	Standard #4	Measurement and Aı	nalysis of Studer	nt Learning and Per	formance					
Use this table to supply data for Criterion 4.2. (Figure 4.2 in self-study)										
Performance Indicator	Definition									
Student Learning Results	A student learning outcome is one that measures a specific competency attainment. 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). Add these to the description of the measurement instrument in column two:  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 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.									
D 6 M		G IP II	Analysis of Results	L c m i						
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 points preferred) (3-5 data					
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?		85	85	85	85	85
What is your goal?	(Indicate type of instrument) direct, formative, internal, comparative					Spring, 2010	Spring, 2012	Spring, 2013	Spring, 2014	Spring, 2016
MFT - Overall  Goal: 85th percentile	Biannual testing Direct Summative External Comparative	The scores dropped a bit. We had a change in the way that we sampled students to participate and some faculty turnover.	We are evaluating are curriculum and the score subscales to determine what we need to do.	Next step: Focused faculty discussion of results.	100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	85	86	98	92	80
MFT - Accounting	Biannual testing Direct Summative External Comparative	The scores dropped a bit. We had a change in the way that we sampled students to participate and some faculty turnover.	CPA scores remain high; keep an eye on these results.	Next step: Focused faculty discussion of results.	90 80 80 Spring, 2015pring, 2015pring, 2015pring, 2015pring, 2016	82	73	91	92	79
MFT - Economics	Biannual testing Direct Summative External Comparative	The scores dropped a bit. We had a change in the way that we sampled students to participate and some faculty turnover.	Need to keep focus on curriculm and rigor.	Next step: Focused faculty discussion of results.	100 90 80 70 Spring, Spring, Spring, Spring, Spring, Spring, 2010 2012 2013 2014 2016	52	88	98	92	87
MFT - Management	Biannual testing Direct Summative External Comparative	The scores dropped a bit. We had a change in the way that we sampled students to participate and some faculty turnover.	Need to keep focus on curriculm and rigor.	Next step: Focused faculty discussion of results.	100 90 80 70 60 Spring, Spring, Spring, Spring, Spring, 2010 2012 2013 2014 2016	95	81	99	98	84

MFT - Quantitiave Business Analysis	Biannual testing Direct Summative External Comparative	The scores dropped a bit. We had a change in the way that we sampled students to participate and some faculty turnover.	Need to keep focus on curriculm and rigor.	Next step: Focused faculty discussion of results.	100 90 80 80 Spring, Spring, Spring, Spring, Spring, Spring, 2010 2012 2013 2014 2016	81	Ş	95 9	0 7	73
MFT - Finance	Biannual testing Direct Summative External Comparative	The scores rose a bit.	Gratified by this result	Next step: Focused faculty discussion of results.	100 90 80 Spring, Spring, Spring, Spring, Spring, 2010 2012 2013 2014 2016	83	; ç	95 7	7 8	82
MFT - Marketing	Biannual testing Direct Summative External Comparative	The scores remain high.	Gratified by this result	Next step: Focused faculty discussion of results.	100 90 80 80 Spring, Spring, Spring, Spring, Spring, Spring, 2010 2012 2013 2014 2016	89	ı ç	9 9	9 9	91
MFT - Legal and Social	Biannual testing Direct Summative External Comparative	The scores rose a bit.	Gratified by this result	Next step: Focused faculty discussion of results.	100 90 80 70 60 Spring, Spring, Spring, Spring, Spring, Spring, 2010 2012 2013 2014 2016	71	ģ	98 8	5 8	89
MFT - Information Systems	Biannual testing Direct Summative External Comparative	This result is very surprising and disconcerting	There is an issue here that we need to uncover and address.	Next step: Focused faculty discussion of results.	100 90 80 80 Spring, Spring, Spring, Spring, Spring, Spring, 2010 2012 2013 2014 2016	87	, ě	94 8	8 3	34
MFT - International	Biannual testing Direct Summative External Comparative	The scores dropped a bit. We had a change in the way that we sampled students to participate and some faculty turnover.	Need to keep focus on curriculm and rigor.	Next step: Focused faculty discussion of results.	100 90 80 80 Spring, Spring, Spring, Spring, Spring, 2010 2012 2013 2014 2016	94	ļ. ģ	9 9	9 8	81
					DATE 201 National Pass Rate 459			013 20		015 9%
CPA - GCC Pass Rate Goal: To be above the national average	Annual results Direct Summative External Comparative	CPA pass rates returned to usual high level	Keep up the good work	No action needed.	90% 90% 80			1% 67		