

Standard #4 Measurement and Analysis of Student Learning and Performance

Use this table to supply data for Criterion 4.2.

		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,																																																
<p>Goal. (1) Maintain Post University performance above (or minimally at) the benchmark level of national online students as measured by Peregrine's CPC test. (2) Relate Post performance trend to causes (understand what impacts student performance)</p>	<p>Measurement. Peregrine Outbound Common Professional Competencies (CPC) test (external, summative and comparative). Performance trend of Accounting MBSOB undergraduate students on Accounting CPC and an average of all measured CPCs (5), compared to a benchmark of comparable online students.</p> <p>Assessment period. Students were assessed beginning in January, 2012 and have continued to be assessed through July 2016.</p>	<p>Results. Post Accounting students scored substantially above the benchmark on Accounting CPC, and similarly to the benchmark on the average of all tested CPCs.</p>	<p>Learning. Accounting is one of our largest major of MBSOB undergraduate students. We knew that our Accounting students are satisfied, and now it is gratifying to affirm that competitively we are doing well in Accounting.</p>	<p>Action taken. The Accounting program has revised several courses and added an Adaptive Learnig tool (CONNECT) in several classes in 2016. Progress will be tracked and adjusted as necessary in 2017. We will keep monitoring the trend to make sure that the up & down in Post performance of the Accounting major relative to the benchmark is incidental and that the gap is maintained.</p>	<p>Performance of Post Online Accounting Students on Peregrine Outbound test</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year (Number of Tests)</th> <th>All CPCs</th> <th>Accounting CPC</th> <th>Benchmark: All CPCs</th> <th>Benchmark: Accounting CPC</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2012 (27)</td> <td>56</td> <td>58</td> <td>54</td> <td>54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013 (64)</td> <td>56</td> <td>62</td> <td>54</td> <td>54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014 (82)</td> <td>56</td> <td>68</td> <td>54</td> <td>54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015 (73)</td> <td>56</td> <td>64</td> <td>54</td> <td>54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016 (20)</td> <td>56</td> <td>58</td> <td>54</td> <td>54</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year (Number of Tests)	All CPCs	Accounting CPC	Benchmark: All CPCs	Benchmark: Accounting CPC	2012 (27)	56	58	54	54	2013 (64)	56	62	54	54	2014 (82)	56	68	54	54	2015 (73)	56	64	54	54	2016 (20)	56	58	54	54														
Year (Number of Tests)	All CPCs	Accounting CPC	Benchmark: All CPCs	Benchmark: Accounting CPC																																													
2012 (27)	56	58	54	54																																													
2013 (64)	56	62	54	54																																													
2014 (82)	56	68	54	54																																													
2015 (73)	56	64	54	54																																													
2016 (20)	56	58	54	54																																													
<p>Goal. MBSOB performance on GenEd outcome assessment will exceed a score of 2.8 on a 1L to 4H scale.</p>	<p>Measurement. Assessment of MBSOB undergraduate students at the exit level on GenEd student learning outcomes (direct, internal, summative and comparative test).</p> <p>Assessment period. Intermediate results reflecting data collected since Jan 2014 to Jun 2016.</p>	<p>Results. The intermediate results point at a consistent lower performance of MBSOB students vs. other Post students on all GenEd outcomes, which are critical to business students.</p>	<p>Learning. The observed trend can be attributed to (1) demographic difference, (2) programmatic difference, and/or (3) assessment process difference. These alternative causes need to be resolved.</p>	<p>Action taken. To eliminate the possibility of assessor bias, additional assessors in the MBSOB are currently being trained and tasked to re-assess and validate the MBSOB low scores. Those trained will begin to assess MBSOB student learning outcome artifacts against the related assessment rubrics. The assessment process and results will continue to be monitored.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">GenEd Exit Level Outcomes Performance Comparison</th> <th colspan="2">W/O MBSOB (116 Sections, 1,126 Artifacts)</th> <th colspan="2">MBSOB Only (34 Sections, 153 Artifacts)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>AVG</th> <th>STDEV</th> <th>AVG</th> <th>STDEV</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Collaboration</td> <td>2.9</td> <td>0.8</td> <td>2.7</td> <td>1.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Creativity and Innovation</td> <td>2.6</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>1.7</td> <td>0.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Critical Thinking</td> <td>3.2</td> <td>0.7</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>1.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Information Literacy</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>0.8</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>0.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>0.8</td> <td>1.8</td> <td>0.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Technological Fluency</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>0.8</td> <td>2.2</td> <td>0.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All Outcomes, averaged</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>0.8</td> <td>2.2</td> <td>0.9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Performance level scale: 1 (lowest) to 4 (highest)</p>	GenEd Exit Level Outcomes Performance Comparison	W/O MBSOB (116 Sections, 1,126 Artifacts)		MBSOB Only (34 Sections, 153 Artifacts)		AVG	STDEV	AVG	STDEV	Collaboration	2.9	0.8	2.7	1.1	Creativity and Innovation	2.6	1.0	1.7	0.8	Critical Thinking	3.2	0.7	2.5	1.2	Information Literacy	3.0	0.8	2.5	0.9	Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning	3.0	0.8	1.8	0.8	Technological Fluency	3.0	0.8	2.2	0.7	All Outcomes, averaged	3.0	0.8	2.2	0.9
GenEd Exit Level Outcomes Performance Comparison	W/O MBSOB (116 Sections, 1,126 Artifacts)		MBSOB Only (34 Sections, 153 Artifacts)																																														
	AVG	STDEV	AVG	STDEV																																													
Collaboration	2.9	0.8	2.7	1.1																																													
Creativity and Innovation	2.6	1.0	1.7	0.8																																													
Critical Thinking	3.2	0.7	2.5	1.2																																													
Information Literacy	3.0	0.8	2.5	0.9																																													
Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning	3.0	0.8	1.8	0.8																																													
Technological Fluency	3.0	0.8	2.2	0.7																																													
All Outcomes, averaged	3.0	0.8	2.2	0.9																																													
<p>Goal. The overall student perception on the application of the 4 C's in their classes (Creativity & Innovation, Critical Thinking, Communication, Collaboration) will exceed the 75% "Agree" level (in a 5-levels Likert scale).</p>	<p>Measurement. Consolidated MBSOB students response on student surveys conducted every module (indirect, internal, summative test).</p> <p>Assessment period. Over three years (2014-16), 20 modules.</p>	<p>Results. The overall student satisfaction with being challenged to be creative, innovative, critical thinker and collaborative is high and stable. Noticeable lower satisfaction level is observed with the creativity and innovation challenge.</p>	<p>Learning. The observation about 'Creativity and Innovation' may be corroborated with what we are starting to observe (intermediate results) with our Creativity and Innovation GenEd outcome assessment. The MBSOB is lagging our performance goal.</p>	<p>Action taken. We plan to complete the assessment collection and analysis of the GenEd outcome of 'Creativity and Innovation', look at the MBSOB data in isolation and start addressing the observed deficiency once confirmed. The Business School has undertaken an analysis of the creativity scores. Although still above the 75% goal, a deeper dive is needed to determine how we can increase creativity throughout the curriculum.</p>	<p>Undergraduate MBSOB Students Response to Learning of 'Creativity and Innovation' (Undergraduate Online Student Surveys)</p> <p>Legend: - This course required me to be creative and innovative in completing my assigned tasks. - This course required me to apply critical analysis and logical thinking in completing my assigned tasks. - This course required professional and respectful communication.</p> <p>Ordinal Scale: 100% is "Strongly Agree" 75% is "Agree" 50% is "Neutral" 25% is "Disagree" 0% is "Strongly Disagree"</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Sample Size</th> <th>Response 1 (%)</th> <th>Response 2 (%)</th> <th>Response 3 (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2014</td> <td>5,241</td> <td>~85</td> <td>~75</td> <td>~80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015</td> <td>7,333</td> <td>~85</td> <td>~75</td> <td>~80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016</td> <td>3,570</td> <td>~85</td> <td>~75</td> <td>~80</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Sample Size	Response 1 (%)	Response 2 (%)	Response 3 (%)	2014	5,241	~85	~75	~80	2015	7,333	~85	~75	~80	2016	3,570	~85	~75	~80																								
Year	Sample Size	Response 1 (%)	Response 2 (%)	Response 3 (%)																																													
2014	5,241	~85	~75	~80																																													
2015	7,333	~85	~75	~80																																													
2016	3,570	~85	~75	~80																																													
<p>Goal. Instructor-Student Engagement is a hallmark of our University and instructional focus. There is no explicit, absolute level of aspired "engagement"; the engagement performance is tracked relative to the population average, and performance below 1.5 standard deviation under the average is being explored. The general average engagement level should not get below 70%.</p>	<p>Measurement. Consolidated MBSOB graduate students response on selected 12 variables from student surveys conducted every module (indirect, internal, summative test). These 12 variables, divided into five categories of engagement, are used to indicate the Instructor-Students Engagement as perceived by students.</p> <p>Assessment period. Over three years (2014-16), 20 modules.</p>	<p>Results. A steady level of instructor-students engagement was observed for 2014-16.</p>	<p>Learning. The best utility of this tool may be at the program level or even course level to identify opportunities to spot-improve the instructor-students engagement.</p>	<p>Action taken. The tool was shared with the full-time faculty to explore trends in their programs and correlate them with additional information they have about the instructors, towards improvement in teaching practices and student retention. Graduate business school held a training session (with Web-Ex for remote faculty) to review expectations and best practices for all Associate Faculty in September 2016.</p>	<p>Engagement Score Trends, MBSOB Graduate students (Based on student surveys data, 0% to 100% scale)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Engagement Total</th> <th>Discussion Forum</th> <th>Teaching Skills</th> <th>Provided Feedback</th> <th>Communication Channels</th> <th>Recommendation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2014</td> <td>~75</td> <td>~75</td> <td>~75</td> <td>~75</td> <td>~75</td> <td>~75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015</td> <td>~75</td> <td>~75</td> <td>~75</td> <td>~75</td> <td>~75</td> <td>~75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016</td> <td>~75</td> <td>~75</td> <td>~75</td> <td>~75</td> <td>~75</td> <td>~75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Engagement Total	Discussion Forum	Teaching Skills	Provided Feedback	Communication Channels	Recommendation	2014	~75	~75	~75	~75	~75	~75	2015	~75	~75	~75	~75	~75	~75	2016	~75	~75	~75	~75	~75	~75																
Year	Engagement Total	Discussion Forum	Teaching Skills	Provided Feedback	Communication Channels	Recommendation																																											
2014	~75	~75	~75	~75	~75	~75																																											
2015	~75	~75	~75	~75	~75	~75																																											
2016	~75	~75	~75	~75	~75	~75																																											
<p>Goal. Alumni perception of Post education contributing to improvement of their critical thinking, communication and leadership skills is better than "Agree" (on a 5-level Likert scale)</p>	<p>Measurement. The annual alumni survey of all Post alumni students is conducted during Oct-Nov time frame. We explore alumni's perception of the educational value and quality received from Post, and their career and placement advances.</p> <p>Assessment period. The annual alumni survey has been executed three times now, in 2014, 2015 and 2016.</p>	<p>Results. The general trend between 2014-16 is of increased appreciation of the value they received at Post (in improving critical thinking, communication and leadership skills).</p>	<p>Learning. Most responding alumni are from the past 1-3 years, and the results may therefore reflect recent improvements in program quality. We may need additional data points to confirm the observed trends.</p>	<p>Action taken. The alumni survey will continue to substantiate or refute the observed trend so far.</p>	<p>Alumni questions to MBSOB students: "The education I received at Post was a major factor in..." (Scale of 1 "Strongly Disagree" to 5 "Strongly Agree")</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Sample Size</th> <th>Developing and improving my critical thinking and communication skills</th> <th>Improving my leadership skills</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2014</td> <td>137</td> <td>~4.1</td> <td>~4.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015</td> <td>270</td> <td>~4.2</td> <td>~4.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016</td> <td>252</td> <td>~4.3</td> <td>~4.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014</td> <td>34</td> <td>~4.1</td> <td>~4.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015</td> <td>47</td> <td>~4.4</td> <td>~4.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016</td> <td>67</td> <td>~4.4</td> <td>~4.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Sample Size	Developing and improving my critical thinking and communication skills	Improving my leadership skills	2014	137	~4.1	~4.0	2015	270	~4.2	~4.1	2016	252	~4.3	~4.2	2014	34	~4.1	~4.0	2015	47	~4.4	~4.3	2016	67	~4.4	~4.3																
Year	Sample Size	Developing and improving my critical thinking and communication skills	Improving my leadership skills																																														
2014	137	~4.1	~4.0																																														
2015	270	~4.2	~4.1																																														
2016	252	~4.3	~4.2																																														
2014	34	~4.1	~4.0																																														
2015	47	~4.4	~4.3																																														
2016	67	~4.4	~4.3																																														