

**ETS Major Field Test (MFT) – Associate Business
April 2011
Chattanooga State Community College (ChSCC)**

Program Student Learning Outcomes Analysis Compiled January 2012
Institutional Effectiveness and Research

See “2011 Business MFT Analysis - full report.pdf” for complete analysis

Number of test takers = 50

Mean Score = 540 (standard deviation = 13)

Chattanooga State graduates scored in the 40th percentile nationally

Content areas:

Accounting – mean 38% correct

Management – mean 52% correct

Marketing – mean 47% correct

Economics – mean 47% correct

Mean percent correct for MFT items:

Chattanooga State: 46%

National: 48%

Program Student Learning Outcome Analysis Summary and Recommendations

Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs) for the Accounting Technology and Management programs were mapped to MFT items. For each PSLO an achievement indicator was calculated for internal assessments and MFT items representing the rate that students have mastered a PSLO, with 0.0 indicating no mastery and 1.0 indicating strong mastery.

Performance on the MFT for ChSCC graduates and the national population is similar on most test items. Achievement indicators on the MFT are consistently and in most cases significantly lower than achievement indicators on internal assessments. While it would be ideal to see consistent levels of achievement between internal assessments and the MFT, achievement levels of PSLOs relative to other PSLOs on either internal assessments or the MFT was also considered in this analysis. This allowed identification of the PSLOs that students and graduates consistently struggle with and those that they master and retain. Results, however, showed few consistencies in the levels of achievement. The 2011 MFT serves as a benchmark for Chattanooga State.

Accounting Technology

Students scored higher on internal course assessments than on the MFT for all Accounting PSLOs, as shown in Table 1. Chattanooga State graduates scored lower than national graduates on the MFT for all Accounting PSLOs; however, the difference is minimal indicating that the MFT content for accounting is equally challenging for all graduates. PSLO achievement indicators ranged from 0.46 to 0.92 on internal assessments, from 0.29 to 0.42 on the MFT for ChSCC graduates, and from 0.31 to 0.47 on the MFT for the national population of graduates. The large variation in achievement indicators between internal assessments and the MFT indicates a need to further analyze course content, curriculum mapping, and whether students are able to apply concepts they learn in the classroom after graduating.

Table 1: Accounting Technology – Variance of PSLO Achievement AY 2010-2011

Accounting PSLO	2011 ChSCC PSLO Achievement Indicator	2011 ChSCC Assessment Count	2011 MFT ChSCC PSLO Achievement Indicator	2011 MFT Item Count	2011 MFT National Achievement Indicator by ChSCC PSLO
1	0.50	2	-	-	-
2	0.46	4	0.42	9	0.47
3	0.84	3	0.36	7	0.40
4	0.56	1	0.41	10	0.43
5	0.50	1	-	-	-
6	0.65	2	0.29	2	0.33
7	0.77	2	-	-	-
8	0.83	5	0.30	1	0.31
9	0.92	4	-	-	-

Recommended Actions

1. Document additional internal assessments for PSLOs 1, 5, 7, and 9 to provide enough evidence to make decisions.
2. Look for opportunities in the curriculum to reinforce PSLOs 2 and 4 to increase Chattanooga State achievement on the MFT to national levels. Document additional internal assessments for PSLO 4 to provide more conclusive evidence of achievement.
3. Review the curriculum for PSLOs 3 and 6 to determine whether additional opportunities exist for reinforcement and whether the documented assessments are good measurements. Additional opportunities to practice these outcomes may raise mastery to national levels on the MFT.

4. Compare content of the PSLO 8 MFT item and determine whether it can and should be incorporated into the curriculum, if it is not already.

Additional Analysis Considerations

An item analysis would be beneficial for items mapped to PSLOs 2, 3, 4, 6, and 8. It may reveal weak areas in the MFT PSLO mapping and/or weak areas in the curriculum.

Management

Students scored higher on internal course assessments than on the MFT for all Management PSLOs, as shown in Table 2. PSLO achievement indicators ranged from 0.76 to 0.90 on internal assessments, from 0.36 to 0.60 on the MFT for ChSCC graduates, and from 0.39 to 0.59 nationally. Again, the large variance in achievement indicators between internal assessments and the MFT indicates a need to determine whether students are still able to apply concepts they learn in the classroom after they have graduated.

Table 2: Management – Variance of PSLO Achievement AY 2010-2011

Management PSLO	2011 ChSCC PSLO Achievement Indicator	2011 ChSCC Assessment Count	2011 MFT ChSCC PSLO Achievement Indicator	2011 MFT Item Count	2011 MFT National Achievement Indicator by ChSCC PSLO
1	0.77	3	0.52	19	0.54
2	0.78	3	0.45	12	0.48
3	0.80	3	0.38	30	0.41
4	0.78	4	0.45	11	0.50
5	0.76	3	0.60	8	0.59
6	0.90	1	0.48	3	0.57
7	-	-	0.58	13	0.52
8	-	-	0.36	2	0.39
9	0.89	4	0.59	2	0.52

Recommended Actions

1. Document additional internal assessments for PSLO 6 and review where this outcome is being taught and reinforced. If students continue to score high on internal assessments and low on the MFT this is an indication that PSLO 6 requires more reinforcement or that internal assessments are not measuring the same outcome as the MFT items.

2. Determine where PSLO 8 is being taught and assessed and document achievement in the student learning outcome assessment system. Because MFT mastery is low, look for opportunities in the current curriculum to reinforce this outcome.
3. Determine where PSLOs 1, 2, and 4 can be reinforced by conducting a PSLO analysis by MFT content area, focusing on the weakest areas.
4. Internal assessments for PSLO 3 should be reviewed to determine whether they are measuring the same skills as the MFT items that have been mapped to this outcome.
5. Learn from strong PSLOs: 9 and possibly 7. For PSLOs that show low performance, utilize strategies that have proven effective for PSLOs 9 and 7.

Additional Analysis Considerations

The Management PSLOs have been mapped to multiple content areas on the MFT. A PSLO analysis by MFT content area, particularly for PSLOs 1, 2, and 4, would provide additional information about content areas that may have the lowest achievement levels and require more immediate or significant action.

An item analysis would be beneficial for items mapped to PSLOs 1, 2, 4, and 5. It may reveal weak areas in the MFT PSLO mapping and/or weak areas in the curriculum.

Next Steps

1. Set goals for PSLO achievement on internal assessments for AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013
2. Set goals for PSLO achievement on MFT 2012 and 2013. Initial goals might be to match national achievement levels. After several iterations of the MFT a trend analysis should be conducted to set more specific data-driven goals.
3. Document planned program improvements based on the data in this report.
4. Document assessment results in AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013 that measure the outcome of the identified program improvements.
5. Conduct an annual PSLO analysis prior to fall term using ChSCC PSLO Data Reports and MFT results, specifically identifying impact of program improvements illustrated in the data.
6. Monitor and document annually the achievement gap between the MFT and internal assessments as one measure of program improvement impact.