

Standard #4 Measurement and Analysis of Student Learning and Performance

Use this table to supply data for Criterion 4.2.

Performance Indicator	Definition
Student Learning Results	<p>A student learning outcome is one that measures a specific competency attainment. <i>Examples of a direct assessment (evidence) of student learning attainment that might be used include: capstone performance, third-party examination, faculty-designed examination, professional performance, licensure examination.</i> Add these to the description of the measurement instrument in column two:</p> <p>Direct - Assessing student performance by examining samples of student work</p> <p>Indirect - Assessing indicators other than student work such as getting feedback from the student or other persons who may provide relevant information.</p> <p>Formative – An assessment conducted during the student’s education.</p> <p>Summative – An assessment conducted at the end of the student’s education.</p> <p>Internal – An assessment instrument that was developed within the business unit.</p> <p>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, or results from a vendor providing comparable data.</p>

Performance Measure	What is your measurement instrument or process?	Current Results	Analysis of Results	Action Taken or Improvement made	Insert Graphs or Tables of Resulting Trends (3-5 data points preferred)																																								
Measurable goal	Do not use grades.	What are your current results?	What did you learn from the results?	What did you improve or what is your next step?																																									
What is your goal?	(Indicate type of instrument) direct, formative, internal, comparative																																												
<p>PSLO #1: Comprehend (Demonstrate understanding of business functions and management concepts. Filter, organize and interpret data relevant to making business decisions)</p> <p>Students will demonstrate knowledge in a broad range of business subjects, including accounting, economics, finance, law, management, marketing, information systems, quantitative analysis and international business. ETS Major Field Test Scores (Overall) Goal: Achieve an average institutional score that is at least 95% of the domestic institutional mean</p>	<p>ETS Major Field Test (Overall Scores) This is a <i>direct, summative, external, comparative</i> assessment of student results. Students take the ETS Major Field Test in Business during their last year of the program, in the Management Seminar (capstone) course. Institutional means are drawn directly from over 30,000 test takers across the nation and used as the basis for comparison. Traditionally scoring below these averages, a benchmark was set in order to bring the institutional results closer to those national averages. The ETS was required as a mandatory component of the capstone course (with varying degrees of impact on a student's grade) as a "requirement of the course". However, some students do not make the effort to perform at their best in the test.</p>	<p>Data is available for 3 years (2020 was skipped due to the pandemic). The benchmark was met in the first two of these data cycles (95.7%, 95.1%) and missed in the last year of testing (93%). There is a slight downward trend in performance, which should be monitored.</p>	<p>In the three years before the present analysis, the benchmark was exceeded, a trend we hoped to see continue. While the present results do exceed the pre-2016 scores, there is a mild downward trend since 2018. Previous gains in performance since making this test a "course requirement" are still being sustained despite the mild downward trend. The downward trend should be monitored.</p>	<p>We continue to use the ETS subscription for in-depth analysis of content areas and subcontent areas. This has allowed discussion on a granular level regarding what topics our students score well on vs. where they perform well below the average. Examining the domains and subdomains has helped us determine what we do well, what might need more focus in the curriculum, and which subjects which might be affecting scores, yet not match an educational goal of our program. For example, "Segmenting consumer and organizational markets" is something we emphasize in several courses, culminating in Management Seminar. We scored 114% of national average score in this domain. However, in another aspect of marketing ("strategic marketing planning") we scored well below the mean (72%) and this is an area where we might want to expand in IT courses as well as other areas in the curriculum. Yet another marketing area where we scored low (69%) is "Marketing research and information technology tools" but that is not an area of curricular focus except for students in the Marketing specialization. This depth of analysis has yielded constructive discussions and curricular analysis among faculty members to guide changes to course objectives.</p>	<table border="1"> <caption>ETS Scores: Comparison to National Mean Scores</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>N</th> <th>% of Mean</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2018</td> <td>79</td> <td>95.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2019</td> <td>79</td> <td>95.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2020</td> <td>0</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2021</td> <td>50</td> <td>93.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	N	% of Mean	2018	79	95.7%	2019	79	95.1%	2020	0	-	2021	50	93.0%																									
Year	N	% of Mean																																											
2018	79	95.7%																																											
2019	79	95.1%																																											
2020	0	-																																											
2021	50	93.0%																																											
<p>PSLO #1: Comprehend (Demonstrate understanding of business functions and management concepts. Filter, organize and interpret data relevant to making business decisions)</p> <p>ETS Major Field Test Scores (Topics): Achieve an average institutional score within 95% of each of the 9 ETS subject areas of Accounting, Economics, Management, Quantitative Analysis, Finance, Marketing, Legal/Social Environment, Information Systems, and International Business.</p>	<p>ETS Major Field Test (Subject Scores) This is a <i>direct, summative, external, comparative</i> assessment of student results. In 2018, 79 students were tested, 2019, 79 students were tested, and in 2021, 50 students were tested. There are 9 subject areas being assessed by the ETS MFT. The combined overall score of the MFT (above) is not specific enough to determine areas of deficiency, as the aggregate can mask strengths and weaknesses. Analysis by subject area allows us to focus on the impact of curricular changes and to be guided towards sub-categories for further analysis</p>	<p>While we hover close to it, the benchmark was only met in the areas in Information Systems and in International Business, in only the earliest of data cycles contained in this analysis (2018). This is consistent with previous strengths, but there are other areas in which we previously excelled (i.e., finance, quant.) where we are now lagging well below the benchmark.</p>	<p>Previously, certain topics tended to be carrying the overall score while others were consistently weaker and the gap between these performance in different areas was more pronounced. In the present assessment results, scores are clustered more tightly with less disparity between subject areas. Unlike in previous years, the benchmark for Econ was not met in any cycle. Topics emphasized in our program (accounting, management, finance, and information systems) provide results more consistently at or close to the benchmark. Relative to the performance in other subjects, International Business scores have improved due to recognition of previous weaknesses in this area and additional focus being placed on this subtopic.</p>	<p>Analysis on the sub-content areas revealed specific topics in which students did not perform well. The faculty reviewed when, where, and if coverage of these specific topics was required to meet our program level outcomes. A review of course-level outcomes and objectives show that some specific content was not emphasized because it wasn't directly supporting program level outcomes. Similarly, a review of course level outcomes for areas we do emphasize (such as IT concepts) indicated that students performed well in those areas. Next steps: Continue to review sub-content areas and adjust coverage of areas that are deemed important to our curriculum. Review benchmarks for each subject area (they need not all be set at 95% if the results are consistently strong in certain areas in the future).</p>	<table border="1"> <caption>ETS Topic Scores as a % of National Mean Scores</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Subject Area</th> <th>2018</th> <th>2019</th> <th>2021</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Acc</td> <td>~90%</td> <td>~85%</td> <td>~90%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Econ</td> <td>~80%</td> <td>~85%</td> <td>~75%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mgmt</td> <td>~90%</td> <td>~90%</td> <td>~85%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Quant</td> <td>~90%</td> <td>~90%</td> <td>~85%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fin</td> <td>~90%</td> <td>~85%</td> <td>~85%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mark</td> <td>~90%</td> <td>~85%</td> <td>~85%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leg/Soc</td> <td>~90%</td> <td>~85%</td> <td>~85%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>InfoSys</td> <td>~95%</td> <td>~90%</td> <td>~85%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Int'l</td> <td>~90%</td> <td>~85%</td> <td>~75%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Subject Area	2018	2019	2021	Acc	~90%	~85%	~90%	Econ	~80%	~85%	~75%	Mgmt	~90%	~90%	~85%	Quant	~90%	~90%	~85%	Fin	~90%	~85%	~85%	Mark	~90%	~85%	~85%	Leg/Soc	~90%	~85%	~85%	InfoSys	~95%	~90%	~85%	Int'l	~90%	~85%	~75%
Subject Area	2018	2019	2021																																										
Acc	~90%	~85%	~90%																																										
Econ	~80%	~85%	~75%																																										
Mgmt	~90%	~90%	~85%																																										
Quant	~90%	~90%	~85%																																										
Fin	~90%	~85%	~85%																																										
Mark	~90%	~85%	~85%																																										
Leg/Soc	~90%	~85%	~85%																																										
InfoSys	~95%	~90%	~85%																																										
Int'l	~90%	~85%	~75%																																										

Use this table to supply data for Criterion 4.2.

Performance Indicator	Definition																															
<p>Student Learning Results</p>	<p>A student learning outcome is one that measures a specific competency attainment. <i>Examples of a direct assessment (evidence) of student learning attainment that might be used include: capstone performance, third-party examination, faculty-designed examination, professional performance, licensure examination.</i> Add these to the description of the measurement instrument in column two: Direct - Assessing student performance by examining samples of student work Indirect - Assessing indicators other than student work such as getting feedback from the student or other persons who may provide relevant information. Formative – An assessment conducted during the student’s education. Summative – An assessment conducted at the end of the student’s education. Internal – An assessment instrument that was developed within the business unit. External – An assessment instrument that was developed outside the business unit. Comparative – Compare results between classes, between online and on ground classes, between professors, between programs, between campuses, or compare to external results such as results from the U.S. Department of Education Research and Statistics, or results from a vendor providing comparable data.</p>																															
<p>PSLO #2: Assess (Evaluate applicable economic, financial, ethical, statistical, legal, and strategic perspectives to support sound business decisions) Students can demonstrate understanding of the various roles and functional areas within a business by making and justifying strategic decisions over multiple time periods. DelVal students should perform at or above the mean score for all Business Strategy Game participants worldwide (10-40k students compete in this simulation worldwide each semester)</p>	<p>Business Strategy Game Overall Performance This is a <i>direct, formative, and external</i> assessment. Students compete in teams in a business simulation modeling the global athletic shoe industry for 8-10 years over the semester. They are responsible for assessing market conditions, determining how to respond to the actions of competitors, forging a long-term direction and strategy for their company, forecasting upcoming sales volumes, and making decisions relating to all functions of the operation, with emphasis placed on the integration and impact of all business decisions. Based on weekly review of the ongoing CSR score and financial performance, interventions to improve this score can be discussed and implemented.</p>	<p>Teams performed at or near the worldwide average for overall company performance in all years except 2020. The rapid pivot to online and the various barriers presented by the pandemic may have impacted students' performance in the simulation</p>	<p>The range of scores (average lowest to average top scores) was generally narrower for our students than it was for the worldwide population, indicating that we have a fairly consistent performance across our student population.</p>	<p>Changes Made: We continue to make improvements to the advising process to enforce prerequisite compliance for this course to ensure optimal preparation. Continued to offer tutoring for Finance course (most critical prerequisite) Increased number of faculty who teach this course and who are involved in serving as "board members" to help students have an earlier understanding of the capstone course Lowered caps on these class sections to allow better student engagement Next Steps: Continue to monitor the benchmark; Incorporate the simulation somewhere earlier in a student's program so that less time is spent learning the simulation itself.</p>	<table border="1"> <caption>BSG Simulation Performance Data</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Semester</th> <th>DelVal Average Score (%)</th> <th>Global Average (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>SP18</td><td>~95</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr><td>FL18</td><td>~95</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr><td>SP19</td><td>~105</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr><td>FL19</td><td>~105</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr><td>SP20</td><td>~85</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr><td>FL20</td><td>~105</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr><td>SP21</td><td>~110</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr><td>FL21</td><td>~95</td><td>100</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Semester	DelVal Average Score (%)	Global Average (%)	SP18	~95	100	FL18	~95	100	SP19	~105	100	FL19	~105	100	SP20	~85	100	FL20	~105	100	SP21	~110	100	FL21	~95	100
Semester	DelVal Average Score (%)	Global Average (%)																														
SP18	~95	100																														
FL18	~95	100																														
SP19	~105	100																														
FL19	~105	100																														
SP20	~85	100																														
FL20	~105	100																														
SP21	~110	100																														
FL21	~95	100																														
<p>PSLO #2: Assess (Evaluate applicable economic, financial, ethical, statistical, legal, and strategic perspectives to support sound business decisions) Critical thinkers "gather and assesses relevant information, using abstract ideas to interpret it effectively comes to well-reasoned conclusions and solutions, testing them against relevant criteria and standards" (Foundation for Critical Thinking). Goal: When evaluating students' internship performance, employers rate 90% of students as having "outstanding" or "very good" critical thinking skills, and at least 50% as "outstanding".</p>	<p>E360 (Internship) Student Evaluation: All students must complete at least one 3-credit internship as a requirement for graduation. Employers must provide detailed ratings of student performance. For this outcome, employer assessment of students' critical thinking skills as demonstrated by the student during his/her internship are aggregated for analysis twice per year. This is an <i>indirect, summative, external</i> assessment of student performance.</p>	<p>Goal #1 (50% "Outstanding") was met in 3 out of 7 data cycles. Goal #2 (90% "Outstanding" or "Very Good") was also met in only 3 of the data cycles. Fall 2020 offered the worst results, possibly attributable to the pandemic.</p>	<p>There may be some subjectivity in differentiating between "Outstanding" and "Very Good" and so there's much variability in the results for Goal #1.</p>	<p>Next steps: Encourage more business faculty to teach sections of the pre-internship course ("DelVal Experience II") Continue to monitor the level of "Outstanding" ratings. Consider performing deeper analysis to look for trends in job types, student specializations, grade level, etc.</p>	<table border="1"> <caption>Employer Ratings of Students' Critical Thinking Skills Data</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Semester</th> <th>% Outstanding</th> <th>% Very Good</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>FL18 & SU18</td><td>~35</td><td>~45</td></tr> <tr><td>SP19 & WN19</td><td>~35</td><td>~45</td></tr> <tr><td>FL19 & SU19</td><td>~50</td><td>~40</td></tr> <tr><td>SP20 & WN20</td><td>~50</td><td>~40</td></tr> <tr><td>FL20 & SU20</td><td>~35</td><td>~30</td></tr> <tr><td>SP21 & WN21</td><td>~50</td><td>~30</td></tr> <tr><td>FL21 & SU21</td><td>~55</td><td>~35</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Semester	% Outstanding	% Very Good	FL18 & SU18	~35	~45	SP19 & WN19	~35	~45	FL19 & SU19	~50	~40	SP20 & WN20	~50	~40	FL20 & SU20	~35	~30	SP21 & WN21	~50	~30	FL21 & SU21	~55	~35			
Semester	% Outstanding	% Very Good																														
FL18 & SU18	~35	~45																														
SP19 & WN19	~35	~45																														
FL19 & SU19	~50	~40																														
SP20 & WN20	~50	~40																														
FL20 & SU20	~35	~30																														
SP21 & WN21	~50	~30																														
FL21 & SU21	~55	~35																														
<p>PSLO #3: Communicate (Use verbal and written communication techniques which engage an audience by conveying business concepts professionally and credibly) E360 employer rating of interpersonal skills Goal: When evaluating students' internship performance, employers rate 90% of students as having "outstanding" or "very good" interpersonal skills, and at least 50% as "outstanding".</p>	<p>E360 (Internship) Student Evaluation: employer assessment of students' interpersonal skills as demonstrated by the student during his/her internship. This is an <i>indirect, summative, external</i> assessment of student performance.</p>	<p>Goal #1 (50% "Outstanding") was met in all but data cycle 2. Goal #2 (90% "Outstanding" or "Very Good") was also missed in that data cycle and in data cycle #5</p>	<p>There may be some subjectivity in differentiating between "Outstanding" and "Very Good" and so there's much variability in the results for Goal #1.</p>	<p>Next steps: Encourage more business faculty to teach sections of the pre-internship course ("DelVal Experience II") Continue to monitor the level of "Outstanding" ratings Consider raising the benchmark for Goal #2 (as this translates to, "better than average" by the options listed) if we continue to meet or beat it.</p>	<table border="1"> <caption>Employer Ratings of Students' Interpersonal Skills Data</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Semester</th> <th>% Outstanding</th> <th>% Very Good</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>FL18 & SU18</td><td>~65</td><td>~25</td></tr> <tr><td>SP19 & WN19</td><td>~40</td><td>~45</td></tr> <tr><td>FL19 & SU19</td><td>~50</td><td>~40</td></tr> <tr><td>SP20 & WN20</td><td>~75</td><td>~20</td></tr> <tr><td>FL20 & SU20</td><td>~50</td><td>~35</td></tr> <tr><td>SP21 & WN21</td><td>~70</td><td>~25</td></tr> <tr><td>FL21 & SU21</td><td>~60</td><td>~40</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Semester	% Outstanding	% Very Good	FL18 & SU18	~65	~25	SP19 & WN19	~40	~45	FL19 & SU19	~50	~40	SP20 & WN20	~75	~20	FL20 & SU20	~50	~35	SP21 & WN21	~70	~25	FL21 & SU21	~60	~40			
Semester	% Outstanding	% Very Good																														
FL18 & SU18	~65	~25																														
SP19 & WN19	~40	~45																														
FL19 & SU19	~50	~40																														
SP20 & WN20	~75	~20																														
FL20 & SU20	~50	~35																														
SP21 & WN21	~70	~25																														
FL21 & SU21	~60	~40																														

Use this table to supply data for Criterion 4.2.

Performance Indicator	Definition																															
<p>Student Learning Results</p>	<p>A student learning outcome is one that measures a specific competency attainment. <i>Examples of a direct assessment (evidence) of student learning attainment that might be used include: capstone performance, third-party examination, faculty-designed examination, professional performance, licensure examination.</i> Add these to the description of the measurement instrument in column two: Direct - Assessing student performance by examining samples of student work Indirect - Assessing indicators other than student work such as getting feedback from the student or other persons who may provide relevant information. Formative – An assessment conducted during the student’s education. Summative – An assessment conducted at the end of the student’s education. Internal – An assessment instrument that was developed within the business unit. External – An assessment instrument that was developed outside the business unit. Comparative – Compare results between classes, between online and on ground classes, between professors, between programs, between campuses, or compare to external results such as results from the U.S. Department of Education Research and Statistics, or results from a vendor providing comparable data.</p>																															
<p>PSLO #3: Communicate (Use verbal and written communication techniques which engage an audience by conveying business concepts professionally and credibly) "Board of Directors" presentation evaluations as rated by faculty from other courses, members of the business community, etc. Goal: Board of Directors scores averaging 85 or higher.</p>	<p>BSG Simulation Mock Board Presentation This is a <i>direct, summative, and internal</i> assessment of team presentations to mock Board of Directors of company. At the culmination of the Management Seminar (capstone) course, students present the results of their semester-long management of a global footwear company in the Business Strategy Game simulation. A "mock board of directors" composed of various faculty, career counselors, and members of the business community to play the role of the BoD of the company the students ran for 8-10 years. Students are evaluated by their audience for their presentation skills, ability to communicate business concepts and decisions, professional conduct during the presentation, etc.</p>	<p>The goal was achieved in 4 of the 6 data cycles measured. It was missed slightly (83) in Spring 2018, but missed rather dramatically (74) in Fall 2020 (which is consistent with other levels of performance in this semester, possibly attributable to sudden changes made due to the pandemic.</p>	<p>The variability of scoring by rater can be great, so the data is more reliable in the semesters where we get a good turnout of "board" members. Each dimension of the presentation score is rated on a numeric scale (1-5) with little description of the varying degrees of performance, thus allowing for subjectivity in the evaluation. Student feedback is provided immediately by the audience first acting "in character" (board members) and then from the perspective of the participants real-life role (teacher, business owner, career counselor, etc.). Sometimes it is very difficult to recruit participants to serve as board members for 6+ hours of student presentations over a 1-2 day period. Therefore, even on the same day we might have 60-80% turnover of audience members from one presentation to another, making the scoring difficult to</p>	<p>Next Steps: Faculty have worked to develop a scoring instrument that is more descriptive and objective but have not reached agreement on wording for a new instrument. It would be advantageous to provide a rubric which describes the expectations for each score level. That would help to reduce the variability of ratings by increasing the objective standards being used. This would help to identify true areas for improvement instead of focusing on a total score. We also might want to consider recording and archiving these presentations to allow students to review their own performance and to offer future students as a point of reference.</p>	<table border="1"> <caption>(Mock) Board of Directors Presentation Scores</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Term</th> <th>Average Rating</th> <th>Goal</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SP18</td> <td>83</td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP19</td> <td>86</td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP20</td> <td>88</td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FL20</td> <td>74</td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP21</td> <td>86</td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FL21</td> <td>86</td> <td>85</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Term	Average Rating	Goal	SP18	83	85	SP19	86	85	SP20	88	85	FL20	74	85	SP21	86	85	FL21	86	85						
Term	Average Rating	Goal																														
SP18	83	85																														
SP19	86	85																														
SP20	88	85																														
FL20	74	85																														
SP21	86	85																														
FL21	86	85																														
<p>PSLO #4: Collaborate (Apply collaborative behaviors to harness the strengths within diverse groups to meet organizational need in a team setting) Students will be recognized by their peers for their effectiveness as contributors to group projects. Goal: Average peer evaluation score of 90.</p>	<p>BSG Simulation Peer Evaluation This is a <i>direct, summative, and external</i>** student assessment of teammates with whom they worked for a high-stakes, semester-long project. **The instrument used in data cycles 1, 2, and 3 was internal, but we have migrated to one integrated in the BSG simulation (with some overlap). *Scores for data cycles 1, 2, and 3 have been normalized to account for an average 18-point difference between the instruments (as calculated by comparing averages from 4 overlapping data cycles).</p>	<p>The benchmark was met in the first five data cycles but missed in the most recent 3.</p>	<p>During the assessment period, we continued to vacillate between two peer evaluation instruments, using a combination of an internal, numeric scoring system and a more descriptive peer evaluation that was embedded in the simulation program. The new form provides narrative descriptions of the specific types of behaviors expected of team members. It is also completed online (as opposed to a paper form in class), so confidentiality of responses are assured. There were four semesters where both instruments were used for the same student groups and that data was used to normalize the results for the semesters in which only the paper-based instrument was used.</p>	<p>Having descriptions of behaviors teammates should exhibit helps to establish a common understanding; the use of the new form has been expanded. During the transition, both versions were used for the same team members and the average of the two scores was used for this analysis. Students provided much more detail in the (new) online form. Next steps: Move exclusively to the use of the new form and enforce 100% student participation Consider adding a mid-semester peer evaluation so that this tool can be formative as well.</p>	<table border="1"> <caption>BSG Peer Evaluations</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Term</th> <th>Average Peer Evaluation Score</th> <th>Goal</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SP18* (N=23)</td> <td>78</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FL18* (N=16)</td> <td>78</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP19* (N=28)</td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FL19 (N=22)</td> <td>78</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP20 (N=42)</td> <td>76</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FL20 (N=17)</td> <td>60</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP21 (N=27)</td> <td>73</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FL21 (N=23)</td> <td>73</td> <td>75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Term	Average Peer Evaluation Score	Goal	SP18* (N=23)	78	75	FL18* (N=16)	78	75	SP19* (N=28)	75	75	FL19 (N=22)	78	75	SP20 (N=42)	76	75	FL20 (N=17)	60	75	SP21 (N=27)	73	75	FL21 (N=23)	73	75
Term	Average Peer Evaluation Score	Goal																														
SP18* (N=23)	78	75																														
FL18* (N=16)	78	75																														
SP19* (N=28)	75	75																														
FL19 (N=22)	78	75																														
SP20 (N=42)	76	75																														
FL20 (N=17)	60	75																														
SP21 (N=27)	73	75																														
FL21 (N=23)	73	75																														