

**Fermanian School of Business**  
**Accounting Major PLO #A1 Assessment**  
**2017-2018**

**Learning Outcome:**

Accounting Major PLO #A1: Demonstrate in-depth knowledge of accounting and federal tax regulations.

**Outcome Measure:**

Accounting Major-Specific Exit Exam Results – implemented Spring 2018

**Criteria for Success:**

Score at or above 60 on the Accounting Major-Specific Exit Exam.

**Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):**

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

**Initial Data:**

**Accounting Major-Specific Exit Exam - Average Student Score:**

Semester	N <sup>1</sup>	Score
Spring 2018	17	59

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

The Accounting Major-specific exit exam was implemented in Spring 2018. Based on the initial score of 59, the criteria for success has been set at 60. The criteria for success will be reevaluated as more data is collected.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**

Based on the limited data, no changes are recommended at this time.

<sup>1</sup>Number of Students Taking Test

**Fermanian School of Business  
Accounting Major PLO #A2 Assessment  
2017-2018**

**Learning Outcome:**

Accounting Major PLO #A2: Apply accounting knowledge in the preparation and evaluation of financial statements.

**Outcome Measure:**

ACC460 – Preparation of Financial Statements and Memo (assessed every Spring beginning Spring 2017)

**Criteria for Success:**

The average score for each criteria of the Accounting Major PLO #A2 Rubric will be a 3.0 or higher out of 4.0.

**Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):**

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

**Longitudinal Data:**

**Accounting Major PLO #A2 Rubric – Average Student Score:**

Semester	# of Assessments	Financial Statement Presentation	Financial Statement Classification	Financial Statement Accuracy	Analytic Review Ratios Table	Audit Planning Memo	Total
Spring 2017	42	2.88	3.29	2.83	3.14	2.27	2.88
Spring 2018	30	3.44	3.22	2.56	3.38	3.27	3.17

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

The criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) was met in the rubric criteria areas of Financial Statement Classification and Analytic Review Ratios Table in both Spring 2017 and Spring 2018. FSB students' scores were below the criteria for success in Spring 2017 but were above the criteria for success in Spring 2018 in the rubric criteria areas of Financial Statement Presentation and Audit Planning Memo. The average student scores were below the criteria for success in both semesters for the rubric criteria area of Financial Statement Accuracy.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**

The assignment instructions were improved prior to collecting artifacts in Spring 2018, which clarified expectations in regards to the Audit Planning Memo. More data needs to be collected before making curricular changes, but the area of Financial Statement Accuracy will be closely monitored in future semesters.

## ACCOUNTING MAJOR PLO A2 RUBRIC

Point Loma Nazarene University Accounting Major Learning Outcome A2: Apply accounting knowledge in the preparation and evaluation of financial statements.

Criteria	Very Good 4	Good 3	Acceptable 2	Poor 1
<b>Financial Statement Presentation</b>	Uses proper financial statement format and presentation consistently throughout all financial statements with fewer exceptions.	Uses proper financial statement format and presentation consistently throughout all financial statements with some exceptions.	Uses proper financial statement format and presentation consistently throughout all financial statements with some exceptions within specific financial statements but uses different formats for different statements.	Does not use proper financial format for any statement and is inconsistent within each statement. All statements contain many exceptions to proper formats.
<b>Financial Statement Classification</b>	Consistently classifies information into appropriate categories (current property, plant equipment, and/or intangibles) and clearly accounts for net change in cash.	Usually classifies information into appropriate categories (current property, plant equipment, and/or intangibles) and usually accounts for net change in cash.	Sometimes classifies information into appropriate categories (current property, plant equipment, and/or intangibles) and sometimes accounts for net change in cash.	Does not classify information into appropriate categories (current property, plant equipment, and/or intangibles) and does not account for net change in cash.
<b>Financial Statement Accuracy</b>	There are no computational errors within any financial statement. Balance sheet: total assets equal total liabilities and equity. Income statement: net income and dividends reconcile to change in retained earnings. Statement of changes in cash categories reconcile to beginning and ending cash.	There are few computational errors within the financial statement categories. Balance sheet: total assets equal total liabilities and equity. Income statement: net income and dividends reconcile to change in retained earnings. Statement of changes in cash categories reconcile to beginning and ending cash.	There are some computational errors within financial statement categories. Balance sheet: total assets equal total liabilities and equity. Income statement: net income and dividends reconcile to change in retained earnings. Statement of changes in cash categories reconcile to beginning and ending cash.	There are many computational errors within financial statement categories. Balance sheet: total assets may not equal total liabilities and equity. Income statement: net income and dividends may not reconcile to change in retained earnings. Statement of changes in cash categories may not reconcile to beginning or ending cash.
<b>“Analytic Review Ratios” Table</b>	Effectively computed all of the financial ratios missing from the “Analytic Review Table;”. Successfully linked the 20X4/20X5 trial balances to the “Analytic Review Ratios table.”.	Effectively computed most of the financial ratios missing from the “Analytic Review Table;”. Successfully linked most of the 20X4/20X5 trial balances to the “Analytic Review Ratios table.”.	Effectively computed some of the financial ratios missing from the “Analytic Review Table;”, successfully linked most of the 20X4/20X5 trial balances to the “Analytic Review Ratios table.”.	Did not effectively compute all of the financial ratios missing from the “Analytic Review Table;”. Did not link the 20X4/20X5 trial balances to the “Analytic Review Ratios table.”.
<b>Audit Planning Memorandum</b>	Memorandum clearly identifies and explains how the “Analytical Review Ratios” analysis supports the risk evaluation; successfully identifies all accounts within the trial balance which would require additional scrutiny to ensure proper reporting in accordance with the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles and clearly addresses how the potential irregularity could lead to material misstatement of the financial statements.	Memorandum generally identifies and explains how the “Analytical Review Ratios” analysis supports the risk evaluation; identifies most accounts within the trial balance which would require additional scrutiny to ensure proper reporting in accordance with the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles and somewhat addresses how the potential irregularity could lead to material misstatement of the financial statements.	Memorandum vaguely identifies and explains how the “Analytical Review Ratios” analysis supports the risk evaluation; identifies some of the accounts within the trial balance which would require additional scrutiny to ensure proper reporting in accordance with the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles and vaguely addresses how the potential irregularity could lead to material misstatement of the financial statements.	Memorandum does not clearly identify nor explain how the “Analytical Review Ratios” analysis supports the risk evaluation; does not successfully identify accounts within the trial balance which would require additional scrutiny to ensure proper reporting in accordance with the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles and does not address how the potential irregularity could lead to material misstatement of the financial statements.

Average Score: \_\_\_\_\_ (Total/# of criteria)

**Fermanian School of Business**  
**Accounting Major PLO #A3 Assessment**  
**2017-2018**

**Learning Outcome:**

Accounting Major PLO #A3: Apply knowledge in federal tax regulations to evaluate tax positions and planning opportunities.

**Outcome Measure:**

PLO #A3: ACC411 – Client Tax Letter (assessed every Spring beginning Spring 2016)

**Criteria for Success:**

PLO #A3: The average score for each criteria of the Accounting Major PLO #A3 Rubric will be a 3.0 or higher out of 4.0.

**Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):**

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

**Longitudinal Data:**

**Accounting Major PLO #A3 Rubric – Average Student Score:**

Semester	# of Assessments	Major Issues Identified	Analysis of Friend's Advice	Alternatives and Recommendations	Total
Spring 2016	40	3.35	3.48	3.43	3.42
Spring 2017	36	3.08	2.78	2.47	2.78
Spring 2018	34	3.47	3.21	3.47	3.38

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

The criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) was met in the rubric criteria area of Major Issues Identified for all three semesters. The average student score met the criteria for success in the areas of Analysis of Friend's Advice and Alternatives and Recommendations in two of the three semesters.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**

The improved assignment instructions, specifically in regards to the Analysis of the Friend's Advice and Alternatives and Recommendations, clarified expectations and positively impacted the scores. No changes are recommended at this time; however, scores in the rubric criteria areas of Analysis of Friend's Advice and Alternatives and Recommendations will continue to be closely monitored.

## ACCOUNTING MAJOR PLO #A3 RUBRIC

Point Loma Nazarene University Management Major Learning Outcome #A3: Apply knowledge in federal tax regulations to evaluate tax positions and planning opportunities.

Criteria	<b>Very Good 4</b>	<b>Good 3</b>	<b>Acceptable 2</b>	<b>Poor 1</b>
<b>Major Issues Identified</b>	Letter clearly identifies all relevant issues regarding the choice of business form. No or little room for improvement.	Letter identifies most of the relevant issues regarding the choice of business form. Very little room for improvement.	Letter identifies a few of the major issues regarding the choice of business form. Acceptable, but some room for improvement.	Letter lacks identification of relevant business forms. There is much room for improvement.
<b>Friend's Advice (*no evidence from outside sources is to be used or cited in letter)</b>	Letter clearly articulates the reasonableness of friend's advice. Backs opinion with strong personal knowledge and evidence tax laws.	Letter mentions the reasonableness of friend's advice. Backs opinion with better than average personal knowledge and evidence of tax laws.	Letter implies the reasonableness of friend's advice. Backs opinion with somewhat average personal knowledge and/or average evidence of tax laws.	Letter does not address the reasonableness of friend's advice. Opinion is missing and/or has no personal knowledge or evidence of tax laws to support it.
<b>Alternatives and Recommendations</b>	All viable alternatives and recommendations are clearly identified and explained.	Most of the obvious viable alternative and recommendations are identified and explained.	Some of the viable opportunities are identified, but explanation is present but could use some improvement.	Few, if any, viable opportunities are identified with little or no explanation.

Average Score: \_\_\_\_\_ (Total/# of criteria)

Note 1: All criteria are weighted equally