appendix to provide more explanation/details. Definitions:

Learning Outcomes: Learning outcomes are statements that describe what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time of graduation. These relate to the skills, knowledge, and behaviors that students acquire in their matriculation through the program (e.g., graduates will demonstrate advanced writing ability).

Assessment Tool: One or more tools to identify, collect, and prepare data to evaluate the achievement of learning outcomes (e.g., a writing project evaluated by a rubric).

Criterion/Target: Percentage of program students expected to achieve the desired outcome for demonstrating program effectiveness (e.g., 90% of the students will demonstrate satisfactory performance on a writing project).

Result: Actual achievement on each learning outcome measurement (e.g., 95%).

Analysis: Determines the extent to which learning outcomes are being achieved and leads to decisions and actions to improve the program. The analysis and evaluation should align with specific learning outcome and consider whether the measurement and/or criteria/target remain a valid indicator of the learning outcome as well as whether the learning outcomes need to be revised.

The Grid Below outlines our Assessment of Learning for the Finance Degree

Finance

Learning Outcomes (most programs will have multiple outcomes)	Assessment Tool (e.g., portfolios, rubrics, exams)	Target/Criteria (desired program level achievement)	Results	Analysis
Students will demonstrate knowledge and capabilities necessary for successful employment in entry level finance positions	Introductory Finance based upon test questions in three areas.	90%	Improvements in the tools and performance are needed to consistently achieve established goals. Please see tables below.	Please see Tables below
	Capstone Finance Course - Rubric based on six areas	80%		

Finance 340 Managerial Finance I: assessment results through Spring 2012 semester

For Finance 340 Managerial Finance, three broad topic areas are assessed; Time Value of Money, Cost of Capital/Equity Valuation, and Capital Budgeting Decision Tools. The results for Spring 2007 through Spring 2012, with percentages of students ranked as exemplary, acceptable, or unacceptable are shown below. The results reported below for each semester represent a pooling of the several class sections offered. ***Please See Appendix I for the Data.***

General student performance across the three learning goals was essentially the same over this period beginning with Spring 2007 and ending with Spring 2012, and there is no clear evidence of either an increasing or decreasing trend. However, in reviewing the assessment results on a semester-by-semester basis, it is clear that there is a large amount of variation in the assessment results across sections. This is true both whether or not one controls for the specific instructor of the individual sections. The large amount of variation attributes to difficulty in ascertaining the overall trend of results (especially the percentage of students categorized as “unacceptable” in the topics assessed).

The high variability in performance across sections appears to be due to the small number of questions used to assess student performance. Currently, we have three multiple-choice questions for each of the three objectives.

More broadly, the broader assessment process has led the finance faculty to implement changes to the requirements for student majoring in finance. In particular, the faculty have approved a curriculum change requiring all finance majors to take a course in Investments to enhance the theoretical and technical skills of our graduating students. Finance majors will also be required to take an additional accounting course (ACCT 310) beyond the Barton School business core.

Six objectives are assessed in Finance 660, our capstone course for finance majors. These six objectives are:

1. A firm's sources and the cost of capital for these sources, as well as the weighted average cost of capital (WACC)
2. Firm valuation (Intrinsic Value) using the Free Cash Flow (FCF) method
3. Capital budgeting
4. Mergers and acquisitions
5. Capital structure
6. Dividend (payout) policy

The results for the period from Fall 2009 through Spring 2012, with percentages of students ranked as exemplary, acceptable, or unacceptable are shown in **Appendix II**:

Upon examining and analyzing the results and trends of the Finance 660 assessments, results can be labeled as mixed. Judging by the percentage of students that achieve ratings of unacceptable, the performance on items other than (4) Mergers and (6) Dividend Policy have experienced gradual improvement. An increased emphasis in FIN 660 on these two areas has only had a marginal effect in improving results. Due to changes resulting from assessment, FIN 660 will no longer be a required course and we will create assessments in the other required finance courses, FIN 620 and FIN 440.

Management Information Systems (3 courses assessed)

Learning Outcomes (most programs will have multiple outcomes)	Assessment Tool (e.g., portfolios, rubrics, exams)	Target/Criteria (desired program level achievement)	Results	Analysis
4 objectives shown below	Exit Questions	80%	See Below	See Below

The MIS faculty developed a plan to continuously improve our students' learning experiences through course assessments. The plan has **four general objectives** that we hope our students can accomplish. They are;

1. To demonstrate knowledge of basic and advanced MIS concepts and terminologies
2. To be able to intelligently discuss and use selected system development tools, techniques, and methodologies.
3. To be able to apply selected technologies to different business functions
4. To be able to intelligently discuss the management of information technology and systems in an organization.

Upon the completion of each MIS course, students are asked to complete exit questions. The questions are instruments to test whether they succeed in each objective. Depending upon the nature of course material, each MIS course incorporates different objectives. For instance, programming courses focus more on the first two objectives. At this point, we compiled the results of exit questions on regular basis and analyzed them. This has led us to make changes to the program accordingly, e.g., changing textbooks, realigning lecture materials and adding or adjusting content in each course.

MIS 395 Assessment Analysis

Core Business Course

The table in Appendix III shows the percent of students that fell into the categories of excellent, acceptable, and unacceptable for each goal. Each row in the table represents the results for a school year. Combining sections into school years helps to smooth fluctuations that result from one section having a more studious group of students than another. School year was selected over calendar year because almost all MIS 395 changes occur at the beginning of the school year. Please See Results in Appendix III.

Changes made due to assessment included:

In the **fall 2008 semester**, a new project was assigned. It required students to study the role of information systems in a current topic. Also, the course was no longer considered the capstone of the general business classes. The class number was changed from 495 to 395, as the course became a core business class that emphasizes the role of information systems and information technology in the business environment.

In the **fall 2009 semester**, two changes were made. First a new edition of the textbook was adopted. And second, a new project was assigned that required students to design a detailed IT/IS solution for a fictional company. This project required students to use the class material in an applied manner.

In the **fall 2011 semester**, the one change expected to have any impact upon assessments was the adoption of a new edition of the textbook. In the spring 2012 semester, two of the three MIS 395 sections became online.

The online sections pulled down the assessment. Part of this may be due to the time limit on the assessment. This was the first time that MIS 395 has been taught as an online course, so some fluctuations to the assessment results are not unexpected.

When 2007-2008 (the first year) is compared to 2011-2012, improvement gains are dramatic with all goals showing a decrease in the level of unacceptable performance.

MIS 395	Year	Goal 1	Goal 3	Goal 4
Unacceptable	2007-2008	16.3%	53.1%	41.7%
Unacceptable	2011-2012	13.7%	0.4%	18.8%

Clearly, modifications to the course made through the assessment process over this time resulted in much better student outcomes.

MIS 605 Assessment Analysis

Results by Year – Please see Appendix IV

The table in **Appendix IV** shows the percent of students that fell into the categories of excellent, acceptable, and unacceptable for each goal.

Changes made due to assessment included:

In 2009, a new edition of the textbook was adopted. Also, for the first time, some of the chapters were eliminated. These chapters contained material that's redundant to material in other MIS classes. This change allowed for more time to be spent on critical thinking and the object-oriented approach.

In 2010, the course project was replaced with multiple homework assignments and the results showed dramatic improvements.

In 2011, more material was cut from the course and more time was spent on the object-oriented approach.

MIS 605	Year	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3
Unacceptable	2007-2008	80.0%	68.0%	36.0%
Unacceptable	2011-2012	30.8%	63.2%	15.8%

As shown above, the unacceptable respondents decreased for all three goals, significantly for Goals 1 and 3, but not significantly for Goal 2. Clearly, modifications to the course made through the assessment process over this time resulted in better student outcomes.

MIS 611 Assessment Analysis

Results by Year

The following table shows the percent of students that fell into the categories of excellent, acceptable, and unacceptable for each goal. Each row in the table represents the results for one class that was taught each spring semester. The year of the semester is given.

In 2010, 2011 and 2012 the reading list was updated to incorporate recent technological changes.

In 2011, the topic of cloud computing was added and a new project was added to better ensure that students develop a comprehensive understanding of a networking solution for a company.

Comparing 2008 (the first year) to 2012 shows a very large improvement in assessment scores over time.

As can be seen below, the level of unacceptable performance dropped significantly for all three goals.

MIS 611	Year	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3
Unacceptable	2007-2008	84.0%	96.0%	96.0%
Unacceptable	2011-2012	29.2%	12.5%	50.0%

More importantly, the level of excellent performance shifted dramatically from single digits to significant levels of high performance.

MIS 611	Year	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3
Excellent	2007-2008	8.0%	4.0%	0.0%
Excellent	2011-2012	37.5%	54.2%	20.8%

The MIS Faculty are committed to the assessment process and have used it to continuously upgrade curriculum in a very dynamic field. They have also achieved vast improvement in reaching their educational goals and those efforts are bearing fruit as more of our students are getting hired immediately after graduation by local IT firms. Provide aggregate data on student majors satisfaction (e.g., exit surveys), capstone results, licensing or certification examination results, employer surveys or other such data that indicate student satisfaction with the program and whether students are learning the curriculum (for learner outcomes, data should relate to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e).

Student Satisfaction (e.g., exit survey data on overall program satisfaction). Percent satisfied or higher					Learner Outcomes (e.g., capstone, licensing/certification exam pass-rates) by year, for the last three years				
Year	Result (e.g., 4.5 on scale of 1-5, where 5 highest)				Year	N	Name of Exam	Program Result	National Comparison±
	N	Finance	N	MIS					
1	--	--	--	--	1				
2	--	--	--	--	2				
3	66	87.9% (4 or 5)	13	84.6 (4 or 5)	3		N/A		

FINANCE:

Based upon the data provided, students are extremely satisfied with our program and its delivery by our instructors, although the sample size is small and data is only available for one year. This evidence is also supported by the SPTes of our faculty over a wide variety of courses. The large number of award winning professors in this area is also supportive of student satisfaction. Assessment should improve with more years of data and larger sample sizes. Students are showing improvement in meeting our assessment goals and we are modifying the curriculum to improve student performance outcomes and employer satisfaction with our graduates. We also realize the shortcomings of our assessment tools and will be working on improving them over the next assessment cycle as well as improving our course instruction. We will also be creating an advisory board to assist with curriculum and enhance the marketability of our finance graduates.

MIS

ased upon the data provided, students are extremely satisfied with our program and its delivery by our instructors, although the sample size is small and data is only available for one year. This evidence is also supported by the SPTes of our faculty and written feedback from students. We also know from our MIS Advisory Board that the quality of our MIS graduates is improving and that assessment metrics should be more reliable with a larger sample size and more years of observations. Assessment metrics show improvement in all three of

...e courses assessed. Some areas of improvement are needed in the assessment metrics which can be affected by better assessment tools and improved instruction, although t

Provide aggregate data on how the goals of the *WSU General Education Program* and *KBOR 2020 Foundation Skills* are assessed in undergraduate programs (optional for graduate programs).

FINANCE

Goals/Skills Measurements of: Oral/written communication, Numerical literacy, Critical thinking and problem solving, Collaboration and teamwork, Library research skills, Diversity and globalization	Results	
	Majors	Non-Majors
These Skills are evaluated by the Barton School of Business, not at the Dept. level		

Note: Not all programs evaluate every goal/skill. Programs may choose to use assessment rubrics for this purpose. Sample forms available at:
<http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/>

MIS

Goals/Skills Measurements of: Oral/written communication, Numerical literacy, Critical thinking and problem solving, Collaboration and teamwork, Library research skills, Diversity and globalization	Results	
	Majors	Non-Majors
These Skills are evaluated by the Barton School of Business, not at the Dept. level		

- d. For programs/departments with concurrent enrollment courses (per KBOR policy), provide the assessment of such courses over the last three years (disaggregated by each year) that assures grading standards (e.g., papers, portfolios, quizzes, labs, etc.) course management, instructional delivery, and content meet or exceed those in regular on-campus sections.
Provide information here:

FINANCE: Not applicable

MIS: Not applicable

- e. Indicate whether the program is accredited by a specialty accrediting body including the next review date and concerns from the last review.
Provide information here:

The Finance Degree is part of the Barton School of Business that is accredited by the AACSB International. Our most recent accreditation visit was in spring of 2013.

The MIS Degree is part of the Barton School of Business that is accredited by the AACSB International. Our most recent accreditation visit was in spring of 2013.

- f. Provide the process the department uses to assure assignment of credit hours (per WSU policy 2.18) to all courses has been reviewed over the last three years. Attach a few examples of course syllabi that communicates this policy to students (provide as an appendix).

Provide information here:

FINANCE:

Faculty are required to comply with policy. They are notified by appropriate administrators each semester of the requirements to meet this policy and this policy is included in course syllabi. See attached syllabi.

Statement included in syllabi: "Success in this 3 credit hour course is based on the expectation that students will spend, for each unit of credit, a minimum of 45 hours over the length of the course (normally 3 hours per unit per week with 1 of the hours used for class) for instruction and preparation/studying or course related activities for a total of 135 hours."

MIS:

Faculty are required to comply with policy. They are notified by appropriate administrators each semester of the requirements to meet this policy and this policy is included in course syllabi. See attached syllabi.

Statement included in syllabi: "Success in this 3 credit hour course is based on the expectation that students will spend, for each unit of credit, a minimum of 45 hours over the length of the course (normally 3 hours per unit per week with 1 of the hours used for class) for instruction and preparation/studying or course related activities for a total of 135 hours."

- g. Provide a brief assessment of the overall quality of the academic program using the data from 3a – 3f and other information you may collect, including outstanding student work (e.g., outstanding scholarship, inductions into honor organizations, publications, special awards, academic scholarships, student recruitment and retention).

Provide assessment here:

FINANCE: Evidence indicates excellent quality of the Finance faculty and the programs they deliver, but there is room for improvement in specific classes. Assessment metrics indicate improvement, but more is needed. We are attracting students in fairly large numbers with ACT scores at the WSU mean. Students completing the program are able to find jobs in finance or a finance-related field with competitive salaries. However, student retention rates could be improved. 67% of finance majors participated in Co-Op with 82% thinking it was a useful experience. 18% were in internships and almost all indicated it was useful. Only 13.6% participated in study abroad, but all found it worthwhile.

MIS: Evidence indicates excellent quality of the MIS faculty and the programs they deliver, but there is room for improvement in specific classes. This faculty group is constantly addressing curriculum due to changing technologies. It is possible that some stability in the course content

would assist the faculty in achieving higher assessment ratios. Assessment metrics indicate strong improvement, but more is needed. We are attracting a good number of students with ACT scores at the WSU mean. Students completing the program are able to find MIS jobs in Kansas with competitive salaries. 69% of MIS majors participated in co-op and all thought it was useful while 23% participated in internship with almost all indicating it was also useful. One area of concern is that student retention rates are low in some years and could be improved through a number of avenues. Exit analysis that is not currently available would be useful.

4. Analyze the student need and employer demand for the program. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

a. Utilize the table below to provide data that demonstrates student need and demand for the program.

Finance

Majors				Employment of Majors*					Race/Ethnicity by Graduate***																
Last 3 YRs - Begins in fall and ends following summer	No. who enter or are admitted in the major	% enrolled one year later	1 Year Attrition %	Average Salary	Employment % In state	Employment % in the field	Employment: % related to the field	Employment: % outside the field	No. pursuing graduate or professional education	Projected growth from BLS**															
Year 1→	33	75.8	24.2																						
Year 2→	21	61.9	38.1																						
Year 3→	19	63.2	36.8	\$39,474	70	55	40	5	1.5																
Race/Ethnicity by Major***											Race/Ethnicity by Graduate***														
	NRA	H	AI/An	A	B	NH/PI	C	M	UNK		NRA	H	AI/An	A	B	NH/PI	C	M	UNK						
Year 1→	24	9	1	11	7	0	122	0	7		15	9	0	8	1	0	44	0	1						
Year 2→	25	7	2	16	9	0	118	0	10		9	2	1	4	3	0	52	0	8						
Year 3→	23	7	1	11	6	0	109	1	10		13	3	0	12	3	0	44	0	7						

MIS

Majors				Employment of Majors					Race/Ethnicity by Graduate***																
Last 3 YRs - Begins in fall and ends following summer	No. who enter or are admitted in the major	% enrolled one year later	1 Year Attrition %	Average Salary	Employment % In state	Employment % in the field	Employment: % related to the field	Employment: % outside the field	No. pursuing graduate or professional education	Projected growth from BLS**															
Year 1→	15	73.3	26.7																						
Year 2→	12	50.0	50.0																						
Year 3→	11	54.6	45.4	\$37,500	100	100	0	0	7.7																
Race/Ethnicity by Major***											Race/Ethnicity by Graduate***														
	NRA	H	AI/An	A	B	NH/PI	C	M	UNK		NRA	H	AI/An	A	B	NH/PI	C	M	UNK						
Year 1→	14	2	0	6	3	0	29	0	3		6	0	0	5	0	0	14	0	4						
Year 2→	11	4	0	5	4	0	29	0	3		6	1	0	4	1	0	10	0	1						
Year 3→	7	3	0	10	2	0	37	0	5		4	1	0	1	2	0	12	0	1						

* May not be collected every year

** Go to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Website: <http://www.bls.gov/oco/> and view job outlook data and salary information (if the Program has information available from professional associations or alumni surveys, enter that data)

*** NRA=Non-resident alien; H=Hispanic; AI/AN=American Indian/ Alaskan Native; A=Asian; B=Black; NH/PI=Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; C=Caucasian; MR=Multi-race; UNK=Unknown

KBOR data minima for UG programs: Majors=25; Graduates=10; Faculty=3; KBOR data minima for master programs: Majors=20; Graduates=5; Faculty=3 additional; KBOR data minima for doctoral programs: Majors=5; Graduates=2; Faculty=2 additional.

Provide a brief assessment of student need and demand using the data from the table above. Include the most common types of positions, in terms of employment, graduates can expect to find.

Finance: The high and sustained number of Finance majors and graduates shows a strong demand by students for our program. There is also a demonstrated need by employers for our graduates with 55% gaining employment in finance and another 40% finding employment in finance-related fields, with an average annual salary of almost \$40,000. 95% of these positions are full time. The combined ratio of 95% is quite high, but may be skewed by the small number of respondents and the possibility that those not finding employment choose not to respond. Also, 70% find employment in Kansas with 30% leaving the state. This measure indirectly shows employability of our students and implies value added to the Kansas economy from the graduates of our program. It is likely that many of those leaving the state are foreign students returning to their home country. The most common positions for finance majors are financial analyst, credit analyst, security and insurance sales and financial advisor. An area of concern is the increasing 1st year attrition rate and slow decline in the number of new finance majors. However, 85% of respondents indicated that their academic background was useful in their career and almost all felt their degree was important to their job opportunities.

MIS: There is a demonstrated need for our graduates with 100% gaining employment in the MIS field, but the small number of respondents may skew this result. Also, 100% of our MIS majors are finding employment in Kansas with an annual average salary of \$37,500 and all of these are full-time positions. This measure indirectly shows employability of our students and implies high value added to the Kansas economy from the graduates of our program. Positions include; System Analyst, Telecommunication Analyst, Information Center Consultant, Database Administrator, Departmental MIS Manager, Application Programmer, Maintenance Programmer, Functional Area MIS Liaison, Network Administrator, Web Database Developer Database Designer, etc. An area of concern is the increasing 1st year attrition rate and slowing number of new MIS majors. 77% found their academic background to be useful in their position and all indicated that their degree was important to their job opportunities.

5. Analyze the cost of the program and service the Program provides to the discipline, other programs at the University, and beyond. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

Percentage of SCH Taken By (last 3 years)			
Fall Semester	Year 1 - 2009	Year 2 - 2010	Year 3 - 2011
UG Majors	33.6	31.9	33.6
Gr Majors	0	0	0
Non-Majors	66.4	68.1	66.4

- a. Provide a brief assessment of the cost and service the Program provides. Comment on percentage of SCH taken by majors and non-majors, nature of Program in terms of the service it provides to other University programs, faculty service to the institution, and beyond.

The table above is aggregated for both MIS and Finance programs. Disaggregated data for the individual programs were not available. So, this analysis is based upon the Finance, Real Estate and Decision Science Department, where both of these majors are housed. Given that both programs provide one required core course in all business degree major’s course of study, the percentage of non-majors taking the introductory finance and MIS courses should be similar. Based upon that assumption, these programs provide a substantial service to the Barton school with two-thirds of our SCH produced to support other majors within the Barton School of Business.

Combined, this department produces over 10,000 SCH per year at an average cost of \$185.41 per SCH, at the mean for the Barton School of Business. These two degree programs are producing over 90 degreed graduates per year. Finance is averaging 78 graduates per year and MIS is lower at 20 per year. In the most recent year of analysis, Finance had 232 majors and MIS had 88, numbers that were fairly stable over the three-year data period.

Our Finance and MIS faculty are well represented on various Barton School Committees and we have excellent representation on University level committees including; Faculty Support Committee Chair, VP Academic Affairs Search Committee, University T&P Committee, University Library Committee, WSU Strategic Planning Steering Committee, WSU Faculty Grievance Committee Convener, Regents Professor Search Committee, WSU Student Union Board of Directors and WSU General Education Committee.

External Service to the community is also noteworthy. One member is Chair of the Board of Directors of the Campus Credit Union and two others serve in committee roles for this institution. One finance faculty member serves as the investment field expert for the Kansas Board of Regents Retirement Planning Committee. Another faculty member is on the Technology committee for Meritrust Credit Union and has been a board member for the Annoor Islamic School. The MIS Faculty, who are very productive in research, are also very active in the reviewing process for the major journals in their discipline as well as serving in organizational roles of major conferences in their field. In summary, the service provided by the Finance and MIS programs to WSU, its students, and beyond is excellent, at a cost per SCH near the mean for the Barton School of Business.

6. Report on the Program’s goal (s) from the last review. List the goal (s), data that may have been collected to support the goal, and the outcome. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

FINANCE: No specific goals from last review.

(For Last 3 FYs)	Goal (s)	Assessment Data Analyzed	Outcome
	High Quality Research		
	High Quality Teaching		

.MIS: No specific goals from last review.

(For Last 3 FYs)	Goal (s)	Assessment Data Analyzed	Outcome
	High Quality Research		
	High Quality Teaching		

The Finance faculty continues to produce a good quantity of high-quality refereed journal publications. The teaching outcomes are very good to excellent and we enjoy a high degree of student satisfaction with our faculty performance as indicated by student surveys.

Student surveys found that in Finance: 97% of students indicated that the Finance faculty are both accessible and well informed regarding program requirements. 87.9% of finance students were satisfied to very satisfied with the program and 88% were satisfied with the quality of instruction. 86% of our students are satisfied with faculty feedback on coursework. 77% felt that classes were offered at convenient times for their schedules and 84% indicated course offerings enabled timely degree completion. 53% of finance students had enrolled in an online course as part of their degree. 92% of our students felt competent in their major and in numerical literacy while 88% indicated their competence in oral and written communication and 89% were competent in critical thinking skills. Of course these competency measures are self-reported.

The MIS faculty continues to produce a good quantity of high-quality refereed journal publications. The teaching outcomes are very good to excellent and their students indicate that they are highly satisfied with our MIS faculty performance.

According to MIS student surveys: 100% of students said that MIS faculty are both accessible and well informed on program requirements. 84.6% of MIS students were satisfied or very satisfied with their degree program and 85% were satisfied with the quality of instruction. 85% of MIS respondents were satisfied with faculty feedback on course work. 85% indicated that classes were held at convenient times and 84% indicated that the course offerings enabled timely degree completion. 23% of MIS students had enrolled in an online course as part of their degree. 77% of MIS students felt competent in their major and in numerical literacy while 85% indicated competence in oral and written communication and critical thinking.

7. Summary and Recommendations

- a. Set forth a summary of the report including an overview evaluating the strengths and concerns. List recommendations for improvement of each Program (for departments with multiple programs) that have resulted from this report (relate recommendations back to information provided in any of the categories and to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e). Identify three-year goal (s) for the Program to be accomplished in time for the next review.

The Finance program is very strong in teaching, research and service. It provides a good number of graduates that are placed in finance and finance related fields and the productivity in research

and community service is excellent. Graduates are very satisfied with the education that they receive and rate faculty performance very highly. They are placed at competitive salaries in Kansas and beyond. The department delivers a high level of SCH per FTE at a cost near the mean for the Barton School. The amount of publications in peer reviewed elite journals is well above expectations for a program without a Ph.D. program.

There are a few minor concerns with the program. Even though the losses in the number of students and the number of graduates per year is small, we look to improve the number of majors and graduates through efforts to improve our retention ratios and reduction in the attrition rates. We have addressed some issues that arose in the assessment process by reformulation of our curriculum and increasing the expectations on our students. We strive to make additional improvement by fine tuning our assessment process and the analysis of results from it. Achieving measurable improvement in completion rates is an important goal.

The MIS program is very strong in teaching, research and service. It provides a good number of graduates that are all placed in the MIS field in the state of Kansas at competitive market salaries. The department is extremely productive in research and provides commendable community service. Graduates are very satisfied with the education that they receive and rate faculty performance very highly. The department delivers a high level of SCH per FTE at a cost near the mean for the Barton School. The amount of publications in peer reviewed elite journals is well above expectations for a program without a Ph.D. program. The Finance Faculty also seeks continuous improvement in assessment tools and enhanced student outcomes on these measures of student educational success as we prepare our students for their careers, e.g. communication and critical thinking skills.

There are a few minor concerns with the program. The losses in the number of students and the number of graduates per year is too large, and we look to improve the number of majors and graduates by improving our retention ratios and reducing in the attrition rates. We have addressed some of these issues that arose in the assessment process by reformulation of our curriculum and increasing the expectations on our students. We strive to make additional improvement by fine tuning our assessment process and the analysis of results we receive from it. Achieving measurable improvement in completion rates is an important goal as is stabilizing the SCH production. The MIS Faculty also seeks continuous improvement in assessment tools and enhanced student outcomes on our measures of student educational success as we prepare our students for their careers, e.g. communication and critical thinking skills.

Appendix I – FIN 340 Assessment Results for Objectives 1, 2 and 3

	<u>Objective 1 (Time Value of Money)</u>		
	<u>Exemplary</u>	<u>Acceptable</u>	<u>Unacceptable</u>
Spring 2007	36.2%	48.9%	14.8%
Fall 2007	42.8%	38.7%	18.5%
Spring 2008	45.5%	37.9%	16.7%
Summer 2008	28.6%	51.2%	20.2%
Fall 2008	60.1%	26.0%	13.9%
Spring 2009	59.4%	30.1%	10.5%
Fall 2009	60.3%	27.6%	12.2%
Spring 2010	58.2%	23.4%	18.4%
Fall 2010	35.6%	43.9%	20.6%
Spring 2011	30.2%	39.7%	30.2%
Fall 2011	55.7%	24.6%	19.7%
Spring 2012	68.0%	22.7%	9.3%

	<u>Objective 2 (Cost of capital and equity valuation)</u>		
	<u>Exemplary</u>	<u>Acceptable</u>	<u>Unacceptable</u>
Spring 2007	58.5%	28.4%	13.1%
Fall 2007	56.4%	28.5%	15.1%
Spring 2008	38.3%	33.7%	28.1%
Summer 2008	42.9%	39.3%	17.9%
Fall 2008	59.9%	25.0%	15.1%
Spring 2009	56.5%	29.3%	14.3%
Fall 2009	59.6%	23.8%	16.6%
Spring 2010	56.9%	32.7%	10.5%
Fall 2010	53.0%	29.3%	17.7%
Spring 2011	47.0%	33.3%	19.7%
Fall 2011	54.7%	28.6%	16.7%
Spring 2012	65.3%	23.4%	11.4%

	<u>Objective 3 (Capital Budgeting decision tools)</u>		
	<u>Exemplary</u>	<u>Acceptable</u>	<u>Unacceptable</u>
Spring 2007	49.3%	37.6%	13.1%
Fall 2007	46.2%	36.7%	17.2%
Spring 2008	49.0%	34.2%	16.8%
Summer 2008	44.6%	54.2%	1.2%
Fall 2008	64.7%	30.0%	5.3%
Spring 2009	57.7%	34.2%	8.1%
Fall 2009	70.7%	19.7%	9.5%
Spring 2010	54.7%	39.3%	6.0%
Fall 2010	41.9%	46.9%	11.2%
Spring 2011	53.4%	37.1%	9.5%
Fall 2011	53.3%	39.1%	7.6%
Spring 2012	67.5%	23.9%	8.6%

Appendix II: FIN 660 Assessment Results, Objectives 1 through 6

FALL 2009

	WACC	Int. Value	Cap. Budget.	Mergers	Cap. Struct.	Div. Policy	Average % of unacceptable 31.61%
Exemplary	48.28%	48.28%	62.07%	31.03%	51.72%	31.03%	
Acceptable	41.38%	48.28%	17.24%	13.79%	10.34%	6.90%	
Unacceptable	10.34%	3.45%	20.69%	55.17%	37.93%	62.07%	

Spring 2010

	WACC	Int. Value	Cap. Budget.	Mergers	Cap. Struct.	Div. Policy	Average % of unacceptable 39.04%
Exemplary	15.79%	52.63%	63.16%	21.05%	47.37%	23.68%	
Acceptable	52.63%	34.21%	18.42%	13.16%	18.42%	5.26%	
Unacceptable	31.58%	13.16%	18.42%	65.79%	34.21%	71.05%	

Summer 2010

	WACC	Int. Value	Cap. Budget.	Mergers	Cap. Struct.	Div. Policy	Average % of unacceptable 26.19%
Exemplary	71.43%	35.71%	71.43%	50.00%	64.29%	21.43%	
Acceptable	7.14%	42.86%	21.43%	7.14%	14.29%	35.71%	
Unacceptable	21.43%	21.43%	7.14%	42.86%	21.43%	42.86%	

Fall 2010

	WACC	Int. Value	Cap. Budget.	Mergers	Cap. Struct.	Div. Policy	Average % of unacceptable 35.56%
Exemplary	40.00%	40.00%	53.33%	60.00%	33.33%	26.67%	
Acceptable	13.33%	40.00%	20.00%	13.33%	33.33%	13.33%	
Unacceptable	46.67%	20.00%	26.67%	26.67%	33.33%	60.00%	

Spring 2011

	WACC	Int. Value	Cap. Budget.	Mergers	Cap. Struct.	Div. Policy	Average % of unacceptable 25.42%
Exemplary	37.50%	52.50%	50.00%	55.00%	55.00%	32.50%	
Acceptable	22.50%	42.50%	15.00%	15.00%	27.50%	42.50%	
Unacceptable	40.00%	5.00%	35.00%	30.00%	17.50%	25.00%	

Summer 2011

	WACC	Int. Value	Cap. Budget.	Mergers	Cap. Struct.	Div. Policy	Average % of unacceptable 16.67%
Exemplary	37.50%	62.50%	75.00%	75.00%	50.00%	37.50%	
Acceptable	37.50%	25.00%	12.50%	0.00%	37.50%	50.00%	
Unacceptable	25.00%	12.50%	12.50%	25.00%	12.50%	12.50%	

Fall 2011

	WACC	Int. Value	Cap. Budget.	Mergers	Cap. Struct.	Div. Policy	Average % of unacceptable 38.25%
Exemplary	25.00%	50.00%	45.00%	42.11%	21.05%	15.00%	
Acceptable	25.00%	40.00%	15.00%	0.00%	47.37%	45.00%	
Unacceptable	50.00%	10.00%	40.00%	57.89%	31.58%	40.00%	

Spring 2012

	WACC	Int. Value	Cap. Budget.	Mergers	Cap. Struct.	Div. Policy	Average % of unacceptable 21.93%
Exemplary	28.95%	71.05%	63.16%	39.47%	44.74%	23.68%	
Acceptable	36.84%	21.05%	28.95%	21.05%	42.11%	47.37%	
Unacceptable	34.21%	7.89%	7.89%	39.47%	13.16%	28.95%	

Appendix III - MIS 395 Assessment Results – Goals 1, 3 and 4

The table shows the percent of students that fell into the categories of excellent, acceptable, and unacceptable for each goal. Each row in the table represents the results for a school year. Combining sections into school years helps to smooth fluctuations that result from one section having a more studious group of students than another. School year was selected over calendar year because almost all MIS 395 changes occur at the beginning of the school year.

		Goal 1	Goal 3	Goal 4
2007-2008	Excellent	50.7%	46.9%	58.3%
	Acceptable	33.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Unacceptable	16.3%	53.1%	41.7%
2008-2009	Excellent	54.0%	32.5%	60.4%
	Acceptable	28.8%	66.6%	25.7%
	Unacceptable	17.2%	0.9%	13.9%
2009-2010	Excellent	55.1%	34.8%	69.7%
	Acceptable	31.0%	65.2%	19.1%
	Unacceptable	13.9%	0.0%	11.2%
2010-2011	Excellent	59.0%	34.8%	67.6%
	Acceptable	30.0%	65.2%	23.8%
	Unacceptable	11.0%	0.0%	8.6%
2011-2012	Excellent	55.5%	40.2%	54.7%
	Acceptable	30.9%	59.4%	26.6%
	Unacceptable	13.7%	0.4%	18.8%

Appendix IV – MIS 605 – Assessment Results – Goals 1, 2 and 3

The following table shows the percent of students that fell into the categories of excellent, acceptable, and unacceptable for each goal. Each row in the table represents the results for one class that was taught each fall semester. The year of the semester is given.

		Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3
2007	Excellent	8.0%	0.0%	36.0%
	Acceptable	12.0%	32.0%	28.0%
	Unacceptable	80.0%	68.0%	36.0%
2008	Excellent	19.5%	3.2%	32.3%
	Acceptable	39.0%	29.0%	41.9%
	Unacceptable	41.5%	67.7%	25.8%
2009	Excellent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Acceptable	26.7%	20.0%	53.3%
	Unacceptable	73.3%	80.0%	46.7%
2010	Excellent	75.0%	8.3%	50.0%
	Acceptable	8.3%	8.3%	25.0%
	Unacceptable	16.7%	83.3%	25.0%
2011	Excellent	30.8%	26.3%	31.6%
	Acceptable	38.5%	10.5%	52.6%
	Unacceptable	30.8%	63.2%	15.8%

Appendix V – MIS 611 – Assessment Results Goals 1, 2 and 3

The following table shows the percent of students that fell into the categories of excellent, acceptable, and unacceptable for each goal. Each row in the table represents the results for one class that was taught each spring semester.

		Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3
2008	Excellent	8.0%	4.0%	0.0%
	Acceptable	8.0%	0.0%	4.0%
	Unacceptable	84.0%	96.0%	96.0%
2009	Excellent	0.0%	8.0%	8.0%
	Acceptable	36.0%	32.0%	40.0%
	Unacceptable	64.0%	60.0%	52.0%
2010	Excellent	8.7%	39.1%	8.7%
	Acceptable	47.8%	13.0%	34.8%
	Unacceptable	43.5%	47.8%	56.5%
2011	Excellent	32.0%	52.0%	4.0%
	Acceptable	48.0%	36.0%	24.0%
	Unacceptable	20.0%	12.0%	72.0%
2012	Excellent	37.5%	54.2%	20.8%
	Acceptable	33.3%	33.3%	29.2%
	Unacceptable	29.2%	12.5%	50.0%