

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														
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														
CPA Pass Rates >= 60%	Annual pass rate as reported by NASBA; External Summative Comparative	We are meeting the goal.	We are now 10th in the nation for pass rates for programs of our size	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. Accounting faculty are experimenting with some changes (text book, online problems, etc.) to decrease attrition rates in those courses while maintaining high CPA pass rate standards	<div style="text-align: center;"> <p>All Testing Events</p> <table border="1" style="margin: 10px auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <caption>CPA Pass Rates Data</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>68.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015</td> <td>85.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016</td> <td>75.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> </div>	Year	Pass Rate (%)	2013	60.00%	2014	68.00%	2015	85.00%	2016	75.00%
Year	Pass Rate (%)														
2013	60.00%														
2014	68.00%														
2015	85.00%														
2016	75.00%														

<p>Undergraduate majors will score at the 60th percentile or higher on a nationally normed exit exam</p>	<p>Annual ETS exan results. External, Summative, Comparative</p>	<p>Achieving goal</p>	<p>Even though our students have been performing well and exceeding goal expectations on the ETS, faculty felt like the ETS was not helping them to identify OFIs. Peregrine was piloted in 2016-2017. Those results were inconclusive. Many students had completion times well below expected times (e.g. some less than 15 minutes) suggesting students did not take the exam seriously.</p>	<p>Perregrine is going to be tested again in 2017-2018 to determine if ETS should remain as the tool to assess this goal or if we will switch to Peregrine.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Chart Title</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Chart Data</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2012</td> <td>71</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013</td> <td>71</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014</td> <td>83</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016</td> <td>80</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Value	2012	71	2013	71	2014	83	2015	80	2016	80														
Year	Value																														
2012	71																														
2013	71																														
2014	83																														
2015	80																														
2016	80																														
<p>MBA Students will score at the 50th percentile or higher on nationally normed exit exam</p>	<p>Annual ETS exan results. External, Summative, Comparative</p>	<p>The last 3 cohorts have achieved the goal. Comparative data are not yet available for the latest exam. (horizontal axis is cohort number with 12 being from the most recent comparative year of summer 16)</p>	<p>We examine both the percentile and the raw score to look for OFIs in our program delivery. Small sample sizes can significantly affect results so we examine trends more than single data points.</p>	<p>Faculty are given the test outline to either assure they are teaching content measured by ETS OR if we are not teaching content as measured by ETS (e.g. accounting), we have identified that we are doing that on purpose, by course intent, and not by accident. Changes to both curriculum and staffing have been informed by ETS results in the past. However, no specific changes were made in 16-17 on the basis of ETS results since the trend has been in a positive direction.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">ETS Percentile</p> <table border="1"> <caption>ETS Percentile Data</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Cohort</th> <th>Percentile</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>1</td><td>75</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>70</td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>65</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>15</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>30</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>30</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>35</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>60</td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td>40</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td>75</td></tr> <tr><td>11</td><td>85</td></tr> <tr><td>12</td><td>75</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Cohort	Percentile	1	75	2	70	3	65	4	15	5	30	6	30	7	35	8	60	9	40	10	75	11	85	12	75
Cohort	Percentile																														
1	75																														
2	70																														
3	65																														
4	15																														
5	30																														
6	30																														
7	35																														
8	60																														
9	40																														
10	75																														
11	85																														
12	75																														
<p>MBA students will demonstrate a Christian worldview in the marketplace. Rating ≥ 4 on 5 point scale</p>	<p>Indirect, summative, internal. Survey of alumni self-reported learning.</p>	<p>Mixed results. We fell slightly below goal in the most recent servey period.</p>	<p>Low sample size can lead to significant vriability in the survey result. Although there have been some staffing changes, that doesn't seem to explain the mixed results.</p>	<p>We changed the MBA Law course in an attempt to address this. It may be working (2015 is an unusual outlier that we can't explain) but there is still room for improvement. We are discussing this SLO as part of our MBA Faculty/Planning meeting in FA 17</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Bib Worldview</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Bib Worldview Data</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Rating</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>2008</td><td>3.5</td></tr> <tr><td>2009</td><td>3.6</td></tr> <tr><td>2010</td><td>4.0</td></tr> <tr><td>2011</td><td>2.8</td></tr> <tr><td>2012</td><td>3.0</td></tr> <tr><td>2013</td><td>2.8</td></tr> <tr><td>2014</td><td>4.0</td></tr> <tr><td>2015</td><td>2.5</td></tr> <tr><td>2016</td><td>4.0</td></tr> <tr><td>2017</td><td>3.8</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Rating	2008	3.5	2009	3.6	2010	4.0	2011	2.8	2012	3.0	2013	2.8	2014	4.0	2015	2.5	2016	4.0	2017	3.8				
Year	Rating																														
2008	3.5																														
2009	3.6																														
2010	4.0																														
2011	2.8																														
2012	3.0																														
2013	2.8																														
2014	4.0																														
2015	2.5																														
2016	4.0																														
2017	3.8																														

