

## Standard #4 Measurement and Analysis of Student Learning and Performance

Use this table to supply data for Criterion 4.2. (Figure 4.2 in self-study)

Performance Indicator	Definition																
<b>1. Student Learning Results</b>	<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>																
Performance Measure	What is your measurement instrument or process?	Analysis of Results			Insert Graphs or Tables of Resulting Trends (3-5 data points preferred)												
<b>Measurable goal</b>	<b>Do not use grades.</b>	<b>Current Results</b>	<b>Analysis of Results</b>	<b>Action Taken or Improvement made</b>													
<b>What is your goal?</b>	<b>(Indicate type of instrument) direct, formative, internal, comparative</b>	<b>What are your current results?</b>	<b>What did you learn from the results?</b>	<b>What did you improve or what is your next step?</b>													
BPA Accounting: CPA Pass Rates >= 60%	Annual pass rate as reported by NASBA; External Summative Comparative	We are meeting the goal. We have been as high as 10th in the nation for pass rates for programs of our size. We dipped to 29th last year but we remain 1st in Oklahoma.	In our last QA we reported: "Strangely, we're wondering if we're too good. That is, are our high success rates also causing low retention rates in our accounting program." We analyzed attrition rates in the Principles and Intermediate courses and decided that we needed to make some changes that would help more students to succeed (graduate with an accounting degree) while maintaining SLO objectives.	We increased coverage of accounting tutors in the Success Center, created an Accounting Club to provide additional support and experimented with changes to our Intermediate and Advanced Accounting courses (offering it 5 days a week so that students had continuous exposure to the material). It is too early to tell if this is affecting CPA pass rates, but our retention an size of the major is significantly improved. Faculty are now considering the addition of a CPA prep course.	<div style="text-align: center;"> <table border="1" style="margin: 10px auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <caption>All Testing Events</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Pass Rate (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2013</td> <td>60.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014</td> <td>65.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015</td> <td>85.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016</td> <td>70.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2017</td> <td>68.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> </div>	Year	Pass Rate (%)	2013	60.00%	2014	65.00%	2015	85.00%	2016	70.00%	2017	68.00%
Year	Pass Rate (%)																
2013	60.00%																
2014	65.00%																
2015	85.00%																
2016	70.00%																
2017	68.00%																

<p>BBA CIS: Majors will get 60% or more of the Information Systems portion of the Peregrine test correct.</p>	<p>Peregrine Exam; External, Comparative, Summative</p>	<p>Goal is not met. N =1 in 18-19 and 17-18.</p>	<p>With N = 1 in the last two periods it is difficult to form strong inferences.</p>	<p>2016-2017 exam had a large enough sample. We are reviewing the subscores to consider areas for improvement</p>	<p>MIS Percentile on Peregrine Exam for CIS Students</p> <table border="1"> <caption>MIS Percentile on Peregrine Exam for CIS Students</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Percentile</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2017</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2018</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2019</td> <td>50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Percentile	2017	50	2018	40	2019	50		
Year	Percentile														
2017	50														
2018	40														
2019	50														
<p>BBA Finance: 75% of the students will score 70% or better on time value of money related quizzes</p>	<p>Courses quizzes. Internal, Formative, Direct</p>	<p>Met goal 205-2017</p>	<p>Changes at the end of 2014 seem to have been effective.</p>	<p>The Dean has recommended that the target be raised or a new SLO be used for reporting purposes as this SLO is currently in a "continue monitoring" phase now.</p>	<p>The Value of Money Results</p> <table border="1"> <caption>The Value of Money Results</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2016</td> <td>71.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2017</td> <td>79.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2019</td> <td>79%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2019</td> <td>76%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Percentage	2016	71.5%	2017	79.5%	2019	79%	2019	76%
Year	Percentage														
2016	71.5%														
2017	79.5%														
2019	79%														
2019	76%														
<p>BBA International Business: 70% of IB majors score 70th percentile or above on Peregrine section.</p>	<p>Peregrine Exam; External, Comparative, Summative</p>	<p>Not meeting goal.</p>	<p>Determining if the target should be adjusted, if the Peregrine instrument is reliable and valid for our program &amp; goals, or if a change to curriculum needs to be made.</p>	<p>Because students are meeting targets for other SLOs (not reported in this abbreviated chart), the faculty are trying to determine if Peregrine is a valid instrument (this is the case in other functional areas as well). It is being reviewed in FA19 for a SP20 decision.</p>	<p>Peregrine International Business Results for IB Majors</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Peregrine International Business Results for IB Majors</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2017</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2018</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2019</td> <td>60%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Percentage	2017	15%	2018	0%	2019	60%		
Year	Percentage														
2017	15%														
2018	0%														
2019	60%														
<p>BBA Management: 100% of students will earn a grade of 70% or better on their business plan submission</p>	<p>Business Plan completed in New Venture Development course: Internal, Formative, Direct</p>	<p>Goal is being met</p>	<p>The target was 80% of students achieving goal in the last QA report. It was moved to 100% for 2017.</p>	<p>The next step is to raise the target from 70% on final submission to 80% since the target is being met.</p>	<p>Business Plan Goal Achievement</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Business Plan Goal Achievement</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2011</td> <td>82</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2017</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2018</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2019</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Value	2011	82	2017	100	2018	100	2019	100
Year	Value														
2011	82														
2017	100														
2018	100														
2019	100														

