

Standard #4 Measurement and Analysis of Student Learning and Performance

Use this table to supply data for Criterion 4.2.

Performance Indicator	Definition																						
1. Student Learning Results	<p>A student learning outcome is one that measures a specific competency attainment. <i>Examples of a direct assessment (evidence) of student learning attainment that might be used include: capstone performance, third-party examination, faculty-designed examination, professional performance, licensure examination.</i> Add these to the description of the measurement instrument in column two:</p> <p>Direct - Assessing student performance by examining samples of student work Indirect - Assessing indicators other than student work such as getting feedback from the student or other persons who may provide relevant information. Formative – An assessment conducted during the student's education. Summative – An assessment conducted at the end of the student's education. Internal – An assessment instrument that was developed within the business unit. External – An assessment instrument that was developed outside the business unit. Comparative – Compare results between classes, between online and on ground classes, Between professors, between programs, between campuses, or compare to external results such as results from the U.S. Department of Education Research and Statistics, or results from a vendor providing comparable data.</p>																						
	Analysis of Results																						
Performance Measure	What is your measurement instrument or process?	Current Results	Analysis of Results	Action Taken or Improvement made	Insert Graphs or Tables of Resulting Trends (3-5 data points preferred)																		
Measurable goal	Do not use grades.	What are your current results?	What did you learn from the results?	What did you improve or what is your next step?																			
What is your goal?	(Indicate type of instrument) direct, formative, internal, comparative																						
Business undergraduate students will demonstrate strong quantitative scores via earning a score in the top 50th percentile or higher of the "Quantitative Skills" category of the MFT. Now Peregrine.	Summative, External, Direct, Formal, Comparative data derived from Business MFT. Now Peregrine.	Most recent year was 48% (fall 15) and 39% (spring 16). From spring 16 to fall 16, there was a 3-point increase. Goal not met.	This is an area that we have been working on in an effort to improve. The scores are improving with much room for growth. Changed to new Assessment Exam (Fall 2015) from Peregrine (see second graph).	Since most students take this course in early in the Business curriculum, there is a need to integrate more quantitative elements in related other Business Core courses (e.g., Operations Management, Marketing, Economics, etc.). Also, there is a need for topic review of	<table border="1"> <caption>Quantitative CPC Percentile Rank (%)</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Term</th> <th>Percentile Rank (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Fall 15</td> <td>48%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Spring 16</td> <td>39%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fall 16</td> <td>42%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Term	Percentile Rank (%)	Fall 15	48%	Spring 16	39%	Fall 16	42%										
Term	Percentile Rank (%)																						
Fall 15	48%																						
Spring 16	39%																						
Fall 16	42%																						
Marketing undergraduate students will demonstrate the understanding and application of developing a marketing plan with an external company. Average grade goal is 85%	Internal and External (faculty member and representative of company providing evaluation). Informal, direct, summative.	Most recent year was 91% utilizing scoring grid on their projects. Goal met.	Students are doing a strong job with these projects and receiving excellent experience, recommendations from employers, and positive comments.	Using our current marketing projects to attract more projects in the future to provide more variety for our students to experience. We will use the CPE and new Waldron Center to continue to find opportunities to connect and engage alumni.	<table border="1"> <caption>Marketing 455: Project Experience</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Term</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Fall 12</td> <td>92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Spring 13</td> <td>94</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fall 13</td> <td>90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Spring 14</td> <td>92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fall 14</td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Spring 15</td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fall 15</td> <td>91</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Spring 16</td> <td>91</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Term	Score	Fall 12	92	Spring 13	94	Fall 13	90	Spring 14	92	Fall 14	84	Spring 15	84	Fall 15	91	Spring 16	91
Term	Score																						
Fall 12	92																						
Spring 13	94																						
Fall 13	90																						
Spring 14	92																						
Fall 14	84																						
Spring 15	84																						
Fall 15	91																						
Spring 16	91																						
Health Care Management students will demonstrate their understanding and application of HCM through internships by earning a 3.5 or higher evaluation from employer.	Informal, Direct, Summative, External.	Most recent year was a 4.85 score. Goal met.	Employer ratings from our most recent internships have continued to improve over previous years with a 97% overall satisfaction rating (score of 4.85)	The director of the HCM program continues to interact with the HR directors and hospital administrators to strengthen our relations and determine their needs. He continues to assist students find meaningful health care related	<table border="1"> <caption>HCM Internships</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2011-12</td> <td>3.27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012-13</td> <td>3.83</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013-2014</td> <td>3.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014-2015</td> <td>4.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015-2016</td> <td>4.85</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Score	2011-12	3.27	2012-13	3.83	2013-2014	3.8	2014-2015	4.5	2015-2016	4.85						
Year	Score																						
2011-12	3.27																						
2012-13	3.83																						
2013-2014	3.8																						
2014-2015	4.5																						
2015-2016	4.85																						
Accounting majors will demonstrate critical thinking skills to interpret and analyze financial data through various class projects. Cumulative average across three projects will exceed 80%.	Formal, Direct, Formative, Internal.	Most recent year was a 81.2. Goal met.	The teachers utilize a grading grid for these time consuming projects (about 6 weeks each). Pleased with results on average.	Although pleased with these numbers, the finding is that students who perform poorly are those turning in their projects last minute. Our goal will be to find ways to encourage early submission and review.	<table border="1"> <caption>Accounting SLO# 3: Critical Thinking</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Term</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Fall 2011</td> <td>84.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Spring 2012</td> <td>82.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fall 2012</td> <td>86.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Spring 2013</td> <td>85.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fall 2013</td> <td>86.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Spring 2014</td> <td>89.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014-15</td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015-16</td> <td>81.2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Term	Score	Fall 2011	84.4	Spring 2012	82.9	Fall 2012	86.1	Spring 2013	85.7	Fall 2013	86.1	Spring 2014	89.1	2014-15	85	2015-16	81.2
Term	Score																						
Fall 2011	84.4																						
Spring 2012	82.9																						
Fall 2012	86.1																						
Spring 2013	85.7																						
Fall 2013	86.1																						
Spring 2014	89.1																						
2014-15	85																						
2015-16	81.2																						