

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2018-19

Consult with your college dean's office regarding due date and how to submit. Deans will submit reports to the Office of Assessment & Accreditation annually by October 15.

Unit/Program Name: Master of Business Administration

Contact Name(s) and Email(s) Ashley Layman, Ashley.layman@indstate.edu

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual data/results?</p>	<p>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report? Can expand on this in Part 2.</p>
<p>1. Students will demonstrate the ability to use business problem solving techniques. G3, G4, G5</p>	<p>1. Questions from the Major Field Test (MFT) identified as pertaining to business problem solving techniques. The MFT was administered during "Exit Day" in fall 2017, spring 2018, and summer 2018 to all graduating MBA students. 60 questions on the MFT pertain to problem solving techniques. 2. Scaled-response exit interview question: "The MBA program improved my business problem solving techniques." The exit interview is required of all graduating students. 2017-2018 data was used by the Graduate Committee in their analysis. 3. A) Exit interview question: Students are asked to rank the learning outcomes from the one they learned the most (rating of 1) to the one they learned the least (rating</p>	<p>1. Any MFT question where our student average is lower than the national average by 20 percentage points is identified as a deficiency and needs remediation. 2. Likert-type responses should be in upper half. 3. A) The average scores calculated for the learning outcomes would be relatively equal. B) The Graduate Committee will perform a content analysis of the open-ended question to identify themes indicating a need for improvement. The expectation is that there are no consistent themes among the student responses.</p>	<p>1. 63 students took the MFT from fall 2017-summer 2018. An analysis of the results showed no deficiencies pertaining to the problem solving techniques learning outcome. That is, there were no questions in which our student average was lower than the national average by 20 percentage points. In fact, the question with the lowest variance for this learning outcome varied by -12.5 percentage points. The average variance between our student average and the national average on questions pertaining to this learning outcome was -1.26. 2. 63 students completed the exit interview and answered the scaled-response question. The results showed that 98.41% of our students either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. This is</p>	<p>1. No changes were made in response to the assessment results for this learning goal. 2. The graduate committee discussed changing the definition of a deficiency (expectation for student performance) on the MFT. They committee would like to revisit this in 2019-2020. 3. The graduate committee would like to revise the standard for the likert-type responses during the 2019-2020 cycle to be more specific.</p>

	<p>of 4). B) Then, the students are asked to “Explain your logic for how you ranked problem solving techniques.”</p>		<p>well above our standard of 50%. It was determined no remediation was necessary. As a further step, the committee broke the results down by program and found 97.44% in the campus MBA program agreed or strongly agreed, 100% in the ProMBA program agreed or strongly agreed, and 100% in the MBA in Education Leadership agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. No remediation was necessary. 3. A) This learning outcome had an average ranking of 2.19 out of 4. B) The Graduate Committee did not identify any deficiencies in their analysis. The data suggests students are learning the most in problem solving and business knowledge.</p>	
<p>2. Students will demonstrate the ability to apply business knowledge consistent with contemporary best practices. G1, G3, G4,</p>	<p>1. Questions from the Major Field Test (MFT) identified as pertaining to business knowledge. The MFT was administered during “Exit Day” in fall 2017, spring 2018 and summer 2018 to all graduating MBA students. 56 questions on the MFT pertain to business knowledge. 2. Scaled-response exit interview question: “The MBA program improved my ability to apply business knowledge consistent with contemporary best practices.” The exit interview is required of all</p>	<p>1. Any question where our student average is lower than the national average by 20 percentage points is identified as a deficiency and needs remediation. 2. Likert-type responses should be in upper half. 3. A) The average scores calculated for the learning outcomes would be relatively equal. B) The Graduate Committee will perform a content analysis of the open-ended question to identify themes indicating a need for improvement. The</p>	<p>1. 63 students took the MFT from fall 2017-summer 2018. An analysis of the results showed no deficiencies pertaining to the business knowledge learning outcome. That is, there were no questions in which our student average was lower than the national average by 20 percentage points. The two questions with the lowest variance for this learning outcome varied by -16.9 and -16.1 percentage points. The average variance between our student average and the</p>	<p>1. No changes were made in response to the assessment results for this learning goal. 2. The graduate committee discussed changing the definition of a deficiency (expectation for student performance) on the MFT. They committee would like to revisit this in 2019-2020. 3. The graduate committee would like to revise the standard for the likert-type responses during the 2019-2020 cycle to be more specific.</p>

	<p>graduating students. 2017-2018 data was used by the Graduate Committee in their analysis.</p> <p>3. A) Exit interview question: Students are asked to rank the learning outcomes from the one they learned the most (rating of 1) to the one they learned the least (rating of 4). B) Then, the students are asked to "Explain your logic for how you ranked business knowledge."</p>	<p>expectation is that there are no consistent themes among the student responses.</p>	<p>national average on questions pertaining to this learning outcome was 1.64.</p> <p>2. 63 students completed the exit interview and answered the scaled-response question. The results showed that 95.24% of our students either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. This is well above our standard of 50%. It was determined no remediation was necessary. As a further step, the committee broke the results down by program and found 92.31% in the campus MBA program agreed or strongly agreed, 100% in the ProMBA program agreed or strongly agreed, and 100% in the MBA in Education Leadership agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. No remediation was necessary.</p> <p>3. A) This learning outcome had an average ranking of 1.82 out of 4. B) The Graduate Committee did not identify any deficiencies in their analysis. The data suggests students are learning the most in problem solving and business knowledge.</p>	
<p>3. Students will demonstrate the ability to work effectively in a team environment. G1, G2, G4, G5</p>	<p>1. Questions from the Major Field Test (MFT) identified as pertaining to teamwork skills. The MFT was administered during "Exit Day" in fall 2017, spring 2018, and summer 2018 to all graduating MBA</p>	<p>1. Any question where our student average is lower than the national average by 20 percentage points is identified as a deficiency and needs remediation.</p>	<p>1. 63 students took the MFT from fall 2017-summer 2018. An analysis of the results showed no deficiencies pertaining to the teamwork learning outcome. That is, there were no questions in</p>	<p>1. No changes were made in response to the assessment results for this learning goal. 2. The graduate committee discussed changing the definition of a deficiency (expectation for student</p>

	<p>students. Only three questions on the MFT pertain to teamwork skills.</p> <p>2. Data provided by faculty who require peer assessments as a result of team projects. Data from four different courses was collected.</p> <p>3. Scaled-response exit interview question: "The MBA program improved my ability to work effectively in a team environment." The exit interview is required of all graduating students. 2017-2018 data was used by the Graduate Committee in their analysis.</p> <p>4. A) Exit interview question: Students are asked to rank the learning outcomes from the one they learned the most (rating of 1) to the one they learned the least (rating of 4). B) Then, the students are asked to "Explain your logic for how you ranked teamwork skills."</p>	<p>2. Student peer assessment ratings should be in upper half.</p> <p>3. Likert-type responses should be in upper half.</p> <p>4. A) The average scores calculated for the learning outcomes would be relatively equal. B) The Graduate Committee will perform a content analysis of the open-ended question to identify themes indicating a need for improvement. The expectation is that there are no consistent themes among the student responses.</p>	<p>which our student average was lower than the national average by 20 percentage points. The question with the lowest variance for this learning outcome varied by -7 percentage points. The average variance between our student average and the national average on questions pertaining to this learning outcome was 0.03.</p> <p>2. Peer assessment results from four courses was received. Results from MBA 610 delivered in the campus MBA program during fall 2017 show an average peer assessment score of 89 out of 100 (89%) for the 29 students enrolled. Data from MBA 610 delivered in the MBA in Education Leadership program in summer 2017 show an average score of 100 out of 100 (100%) for the nine students enrolled. Data from MBA 621 delivered in the campus MBA program during spring 2018 show an average peer assessment score of 98.23 out of 100 (98.23%). Data from MIS 690 delivered in the ProMBA program during the summer 2018 semester show an average peer assessment score of 21.62 out of 25 (86%). These results are well above our standard that the averages</p>	<p>performance) on the MFT. They committee would like to revisit this in 2019-2020.</p> <p>3. During the 2019-2020 academic year, the committee will reevaluate the standard for the peer assessment data in hopes of making in more specific.</p> <p>4. The graduate committee would like to revise the standard for the likert-type responses during the 2019-2020 cycle to be more specific.</p>
--	---	--	---	---

			<p>must be in the upper half. No deficiencies were identified.</p> <p>3. 63 students completed the exit interview and answered the scaled-response question. The results showed that 82.54% of our students either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. This is well above our standard of 50%. It was determined no remediation was necessary. As a further step, the committee broke the results down by program and found 76.92% in the campus MBA program agreed or strongly agreed, 90% in the ProMBA program agreed or strongly agreed, and 92.86% in the MBA in Education Leadership agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. No remediation was necessary.</p> <p>4. A) This learning outcome had an average ranking of 2.87 out of 4. B) The Graduate Committee did not identify any deficiencies in their analysis. The data suggests students are learning the most in problem solving and business knowledge. The responses pertaining to teamwork and global business were more varied by student.</p>	
4. Students will demonstrate an advanced understanding of global business practices.	1. Questions from the Major Field Test (MFT) identified as pertaining to global business practices. The MFT was administered during "Exit	1. Any question where our student average is lower than the national average by 20 percentage points is	1. 63 students took the MFT from fall 2017-summer 2018. An analysis of the results showed no deficiencies pertaining to the global	1. In response to the results from the International Business Assessment, the management faculty teaching MBA 690 were contacted and

<p>G1, G2, G3, G4, G5</p>	<p>Day” in fall 2017, spring 2018, and summer 2018 to all graduating MBA students. Only five questions on the MFT pertain to global business practices.</p> <p>2. Questions from the international business assessment, a 20 point assessment developed by the graduate committee that is given on “Exit Day.”</p> <p>3. Scaled-response exit interview question: “The MBA program improved my understanding of global business practices.” The exit interview is required of all graduating students. 2017-2018 data was used by the Graduate Committee in their analysis.</p> <p>4. A) Exit interview question: Students are asked to rank the learning outcomes from the one they learned the most (rating of 1) to the one they learned the least (rating of 4). B) Then, the students are asked to “Explain your logic for how you ranked global business practices.”</p>	<p>identified as a deficiency and needs remediation.</p> <p>2. The percentage of our students answering correctly on each question should be greater than 45%.</p> <p>3. Likert-type responses should be in upper half.</p> <p>4. A) The average scores calculated for the learning outcomes would be relatively equal. B) The Graduate Committee will perform a content analysis of the open-ended question to identify themes indicating a need for improvement. The expectation is that there are no consistent themes among the student responses.</p>	<p>business learning outcome. That is, there were no questions in which our student average was lower than the national average by 20 percentage points. The question with the lowest variance for this learning outcome varied by -3.5 percentage points. The average variance between our student average and the national average on questions pertaining to this learning outcome was 5.92.</p> <p>2. 63 students took the international business assessment from fall 2017-summer 2018. Results show that more than 45% of our students answered each question correctly. Thus, no deficiencies were identified. However, the committee indicated that questions 7, 8, and 14 are approaching the standard (61.9%, 60.32%, and 61.9% correct, respectively) and may need additional focus.</p> <p>3. 63 students completed the exit interview and answered the scaled-response question. The results showed that 90.48% of our students either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. This is well above our standard of 50%. It was determined no remediation was necessary. As a further step, the</p>	<p>asked that the concepts from questions 7 and 14 be addressed. The marketing faculty teaching MBA 624 were asked to address the concepts from question 8. The faculty were asked to provide evidence of remediation by December 1, 2019.</p> <p>2. The graduate committee discussed changing the definition of a deficiency (expectation for student performance) on the MFT. They committee would like to revisit this in 2019-2020.</p> <p>3. The graduate committee would like to revise the standard for the likert-type responses during the 2019-2020 cycle to be more specific.</p>
---------------------------	--	--	--	--

			<p>committee broke the results down by program and found 92.31% in the campus MBA program agreed or strongly agreed, 70% in the ProMBA program agreed or strongly agreed, and 100% in the MBA in Education Leadership agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. No remediation was necessary.</p> <p>4. A) This learning outcome had an average ranking of 3.11 out of 4. B) The Graduate Committee did not identify any deficiencies in their analysis. The data suggests students are learning the most in problem solving and business knowledge. The responses pertaining to teamwork and global business were more varied by student.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Note: If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit "tab" to add a new row.

Helpful Hints for Completing this Table

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference. Note any alignment with professional standards, as applicable.
- b. Each outcome should be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam should be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program's outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses. Describe or attach any evaluation tools such as rubrics, scales, etc.
- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of "3" to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.)
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., 85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).

Part 1b: Review of Student Success Data & Activities

The data below has been summarized from a report distributed to the Scott College of Business Graduate Programs Office from the College of Graduate and Professional Studies. The data includes cohort sizes for our fall term (by program) for the last six years. In addition, one-year retention rates and four-year graduation rates have also been included. The full data file provided to the Graduate Programs Office is available on Blackboard with this report file.

Cohort Sizes	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Campus MBA	14	17	17	28	20	20
ProMBA	24	19	22	17	17	13
MBA EL	n/a	n/a	n/a	12	13	9
Total Cohort	38	36	39	57	50	42

The first MBA EL cohort started in summer 2016

1 Year Retention Rates	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Campus MBA	12	86%	11	65%	15	88%	23	82%	16	80%	20	100%
ProMBA	22	92%	17	89%	20	91%	14	82%	16	94%	11	85%
MBA EL	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a*	n/a	2*	15%	n/a*	n/a
Total Cohort	34	89%	28	78%	35	90%	37/45*	82%	34/39*	87%	31/33*	94%

**MBA EL students start in summer and finish in following summer.*

This data has been adjusted to remove graduates from one-year retention rate totals in 2016-2018.

4 YR Graduation Rates	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Campus MBA	12	86%	11	65%	15	88%	23	82%	14	70%	n/a	n/a
ProMBA	19	79%	16	84%	17	77%	12	71%	13	76%	n/a	n/a
MBA EL	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	12	100%	13	100%	9	100%
Total Cohort	31	82%	27	75%	32	82%	47	82%	40	80%	9	21%

What worked well in supporting student success this year?

In 2018-2019, the Scott College of Business Graduate Committee decided to focus on two broad objectives: 1) increase the retention of students in the on-campus and Professional MBA programs 2) identify tutoring opportunities for MBA students in an effort to increase student performance and degree completion.

To support the first objective, the Graduate Committee asked the Graduate Programs Office to implement a system to track all students who start the program, monitor student progress and enrollment status throughout the program, communicate regularly with students who have not enrolled, and keep detailed notes when students do not enroll/re-enroll. Thus, we have developed a simple Excel spreadsheet to track students by program and cohort (start term) that provides their enrollment status by term and graduation date. This system works well and allows us to easily view who has not enrolled each semester. We have a column to enter the student's graduation date and another to make detailed notes to which we can refer in the future. Our office procedures have evolved so that we communicate regularly with those that need to schedule an advisement appointment and those who have been advised but have not registered. Communication methods used are primarily email and phone.

To support the second objective, the Graduate Committee asked the Graduate Programs Office to work with faculty teaching MBA core classes to create a database of top performing students suitable for tutoring, to contact the Center for Student Success about tutoring opportunities available for MBA students, and to communicate regularly with MBA students regarding tutoring opportunities available. The Graduate Programs was successful in developing a database of top performing students suitable for tutoring. In fact, this list has been used to make several successful tutoring connections for MBA students this past year.

What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus in the coming year?

The most significant opportunity for improvement this academic year is tutoring. Anecdotal evidence suggests that most students who request tutoring are looking for help in subjects that have a more quantitative focus such as: MBA 612 (statistics), MBA 613 (accounting), MBA 622 (corporate finance), and MBA 623 (supply chain). The Graduate Programs Office will be reaching out to various units on campus, in addition to the Center for Student Success, to identify any tutoring opportunities that are available. As a further measure, the Interim Director will personally reach out to the faculty teaching these courses to identify tutoring opportunities and other resources that are available as well as current top performing students who could serve as tutors.

Part 2: Continuous Quality Improvement

Reflect on the information shared above regarding student learning, success, and career readiness.

During the 2018-2019 academic year, the Scott College of Business Graduate Committee and Graduate Programs Office completed the second assessment cycle of the new learning outcomes adopted in August 2016. As indicated in the matrix above, no deficiencies were identified this cycle.

Over the past couple of years, results from the MFT indicated that our students consistently underperformed and were deficient on a question pertaining to breakeven analysis. In discussing this with the faculty, it was determined the question did not provide all of the relevant information (fixed and variable costs) to answer the question correctly. The assessment results from this cycle revealed a new version of the MFT was implemented in fall 2017 and two new questions pertaining to breakeven analysis were incorporated. Our students performed better than the national average of both questions by .4 and .5 percentage points respectively. Further analysis of the MFT revealed that our students actually performed better than the national average on one question pertaining to strategic marketing and innovation by 23.8 percentage points. The committee looked at the overall average variance and found our students were performing similar to the national average (.4% difference).

Conversations among the Graduate Committee members about outcomes assessment indicated that we may need to redefine the performance expectations (deficiency definitions) of our measures to be more specific and rigorous. For example, on the Major Field Test (MFT) we identify a deficiency when our student average score on each question is lower than the national average by more than 20 percentage points. The two questions with the lowest scores from this cycle showed our students underperformed by 16.9 and 16.1 percentage points, respectively. With only a few deficiencies identified on the MFT over the past few years, it may be necessary to narrow our standard.

Three questions on the International Business Assessment were flagged as approaching our current deficiency standard and may need additional focus. Thus, the faculty teaching MBA 690, the culminating experience course for the program, were contacted and asked to remediate the two questions that addressed globalization and internationalization, respectively. The faculty teaching MBA 624, strategic marketing management, were contacted and asked to remediate the third question that pertains to international business negotiations. The faculty were asked to include an assignment, lecture topic, or other way to cover these near-deficient items in future course offerings.

During the 2019-2020 assessment cycle, the Graduate Committee will first analyze the measures of each learning outcome with the intent of revising the level of performance (or definition of a deficiency) on the Major Field Test, exit interview scaled-response questions, peer review data, and international business assessment. The committee will then assess the four learning outcome using the following measures: 1) questions from the MFT that have been mapped to each learning outcome, 2) peer review data from group projects across the MBA curriculum, 3) an international business assessment, 4) exit interview scaled response questions to gauge student perceptions of learning, and 5) exit interview questions asking students to rank the learning outcomes from the one they learned the most to least and then to provide rationale on their ranking. Additionally, the graduate committee will develop and administer a survey of the Scott College of Business faculty to determine what content is currently covered and what resources are used in the MBA curriculum pertaining to teamwork and global business practices.

When the results indicate a deficiency in a particular subject, topic, or outcome, the appropriate core courses and faculty teaching those courses are identified. The Graduate Programs Office contacts the faculty via email and asks for the subject or topic to be addressed in their courses and to provide evidence of the change. Aggregate results are shared at the annual faculty and staff meeting each spring.

Dear Ashley,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2018-19 with the Assessment Council. You will find feedback and ratings on the rubric below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but were not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President's Office and the Provost's team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: M.B.A. Business Administration	Overall Rating: Exemplary (3.00/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Learning outcomes are clear, specific, and measurable, and they are aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcomes to demonstrate graduate-level learning.• Courses/assignments/tests used as measures for assessment are clearly described. There is a good mix of direct and indirect assessment, as well as multiple points of assessment for each learning outcome. This provides a more robust picture of student learning from which to draw analysis.• Exceptionally clear information about expected and actual student performance and how performance was evaluated. The analysis provided excellent cohort and individual insights that allowed for targeting of areas of weakness despite the high achievement of outcomes. This will help you continue to strengthen student learning and maintain strong performance over time.• Plans to address areas of weakness and strengthen assessment by reconsidering expectations thresholds are clear, reasonable, and achievable. A plan is in place to follow-up on impact of changes.• Faculty are clearly involved in the sharing and use of findings to improve student learning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I know the Business Core is the focus of alignment to the AACSB standards in SCOB, but note any alignment of your learning outcomes, as applicable.• For the International Business areas requiring remediation, consider a formative measure from a courses assessment(s) to determine if you're on the right track. I noted that you were going to require some evidence of remediation, so this may be something you're already doing.

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Student Learning Outcomes</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.</p>	<p>No learning outcomes are identified for assessment or the outcomes that are identified are not linked to program outcomes aligned with program coursework (e.g. – curriculum map) or are not measurable.</p>
<p>Performance Goals & Measures</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools used to measure student performance are described and were reviewed for validity or trustworthiness prior to use (note this in the report; attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome.</p> <p>Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

Analysis & Results	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p> <p>Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with little description of analysis.</p>	<p>No data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided.</p>
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.</p>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p>	<p>Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn)</p>
Overall Rating	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped