

**Fermanian School of Business**  
**MBA PLO #1 Assessment**  
**2015-2016**

**Learning Outcome:**

MBA PLO #1: Demonstrate competency of the concepts, models and theories in the core business disciplines.

**Outcome Measure:**

Peregrine Comprehensive Exit Exam Results – implemented Spring 2016

**Criteria for Success:**

Score at or above the average total score and the average disciplinary area scores of national ACBSP schools

**Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):**

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

**Data:**

Peregrine Comprehensive Exam Results - Average	PLNU Spring 2016	PLNU Summer 2016	National ACBSP Schools AY 15-16
Total	55.0	51.0	54.4

Peregrine Comprehensive Exam Results – Disciplinary Areas	PLNU Spring 2016	PLNU Summer 2016	National ACBSP Schools AY 15-16
Accounting	55	48.5	55.6
Business Ethics	61.7	52.6	55.4
Business Finance	51.7	44.8	48.5
Business Integration and Strategic Management	61.7	58.2	56.4
Economics (Macro/Micro)	38.3	51.1	54
Global Dimensions of Business	51.7	52.6	49.3
Management (Operations, HRM, & Organizational Behavior)	60	54.1	56.5
Marketing	58.3	51.5	57.5
Quantitative Techniques/Statistics	56.7	45.2	52.1

**N (Spring 2016) = 6 students**

**N (Summer 2016) = 22 students**

### **Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

It is important to note that PLNU's methodology of administering the Peregrine Comprehensive Exam is delivered in a face-to-face format, proctored and students are given a two-hour time limit to complete the test. According to Peregrine, a majority of the schools who administer the Peregrine Comprehensive Exam do so in an un-proctored online format with time limits higher than two hours. Therefore, there are limitations in comparing PLNU's MBA results to the ACBSP National Results.

The first implementation of the Peregrine Comprehensive Exam was during Spring 2016. Prior to AY 15-16, The ETS exam was administered. The initial results of using the Peregrine Comprehensive Exam for Spring 2016 and Summer 2016 allow for a baseline measurement. However, before making significant program changes, more data is required.

During the Spring 2016 semester, PLNU's average total score was above the ACBSP National Results meeting the criteria for success. However, during the Summer 2016 semester, PLNU's average total score was below the ACBSP National Results; therefore, not meeting the criteria for success.

During the Spring 2016 semester, PLNU's score was at or above the ACBSP National Results for seven of the nine disciplinary areas; therefore, meeting our criteria for success in a majority of the discipline areas. Of the two disciplinary areas in which PLNU did not meet the criteria for success, only one disciplinary area (Economics) was significantly below (defined as 4 or more points) the ACBSP National Results.

During the Summer 2016 semester, PLNU's score was at or above the ACBSP National Results for two of the nine disciplinary areas; therefore, meeting our criteria for success in two of the discipline areas. Of the seven disciplinary areas in which PLNU did not meet the criteria for success, three of the seven disciplinary areas (Accounting, Marketing, and Quantitative Techniques) were significantly below (defined as 4 or more points) the ACBSP National Results. For both Marketing and Quantitative Techniques, the Spring 2016 results were above the ACBSP National Results.

While Spring 2016 and Summer 2016 are the initial semesters of implementing the Peregrine Comprehensive Exam for assessment purposes, and are going to be used primarily for baseline measurement, there are two disciplinary areas that changes were already identified as areas needing improvement – Accounting and Economics. The Peregrine Comprehensive Exam confirms a potential need for improvement in both of these areas – Accounting and Economics were the only two areas in which both semesters showed below ACBSP National Results, and in each case, one semester significantly below (defined as 4 or more points) the ACBSP results. In these two curriculum areas, we have identified areas to expand and improve the content of the courses (described below under changes to be made).

### **Changes to be Made Based on Data:**

Historically, the MBA accounting course (BUS 615) focused primarily on managerial accounting. During the 2015-2016 Academic Year, curriculum changes were proposed to address this issue and increase the amount of financial accounting and financial statement analysis content. These changes will take effect in the Fall of 2016. Therefore, we expect to see improvements in this area in future years.

Historically, the MBA economics course (BUS 630) focused narrowly on certain economic topics. The course content had migrated away from the course description and no longer used a broad economic focus. An opportunity to improve the BUS 630 Economics course was identified during the Fall 2015 semester and confirmed with the Spring 2016 and Summer 2016 Peregrine Economics test results. To refocus the course content, working sessions were held with the faculty teaching the course. Changes to the course content will take effect in the Fall of 2016. Therefore, we also expect to see improvements in this area in future years.

**Fermanian School of Business  
MBA PLO #2 Assessment  
2015-2016**

**Learning Outcome:**

MBA PLO #2: Integrates learning across core business disciplines to identify key strategies and opportunities.

**Outcome Measure:**

BUS 695 Strategic Management - Final Written Case

**Criteria for Success:**

The average total score and the average score for each criterion on the Integrative Learning Rubric will be a 3.0 or higher out of 4.0.

**Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):**

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. **Broad Integrative Knowledge**
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

**Data – Final Written Case:**

**Integrative Learning Rubric – Average Student Scores**

Semester	N	Connecting Business Theory and Practice	Connections Between Business Disciplines	Application of Strategic Models and Tools	Transfer of Business Theory to Practice	Total
Spring 2016	12	3.17	3.00	2.83	2.83	2.94
Summer 2016	44	3.55	3.34	3.18	2.84	3.23

Note: N=number of assessments (2 assessor scores per student)

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

This signature assignment was first implemented in the Spring of 2016. The Spring 2016 BUS 695 Strategic Management course consisted of six students and the summer course consisted of 22 students. These results allow for a baseline measurement.

The average total score on the Integrative Learning Rubric was a 2.94 in Spring 2016 and 3.23 in Summer 2016, meeting the criteria for success in Summer 2016 and falling just below the criteria for success in Spring 2016. In two of the four rubric criteria areas (Connecting Business Theory and Practice and Connections Between Business Disciplines), the criteria for success score of a 3.0 was met for both Spring and Summer 2016. In the rubric criteria area of Application of Strategic Models and Tools, the score was just below 3.0 in Spring 2016; however, the score improved to 3.18 in Summer 2016 thereby

Approved by Assessment Committee 10/13/2016  
Approved by FSB Faculty 10/18/16

meeting the criteria. The Transfer of Business Theory to Practice rubric criteria area scores fell just below our criteria for success at 2.83 in Spring 2016 and 2.84 in Summer 2016.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**

The Summer 2016 total average score, two of the four rubric criteria areas in Spring 2016, and three of the four rubric criteria areas in Summer 2016 met the criteria for success score of 3.0. The scores that did not meet the criteria for success are just below 3.0. As these are baseline scores, we will not make significant changes at this point. We will continue to collect data and monitor the results to determine if changes are needed, in particular the Transfer of Business Theory to Practice rubric criteria area will be closely monitored.

## INTEGRATIVE LEARNING RUBRIC

Point Loma Nazarene University MBA Program Learning Outcome #2: Integrate learning across core business disciplines to identify key strategies and opportunities.

Criteria	Very Good 4	Good 3	Acceptable 2	Poor 1
<b>Connecting Business Theory and Practice</b>	Meaningfully synthesizes connections between business theories and corporate practice to deepen understanding of the business disciplines and to broaden own points of view.	Effectively selects and develops connections between business theories and corporate practice to illuminate concepts/theories/frameworks of the business discipline.	Compares connections between business theories and corporate practice to infer differences, as well as similarities, and acknowledge perspectives other than own.	Identifies connections between business theories and corporate practice.
<b>Connections Between Business Disciplines</b>	Independently synthesizes or draws conclusions by combining examples, facts, or theories from all relevant business disciplines.	Independently connects examples, facts, or theories from multiple business disciplines.	Connects a limited number of examples, facts, or theories from multiple business disciplines.	Presents a very limited number of examples, facts, or theories from multiple business disciplines.
<b>Application of Strategic Models and Tools</b>	Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing all relevant strategic models and tools to perform corporate strategic analysis.	Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing multiple strategic models and tools to perform corporate strategic analysis.	Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a limited number of strategic models and tools to perform corporate strategic analysis.	Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a very limited number of strategic models and tools to perform corporate strategic analysis.
<b>Transfer of Business Theory to Practice</b>	Applies all relevant business theories to recommend new business strategy elements.	Applies multiple business theories to recommend new business strategy elements.	Uses limited business theories to present limited business strategy elements.	Uses basic business theory to present very limited business strategy elements.

Average Score: \_\_\_\_\_ (Total/# of criteria)

Note 1: All criteria are weighted equally

Note 2: This rubric was adapted from the AAC&U Integrative Learning Value Rubric

**Fermanian School of Business**  
**MBA PLO #3 Assessment**  
**2015-2016**

**Learning Outcome:**

MBA PLO #3: Identify business issues and recommend solutions using analytical and critical thinking skills.

**Outcome Measure:**

BUS 670 Financial Management - Finance Case Study Analysis

**Criteria for Success:**

The average total score and the average score for each criterion of the Analytical and Critical Thinking Rubric will be a 3.0 or higher out of 4.0.

**Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):**

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

**Data:**

**Analytical and Critical Thinking Rubric – Average Student Scores:**

Semester	N	Explanation of Issues	Evidence and Analysis	Influence of Context and Assumptions	Student's Position	Conclusions and Related Outcomes	Total
Fall 2015	22	3.27	3.00	2.95	3.05	3.00	3.05
Spring 2016	28	3.32	3.04	3.00	2.89	2.89	3.03
Summer 2016	42	3.36	3.29	3.21	3.24	2.71	3.16

Note: N=number of assessments (2 assessor scores per student)

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

This signature assignment was first implemented in the Fall of 2015. The average total score on the Analytical and Critical Thinking Rubric was above 3.0 in all three semesters, therefore meeting the overall criteria for success. In two of the rubric criteria areas, Influence of Context and Assumptions and Student's Position, the criteria for success score was met in two of the three semesters; however, fell just below 3.0 in one of the three semesters. The rubric criteria area, Conclusions and Related Outcomes, has fallen below 3.0 in two of the three semesters, and exhibits a small downward trend.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**

The criteria for success score of a 3.0 was met for the overall rubric score and a majority of the rubric criteria scores in both the Fall 2015, Spring 2016 and Summer 2016 semesters.

Approved by Assessment Committee 10/13/2016  
Approved by FSB Faculty 10/18/16

We will continue to collect data and closely monitor the results in the areas of Influence of Context and Assumptions and Student's Position to determine if changes are needed. With regard to improving students ability to logically develop Conclusions and Related Outcomes, professors in courses where Analytical and Critical Thinking are introduced and developed will include additional content and focus on how to better incorporate data, evidence and other information to support conclusions.

## ANALYTICAL & CRITICAL THINKING RUBRIC

Point Loma Nazarene University MBA Program Learning Outcome #3: Identify business issues and recommended solutions using analytical and critical thinking skills.

Criteria	Very Good 4	Good 3	Acceptable 2	Poor 1
<b>Explanation of Issues</b>	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.
<b>Evidence and Analysis</b>	Data and information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive financial analysis or synthesis. Data is thoroughly analyzed and tools (Excel) are appropriately used.	Data and information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent financial analysis or synthesis. Data is analyzed and tools (Excel) are appropriately used in most circumstances.	Data and information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent financial analysis or synthesis. Data is analyzed and tools (Excel) are used in some circumstances.	Data and information is taken from source(s) without any financial interpretation/evaluation. Data is not analyzed and tools (Excel) are used very little or not at all.
<b>Influence of Context and Assumptions</b>	Thoroughly analyzes own and case assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies own and case assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.
<b>Student's Position</b>	Specific position is thorough and complete, taking into account the complexities of the financial issue. Limits of position are acknowledged. Supporting sources are used extensively.	Specific position takes into account the complexities of the financial issue. Supporting sources are used somewhat.	Specific position is stated, but does not consider the complexities of the financial issue. Supporting sources are used minimally.	Specific position is stated, but it is simplistic and obvious. Support is not used.
<b>Conclusions and Related Outcomes</b>	Conclusions and related outcomes are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of data and information; related outcomes are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to data and information (because data and information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes are identified clearly.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the data and information discussed; related outcomes are oversimplified.

Average Score: \_\_\_\_\_ (Total/# of criteria)

Note 1: All criteria are weighted equally

Note 2: This rubric was adapted from the AAC&U Analytical and Critical Thinking Value Rubric

**Fermanian School of Business  
MBA PLO #6 Assessment  
2015-2016**

**Learning Outcome:**

MBA PLO #6: Convey ideas and decisions clearly through effective communication.

**Outcome Measure:**

BUS 695 Strategic Management – Final Written Case

We will implement an Oral Communication assessment in the Spring of 2017 in BUS 650 Operations Management.

**Criteria for Success:**

The average total score and the average score for each criterion of the Written Communication Rubric will be a 3.0 or higher out of 4.0.

**Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):**

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

**Data:**

**Written Communication Rubric – Average Student Score:**

Semester	N	Context of and Purpose for Writing	Content Development	Genre and Disciplinary Conventions	Sources and Evidence	Control of Syntax and Mechanics	Total
Spring 2016	12	3.17	3.08	3.00	2.92	3.25	3.08
Summer 2016	44	3.59	3.32	3.32	3.05	3.14	3.28

Note: N=number of assessments (2 assessor scores per student)

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

This signature assignment was first implemented in the Spring of 2016. The Spring 2016 BUS 695 Strategic Management course consisted of six students and the summer course consisted of 22 students. These results allow for a baseline measurement.

The average total score on the Written Communication Rubric was a 3.08 for Spring 2016 and 3.28 for Summer 2016, which exceeds the overall criteria for success. In four of the five rubric criteria areas, the criteria for success score of a 3.0 was met or exceeded for Spring 2016. In one rubric criteria area (Sources and Evidence), the score fell just below the criteria for success at a 2.92. For all five rubric criteria areas, the criteria for success score of 3.0 was exceeded for Summer 2016.

Approved by Assessment Committee 10/13/2016  
Approved by FSB Faculty 10/18/16

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**

The overall criteria for success of a 3.0 was exceeded in both Spring 2016 and Summer 2016. The one rubric criteria area in Spring 2016 that did not meet the criteria for success (Sources and Evidence) had previously been recognized as an opportunity for improvement.

As of the 15/16 Academic Year, all papers in the MBA Program are required to be cited using proper APA format. Beginning in the 16/17 Academic Year, the use of proper APA format and citations will be covered in the BUS 655 Contemporary Marketing, as this is an early course in the sequence of classes. Also, full-time faculty will be provided APA guidelines and taught proper APA format by the librarian.

Other than the implementation of APA format, no major curriculum changes will be made at this time, as we view these scores as a baseline. We will continue to collect data and monitor the results to determine if changes are needed.

## WRITTEN COMMUNICATION RUBRIC

Point Loma Nazarene University MBA Program Learning Outcome #6: Convey ideas and decisions clearly through effective communication.

Criteria	Very Good 4	Good 3	Acceptable 2	Poor 1
<b>Context of and Purpose for Writing</b>	Demonstrate a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned task(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose and to the assigned task(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).
<b>Content Development</b>	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.
<b>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions</b>	Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices.	Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices.	Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation.	Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation.
<b>Sources and Evidence</b>	Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing; appropriate use of APA format.	Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing; appropriate use of APA format.	Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support the ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of writing; uses APA format.	Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing; limited use of APA format.
<b>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</b>	Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.	Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.

Average Score: \_\_\_\_\_ (Total/# of criteria)

Note 1: All criteria are weighted equally

Note 2: This rubric was adapted from the AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric

**Fermanian School of Business**  
**MBA PLO #7 Assessment**  
**2015-2016**

**Learning Outcome:**

MBA PLO #7: Demonstrate the ability to work collaboratively and function as an effective team member.

**Outcome Measure:**

1. MarkStrat Team-Based Simulation (Direct)
2. Peer Evaluation Survey (Indirect)

**Criteria for Success:**

1. MarkStrat Simulation - 70% of the teams will increase the Share Price Index in the Markstrat Team-Based Simulation
2. Peer Evaluation Survey - The average score for each criterion on the Teamwork Rubric will be a 3.5 or higher out of 4.0.

**Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):**

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

**Data:**

**MarkStrat Simulation Results**

**Percentage of Teams Increasing the SPI:**

Semester	N	MarkStrat Team-Based Simulation
Fall 2015	5	60%
Spring 2016	4	75%
Summer 2016	4	100%

Note: N=number of teams

**Peer Evaluation Survey Results**

**Teamwork Rubric – Average Student Score:**

Semester	N	Contributes to Team Meetings	Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members	Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings	Fosters Constructive Team Climate	Responds to Conflict
Fall 2015	15	3.75	3.75	3.71	3.80	3.75
Spring 2016	10	4.0	4.0	3.97	3.97	3.97
Summer 2016	15	3.69	3.67	3.62	3.82	3.76

Note: N=number of students that completed the Peer Evaluation Survey

Approved by Assessment Committee 10/13/2016  
Approved by FSB Faculty 10/18/16

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

These signature assignments were first implemented in the Fall of 2015. The MarkStrat Simulation is a direct measure of the performance of student teams. The criteria for success is defined as 70% of the teams will increase the Share Price Index (SPI) in the results of the simulation. For Fall 2015, 60% of the teams increased the SPI. For Spring 2016, 75% of the teams increased the SPI, and for Summer 100% of the teams increased the SPI. This data exhibits a positive trend.

The Peer Evaluation Survey is an indirect measure of how each student works within their team. The students evaluate each other using the Teamwork rubric. All rubric criteria scores exceeded the criteria for success.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**

All of the criteria for success were met or exceeded for this learning outcome, with the exception of Percentage of the Teams Increasing the SPI for Fall 2015. As this data exhibits a positive trend, no changes are recommended at this time.

## TEAMWORK RUBRIC

Point Loma Nazarene University MBA Program learning outcome #7: Demonstrate the ability to work collaboratively and function as an effective team member.

Criteria	Very Good 4	Good 3	Acceptable 2	Poor 1
<b>Contributes to Team Meetings</b>	Helps the team move forward by articulating the merits of alternative ideas or proposals.	Offers alternative solutions or courses of action that build on the ideas of others.	Offers new suggestions to advance the work of the group.	Shares ideas but does not advance the work of the group.
<b>Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members</b>	Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by both constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others as well as noticing when someone is not participating and inviting them to engage.	Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others.	Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by restating the views of other team members and/or asking questions for clarification.	Engages team members by taking turns and listening to others without interrupting.
<b>Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings</b>	Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough, comprehensive and advances the project. Proactively helps other team members complete their assigned tasks to a similar level of excellence. Work is of very high quality.	Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough, comprehensive, and advances the project. Work is good quality.	Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished advances the project. Work is of fair quality.	Completes all assigned tasks by deadline. Work needs to be supplemented or edited by others on the team.
<b>Fosters Constructive Team Climate</b>	Supports a constructive team climate by doing all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication</li> <li>• Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.</li> <li>• Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.</li> <li>• Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.</li> </ul>	Supports a constructive team climate by doing any three of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication</li> <li>• Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.</li> <li>• Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.</li> <li>• Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.</li> </ul>	Supports a constructive team climate by doing any two of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication</li> <li>• Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.</li> <li>• Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.</li> <li>• Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.</li> </ul>	Supports a constructive team climate by doing any one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication</li> <li>• Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.</li> <li>• Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.</li> <li>• Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.</li> </ul>
<b>Responds to Conflict</b>	Addresses destructive conflict directly and constructively, helping to manage/resolve it in a way that strengthens overall team cohesiveness and future effectiveness.	Identifies and acknowledges conflict and stays engaged with it.	Redirecting focus toward common ground, toward task at hand (away from conflict).	Passively accepts alternate viewpoints/ideas/opinions.

Average Score: \_\_\_\_\_ (Total/# of criteria)

Note 1: All criteria are weighted equally

Note 2: This rubric was adapted from the AAC&U Teamwork Value Rubric