

TO: IUPUI Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC)

FROM: Associate Dean of Academic Programs Philip Powell
Faculty Assessment Coordinator Todd Roberson

RE: Kelley School of Business at IUPUI 2016-17 PRAC Report

During the 2016-17 academic year, the Kelley School completed a comprehensive review for reaccreditation by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). Reaccreditation occurs every five years. This review required reflection upon assessment performance between 2012 and 2016. The reports generated for this exercise satisfy the 2016-17 reporting guidelines for PRAC and represent the Kelley School's submission to the committee.

KELLEY SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AT IUPUI ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

Background

The Kelley School of Business is one business school in two locations – Bloomington and Indianapolis. In Indianapolis, the Kelley School provides graduate and undergraduate business education on the Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) campus. The scale of the Kelley School's operations at IUPUI is generally one-fourth of the size of operations on the Bloomington campus. There are four Kelley programs on the IUPUI campus that are part of the AACSB Assurance of Learning assessment process – an undergraduate program with 1200 students with a job placement rate of nearly 100%, an Evening MBA program ranked sixth nationally among part-time programs in *U.S. News & World Report*, a Business of Medicine MBA program for mid-career physicians that is the only program of its kind among top twenty business schools, and a Graduate Accounting Program that offers a MS in Accounting and an MS in Tax and is top draw for talent for accounting firms in central Indiana.

Formal assessment by the Kelley School on the IUPUI campus predates such activity on the Bloomington campus. In 1997, the IUPUI campus formalized Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs) against which all schools offering undergraduate degrees had to map learning objectives and evaluate student performance. To meet campus requirements, the undergraduate faculty defined Principles of Business Learning (PBLs) which became the first learning goals formalized in the Kelley School on either campus for purposes of assessment. These PBLs set a foundation for strong demonstration of assessment in the 2007-2011 AACSB accreditation report and carried over into this 2012-2016 report. Early efforts to formalize the PBLs established templates, processes, and review procedures that were adopted on the Bloomington campus. Activities on the IUPUI campus were foundational in the establishment of a strong assessment culture within the Kelley School.

Differences in Process between Indianapolis and Bloomington

While faculty on both campuses followed the same process of data collection and evaluation for their courses, coordination of those efforts was structured differently between the two campuses for this 2012-2016 report. In Bloomington, each faculty program chair with her policy committee directed faculty to evaluate specific learning goals in specific courses. This generated a holistic review, the process for which was decentralized and owned by each program. In contrast in Indianapolis, a centralized faculty committee directed faculty to assess learning goals of their own choosing in specified courses across all programs. This centralized approach was a carryover of earlier processes designed to meet campus PUL assessment requirements before AACSB guidelines were established. Faculty sensed individual ownership of the assessment exercise through their ability to choose learning goals to evaluate, but the tradeoff often was an imbalanced coverage of learning goals in a program.

The table on the next page details the scale of assessment on the IUPUI campus and the imbalance in learning goal coverage that occurred. Kelley School faculty collected and evaluated 98 samples of student performance data assessing one or more student learning objectives (SLOs) in support of a single program learning goal. Because faculty usually assessed more than one learning goal at a time, two data samples often came from assessment of one course. As previously noted, there was unintentional imbalance of coverage of learning goals. In the undergraduate program, Assurance of Learning evaluation of half of each of the learning goals used ten or

more data samples whereas evaluation of each of the other half was limited to two or three samples. The Evening MBA program missed assessment of two learning goals and almost half of Graduate Accounting Program data assessed only one of the five learning goals. The Business of Medicine program also missed coverage of one learning goal, but the program's newness did not allow completion of a full assessment cycle.

Program	Total Data Samples	Distribution of Samples Across Learning Goals
Undergraduate	61	1a (12), 1b (10), 1c (3), 2 (13), 3 (15), 4 (3), 5 (2), 6 (3)
Evening MBA	16	1 (6), 2 (6), 3 (0), 4 (2), 5 (2), 6 (0)
Business of Medicine MBA	9	1 (4), 2 (1), 3 (2), 4 (1), 5 (0), 6 (1)
Graduate Accounting	12	1 (5), 2 (2), 3 (2), 4 (2), 5 (1)

As in Bloomington, all four programs on the IUPUI campus recasted and formalized their learning goals, identified SLOs that supported them, and constructed a curriculum map. Learning goals, SLOs, and learning maps were formulated in the same way on both Kelley School campuses.

Process Changes and Improvements for the 2017-2021 Assessment Cycle

Balanced assessment of all learning goals in each program must be achieved in the next assessment cycle. Assessment on the IUPUI campus will adopt all processes already in place on the Bloomington campus and coordination will be fully centralized in the office of the Assessment Specialist who resides in Bloomington and is appointed by the dean. Bloomington and Indianapolis program portfolios will be seamlessly managed as one for purposes of assessment. In Fall 2016, as in Bloomington, faculty chairs and policy committees for the IUPUI campus programs assumed responsibility for their own program's assessment and a centralized faculty assessment committee was not reappointed. Each program will assess SLOs and learning goals based on a schedule approved and monitored by the dean's office. Assessment of learning goals missed or sparsely evaluated during the recent cycle will receive priority coverage during the first two years of the 2017-2021 cycle.

In addition to full adoption of Bloomington procedures and processes, three other changes will occur in assessment on the IUPUI campus. First, faculty will classify student performance as "excellent", "satisfactory", or "unsatisfactory" instead of "very effective", "effective", "somewhat effective", or "not effective". Use of four discrete measurements of performance was helpful during this assessment cycle. For example, the undergraduate program specified the share of students demonstrating "very effective" or "effective" use as its standard measure of course performance (see the Indianapolis undergraduate program packet for further illustration). A shift to the "excellent", "satisfactory", and "unsatisfactory" categories already used in Bloomington, though, is necessary for further process standardization across both campuses. Second, the Graduate Accounting Program will separately assess learning outcomes in the MS in Accounting and MS in Tax programs. In this report, assessment of both programs was integrated. Separate assessment will better comply with AACSB guidelines. Third, the Business of Medicine MBA program will complete its first assessment cycle and a full "closing the loop" review of performance, teaching, and the curriculum will take place based on data that is collected. Because the Business of Medicine MBA program enrolled its first class in Fall 2013, a complete Assurance of Learning exercise was not possible during the 2012-2016 cycle.

MAJOR CURRICULAR AND INSTRUCTIONAL CHANGES IN RESPONSE TO ASSESSMENT OF IUPUI PROGRAMS

Degree Program	Description
Undergraduate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More formally collaborate with the IUPUI Writing Center to offer faculty guidance on development of student writing skills, especially within the freshman Learning Community courses. Additionally encourage faculty to offer first and second draft submissions for written deliverables so that students learn through response to faculty edits and feedback. • In courses that emphasize quantitative methods, suggest more practice problems so students can better drill themselves, stronger linkage of quantitative tools to conceptual business questions, and more detailed instruction in derivation of calculations that are relevant to decision making.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage faculty to consider tighter linkage between course material and exam content, more evenness in the coverage of topics over a semester, and stronger incentives for students to prepare materials before class sessions. • Expand coverage of topics in diversity, cross-cultural communication, and cultural intelligence and advocate role playing, structured debates, and journalization as methods to further student learning .
Evening MBA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coach faculty to offer deeper and more detailed explanation of linkages between theory and practice and provide more opportunities to apply concepts to “real world” problems through cases, discussion, and projects. • To reverse “blind spots” in student ability to match strategic and tactical decisions to observations in the environment that surrounds the firm, encourage exercises in core courses that ask students to more explicitly map external variables (e.g., interest rates, market concentration, political risk) to internal decisions that are best for the organization (e.g., plant size, salaries, adoption of technology). • Provide faculty more guidance and support in identification and implementation of “best practice” teaching methods in 50% online/ 50% live instruction hybrid course formats (e.g., “flipping the classroom” to shift live class time from lecture to interactive discussion of applied problems). • Review the accounting primer that students take prior to program enrollment to insure that coverage of basic concepts sufficiently prepares students for core courses. • Increase opportunities for students to indentify, explain, and apply market trends within core courses. • Improve oral communication skills through formally structured and graded peer-to-peer communication (e.g., in-class presentations, role playing during a case discussion) within relevant courses.
Business of Medicine MBA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To adapt to the learning style and attention to detail of physicians, encourage faculty to more clearly map theoretical concepts to “on the ground” problems to improve absorption and application of content presented in a course. • Emphasize creative problem solving in classroom sessions. • Because physician students can overinvest in a single functional business topic and demonstrate hypersensitivity to it in managerial decision making, ask instructors to compensate for this tendency by emphasizing to students a need for balance in the information used to make a decision. • Exhibit patience in the ability of physician students to understand concepts in financial analysis. • Offer assignments that require physician students to build their written communication skills and learn how to translate complex ideas into simple illustrations and concepts.
Graduate Accounting (MSA and MST)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate comprehension of fundamental accounting principles and reverse “blind spots” in learning that reveal themselves in advanced courses. • Expose students to more complicated practice problems that more accurately reflect client encounters and better prepare students for the workplace. • Explore clearer sequential illustration of process steps in accounting practice to improve application of theoretical concepts, especially in auditing and information systems.

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REVIEW

The Kelley School boasts a second smaller undergraduate program on the IUPUI campus that serves the talent and business needs of the Indianapolis region. The student body is more diverse than the larger program in Bloomington. Learning reflects and engages the urban environment in which the program is imbedded. A large share of students work part-time or full-time while enrolled in courses, some are older adult learners, and many transfer into the program from other local institutions of higher education (especially Ivy Tech Community College). The mix generates a vibrant undergraduate learning experience that is distinct from Bloomington but insists on the same high level of academic excellence.

The earliest move to formal assessment within Indiana University began on the IUPUI campus with formalization of Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs) in 1997. All undergraduate programs on the IUPUI campus mapped learning objectives to PULs and evaluated performance against them. This set a robust foundation for assessment for purposes of AACSB accreditation. For these reasons, the culture and history of assessment within the Indianapolis undergraduate program is among the strongest in the Kelley School. Assessment procedures and processes pioneered in this program inspired templates used by other programs in both Bloomington and Indianapolis.

The 2011-2016 cycle witnessed evaluation of a large set of courses, movement to a new set of learning goals, congruent with the IUPUI PULs, disaggregation of goals into Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), and curricular changes inspired by insights and data from the assessment exercise.

Objectives and Program Changes

The Indianapolis Undergraduate Program has undergone significant curricular, admissions, and co-curricular changes during this assessment cycle. Those changes were prompted by several factors:

- 1) Importance shifted from a focus on placement in the first job after graduation to broader preparation for professional success the first five years after graduation (beyond the first job).
- 2) The program wanted to respond to local market needs uncovered through feedback from businesses and organizations that employ Kelley Indianapolis graduates.
- 3) The program separately needed to address student concerns about academic content in the general plan of study and build self-confidence in their employability.
- 4) Students required better exposure to theory and practice of self-motivation, leadership, high performance teams, and ethics.
- 5) Continuous review helped the Indianapolis undergraduate program keep pace with any changes in the Bloomington undergraduate program.

Pursuance of these objectives produced specific major changes and improvements in Fall 2013. Emphasis on professional development and career planning shifted from the junior to the freshman year. This included new availability of for-credit internships for freshmen and sophomores. The core curriculum deepened its coverage of theory and applied topics in human resource management. A fourth course on team dynamics and leadership was added to the marketing, finance, and operations management courses that comprise the integrated core experience in the junior year. The program also shifted features of the Honors program and granted faculty more flexibility in course development to improve learning outcomes. In Fall 2015, admissions requirements tightened for all pathways into the program – Direct Admit (direct admission as a freshman), Option 1 (admission after freshman year), and Option 2 (admission after sophomore year). Performance standards also tightened – a grade of C or higher was now required to maintain enrollment in the Kelley School.

Assessment Activity

Faculty completed a comprehensive review and redefinition of learning goals. The program began this assessment cycle with learning goals labeled as Principles of Business Learning (PBLs). These PBLs were formed for a dual purpose – to serve as learning goals for AACSB assessment purposes and to map to Principles

of Undergraduate Learning (PULs) defined and mandated by the IUPUI campus. The review sought a restatement of objectives that better served the needs of students, employers, and the community and added an emphasis on quantitative analysis. Later, to streamline the process, the six PBLs were merged with the IUPUI PULs to result in six Undergraduate Business Learning Goals (UBLGs) allowing for each assessment to serve both the North Central accreditation effort for the IUPUI campus and the AACSB accreditation effort for the Kelley School. Next, twenty-seven student learning outcomes (SLOs) were developed in support of the six UBLGs. The UBLGs and their attendant SLOs were then remapped against required Undergraduate courses to ensure alignment in the undergraduate curriculum. Since the beginning of 2012, multiple sections of over forty courses were assessed with all UBLGs evaluated.

While assessment evaluated all UBLGs, they were sampled in an uneven fashion – half of the UBLGs each enjoyed data from ten or more course sections and the other half each had limited data from just two or three course sections. In contrast to Bloomington, a centralized faculty committee instead of individual program offices directed assessment. The committee invited faculty to individually select two SLOs per course to assess. This approach gave faculty ownership of their assessment choices, but such autonomy meant no coordination of choice to insure even coverage of UBLGs and SLOs. For the next assessment cycle, as in Bloomington, the undergraduate policy committee will direct faculty surveys so that balance is achieved. Focus will first be placed on those UBLGs that received light coverage in this assessment cycle – 1c Information and Business Resource Skills, 4 Integrative Business Reasoning, 5 Diversity and Collaboration in Business, and 6 Business and Management Ethics. Shift in control from a centralized faculty committee to a more directive program-specific faculty committee will result in a shift in focus from courses to program-wide UBLGs and SLOs. This administrative change will enable assessment to generate a more complete picture of learning in the Indianapolis undergraduate program.

Of special interest moving forward is evaluation of UBLG 4 Integrative Business Reasoning through comprehensive assessment of the four courses that comprise the integrated core and the project that is the capstone deliverable. Coordinated and simultaneous assessment across multiple courses with complementary SLOs offers more holistic measurement of student performance within the program's signature learning experience. The program seeks to better ascertain how teamwork adds value within the integrated core. The assessment exercise will deepen faculty collaboration and tighten the delivery of knowledge and skills to students.

Future Improvements

As previously noted, real-time responses to assessment between 2012 and 2016 generated notable program changes. In addition to recent changes, assessment suggests a plan for future improvement in multiple areas:

- Further development of written communication skills is needed. The program will more formally collaborate with the IUPUI Writing Center to offer faculty guidance on development of student writing skills, especially within the freshman Learning Community courses. In addition, the program will encourage faculty to offer first and second draft submissions for written deliverables so that students learn through response to faculty edits and feedback. After both of these changes, written communication under UBLG 1a Business Language will again be assessed to see if improvement is noted.
- In courses that emphasize quantitative methods, the program will suggest more practice problems so students can better drill themselves, stronger linkage of quantitative tools to conceptual business questions, and more detailed instruction in derivation of calculations that are relevant to decision making. All SLOs that comprise UBLG 1b Business Quantitative Skills will be evaluated to detect any measurable impact on learning.
- The program will suggest that faculty consider tighter linkage between course material and exam content, more evenness in the coverage of topics over a semester, and stronger incentives for students to prepare materials before class sessions. In recent course assessment reports, several faculty recommended these as ways to improve learning outcomes in their own courses. Several semesters after these recommendations are communicated to faculty, the program will review course assessment reports and see if fewer faculty offer these adjustments as suggestions to improve learning, indicating more instructors have adopted the suggested changes.

- The program will expand coverage of topics in diversity, cross-cultural communication, and cultural intelligence and advocate role playing, structured debates, and journaling as methods to further student learning in support of UBLG 5 Diversity and Collaboration in Business. Deeper assessment of this learning goal will be a priority, and the policy committee will monitor course assessment reports to insure progress in a deepening of learning outcomes.

In addition to these tactical changes, the program will use assessment to guide a new strategy that strengthens niche foci (e.g., supply chain and logistics management, commercial real estate, business in Africa) which better complement Bloomington and make the Kelley School at IUPUI a national destination for interested undergraduate students.

EVENING MBA PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REVIEW

Within the Kelley School graduate program portfolio, the Evening MBA program on the IUPUI campus positions itself to graduate executive talent for businesses in the Indianapolis region. Ranked sixth by *U.S. News & World Report* in 2016, the program offers one of the premiere part-time MBA experiences in the country. Assessment confirms strong performance by students in some areas and reveals skill deficits that must be reversed to satisfy learning goals with excellence. While major recent changes include addition of electives and a shift from 100% in-person delivery to 50% in-person/50% online hybrid delivery, several years have passed since completion of a curriculum review and market positioning study. This report informs a major program review that begins in 2017.

Assessment Process and Oversight

Building on efforts from the 2007-2011 assessment cycle, the Evening MBA faculty re-formalized 6 learning goals and defined, for the first time, 19 student learning outcomes (SLOs) after reviewing those of other established MBA programs in the Kelley School (especially the full-time and online MBA programs based in Bloomington). These SLOs were mapped against the 11 core courses that comprise the program. Each SLO has coverage in at least one course. At present, the curriculum map is binary – an “X” for measurable coverage of the SLO and a “blank space” for no measurable coverage. For the next assessment cycle, the program will code depth of coverage and sophistication of required student knowledge as seen in other Kelley graduate program curriculum maps (e.g., the coding scheme that denotes “N” for novice, “I” for intermediate, and “A” for advanced).

Ownership of assessment recently moved from a centralized faculty committee that oversaw all Kelley Indianapolis programs to the Evening MBA policy committee led by the program chair. This structure, which is new for Indianapolis, is an import of best practice from Bloomington. This gives the program chair better ability to match the assessment process to an already responsive loop that informally functions in the program based on frequent and unsolicited feedback from students. More systematic appraisal of learning performance allows better “real time” intervention if challenges arise and enables the program to confidently attract students on a promise of strong teaching quality. Frequent review of assessment reports as they are submitted means the program chair and policy committee push improvement continuously throughout an academic year and match data with anecdotal student comments.

The table in the next section summarizes the assessments completed in the Evening MBA Program for the current Assurance of Learning (AoL) cycle. Eager to assess broadly across the required curriculum, the centralized assessment committee sought to conduct assessments in a range of courses, inviting faculty to select two SLOs per course to assess. As can be seen below, this strategy resulted in uneven assessment across the program’s six learning goals: some goals were assessed frequently (1 and 2), some less frequently (4 and 5), and some, unfortunately, not at all (3 and 6). Inviting faculty to choose what to assess resulted in greater buy-in and interest among the instructors who performed the assessments. At the same time, this level of faculty autonomy resulted in the omission of important assessments, a mistake that must be corrected for the next AoL cycle. With the shift in oversight from a centralized assessment committee to the program’s policy committee, assessment will be much more directive going forward. The committee’s first step will be to plan assessments that address Goals 3 and 6. Then, structurally, assessment planning will be centered on learning goals and SLOs (not courses) and faculty will be asked specifically to assess particular SLOs in order to develop a more balanced and complete picture of learning in the Evening MBA Program.

Recent Assessment Activity

Course	Term Assessed	SLOs Assessed
G512 Global Macroeconomics for Managers	Summer 2012	2.1
M501 Strategic Marketing Management	Fall 2012	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4
J501 Developing Strategic Capabilities	Fall 2014	2.1, 2.2, 2.3
G512 Global Macroeconomics for Managers	Fall 2014	2.1, 2.2
J506 Leadership and Ethics	Spring 2015	4.1, 4.2
L512 Law and Ethics in Business	Spring 2015	2.1; 4.1, 4.2, 4.3
M501 Strategic Marketing Management	Spring 2015	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4; 2.3
F523 Financial Management	Fall 2015	1.1, 1.2
A524 Managing Accounting Information for Decision Making	Fall 2015	1.1, 1.2; 2.1
J501 Developing Strategic Capabilities	Spring 2016	1.1, 1.3; 5.1, 5.2
M501 Strategic Marketing Management	Spring 2016	1.1 ;5.1

Assessment-Driven Program Changes and Improvements

Assessment of mostly core courses by faculty reveals important needs for pedagogical change and motivates ideas for program innovation that corroborate feedback already received from students. Analysis of the individual course reports and reflection upon their insights and recommendations suggest the following actionable initiatives the program will pursue:

- In five of the eleven courses assessed, instructors expressed disappointment in the ability of students to effectively apply theoretical concepts to managerial decisions. Students either missed the relevance of a theory or tool to a decision (e.g., ignoring legal and regulatory constraints upon the solution to a management problem) or suggested sub-optimal solutions after applying concepts (e.g., approving a capital project when the predicted net present value of cash earnings was less than zero). The program will coach faculty to offer deeper and more detailed explanation of linkages between theory and practice and provide more opportunities to apply concepts to “real world” problems through cases, discussion, and projects. A year or two after these changes are made, we will re-assess to determine whether the changes to instruction have improved learning.
- Assessment affirmed a high level of macroenvironmental literacy but revealed “blind spots” in student ability to match strategic and tactical decisions to observations in the environment external to the firm. To help students build applied skills, the core program courses will ask students to map external variables (e.g., interest rates, market concentration, political risk) to internal decisions that are best for the organization (e.g., plant size, salaries, adoption of technology). A year or two after these changes are made, we will re-assess to determine whether the changes to instruction have improved learning.
- The shift from 100% in-person course delivery to 50% in-person/50% online hybrid delivery possibly increased variance in student performance. The program will provide more guidance and support for faculty in identification and implementation of “best practice” in hybrid course formats (e.g., “flipping the classroom” to shift live class time from lecture to interactive discussion of applied problems). Investment in assistance for faculty is currently incomplete.
- The program will review the accounting primer that students take prior to program enrollment to insure that coverage of basic concepts sufficiently prepares students for core courses. Should the primer undergo revision, we will re-assess student preparation in accounting to determine whether the revised primer improves student preparation with respect to basic accounting skills.
- Assessment suggests that student ability to recognize, understand, and apply market trends may need further development, either across core course or within the marketing core course. The program will support the instructor in increasing opportunities for students to identify, explain, and apply market trends in the core curriculum. A year or two after these changes are made, we will re-assess to determine whether the changes to instruction have improved learning.

- Written communication skills are strong, but oral communication skills need advancement. Opportunities for formally structured and graded peer-to-peer communication (e.g., in-class presentations, role playing during a case discussion) will be increased to improve students' oral skills. A year or two after these changes are made, we will re-assess to determine whether the changes to instruction have improved learning.

Already planned is a new capstone experience at the end of the core. The capstone is a major opportunity to offer live cases, projects, and industry-specific discussions that strengthen linkage of theory to practice and improve executive decision making. The capstone will unambiguously strengthen the program's delivery of skills in leadership, team dynamics, and professional development. The program will invest in these learning outcomes even though they were not assessed during this past cycle.

BUSINESS OF MEDICINE MBA PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REVIEW

The Business of Medicine MBA program, exclusively for practicing physicians, admitted its first cohort of approximately 40 students in Fall 2013. As a new program, full assessment is just now underway after identification by faculty of program learning goals and outcomes. That said, insights from assessments have already helped the program understand physicians as MBA students and adjust pedagogy and course offerings to improve performance. The attention to detail of these students keeps faculty alert and responsive. Any sense of wasted time or poor teaching quickly drives physicians away from the program. Among the Kelley School's graduate programs, strong learning outcomes must be the highest for the Business of Medicine MBA program to grow in the lucrative physicians market. Under these conditions, there already exists an informal cycle of assessment (i.e., listen, observe, and measure; then interpret; then improve pedagogy and curriculum) within the program that generates improvements more quickly than formal documentation suggests.

Establishment of an Assessment Process

Business of Medicine MBA faculty instituted 5 learning goals and 17 student learning outcomes (SLOs) in 2015 after extensive discussion as well as a review learning goals and outcomes adopted MBA programs in the Kelley School (the full-time and online programs based in Bloomington and the part-time program based in Indianapolis). These were then mapped against the 15 core courses that comprise the program. Each SLO has coverage in at least two courses. At present, the curriculum map is binary – an “X” for measurable coverage of the SLO and a “blank space” for no measurable coverage. As faculty gain experience in teaching their MBA material to physicians, the program will code depth of coverage and sophistication of required student knowledge as seen in other Kelley graduate program curriculum maps (e.g., the coding scheme that denotes “N” for novice, “I” for intermediate, and “A” for advanced). This is an explicit goal for the next assessment cycle.

Ownership of assessment recently moved from a centralized faculty committee that oversaw all Kelley Indianapolis programs to the Business of Medicine policy committee led by the program chair. This structure, which is new for Indianapolis, is an import of best practice from Bloomington. This gives the program chair better ability to match the assessment process to an already responsive loop that informally functions in the program based on frequent feedback from students. More systematic appraisal of learning performance allows better “real time” intervention if challenges arise and enables the program to confidently attract students on a promise of strong teaching quality. Frequent review of assessment reports as they are submitted means the program chair and policy committee push improvement continuously throughout an academic year and match feedback received in both numerous informal one-on-one conversations with students, and moderated group discussions and focus groups.

Recent Assessment Activity

With learning goals and outcomes established in 2015, formal assessment began in Fall 2015. The following table summarizes the courses and SLOs assessed for purpose of this report:

Course	Term Assessed	SLOs Assessed
A524 Accounting for Decision Makers	Fall 2015	1.2, 1.3; 3.1, 3.2
F523 Financial Management	Spring 2016	3.3
M500 Consumer Healthcare Behavior	Spring 2016	1.2
M501 Strategic Marketing Management	Spring 2016	1.2; 4.1

J506 Leadership and Ethics	Summer 2016	2.3, 2.4
D595 International Management	Summer 2016	1.1; 6.2

Six courses generated data for all learning goals except Learning Goal 5 Leadership and Collaboration. Assessment of SLOs within Learning Goal 5 is a priority for the 2016-17 academic year. Measurement against all SLOs is planned for the next assessment cycle and AACSB review.

Learning Performance and Improvements

With physicians comes the highest level of intelligence, drive, and commitment a faculty member can witness in the classroom. Thus, generally strong (and sometimes perfect) demonstration of student learning outcomes were not a surprise for the program. In the spirit of continuous improvement, faculty recommended the following teaching adjustments based on assessment data they collected:

- Theoretical concepts can be better mapped to “on the ground” problems to improve absorption and application of content presented in a course. Clear mapping plays to a physician’s learning style and attention to detail.
- Physician MBA students respond well to an emphasis on creative problem solving in the classroom.
- Physician MBA students can overinvest in a single functional business topic and demonstrate hypersensitivity to it in managerial decision making. Instructors must compensate for this tendency by emphasizing balance in the information used to make a decision.
- A previous lack of exposure to finance is a challenge for physician MBA students. Time and care devoted by the instructor to the mechanics of financial analysis improves student performance.
- Some physicians struggle with written communication. Students benefit from continuous emphasis on the need to translate complex ideas clearly and in terms that more general audiences can understand.

Course Changes and Additions

Motivated by student feedback and assessment data, the program implemented several recent changes within the plan of study and the structure of course delivery. First, the program added three new courses that bridge classroom concepts to management practice and public policy – organizational change, a residency week at The Washington Campus, and a lecture series on emerging healthcare topics led by the associate dean. Second, all students now receive academic credit for an executive coaching experience that parallels movement through courses in the academic core. Third, where possible, the program is phasing out six week (half term) courses and replacing them with twelve week (full term) courses so that students better absorb technical material such as economics and statistics. These three sets of changes deliberately broaden the program’s ability to achieve learning goals.

GRADUATE ACCOUNTING PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REVIEW

Assessments During the Last Five Years

After the last AACSB review, the Indianapolis Graduate Accounting Program (GAP) program revisited and revised its learning goals and student learning outcomes (SLOs). The entire Indianapolis accounting faculty fully participated in that program process. The process was completed in 2013. The Indianapolis MSA learning goals and SLOs are shown in Section 2. Assessments during the past five years are summarized below:

The greatest number of assessments related to accounting knowledge (learning goal one), assessed in six courses (A511, A514, A514, A522, A523, A538).

Accounting research (learning goal two) was addressed in two courses (A538, A551).

For accounting faculty, technical skills and critical thinking are integrally linked, and most faculty assessed technical skills. Therefore, critical thinking (learning goal three) was only assessed in two courses (A511, A523).

Communication skills (learning goal four) were also addressed in evaluation of two courses (A522, A551).

Professional responsibilities and professional development (learning goal five) were assessed in one course (A514).

Learning Goals and SLOs

During the last assessment cycle, the accounting faculty revised the learning goals and SLOs for the MSA and MST programs, and we drafted one set of learning goals and SLOs for both programs. For example, the learning goal Accounting Knowledge has three SLOs:

1. Accounting Knowledge

The ability to apply fundamental accounting and tax principles and techniques in a variety of business settings.

- **SLO 1.1:** Identify core accounting and tax issues in a variety of business scenarios.
- **SLO 1.2:** Apply fundamental accounting principles, tools, and techniques to basic accounting and tax problems.
- **SLO 1.3:** Solve accounting and tax reporting problems.

Note that the learning goals are more general in nature, and it may be appropriate for two graduate accounting programs to have the same learning goal, e.g., accounting knowledge. However, the accounting faculty drafted each SLO so that it applied to both the MSA and MST programs. To be more specific, consider SLO 1.3 which states: "Solve accounting and tax reporting problems." Technically, we could separately designate an SLO statement for each degree program: "Solve accounting reporting problems" for the MSA degree and "Solve tax reporting problems" for the MST degree. Given that MSA and MST students take a high percentage of the same courses, use of more general statements that simultaneously apply to both programs seemed practical for purposes of assessment. However, AACSB Standard A5 indicates that learning goals should be set for each degree program. To be more consistent with this guideline in the next assessment cycle, the accounting faculty will revise the learning goals and SLOs for each of the MSA and MST programs so that each graduate accounting program has its own learning goals and SLOs and is separately assessed.

Selected Instructional and Curricular Improvements in the MSA and MST Programs

The assessment reports indicate, that, in general, our students satisfactorily perform across courses in terms of demonstration of learning outcomes desired for the program. As noted above, we must begin to assess the two required courses (A500 and L503) that have not previously been assessed. While faculty are generally pleased with accomplishment of learning goals, assessment suggests specific opportunities for pedagogical improvement. First, faculty should be alert for and correct blind spots" in comprehension of fundamental accounting principles. For example, disappointing retention of knowledge of bond accounting motivated a faculty member to offer more coverage of this topic with a larger set of practice problems. Second, exposure to more complicated practice problems that better reflect realistic situations presented by clients better prepares students for the workplace. Expanded integration into the curriculum will strengthen academic outcomes. Third, clearer sequential illustration of process steps in accounting practice can improve application of theoretical concepts, especially in auditing and information systems. This can be complemented by faculty role play as a client within cases discussed in class.

Beyond traditional assessment, we have, through our interviews with employers, obtained feedback that is helping us to improve our curriculum for our students. Employers have suggested that accounting students, in general, need to improve their interpersonal skills. They have also suggested that our students, in particular, are not as strong compared to candidates from peer schools (as assessed through internships with the employers) in their knowledge of Microsoft Excel and their familiarity with audit software.

We have undertaken two other initiatives. The first is an initiative to provide workshops for our graduate students in the computer skills mentioned above and we offer many more events that allow students to practice their interpersonal skills. The second is an effort to make certain that computer skills are addressed and assessed in several courses in the curriculum.