

## Standard Four - Measurement and Analysis of Student Learning and Performance

### Figure 4.2 - Measurement and Analysis

Use this table to supply data for Criterion 4.2.

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 exam, professional performance, licensure examination.</i> Add these to the description of the measurement instrument in column two:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Direct - Assessing student performance by examining samples of student work</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Indirect - Assessing indicators other than student work such as getting feedback from the student or other persons who may provide relevant information.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Formative – An assessment conducted during the student’s education.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Summative – An assessment conducted at the end of the student’s education.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Internal – An assessment instrument that was developed within the business unit.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">External – An assessment instrument that was developed outside the business unit.</p> <p>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 from a vendor providing comparable data.</p>

Analysis of Results											
Performance Measure	assessment method	Date	Current Results	Analysis of Results	Action Taken or Improvement Made	GRAPH					
Capstone MGT 3990 rubric for written work, 75% score at or above 70%	internal, summative	SP 2013	10 of 11 students scored above 75% on the rubric or 91%								
		FA 2015	17 of 21 students scored above 75% or 81%								
		SP 2016	7 of 9 (77%) scored at or above 75% on the approved rubric								
		FA 2016	14 out of 15 (93%) students scored at or above 75%	Most of the students scored at or above the standard.	The assessment tool will be expanded in the future to include not only the major team case presentation, but also the 4 required presentations preceding it of experiential exercises.						
		SP 2017	12 out of 12 (100%) students scored at or above 75%	All of the students scored at or above the standard.	The assessment tool was expanded to include not only the major team case presentation, but also the 4 required presentations preceding it of experiential exercises.						
Capstone MGT 4401 final oral presentation of Internship, 75% score at or above 70%	internal, summative	FA 2014	66% scored above 70% on their oral presentation								
		FA 2016	85% of students scored above 70% the oral presentation of their internships.	While not everyone is comfortable with oral presentations, additional practice is needed.	Incorporate an additional oral presentation at some point in the semester to allow the students to become more comfortable in their abilities to present.						
		SP 2017	90% of students scored above 70% on the oral presentation of their internships.	While not everyone is comfortable with oral presentations, additional practice is needed.	Incorporate an additional oral presentation at some point in the semester to allow the students to become more comfortable in their abilities to present.						
Quantitative Business Analytics subscore on ETS major field test in Business, mean percent correct above 50%	external, summative	FA 2007	12 students mean percent correct 53%								
		SP 2008	11 students mean percent correct 45%								
		FA 2011	15 students mean percent correct 35%		Departmental program review introduced new statistics course and changed program requirements						
		SP 2012	22 students mean percent correct 32%								
		SP 2013	15 students mean percent correct 32%								
		SP 2014	16 students mean percent correct 27%								
	SP 2015	11 students mean percent correct 31%		Departmental Review of Assessment data suggested changing the program requirements for statistics based courses in the Bachelor of Science Business Administration degree, proposed and adopted							

		SP 2016	21 students mean percent correct 32%																												
		SP 2017	12 students mean percent correct 37%																												
ETS Major Field test in Business, 50% of students will score at or above 40th percentile	external summative	SP 2014	5 of 16 students 31% performed above 40th comparable percentile for those who took the test from September 1, 2010 to June 30, 2013.		0.31					<p><b>ETS Major Field Test</b></p> <p>This line graph compares the standard (blue line) and result (red line) percentages for the ETS Major Field Test. The standard is consistently at 40%. The results fluctuate, starting at approximately 31% in SP 2014, rising to 43% in FA 2014, dipping to 16% in SP 2015, rising to 41% in FA 2015, and ending at 50% in SP 2016.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Standard (%)</th> <th>Result (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SP 2014</td> <td>40</td> <td>31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FA 2014</td> <td>40</td> <td>43</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP 2015</td> <td>40</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FA 2015</td> <td>40</td> <td>41</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP 2016</td> <td>40</td> <td>50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Standard (%)	Result (%)	SP 2014	40	31	FA 2014	40	43	SP 2015	40	16	FA 2015	40	41	SP 2016	40	50			
		Year	Standard (%)	Result (%)																											
		SP 2014	40	31																											
		FA 2014	40	43																											
		SP 2015	40	16																											
		FA 2015	40	41																											
SP 2016	40	50																													
FA 2014	7 of 16 students 43% performed above the 40th comparable percentile		0.44			Reporting Professor implements preparation exercises to review major field test areas																									
SP 2015	5 of 11 students 45% performed above the 40th comparable percentile		0.45																												
FA 2015	3 of 18 students 16% performed above the 40th comparable percentile		0.17																												
SP 2016	9 of 22 students 41% performed above the 40th comparable percentile		0.41																												
FA 2016	7 of 15 students 46% performed above the 40th comparable percentile		0.47																												
SP 2017	6 of 12 students 50% performed above the 40th comparable percentile		0.50																												
Legal and Social Environment subscore on ETS major field test in Business, mean percent correct above 50%	external summative	SP 2012	22 students mean percent correct 47%							<p><b>ETS Legal &amp; environment subscore</b></p> <p>This line graph compares the standard (blue line) and result (red line) percentages for the ETS Legal &amp; environment subscore. The standard is consistently at 50%. The results fluctuate, starting at 47% in SP 2012, rising to 54% in SP 2013, dipping to 49% in SP 2015, and ending at 49% in SP 2017.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Standard (%)</th> <th>Result (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SP 2012</td> <td>50</td> <td>47</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP 2013</td> <td>50</td> <td>54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP 2014</td> <td>50</td> <td>52</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP 2015</td> <td>50</td> <td>49</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP 2016</td> <td>50</td> <td>64</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP 2017</td> <td>50</td> <td>49</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Standard (%)	Result (%)	SP 2012	50	47	SP 2013	50	54	SP 2014	50	52	SP 2015	50	49	SP 2016	50	64	SP 2017	50	49
		Year	Standard (%)	Result (%)																											
		SP 2012	50	47																											
		SP 2013	50	54																											
		SP 2014	50	52																											
		SP 2015	50	49																											
SP 2016	50	64																													
SP 2017	50	49																													
SP 2013	12 students mean percent correct 54%																														
SP 2014	16 students mean percent correct 52%																														
SP 2015	11 students mean percent correct 49%																														
SP 2016	21 students mean percent correct 64%																														
SP 2017	12 students mean percent correct 49%																														
Capstone MGT 3990 case study rubric, 75% will score at or above 70 percent	internal, summative	SP 2013	12 out of 12 (100%) scored at or above 75% on the approved rubric						<p><b>MGT 3990 Case Study</b></p> <p>This line graph compares the standard (blue line) and result (red line) percentages for the MGT 3990 Case Study. The standard is consistently at 75%. The results fluctuate, starting at 100% in SP 2013, dipping to 95% in FA 2015, and ending at 100% in SP 2017.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Standard (%)</th> <th>Result (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SP 2013</td> <td>75</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FA 2015</td> <td>75</td> <td>95</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP 2016</td> <td>75</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FA 2016</td> <td>75</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP 2017</td> <td>75</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Standard (%)	Result (%)	SP 2013	75	100	FA 2015	75	95	SP 2016	75	100	FA 2016	75	100	SP 2017	75	100				
		Year	Standard (%)	Result (%)																											
		SP 2013	75	100																											
		FA 2015	75	95																											
SP 2016	75	100																													
FA 2016	75	100																													
SP 2017	75	100																													
FA 2015	20 out of 21 (95%) students scored at or above 75% on the approved rubric																														
SP 2016	9 out of 9 (100%) students scored at or above 75%																														
FA 2016	15 out of 15 (100%) students scored at or above 75%	The standard needs to be raised to scoring 80% or higher since 9 students were below this score.	The assessment tool will be raised to scoring 80% or higher in future semesters.																												
SP 2017	12 out of 12 (100%) students scored at or above 80%	Scores assigned by students needs to be supplement with a score by the Professor also.	The assessment tool will be supplemented with a score by the Professor also.																												
Faculty Approved rubric in ACC 4101, 75% must score at or higher than acceptable	internal, summative	SP 2015	78.6% of students (11 students out of 14 total students) scored 70% or above	The assessment data for this academic year 2014-15 represents the first year of outcomes measurement (assessment). So, no positive or negative trend in performance can be noted. Current results indicate that while improving trends in student achievement on this learning outcome are desirable, students are performing at or above the defined standard.		The following pedagogical methods will be introduced in the future: In-class small group discussion and additional case study analysis work.			<p><b>Accounting 4101 rubric LO1</b></p> <p>This line graph compares the standard (blue line) and result (red line) percentages for Accounting 4101 rubric LO1. The standard is consistently at 70%. The results fluctuate, starting at 80% in SP 2015, rising to 100% in SP 2016, and ending at 89% in SP 2017.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Standard (%)</th> <th>Result (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SP 2015</td> <td>70</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP 2016</td> <td>70</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP 2017</td> <td>70</td> <td>89</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Standard (%)	Result (%)	SP 2015	70	80	SP 2016	70	100	SP 2017	70	89										
		Year	Standard (%)	Result (%)																											
		SP 2015	70	80																											
SP 2016	70	100																													
SP 2017	70	89																													
SP 2016	100% of students (17 students out of 17 total students) scored 70% or above	Students achieved the desired learning outcome in accordance with the defined standards.	Additional case students related to this learning outcome will be assigned. Also, more class time will be allocated for small group discussions. Forensic accounting topics will be introduced.																												
SP 2017	89% of students (7 students out of 8 total students) scored 70% or above	Students achieved the desired learning outcome in accordance with the defined standards.	Learning outcomes and assessment methods will be reviewed. Pedagogical methods related to adopted learning outcomes will be reviewed and modified as needed.																												
Faculty approved rubric in ACC 4101, 75% must score at or higher than acceptable	internal, summative	SP 2015	92.8% of students (13 students out of 14 total students) scored 70% or above	The assessment data for this academic year 2014-15 represents the first year of outcomes measurement (assessment). So, no positive or negative trend in performance can be noted. Current results indicate that while improving trends in student achievement on this learning outcome are desirable, students are performing at or above the defined standard.		The following pedagogical methods will be introduced in the future: In-class small group discussion and additional case study analysis work.		<p><b>Accounting 4101 rubric LO2</b></p> <p>This line graph compares the standard (blue line) and result (red line) percentages for Accounting 4101 rubric LO2. The standard is consistently at 70%. The results fluctuate, starting at 93% in SP 2015, rising to 94% in SP 2016, and ending at 89% in SP 2017.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Standard (%)</th> <th>Result (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SP 2015</td> <td>70</td> <td>93</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP 2016</td> <td>70</td> <td>94</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP 2017</td> <td>70</td> <td>89</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Standard (%)	Result (%)	SP 2015	70	93	SP 2016	70	94	SP 2017	70	89											
		Year	Standard (%)	Result (%)																											
		SP 2015	70	93																											
SP 2016	70	94																													
SP 2017	70	89																													
SP 2016	94% of students (16 students out of 17 total students) scored 70% or above	Students achieved the desired learning outcome in accordance with the defined standards.	Additional case students related to this learning outcome will be assigned. Also, more class time will be allocated for small group discussions. Forensic accounting topics will be introduced.																												
SP 2017	89% of students (7 students out of 8 total students) scored 70% or above	Students achieved the desired learning outcome in accordance with the defined standards.	Learning outcomes and assessment methods will be reviewed. Pedagogical methods related to adopted learning outcomes will be reviewed and modified as needed.																												

Accounting pre-test and post-test, at least 70 percent of students will realize at least a 50 percent improvement on pre-test and post-test.	internal, summative	FA 2015	Only 10% of students realized at least a 50% improvement on pretest and posttest.	Students are not meeting this learning objective.	Pedagogical changes that will demonstrate learning outcome goals: increases in the number of sample multiple choice and discussion of multiple choice, the inclusion of content-related embedded questions in all homework and in-class learning activities. The relevancy of pretest and posttest questions will be evaluated.	
		FA 2016	Students met standards for more than 80% of students made improvements between pretest and post test, average improvement of 50 points out of 100.	This course is students' first exposure to accounting, some had harder time showing their knowledge in multiple choice question test.	Planning on adding more interactive activities in class to improve learning enthusiasm.  A big portion of students in this class have non-qualitative subject majors and are not used to accounting terminology. Multiple choices questions and terminology can be tricky. Planning on adding short answer questions with multiple steps to give students chance to show understanding of different levels.	
		SP 2017	90% of students realized at least a 50% improvement on pretest and posttest.	Students are meeting this learning objective.	Assessment methods, techniques, and content will be required each semester going forward to ensure adequate, accurate assessment.	
Targeted questions from examinatio in CA 1110 Introduction to Mass Media, 75 percent must score at or higher than 70 percent.	internal, formative	FA 2014	12 of 14 (85%) scored better than 70% on 14 specific questions			
		FA 2015	6 of 8 (75%) scored better than 70% on 8 specific questions		Faculty discussed plans to drop Communication Concentration - one student enrolled since creation of concentration	
Objective Test Average (based on two tests covering all theories and applied environmental economics taught in the course, 70 percent will score 80 percent or higher	internal summative	FA 2016	11 of 14 met the benchmark: 78.57%	outcome achieved	none needed	
ETS subfield test in International business, mean percent correct 50 percent	external summative	SP 2013	12 students achieved 54% mean correct on int'l field			
		SP 2014	16 students achieved 29% mean correct on int'l field			
		SP 2015	11 students achieved 29% mean correct on int'l field			
		SP 2016	21 students achieved 34% mean correct on int'l field			
		SP 2017	12 students achieved 36% mean correct on int'l field			
Objective Exam Average in international economics, 70 percent will score 80 percent or higher	internal, formative	SP 2017	15 of 22 met the benchmark: 68.18	outcome NOT achieved	none expected, standard was nearly met.	
Answer specific questions analyzing the role of culture in the evolution of an economy or specific historical context. 70 percent of students will perform at or above 70%	internal summative	SP 2014	7 of 11 scored 70% or better, 63%			
		SP 2016	10 of 12 scored a 70% or better, or 83 percent	students are meeting the requirement to evaluate content in a cultural context	Develop additional introductory lecture and essay assignment on the impact of culture on organizing action (rules and beliefs essay)	
		SP 2017	11 of 15 scored 70 percent or better, 73%			

Final Innovation Project in Creativity and Innovation with 75% of students must pass with a B or better	Internal, summative	FA 2016	90% of the students passed this project designed to stimulate and drive innovation.	While some students struggle with conceptual frameworks and ambiguity the majority stretched beyond their comfort zone and excelled.	In the future I will add an another component to the innovation project that will allow the students to chart their progress as a reflective tool thereby allowing for enhancement of their innovation potential.	
		FA 2016	95% of the students earned a C or better in the development of a comprehensive business plan for an entrepreneurial organization they created.	75% may not be a high enough assessment goal.	Increase assessment goal to 85%.	
		SP 2017	95% of the students earned a C or better in the development of a comprehensive business plan for an entrepreneurial organization they created.	Some students excelled in the writing of their business plan, however struggled in the presentation component.	Spend more time reviewing presentation skills, tactics and providing more detailed feedback throughout the semester.	
1. be able to plan, develop, implement and maintain software systems, network systems, Web-based electronic commerce systems and database systems.	internal, formative	SU 2016	10 out of the 11 students scored 75% or higher on the grading rubric for the project	Online nature of the class and tutorial features in book require students to learn on their own. I encourage online office hours but few students take advantage of the opportunity.	Early in the class require participation in the online office hours in order for the class to feel more engaged with the online class.	
		FA 2016	Only 39% of students scored higher than 75% on this final cumulative assessment. (see Support tab) 7 of 18 students	Students need more practice writing actual programs - the etext provides practice on short assignments but does not provide many complete programming projects.	I will incorporate more complete programming projects early in the course so students have more experience in the integrated development environment writing complete programs.	
		FA 2016	100% of students scored 75% or higher on the grading rubric for the project	Small class size, engaging subject matter and competency based assessment allow for excellent learning in the class.	I would like to use actual business requirements documents for this assignment in the future in order to enhance the real world aspect of the project.	
		WIN 2016	100% of students scored 75% or higher on the grading rubric for the project (83.33%)	Small class size, engaging subject matter and competency based assessment allow for excellent learning in the class. This class was delivered online - one student had to get an extension on the final project.	I used actual business requirements documents for this assignment in in order to enhance the real world aspect of the project. I will continue to make the project as realistic as possible and hope to incorporate more real world components into the project requirements.	
		SP 2017	100% of students achieved this goal.	Students gained additional practice writing complete programs through the use of assignments that emphasized the complete development process and completion of a program even with early basic programming teaching beginning skills.	The incorporation of complete programming projects in IS2550 helped significantly with the improvement exhibited in this outcome measure. From the first assignment, students had projects that emphasized development of complete applications using Java in the Android Studio IDE.	
Analysis of Exam questions (interactive exam) for excel lessons, 75 percent of students must score at or higher than acceptable.	internal, formative	SP 2016	100% of students scored at 75% or higher. Low score 84, High score 100	The combination of the lesson, practice exam, and final timed exam improves the outcomes on this LO.	No Action Needed.	
		FA 2016	100% of students scored at 75% or higher. Low score 84, High score 100	The combination of the lesson, practice exam, and final timed exam improves the outcomes on this LO.	No Action Needed.	
		SP 2017	100% of students scored at 75% or higher. Low score 95, High score 100	The combination of the lesson, practice exam, and final timed exam improves the outcomes on this LO.	Continued high scores may warrant strengthening the LO.	
Major field test subfield for information systems, mean correct 50%	External, summative	SP 2014	16 students achieved a mean correct score of 42 percent			
		SP 2015	11 students achieved a mean correct score of 43			
		SP 2016	21 students achieved a mean correct score of 50			
		SP 2017	12 students achieved a mean correct score of 48			
Embedded questions in IS 2501 Exams, 75% of students will correctly answer questions related to strategic importance of information systems		FA 2016	See support tab for question analysis from Midterm and Final exam - two questions related to tangible benefits of information systems were not at the 75% level	Students seem to have difficulty understanding the difference between tangible and intangible benefits of strategic information systems	An additional lecture will be added discussing IS project management and the evaluation of information systems with respect to tangible and intangible benefits.	
		WIN 2016	See support tab for question analysis from Midterm and Final exam - all questions were at the 75% level or above.	Online test scores for objective questions tend to be higher.	For the online class, if offered in Winter 2017, add a project that requires discussion and deliverable that focuses on the strategic benefits of technology.	

		SP 2017	See support tab for question analysis from Midterm and Final exam - two questions related to tangible benefits of information systems were closer but not quite at the 75% level for Spring 2017.	Students seem to have difficulty understanding the difference between tangible and intangible benefits of strategic information systems	Along with the additional lecture will be added discussing IS project management and the evaluation of information systems with respect to tangible and intangible benefits, an exercise will also be used to distinguish between the two. Additionally, the exercise will relate to the strategic importance of goals and cost/benefit analysis relative to tangible and intangible benefits.															
Final comprehensive problem incorporation optimization strategy in advance formula driven worksheet, 75 percent of students will successfully complete the problem.	External, summative	SU 2016	Out of 11 students, 10 successfully completed all parts of the final exam (five problems - see other worksheets here). These problems represent comprehensive requirements and include advanced formulas and analysis in the solution.	This class was online and this creates difficulties for the students with a class of this nature with heavy quantitative components. I held online office hours but few students took advantage of the opportunity.	I will make "checking in" to online office hours mandatory early in the semester for the online class. Additionally, I am looking for a more interactive text.															
		SP 2017	All students successfully completed the project. Students presented the results of their research related to research centers, institutes and organizations and demonstrated a custom Salesforce DBMS to real world clients	Students benefit from real world projects over case studies in most cases. This project was exceptional.	Continue to integrate real world data (from Kaggle, other sources) or real world projects in the requirements for the class in order to increase student engagement and learning.															
Education related travel, students pursuing international business concentration will travel internationally.	internal, summative	SP 2014	Japan: Japanese, Business and Culture																	
		SU 2015	Spain - summer language program																	
		SP 2016	France - French language and culture		graduation requirement, should alter this assessment tool															
pre-test and post-test in principles of management, 90% of students will see improvement.	internal formative	FA 2016	Of the 54 students who took both the pre-test and the post-test, 49 or 90.7% improved	Most of the students understand what management is all about by the end of the course.	Offer more incentives for completion of pre-test and post-test by all students in both sections to insure accuracy of results. Seven (7) students did not complete both tests.															
		SP 2017	Of the 50 students who took both the pre-test and the post-test, 48 or 96% improved	Most of the students understand what management is all about by the end of the course.	Offer more incentives for completion of pre-test and post-test by all students in both sections to insure accuracy of results. Eleven (11) students did not complete both tests.															
pre-test, post-test for marketing principles, 70 percent of students will achieve 70 percent or better on post-test.	internal, formative	FA 2016	A combined total of 49 students (for both sections) took both the pre test and post tests. 100 % of the students received less than a C on the pre-test. 96% of students received a B or better on the Post Test. Only 1 person from each section of the course received a grade below 60%. The average score on the pre test was 4/15 and the average score on the post test was 13/15.	On the pretest all students answered all the multiple choice questions but more than half of the students did not attempt to answer the short answer questions. On the post test students were now able to answer all questions including the short answers. For the group project students did a better job on the oral presentation versus the written presentation.	Review question types on both pre-test and post test: Remove multiple choice questions to reduce risk of students guessing answers. I plan to increase the assessment standard for both the post test and final group project to at least 80% of students will attain a B or better on the post test and final group project.															
		SP 2017	A combined total of 38 students (for both sections) took both the pre test and post tests. 94% of students received a C or better on the post test. On the final group oral presentation 98% of students enrolled in both sections of the course received a B or better on the oral and 90% received a B or better on the written project with the oral presentation grades being higher than the grades for the written project.	I revised the pre-test and only included short answer questions. I feel more confident about the validity of these results as these types of questions eliminated the likelihood of students guessing the answers as in the case of multiple choice type questions. For the group project students did a better job on the oral presentation versus the written presentation.	I did remove multiple choice questions to reduce risk of students guessing answers. I think this strategy was successful. I will continue using the revised format for the pre-test-posttest.															
pre-test, post-test for sales management, 70 percent of students will achieve 70 percent or better on post-test.	external summative	FA 2016	100% of students received less than a C on the pretest. 100 % of students received at least a C on the post test. 66 % of students received at least a C or better on exam 1 and 94% received at least a C or better on exam 2. 100% of students received at least a C or better on the final project	Students would receive higher grades if they wrote more detailed responses for the essay questions on the exams.	Students need to practice responding to essay questions more. I plan on also raising the standard to at least 80% of students should receive at least a B on exams and group project. I also plan give a greater weight to essays on the exams. (I would recommend revising this learning outcome to match course content more)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>result</td> <td>70</td> <td>70</td> <td>70</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>96</td> <td>94</td> <td>100</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	result	70	70	70					96	94	100			
result	70	70	70																	
	96	94	100																	
ETS Major field test in business, marketing field, mean percent correct above 50%	external summative	SP 2014	16 students achieved 44% mean percent correct																	
		SP 2015	11 students achieved 45% mean percent correct																	
		SP 2016	21 students achieved 53% mean percent correct																	
		SP 2017	12 students achieved 47% mean percent correct																	

pre-test and post test exams in marketing, with at least 70 percent of students receiving a C or better on the post test.	internal, summative	FA 2016	100% of students received less than a C on the pretest. 88 % of students received at least a C on the post test.	Students would receive higher grades if they wrote more detailed responses for the essay questions on the exams. Students did a better job on the oral presentation versus the final written project.	Students need to practice responding to essay questions more. I plan on also raising the standard to 85% of students should receive at least a C on exams. Students need to write in more detailed when completing project. (Recommend revision of this learning outcome to mirror content of course).	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Standard</th> <th>Result</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>sp 2014</td> <td>70</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>sp 2015</td> <td>70</td> <td>88</td> </tr> <tr> <td>sp 2016</td> <td>70</td> <td>88</td> </tr> <tr> <td>sp 2017</td> <td>70</td> <td>88</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Standard	Result	sp 2014	70	70	sp 2015	70	88	sp 2016	70	88	sp 2017	70	88
Year	Standard	Result																			
sp 2014	70	70																			
sp 2015	70	88																			
sp 2016	70	88																			
sp 2017	70	88																			
Strategic marketing Capstone or other upper division marketing courses, 70 percent of students will successfully complete the capstone project	internal summative	FA 2016	100% of students received less than a C on the pretest. 96 % of students received at least a C on the post test.	The exams include both multiple choice and essay questions. Students tend to do better on multiple choice questions and do not write detailed essays. Most points are lost on essay questions. Students would receive higher grades if they wrote more detailed responses for the essay questions on the exams.	Students need to practice responding to essay questions more. I plan on also raising the standard to 85% of students should receive at least a C on exams. I also plan to increase the weight of the essay questions on exams. Consider revision of Learning outcome to more appropriately evaluate learning in course.	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Standard</th> <th>Result</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>FA 2016</td> <td>70</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP 2017</td> <td>70</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP 2017</td> <td>70</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Standard	Result	FA 2016	70	100	SP 2017	70	100	SP 2017	70	100			
Year	Standard	Result																			
FA 2016	70	100																			
SP 2017	70	100																			
SP 2017	70	100																			
		SP 2017	100% of students received more than a C or better on the final project	Students grasped the basic concepts needed to enter the business world. During the oral presentation in the question and answer section at the end of the presentation, students were asked a lot of questions to determine if students understand the marketing concepts. I was pleased with the outcome (All groups answered all questions however in some groups, the same student kept answering the questions.	The next step is to use the pre-test and post test method to see how much information each student has grasped (individual assessment) instead of group assessment. Students need to practice responding to essay questions on the exam. I therefore plan to use the final exam in this course as an assessment tool and require that at least 85% of students receive a C or better on the final exam. Consider revising this learning outcome in FA 2017																
		SP 2017	100% of students received a C or better on both the final group project oral presentation and the final written project.	Students did a better job on the oral presentation compared to the written project. Students would receive higher grades on the written projects if they were more detailed.	Next time I plan on asking the client to evaluate the written plans and also increasing the standard and require that at least 85% of students to receive a B or better on the final oral presentation and final written group project. Students also need to practice writing in complete sentences using paragraph format. I plan on also raising the standard to at least 80% of students should receive at least a B on the final exam and group project. I also plan to give a greater weight to essay questions on the exams.	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>result</td> <td>70</td> <td>70</td> <td>70</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>100</td> <td>100</td> <td>100</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	result	70	70	70					100	100	100				
result	70	70	70																		
	100	100	100																		
Pretest and post-test in upper division accounting courses, at least 70% of students will achieve at least 50% improvement on pretest and posttest.	internal, summative	FA 2015	Only 10% of students realized at least a 50% improvement on pretest and posttest.	Students are not meeting this learning objective.	Pedagogical changes that will demonstrate learning outcome goals: increases in the number of sample multiple choice and discussion of multiple choice, the inclusion of content-related embedded questions in all homework and in-class learning activities. The relevancy of pretest and posttest questions will be evaluated.	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Standard</th> <th>Result</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>FA 2015</td> <td>50</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FA 2016</td> <td>50</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP 2017</td> <td>50</td> <td>90</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Standard	Result	FA 2015	50	10	FA 2016	50	80	SP 2017	50	90			
Year	Standard	Result																			
FA 2015	50	10																			
FA 2016	50	80																			
SP 2017	50	90																			
		FA 2016	Students met standards for more than 80% of students made improvements between pretest and post test, average improvement of 50 points out of 100.	This course is students' first exposure to accounting, some had harder time showing their knowledge in multiple choice question test.	Planning on adding more interactive activities in class to improve learning enthusiasm. A big portion of students in this class have non-qualitative subject majors and are not used to accounting terminology. Multiple choices questions and terminology can be tricky. Planning on adding short answer questions with multiple steps to give students chance to show understanding of different levels.																
		SP 2017	90% of students realized at least a 50% improvement on pretest and posttest.	Students are meeting this learning objective.	Assessment methods, techniques, and content will be required each semester going forward to ensure adequate, accurate assessment.																
pre-test and post-test in Principles of Microeconomics and Macroeconomics, 90 percent of students will see improvement.	internal, formative	FA 2015	34 students completed the pre-test, post test, 33 saw improvement, 97% rate	97 percent very high	some questions added about current economic performance indicators	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Standard</th> <th>Result</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>FA 2015</td> <td>90</td> <td>97</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FA 2016</td> <td>90</td> <td>86</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP 2017</td> <td>90</td> <td>93</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Standard	Result	FA 2015	90	97	FA 2016	90	86	SP 2017	90	93			
Year	Standard	Result																			
FA 2015	90	97																			
FA 2016	90	86																			
SP 2017	90	93																			
		FA 2016	28 students completed the pre-test, post test assessment in two sections of Macroeconomics. 24 students saw improvement - 86% improvement	86% is very close to the assessment standard. I believe the standard and outcomes are reasonable.	I have reviewed the questions on the pre and post test and see one typo that could have affected comprehension.																

		FA 2016	27 students completed the pre-test, post test assessment in two sections of Macroeconomics. 25 students saw improvement - 93% improvement	93% achieves the assessment standard. I believe the standard and outcomes are reasonable.	I have reviewed the questions on the pre and post test and see one typo that could have affected comprehension.	84 82 80
		SP 2017	24 students completed the pre-test, post test assessment in one section of Macroeconomics. 21 students saw improvement - 88% improvement	88% is very close to the assessment standard. I believe the standard and outcomes are reasonable.	Some of the questions that test current knowledge of economic variables have been rewritten to provide more distinct options.	FA 2015 FA 2016 FA 2016 SP 2017 Standard Result
Case study analysis in monetary theory courses, Money and Banking, Capital Markets, 70 percent of students will achieve 70 percent or greater on these assignments	internal, formative	FA 2014	100 percent of students performed above 70% on the case study presentation			Monetary Cases 150 100 50 0 FA 2014 SP 2016 FA 2016 standard result
		SP 2016	100 percent of students performed above 70% on the case study presentation			
		FA 2016	100 percent of the students performed above 70% on the case study presentation	all students enjoyed the case based approach.	more specific evaluation of tools and techniques used should be included	
IS 2300 Module results, 70 percent of students will achieve 70 percent or greater on these questions.	internal, formative	Fall 2015	21/21 or 100% low score: 79 high score: 100 (Woodhouse)			IS 2300 Results 120 100 80 60 40 20 0 FA 2015 SP 2016 FA 2016 SP 2017 standard result
		Spring 2016	19/19 or 100% low score: 84 high score: 100 (Thompson)			
		Fall 2016	5/5 or 100% low score: 84 high score: 100 (cranford)			
		Spring 2017	7/7 or 100% low score: 95 high score: 100 (cranford)		Faculty discussion to review course and suggest alternative course or assessment tool in FA 2017	
capstone, economics seminar, faculty approved final project, 70 percent of the students will achieve 70% or greater on these questions	internal, summative	SP 2015	3 of 5 passed case study with better than 70% (60%)			Economics Case Studies 120 100 80 60 40
		SP 2016	9 of 9 passed: 100%	outcome achieved	none needed	
		SP 2017	six of six students successfully developed case studies using Chandler's theory of the multi-unit business enterprise. 100 percent.	The semester long research project based on seminar readings was very effective in engaging the seniors and each produced a unique project.	The use of seminar discussion to develop and discuss a common theoretical construct was very successful. Explore the introduction of a readings section for lower level classes to duplicate this result.	