



**THE WILLIAM G. MCGOWAN SCHOOL OF BUSINESS  
WILKES-BARRE, PA 18711**

**PREPARING STUDENTS FOR  
MEANINGFUL AND PURPOSEFUL LIVES**

**AACSB INTERNATIONAL**

***ASSURANCE OF LEARNING OUTCOMES  
2013 - 2018***



## Assurance of Learning

In constructing the learning goals for both undergraduate and graduate studies the School of Business proceeded from the mission statement along with the vision and values statements and the educational vision of the Congregation of Holy Cross. The learning goals at the graduate and undergraduate level are shown in bold print in the following mission, vision, and values statements and are reported in the table below based upon mission alignment.

### WILLIAM G. MCGOWAN SCHOOL OF BUSINESS MISSION STATEMENT

The William G. McGowan School of Business seeks to develop in its students the **professional knowledge** and **skills needed** to function successfully in the dynamic environments of business with a commitment to exercising their professional responsibilities in an **ethical and socially responsible manner** in a **global marketplace**.

#### To achieve its Mission, the William G. McGowan School of Business:

- Draws primarily traditional undergraduate students from the Mid-Atlantic region and students for the specialized certificate and master's degree in Health Care Administration regionally, nationally and globally and supports the educational tradition of the Congregation of Holy Cross in **educating both the hearts and mind of students**.
- Faculty provides a vital component in achieving **our career focused and lifelong learning oriented student centered learning goals** through mentorship, teaching, scholarship, and service activities.
- Faculty maintains proficiency in their fields and teaching through pedagogical and applied research and by sharing their business expertise in private, public, and philanthropic endeavors.

### VISION STATEMENT

The William G. McGowan School of Business seeks to be a leader in undergraduate business education in the Middle Atlantic Region and specialized graduate education in Health Care Administration in the Catholic tradition in the Middle Atlantic Region and in the **distance (online) learning format**.

### VALUES STATEMENT

*"Society has a greater need for people of values than it has for scholars. Knowledge itself does not bring about positive values, but positive values do influence knowledge." From Christian Education (1854) By Fr. Basil Moreau, founder of the Congregation of Holy Cross*

MISSION ALIGNMENT OF LEARNING GOALS			
Mission Elements (Highlighted in Mission Statement)	BSBA Learning Goal	College Undergraduate Learning Assessment	MHA Learning Goal
<i>Professional Knowledge</i>	Professional Knowledge		Professional Knowledge
<i>Skills Needed</i>	Effective Communicator		Effective Communicator
		Critical Thinker	Problem Solver
<i>Ethical And Socially Responsible Manner</i>	Ethics and Social Responsibility		Ethics and Social Responsibility
<i>Educating Both The Hearts And Mind Of Students.</i>	Ethics and Social Responsibility		Ethics and Social Responsibility
<i>Global Marketplace</i>	Professional Knowledge	Global CART Assessment	Professional Knowledge
<i>Career Focused And Lifelong Learning Oriented Student Centered Learning Goals</i>	Information Literacy		Curriculum designed as practitioner oriented

The School of Business approaches assurance of learning utilizing a combination of two approaches: (1) Course-embedded measurement, where required courses expose students to systematic learning experiences designed to produce graduates with the particular knowledge or abilities specified in the School of Business' learning goals and wherein the School of Business has established assessments and instruments within the required courses for measurement of the outcomes for the learning goals; and, (2) Demonstration measurement through stand-alone testing where the students are required to demonstrate certain knowledge or skills as a requirement at some other point in the BSBA and M.S. in Health Care Administration degree programs.

The following outlines the approach taken for each learning goal:

<b>ASSURANCE OF LEARNING APPROACHES BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION</b>			
<i>Goal</i>	<i>Approach</i>	<i>Course</i>	<i>Measure</i>
<b>Effective Communications - Written</b>	Course Embedded Direct Measure	MSB 250	Cengage Learning's Write Experience©
<b>Effective Communications – Oral</b>	Course Embedded Direct Measure	MSB 100; MSB 250; and CARP 412	School of Business Rubric
<b>Ethical and socially responsible behavior</b>	Demonstration Direct Measure	MSB 100 and MSB 400	King's College Ethics Survey
<b>Information Literacy</b>	Demonstration Direct Measure	MSB 100 and MSB 400	King's College Information Literacy Survey
<b>Professional Knowledge</b>	Demonstration Direct Measure	MSB 400	ETS Major Field Test in Business
	Course Embedded Indirect Measure	MSB Internship Courses	Site Supervisor Final Evaluations

<b>ASSURANCE OF LEARNING APPROACHES MASTER OF SCIENCE IN HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATION</b>			
<i>Goal</i>	<i>Approach</i>	<i>Course</i>	<i>Measure</i>
<b>Effective Communications - Written</b>	Course Embedded Direct Measure	HCA 500 and HCA 571	School of Business Rubric
<b>Effective Communications – Oral</b>	Course Embedded Direct Measure	HCA 501; HCA 507; HCA 521; and HCA 597	School of Business Rubric
<b>Ethical and socially responsible behavior</b>	Demonstration	New Entrants in Program; HCA 531; and HCA 598	King's College Ethics Survey
<b>Problem Solving</b>	Demonstration	HCA Core Courses	School of Business Rubric
<b>Professional Knowledge</b>	Course Embedded Direct Measure	HCA 597 and HCA 598	School of Business Rubric
	Demonstration Indirect Measure	HCA Faculty Research	Survey Instrument

## *Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes- Undergraduate*

### *Effective Communications Learning Goal*

#### *Written Communications*

The direct measure used is Cengage Learning's Write Experience© technology product which allows the students written communications skills to be assessed utilizing artificial intelligence creating consistent scoring across the courses in which it is administered and also provides feedback to the students to help improve written communications skills. The instrument is administered in all sections of MSB 250 – Business Communications and Mentoring which was added to the curriculum for students entering the College in the fall semester of 2010.

The Write Experience © measures five writing traits of the students writing in relation to assignments given (Source: Instructors Users Guide):

- A. **Focus and Meaning:** This details the degree to which the students establish and maintain a controlling idea within the assignment given and addresses the purpose and the audience of the assignment.
- B. **Content and Development:** This details the extent to which the students are able to demonstrate their ideas fully and creatively using details that are specific, accurate and relevant to the assignment.
- C. **Organization:** This details the extent to which the students utilized a unified structure and transitional devices in the writing regarding the assignment given.
- D. **Language use:** This details the extent to which the students demonstrate an awareness of audience and purpose through effective sentence structure, variety, and word selection.
- E. **Mechanics and Conventions:** This details the extent to which the students utilize the conventions of English, including paragraphing, grammar, punctuation and spelling.

<i>Measure</i>	<i>Benchmark</i>	<i>Assessment Date</i>	<i>Assessment Results</i>
Cengage Learning's Write Experience©  Competent Language Usage Essentials (C.L.U.E.)©	Increase of at least 5% on average scores on assessments over first assessment.	Fall 2013	Holistic score increase 13.07% with an n=50  C.L.U.E. score increase of 16% with an n=29.
		Spring 2015	Holistic score increase 16.33% with an n=74  C.L.U.E. score increase of 20.75% with an n=74.
	Increase in C.L.U.E. scores should average at least a 5% increase on change in pre-test and post-test	Fall 2015	Holistic score increase 17.50% with an n=63  C.L.U.E. score increase of 6.03% with an n=61

#### *Oral Communications*

The direct measure used is an effective communications rubric created in conjunction with Dr. James Dolhon, Professor of Speech and the faculty teaching the classes in which the assessments were embedded. The measure is course embedded in MSB 100 – Introduction to Business, MSB 250 – Business Communications and Mentoring, and CARP 412 – Career Planning II. The traits that are being evaluated as part of this learning goal which apply to the classes are as follows:

- 1) Content                      2) Organization                      3) Language                      4) Delivery                      5) Presence

The focus of the oral communications exercises begins with self-efficacy in MSB 100 and evolve into a career tract focus in MSB 250 and CARP 412. This process reflects the development of the student in the Student Professional

Development Program from looking at themselves as a contributor to an organization and society to the focus of the student and various business organizations they may join upon graduation. A summary of the outcomes of this assessment are as follows with a complete report in the Assurance of Learning Activity Report.

<i>Course and Assessment Level</i>	<i>Benchmark</i>	<i>Assessment Date</i>	<i>Assessment Results</i>
MSB 100 Baseline	Achieve an average score of 3.00 on a scale 4.00	Fall 2015	A. Overall Average 3.05 (on 4.0 pt. scale) N=127
		Fall 2016 Spring 2017	A. Overall Average 3.46 (on 4.0 pt. scale) N=143
MSB 250 Developmental and Evaluative		Fall 2015	A. Overall Average 3.476 (on 4.0 pt. scale) N=74
		Fall 2016 Spring 2017	B. Overall Average 3.65 (on 4.0 pt. scale) N=63
CARP 412 Evaluative		Fall 2015	B. Overall Average 3.43 (on 4.0 pt. scale) N=42
		Fall 2016 Spring 2017	C. Overall Average 3.4 (on 4.0 pt. scale) N=107

### ***Ethics and Social Responsibility Learning Goal***

An ethics survey was developed by John Ryan, C.S.C., Ph.D., and President of King's College in conjunction with a grant received from the William G. McGowan Charitable Trust which was intended to enhance and support ethics education. The elements that are being evaluated as part of this assessment are as follows:

- **Pre-conventional Morality** is based on Kohlberg's levels of moral development. Persons who reason at the pre-conventional level evaluate actions in terms of direct consequences for themselves. The scores for pre-conventional morality should decrease after completion of the program and as students use higher levels of reasoning.
- **Conventional Morality** is based on Kohlberg's levels of moral development. The scores for conventional morality should increase after completion of the program.
- **Moral Maturity** is the personal moral values and principles which may affect behavior. Moral maturity would roughly approximate Kohlberg's stage three (post-conventional reasoning) in that the person makes moral decisions based upon principles (e.g., respect for human dignity). Ideally, scores for moral maturity should increase after completion of the program, though research shows that few persons score at this level of moral reasoning.
- **Moral courage** is the courage to take action for moral reasons despite the risk of adverse consequences. Moral courage relates to the ability and willingness to act on one's moral reasoning. We should see higher moral courage scores after completion of the program.

Results from the Ethics survey have demonstrated an increase in elements of the ethical and socially responsible awareness and behavior on the part of the School of Business students.

### Ethical and Socially Responsible Behavior Results 2014 - 2015

	<b>FA14 First Year (n=81) Mean</b>	<b>Std Dev</b>	<b>SP15 Seniors (n=74)</b>	<b>Std Dev</b>	<b>Sig. change<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Expectation</b>
Pre-conventional Morality	2.2877	0.738	2.0171	0.813	0.031*	Significant Change. Decreasing scores after completion of the program and as students use higher levels of reasoning
Conventional Morality	4.1325	0.783	4.1456	0.682	0.912	Higher conventional morality scores after completion of the program
Moral Maturity	3.6127	0.894	3.7267	0.830	0.413	Ideally, higher moral maturity scores after completion of the program, though research shows that few students reach this level of moral reasoning by the end of college
Moral Courage	4.1934	0.649	4.3153	0.578	0.221	Higher moral courage scores after completion of the program

### Ethical and Socially Responsible Behavior Results 2016 - 2017

	<b>FA16 First Year Mean (n=128)</b>	<b>Std Dev</b>	<b>SP17 Seniors Mean (n=89)</b>	<b>Std Dev</b>	<b>Sig. change<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Expectation</b>
Pre-conventional Morality	2.434	0.786	2.093	0.775	0.002*	Significant Changes - We see decreasing scores after completion of the program and as students use higher levels of reasoning
Conventional Morality	4.060	0.781	4.044	0.839	0.880	We want higher conventional morality scores after completion of the program-- essentially unchanged
Moral Maturity	3.643	0.785	3.651	0.828	0.938	Ideally, we would like to see higher moral maturity scores after completion of the program -- essentially unchanged
Moral Courage	3.906	0.780	4.451	0.629	0.000*	Significant Changes - We want higher moral courage scores after completion of the program -- we see a slight increase.

### Comparison of First Year Students Fall 2016 and Fall 2014

	FA16 First Year Mean (n=128)	Std Dev	FA14 First Year (n=81) Mean	Std Dev	Change in Mean	Change in Std. Dev
Pre-conventional Morality	2.434	0.786	2.2877	0.738	.1463	.048
Conventional Morality	4.060	0.781	4.1325	0.783	-.0725	-.002
Moral Maturity	3.643	0.785	3.6127	0.894	.0303	-.109
Moral Courage	3.906	0.780	4.1934	.649	-.2874	.131

### Comparison of Senior Students Spring 2017 and Spring 2015

	SP 17 Seniors (n=81) Mean	Std Dev	SP15 Seniors (n=74)	Std Dev	Change in Mean	Change in Std. Dev
Pre-conventional Morality	2.093	0.775	2.0171	0.813	.0759	-.038
Conventional Morality	4.044	0.839	4.1456	0.682	-.1016	.157
Moral Maturity	3.651	0.828	3.7267	0.830	-.0757	-.002
Moral Courage	4.451	0.629	4.3153	0.578	.1357	.051

### Comparison of Significant Changes 2017 and 2015

	2017 Significant Change*	2015 Significant Change*
Pre-conventional Morality	0.002*	0.031*
Conventional Morality	0.880	0.912
Moral Maturity	0.938	0.413
Moral Courage	0.000*	.221

### Information Literacy

Course	Benchmark	Assessment Date
MSB 100 Baseline	Composite and individual measure increases of 15% from first year to graduating senior.	Fall 2014 (A)
MSB 480 Evaluative		Spring 2014 (A)
MSB 100 Baseline		Fall 2015 (B)
MSB 480 Evaluative		Spring 2016 (B)



## Assessment Results

### Information Skills by Standard: Mean Scores - Fall 2013 and Spring 2014

Major	N	Composite Scores	Standard 1	Standard 2	Standard 3	Standard 4	Standard 5	Knowledge	Application
<b>Spring 2014 – McGowan School of Business Students</b>									
Seniors	257	54.51	64.98	50.51	57.82	44.59	54.63	56.06	53.06
MSB	90	55.73 <sup>g</sup>	66.44	48.89 <sup>b</sup>	57.56	48.89 <sup>c</sup>	56.89 <sup>g</sup>	57.22	54.35 <sup>e</sup>
<b>Fall 2013 – All MSB 100 Students (First Year)</b>									
MSB 100	127	43.62	58.27	40.16	38.58	38.58	42.52	39.37	47.55
<b>Change</b>									
		<b>12.11</b>	<b>8.17</b>	<b>8.73</b>	<b>18.98</b>	<b>10.31</b>	<b>14.37</b>	<b>17.85</b>	<b>6.8</b>
		<b>28%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>14%</b>

ab, cd, ef, gh Refers to comparisons within column where the MEAN scores of group <sup>a, c, e, g</sup> are significantly ( $P \leq .05$ ) higher than the MEAN scores of group <sup>b, d, f, h</sup>.

Standard 1 Determine the extent of information needed

Standard 2 Access the needed information effectively and efficiently

Standard 3 Evaluate information and its sources critically

Incorporate selected information into one's knowledge base

Standard 4 Use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose

Standard 5 Understand the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information, and access and use information ethically and legally

There are a number of similarities between the scores of the MSB 100 students and students in Core 99, Core 100, and Core 110. Both groups had similar composite scores (MSB 43.62 - Core 41.09), did best on Standard 1, and had nearly identical scores for Standards 3 and 4.

### Information Skills by Standard: Mean Scores - Fall 2015 and Spring 2016

Major	N	Composite Scores	Standard 1	Standard 2	Standard 3	Standard 4	Standard 5	Knowledge	Application
<b>Spring 2016 – McGowan School of Business Students</b>									
Seniors	230	55.03	69.65	50.70	57.74	44.43	52.61	55.47	54.61
MSB	74	52.54 <sup>b</sup>	65.14 <sup>b</sup>	47.57 <sup>b</sup>	52.97	46.76 <sup>a</sup>	50.27	52.70 <sup>b</sup>	52.39
<b>Fall 2015 – All MSB 100 Students (First Year)</b>									
MSB 100	100	42.52	49.00	41.60	43.40	37.00	41.60	41.25	43.69
<b>Change</b>									
		<b>10.02</b>	<b>16.14</b>	<b>5.97</b>	<b>9.57</b>	<b>9.76</b>	<b>8.67</b>	<b>11.45</b>	<b>8.7</b>
		<b>25%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>20%</b>

ab, cd Refers to comparisons within column where the MEAN scores of group <sup>a, c</sup> are significantly ( $P \leq .05$ ) higher than the MEAN scores of group <sup>b, d</sup>.

Standard 1 Determine the extent of information needed

Standard 2 Access the needed information effectively and efficiently

Standard 3 Evaluate information and its sources critically

Incorporate selected information into one's knowledge base

Standard 4 Use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose

Standard 5 Understand the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information, and access and use information ethically and legally

### Professional Knowledge Learning Goal

In assessing student learning goals and objectives, the ETS Major Field Test in Business has been utilized to measure a student's subject knowledge and the ability to apply facts, concepts, theories and analytical methods.

<i>Benchmark</i>	<i>Assessment Date</i>	<i>Assessment Results</i>
Median Score on ETS Examination	Spring 2015	King's College Mean Score: 149 ETS Mean Score: 150.2
	Spring 2016	King's College Mean Score: 168 ETS Mean Score: 150.3
	Spring 2017	King's College Mean Score: 172 ETS Mean Score: 150.3
	Spring 2018	King's College Mean Score: 166 ETS Mean Score: 150.3

### ETS Major Field Test Administered Spring, 2015 and Spring, 2016

Test: Business						
Form Code: 4JMF						
Assessment Indicator Number	Assessment Indicator Title	Mean Percent Correct 2016 <sup>1</sup>	Mean Percent Correct 2015 <sup>1</sup>	Percentage Change	Percentile 2016 <sup>2</sup>	Percentile 2015 <sup>2</sup>
1	Accounting	59	41	43.90%	98%	42%
2	Economics	47	39	20.51%	87%	38%
3	Management	68	53	28.30%	98%	35%
4	Quantitative Business Analysis	50	35	42.86%	99%	35%
5	Finance	58	42	38.10%	98%	44%
6	Marketing	68	54	25.93%	98%	35%
7	Legal and Social Environment	77	58	32.76%	99%	30%
8	Information Systems	69	51	35.29%	99%	50%
9	International Issues	60	40	50.00%	99%	42%
	Average	62	46	35.29%		
	Total Scaled Score	168	149	12.75%	99%	36%
	Standard Deviation	14	13			
		<b>2016</b>	<b>2015</b>			
	Students responding to less than 50% of the questions:	0	0			
	Students in frequency distribution:	81	97			
	Students tested:	81	97			

ETS Major Field Test Administered Spring, 2016 and Spring, 2017

Test: Business				
Form Code: 4JMF				
Assessment Indicator Number	Assessment Indicator Title	Mean Percent Correct 2016	Mean Percent Correct 2017	2016 – 2017 Percentage Change
1	Accounting	59	63	7%
2	Economics	47	52	11%
3	Management	68	72	6%
4	Quantitative Business Analysis	50	53	6%
5	Finance	58	64	10%
6	Marketing	68	70	3%
7	Legal and Social Environment	77	78	1%
8	Information Systems	69	72	4%
9	International Issues	60	64	7%
	Average	62	63	2%
	Total Scaled Score	168	172	2%
	Standard Deviation	14		
		<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	
Students responding to less than 50% of the questions:		0	0	
Students in frequency distribution:		81	98	
Students tested:		81	98	

## Master of Science in Health Care Administration Learning Goals

<b><i>Learning Goal 1: Effective Communications – Written</i></b> <b>Benchmark -</b> Achieve an average score of 2.50 on a scale of 4.00 with at least 75% scoring at or above the 2.50 level.		
<i>Course</i>	<i>Last Assessment Date</i>	<i>Assessment Results</i>
HCA 500 Baseline	Fall 2014 Traditional	Average 2.96 Median 3.20 2.50 and Above 16 Percentage 73% Number 22
HCA 500 Baseline	Spring 2015 Fall, 2015 Spring, 2016	Average 3.33 Median 3.25 2.50 and Above 38 Percentage 88% Number 43
HCA 521 Eval-uative	Fall 2014 Traditional	Average 3.37 Median 3.00 2.50 and Above 26 Percentage 100% Number 26
HCA 598 Eval-uative	Spring 2016 Online and Traditional	Average 3.21 Median 3.20 2.50 and Above 15 Percentage 88% Number 17

<b>Learning Goal 1: Effective Communications – Oral</b> <b>Benchmark</b> – Achieve an average score of 3.00 on a scale of 4.00 with at least 80% scoring at or above the 3.00 level. Assignment complexity increases through the two evaluations.		
<i>Course</i>	<i>Last Assessment Date</i>	<i>Assessment Results</i>
HCA 501 Baseline (B)	(A) Fall 2014	(A - B) Overall Average @3.30 (on 4.0 pt. scale) N=20 Percentage at or above 3.00 = 90%
HCA 571 Evaluative (E)	(A) Fall 2014	(A - E) Overall Average @3.40 (on 4.0 pt. scale) N=18 Percentage at or above 3.00 = 100%
HCA 571 WP Evaluative Distance Learning (ED)	(A) Fall 2014	(A - ED) Overall Average @3.60 (on 4.0 pt. scale) N=7 Percentage at or above 3.00 = 90%
HCA 501 Baseline Distance Learning (BD)	(B) Spring 2016	(B - BD) Overall Average @3.67 (on 4.0 pt. scale) N=12 Percentage at or above 3.00 = 100%
HCA 501 Baseline (B)	(B) Fall 2016	(B - B) Overall Average @3.64 (on 4.0 pt. scale) N=12 Percentage at or above 3.00 = 100%
HCA 598 Evaluative All Delivery Methods (E)	(B) Spring 2016	(B - E) Overall Average @2.88 (on 4.0 pt. scale) N=15 Percentage at or above 3.00 = Not provided in assessment report
HCA 511 Development (D)	(C) Fall 2017	(D - C) Overall Average @ 2.31 (on 4.0 pt. scale) N= 12 Percentage at or above 3.00 = 42%

**Learning Goal 2: Problem Solving**

**Benchmark -** Achieve an average score of 2.50 (average of Benchmark 2 and 3) on a scale of 4.00 with at least 75% scoring at or above the 2.50 level.

<i>Course</i>	<i>Last Assessment Date</i>	<i>Assessment Results</i>
HCA 504 Baseline	Summer 2014 Traditional	Average - 2.89 Median - 2.83 2.50 and Above - 20 Percentage Scoring at or above - 87% Number - 23
HCA 511 Evaluative	Fall 2014 Online	Average - 3.03 Median - 3.17 2.50 and Above - 17 Percentage Scoring at or above 2.50 - 89% Number - 19
HCA 504 Baseline	Fall 2014 Online	Average - 3.10 Median - 3.17 2.50 and Above - 5 Percentage Scoring at or above 2.50 - 100% Number - 5
HCA 511 Evaluative	Fall 2015 Traditional	Average - 3.29 Median - 3.33 2.50 and Above - 16 Percentage Scoring at or above 2.50 - 89% Number - 18
HCA 507 Baseline	Spring 2016 Online	Average - 3.38 Median - 3.75 2.50 and Above - 19 Percentage Scoring at or above 2.50 - 86% Number - 22
HCA 511 Evaluative	Fall 2016 Traditional	Average - 3.31 Median - 3.33 2.50 and Above - 18 Percentage Scoring at or above 2.50 - 100% Number - 18
HCA 504 Baseline	Fall 2016 Online	Average - 3.33 Median - 3.33 2.50 and Above - 15 Percentage Scoring at or above 2.50 - 100% Number - 5

<b>Learning Goal 3: Ethical and Socially Responsible Behavior</b> <b>Benchmark – Statistically significant change in an element.</b>		
<b>Course</b>	<b>Last Assessment Date</b>	<b>Assessment Results</b>
Pre-Admission Students – Baseline Data  Graduating Students	Summer 2014 Summer 2014 And Fall 2014	Results of the pre and post surveys indicated one statistically significant change with other traits not changing at a level to meet the benchmark.
Pre-Admission Students – Baseline Data  Graduating Students	Fall 2016 Pretest And Spring 2017 Post Test	Results of the pre and post surveys indicated one statistically significant change with other traits not changing at a level to meet the benchmark.

The elements that are being evaluated as part of this assessment are as follows:

**Moral Motivation** is based on universal values that can be held across time, culture, politics, religion, and ethnicity that represent motivation underneath reasoning and action. The scores for moral motivation should increase after completion of the program (closer to 7 not morally right, unjust, and unfair, etc. as currently worded on the survey).

**Pre-conventional Morality** is based on Kohlberg's levels of moral development. Persons who reason at the pre-conventional level evaluate actions in terms of direct consequences for themselves. The scores for pre-conventional morality should decrease after completion of the program and as students use higher levels of reasoning.

**Conventional Morality** is based on Kohlberg's levels of moral development. The scores for conventional morality should increase after completion of the program.

**Moral Maturity** is the personal moral values and principles which may affect behavior. Moral maturity would roughly approximate Kohlberg's stage three (post-conventional reasoning) in that the person makes moral decisions based upon principles (e.g., respect for human dignity). Ideally, scores for moral maturity should increase after completion of the program, though research shows that few persons score at this level of moral reasoning.

**Moral courage** is the courage to take action for moral reasons despite the risk of adverse consequences. Moral courage relates to the ability and willingness to act on one's moral reasoning. We should see higher moral courage scores after completion of the program.

	<b>Summer 2014 HCA Students</b>			<b>Incoming HCA Students</b>			<b>Comparison</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>Sig. (2-tailed)</b>
Moral Motivation	19	6.4095	0.7015	14	6.5282	0.43703	(0.597)	0.555
Pre-conventional Morality	19	1.4123	0.43343	14	1.8241	0.91448	(1.561)	0.137
Conventional Morality	19	4.6023	0.49319	14	4.3571	0.59943	1.250	0.223
Moral Maturity	19	3.8538	0.7454	14	3.8165	0.82421	0.134	0.895
Moral Courage	19	4.7018	0.4567	14	4.7619	0.27514	(0.470)	0.642
Valid N (listwise)	19			14				

	Fall 2016 Pretest			Spring 2017 Post Test			Comparison
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation		N	Mean	Sig. Change
Pre-conventional Morality	19	2.130	0.633	10	1.592	0.562	0.032*
Conventional Morality	19	4.026	0.696	10	4.000	1.132	0.939
Moral Maturity	19	3.781	0.834	10	3.799	0.910	0.958
Moral Courage	19	4.491	0.450	10	4.667	0.544	0.361

	Comparison	
	Sig. Change	Description
Pre-conventional Morality	0.032*	Significant Changes - We see decreasing scores as students use higher levels of reasoning
Conventional Morality	0.939	We want higher conventional morality scores after completion of the program-- essentially unchanged
Moral Maturity	0.958	We would like to see higher moral maturity scores after completion of the program -- essentially unchanged
Moral Courage	0.361	We want higher moral courage scores after completion of the program -- we see a slight increase.



**Learning Goal 4 - Professional Knowledgeable**

**Benchmark -** Achieve an average score of 2.50 (average of Benchmark 2 and 3) on a scale of 4.00 with at least 75% scoring at or above the 2.50 level.

<i>Course</i>	<i>Last Assessment Date</i>	<i>Assessment Results</i>
HCA 598 Evaluative	Spring 2015	New course following program revisions, no results as of this date.
	Spring 2015	Average 3.71 Median 3.67 2.50 and Above 4 Percentage 100% Number 4
	Fall 2015	Average 3.42 Median 3.50 2.50 and Above 8 Percentage 100% Number 8
	Spring 2016	Average 3.45 Median 3.33 2.50 and Above 19 Percentage 100% Number 19
	Fall 2016 (Revised Rubric)	Average 3.27 Median 3.36 2.50 and Above 3 Percentage 100% Number 3
	Spring 2017 (Revised Rubric)	Average 3.26 Median 3.29 2.50 and Above 14 Percentage 74% Number 14