1. What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?
The student learning outcome assessed was to develop the entry-level knowledge and skills expected by
the accounting profession with respect to written communications.

2. How were they assessed?

A) What methods were used?

Students were assessed using the Master of Professional Accountancy Comprehensive Examination in
combination with the written communications rubric developed by the College of Business.

B) Who was assessed?

The population assessed consisted of fifteen (15) graduating accounting MPA students during Spring
quarter 2011.

C) When was it assessed?

The Comprehensive Exam was given in May 2011. MPA accounting faculty evaluated the answer to one
each exam question for each student using the College of Business' Written Communication Rubric. The
mastery criterion is that 90% of the students score three (above average) or higher in each area.

3. What was learned?

The chart below presents the summary of results for the written communication rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below Average-1</th>
<th>Average-2</th>
<th>Above Average-3</th>
<th>Excellent-4</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent Greater than 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Language</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results show that the percentage of students scoring higher than two for the Organization criterion
has not changed since the prior assessment, there has been a significant decrease in the percentage of
students with a score of three or higher for the Style, Depth, and Use of Language criteria. Since
admissions standards have not changed and have been complied with, there is only one obvious reason
for the significant drop: Past assessment has been performed by undergraduate and graduate accounting faculty, while this year’s assessment was performed by MPA faculty as they graded students’ exam answers. It is reasonable to expect that 1) accounting faculty at all levels would agree on performance with respect to the Organization criterion (hence no significant difference from the prior year), and 2) that graduate faculty would be more rigorous in assessing performance on the other criteria with respect to the questions for their courses.

Thus, it is reasonable to hypothesize that the assessment procedures have become more rigorous, and the same procedure will be used in the future, at least for assessing communications skills.

4. **What will the department or program do as a result of that information?**

First, the results will be discussed with MPA faculty and the need to help students develop their written communications skills during each course will be emphasized. The program must ensure that faculty are preparing students during their courses, for the assessment criteria that they will apply to the comprehensive examination.

Second, more detailed analysis of the assessment results will be performed in the future to control for the influence of each student’s performance on admissions standards. In addition, future analysis will be based on having each student’s performance assessed for each answer submitted for the comprehensive exam. (This year, only one answer for each student was assessed.) Thus, there will be four assessment measures for each student, which should increase the reliability of the measures.

5. **What did the department or program do in response to last year’s assessment information?**

While the results of last year’s results were discussed with faculty, the change in assessment procedures discussed above, makes it impossible to determine the efficacy of these efforts.