**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 following:

| Peregrine MBA Comprehensive Exit Exam Criteria for Success | |
|---|---|
| **Disciplinary Area** | **Score** |
| Accounting | 50 |
| Business Ethics | 50 |
| Business Finance | 45 |
| Strategic Management | 55 |
| Economics (Macro/Micro) | 50 |
| Global Dimensions of Business | 50 |
| Management (OPS, HR, OB) | 55 |
| Marketing | 50 |
| Legal Environment of Business | TBD |

**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

**Approved by FSB Full Faculty 9/20/17**
**Approved by Assessment Committee 9/13/17**

**Longitudinal Data:**

| | N | Graduate Total | Accounting | Business Ethics | Business Finance | Strategic Management | Economics (Macro/Micro) | Global Dimensions of Business | Management (OPS, HR, OB) | Marketing | Legal Environment of Business |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria for Success** | | | 50 | 50 | 45 | 55 | 50 | 50 | 55 | 50 | |
| 2015-2016 | 33 | 51.7 | 49.7 | 54.2 | 46.1 | 58.8 | 48.8 | 52.4 | 55.2 | 52.7 | |
| 2016-2017 | 51 | 47.7 | 44.7 | 51 | 43.9 | 51.4 | 45.5 | 45.3 | 52.4 | 52 | |

**N= number of students completing the exam**

**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 2.5 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 2.5 hours. Therefore, criteria for success were determined considering: (a) average total score and average disciplinary area scores of National and Region 7 ACBSP schools, and (b) the FSB's MBA curriculum focus.

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 on the Peregrine Comprehensive Exam from AY15-16 and AY16-17 allow for a baseline measurement. Testing on the disciplinary area of Legal Environment of Business will be implemented in AY17-18.

During AY15-16, the criteria for success were exceeded for six of the eight disciplinary areas. The area of Accounting fell slightly below (within 0.3 points) the criteria for success. The remaining area of Economics fell below (within 1.2 points) the criteria for success.

During AY16-17, the criteria for success were exceeded for two of the eight disciplinary areas. As indicated in the table above, the areas of Accounting, Business Finance, Strategic Management, Economics, Global Dimensions of Business and Management fell below (within 1.1-5.3 points) the criteria for success.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**
The average scores in the areas of Business Finance, Strategic Management and Global Dimensions of Business fell below the criteria for success in one of the two years; therefore, scores for these areas will be closely monitored over the next several academic years to determine if curricular changes are needed. Management also fell below in only one year; however, opportunities for improvement in this area have been recognized (as indicated below).

Accounting, Economics and Management have been recognized as opportunities for improvement:

- 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. Initial changes were implemented Fall of 2016, with additional content being added in Spring 2018. 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 AY15-16 Peregrine Economics test results. To refocus the course content, working sessions were held with the faculty teaching the course. Changes to the course content were implemented in the Fall of 2016. Therefore, we also expect to see improvements in this area in future years.
- Historically, the MBA management course (BUS 660) did not focus on all essential areas of management. During the 2016-2017 Academic Year, curriculum changes were proposed to address this issue and increase the amount of content in certain management areas. Initial changes will be implemented in AY17-18. Therefore, we expect to see improvements in this area in future years.

**Fermanian School of Business**
**MBA PLO #2 Assessment**
**2016-2017**

**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 |
| **Fall 2016** | 22 | 3.23 | 3.18 | 3.09 | 3.18 | 3.17 |
| **Summer 2017** | 34 | 3.09 | 3.39 | 2.61 | 2.03 | 2.78 |

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

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**
The average total score on the Integrative Learning Rubric exceed the criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) in Summer 2016 and Fall 2016, but fell below the criteria for success in Spring 2016 and Summer 2017.

In two of the four rubric criteria areas, Connecting Business Theory and Practice and Connections Between Business Disciplines, the criteria for success was met for each semester. In the rubric criteria area of Application of Strategic Models and Tools, the average score fell below the criteria for success in two of the four semesters. The Transfer of Business Theory to Practice rubric criteria area scores have fallen below the criteria for success three of the last four semesters.

**Approved by FSB Full Faculty 9/20/17**
**Approved by Assessment Committee 9/13/17**

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**
Application of Strategic Models and Tools and Transfer of Business Theory to Practice have been recognized as opportunities for improvement.

- Curricular: Beginning AY17-18, Faculty teaching BUS695 will put more focus on the instruction of, further clarify the expectations of, and provide more feedback regarding both the analysis and recommendation sections of all case study assignments throughout the semester. It is anticipated that these changes in the course will result in improvement in the students' ability to choose relevant models and tools for strategic analysis and the application of theories to strategy recommendations.
- Assignment clarification: Through the assessment process, a need was recognized to improve the clarity of the assignment instructions, which will be implemented in AY17-18.

# 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Connecting Business Theory and Practice** | 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. |
| **Connections Between Business Disciplines** | 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. |
| **Application of Strategic Models and Tools** | 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. |
| **Transfer of Business Theory to Practice** | 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

**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 |
| **Fall 2016** | 20 | 3.60 | 3.25 | 3.45 | 3.45 | 3.35 | 3.42 |
| **Spring 2017** | 40 | 3.45 | 3.65 | 3.15 | 3.13 | 2.95 | 3.27 |
| **Summer 2017** | 38 | 3.18 | 3.03 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 2.82 | 3.01 |

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

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**
The average total score on the Analytical and Critical Thinking Rubric, as well as the rubric criteria areas of Explanation of Issue and Evidence and Analysis, exceeds the criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) in all six semesters. In two of the rubric criteria areas, Influence of Context and Assumptions and Student's Position, the criteria for success was met in five out of the six semesters. Scores in the rubric criteria area Conclusions and Related Outcomes have fallen below the criteria for success in four of the six semesters and exhibit variability.

**Approved by FSB Full Faculty 9/20/17**
**Approved by Assessment Committee 9/13/17**

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**
Conclusions and Related Outcomes has been recognized as an opportunity for improvement. Beginning AY17-18, the assignment assessed with the Analytical and Critical Thinking Rubric will be changed to the final case study of the semester rather than the first. Faculty teaching BUS670 will put more focus on the instruction of, further clarify the expectations of, and provide more feedback regarding the recommendations and conclusions sections of all case study assignments throughout the semester. These changes will allow additional time to develop the students' ability to draw more logical and well-supported 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Explanation of Issues** | 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. |
| **Evidence and Analysis** | 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. |
| **Influence of Context and Assumptions** | 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. |
| **Student's Position** | 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. |
| **Conclusions and Related Outcomes** | 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

**Learning Outcome:**
MBA PLO #4: Evaluate the impact of business decisions in a global context.

**Outcome Measure:**
BUS 635 International Business – Final Exam Question

**Criteria for Success:**
The average total score and the average score for each criterion on the Global Context 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

**Initial Data:**

**Global Context Rubric – Average Student Scores**

| Semester | N | Perspective | Cultural Diversity | Applying Knowledge | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Spring 2017** | 46 | 3.07 | 2.96 | 2.65 | 2.89 |
| **Summer 2017** | 28 | 2.61 | 2.54 | 2.68 | 2.61 |

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

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**
This signature assignment was first implemented in the Spring of 2017. This allows for a baseline measurement.

The average total score on the Global Context Rubric was 2.89 in Spring 2017, just below the overall criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0), and 2.61 in Summer 2017. In one of the three rubric criteria areas, Perspective, the criteria for success was met in Spring 2017 but fell below in Summer 2017. The scores for the remaining two rubric criteria areas, Cultural Diversity and Applying Knowledge, fell below the criteria for success both semesters.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**
As these are baseline scores, curricular changes will not be made at this time. Data will continue to be collected and results will be monitored to determine if changes are needed; however, during AY 17-18, content in the BUS 635 course will be analyzed to determine if opportunities for improvement exist in regards to students better achieving the learning outcome.

In addition, through the assessment process, a need was recognized to clarify the exam question.

**Approved by FSB Full Faculty 9/20/17**
**Approved by Assessment Committee 9/13/17**

# GLOBAL CONTEXT RUBRIC

Point Loma Nazarene University MBA Program learning outcome #4: Evaluate the impact of business decisions in a global context.

| Criteria | Very Good 4 | Good 3 | Acceptable 2 | Poor 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Perspective Taking** | Evaluates and applies diverse perspectives to complex business decisions in the face of multiple and even conflicting positions (i.e. cultural, disciplinary, and ethical). | Synthesizes other perspectives (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical) when investigating business decisions. | Identifies and explains multiple perspectives (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical) when exploring business decisions. | Identifies multiple perspectives while maintaining a value preference for own positioning (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical). |
| **Cultural Diversity** | Adapts and applies a deep understanding of multiple worldviews, experiences, and power structures while initiating meaningful interaction with other cultures to address significant global problems. | Analyzes substantial connections between the worldviews, power structures, and experiences of multiple cultures historically or in contemporary contexts, incorporating respectful interactions with other cultures. | Explains and connects two or more cultures historically or in contemporary contexts with some acknowledgement of power structures, demonstrating respectful interaction with varied cultures and worldviews. | Describes the experiences of others historically or in contemporary contexts primarily through one cultural perspective, demonstrating some openness to varied cultures and worldviews. |
| **Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Global Business Contexts** | Applies knowledge and skills to implement sophisticated, appropriate, and workable solutions to address complex global business problems using multiple perspectives. | Plans and evaluates more complex solutions to global business challenges that are appropriate to their contexts using multiple perspectives. | Formulates practical yet elementary solutions to global business challenges that use more than one perspective. | Defines global business challenges in basic ways, including a limited number of perspectives. |

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 #5 Assessment**
**2016-2017**

**Learning Outcome:**
MBA PLO #5: Analyze the ethical impacts of executive-level decision making.

**Outcome Measure:**
BUS 617 Business Ethics – Stand Your Ground Paper

**Criteria for Success:**
The average total score and the average score for each criterion on the Ethical Impacts 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

**Initial Data:**

**Ethical Impacts Rubric – Average Student Scores**

| Semester | N | Ethical Self-Awareness | Understanding | Recognition | Application | Evaluation | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Spring 2017 | 40 | 3.63 | 2.9 | 3.38 | 3.1 | 3.15 | 3.23 |
| Summer 2017 | 40 | 3.23 | 2.48 | 2.75 | 2.68 | 2.70 | 2.77 |

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

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**
This signature assignment was first implemented in the Spring of 2017. This allows for a baseline measurement.

The average total score on the Ethical Impacts Rubric exceeded the criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) in Spring 2017 and fell below the criteria for success in Summer 2017. Scores for the rubric criteria area Ethical Self-Awareness exceeded the criteria for success in both semesters. For the rubric criteria areas of Recognition, Application and Evaluation, scores exceeded the criteria for success in one of the two semesters. The scores on the rubric criteria area of Understanding fell below the criteria success in both Spring 2017 and Summer 2017.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**
As these are baseline scores, curricular changes will not be made at this time; however, improvements to the assignment prompt, including clarity regarding the organization of the paper, have been made and will be instituted in AY17-18.

# ETHICAL IMPACTS RUBRIC

Point Loma Nazarene University MBA Program Learning Outcome #5: Analyze the ethical impacts of executive level decision making.

| Criteria | Very Good 4 | Good 3 | Acceptable 2 | Poor 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Ethical Self-Awareness** | Student articulates or analyzes, in detail, core beliefs and their origins. | Student articulates or analyzes core beliefs and their origins with some detail. | Student articulates core beliefs and their origins with minimal analysis. | Student states either their core beliefs or articulates the origins of the core beliefs, but not both. |
| **Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives / Concepts** | Student identifies the ethical theory or theories utilized to prioritize organizational aspects and recommendations, and accurately explains the details of the theory or theories utilized in the decision-making process. | Student identifies the ethical theory or theories utilized to prioritize organizational aspects and recommendations, and explains the theory or theories utilized in the decision-making process, but has some inaccuracies. | Student identifies ethical theory or theories utilized, but do not apply the details to the setting, accurately. | Student identifies the ethical theory or theories utilized, only. |
| **Ethical Issue Recognition** | When looking at complex, multilayered context, student recognizes and can accurately explain the cross-relationships among ethical issues and ethical elements of the organization. | When looking at complex, multilayered context, student recognizes cross-relationships among ethical issues and ethical elements of the organization with some degree of explanation. | When looking at complex, multilayered context, student recognizes some cross-relationships among ethical issues and ethical elements of the organization with minimal explanation. | When looking at complex, multilayered context, student fails to recognize cross-relationships among ethical issues and ethical elements of the organization. |
| **Application of Ethical Perspectives / Concepts** | Student independently and accurately considers full implications of ethical perspectives / concepts and applies ethical perspectives or concepts to organizational settings. | Student independently and with some accuracy considers full implications of ethical perspectives / concepts and applies ethical perspectives or concepts to organizational settings. | Student successfully considers implications of ethical perspectives / concepts, but application of ethical perspectives or concepts is flawed. | Student attempts to consider the implications of ethical perspectives / concepts, but does not include application of the perspectives / concepts. |
| **Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspective/Concepts** | Student accurately states and defends a position on various ethical concepts or perspectives at play within an organization, and identifies the objections to, assumptions about, and implications these perspectives have on the decision-making process. | Student states a position on ethical concepts or perspectives at play within an organization with some accuracy, and identifies the objections these perspectives present to the decision-making process. | Student states a position on various ethical concepts or perspectives at play within an organization with some accuracy, and identifies the objections to, assumptions about, and implications these perspectives have on the decision-making process. | Student fails to state a position on various ethical concepts or perspectives at play within an organization accurately, and/or fails to identify the objections to, assumptions about, and implications these perspectives have on the decision-making process. |

Average Score: _____ (Total/# of criteria)

Note 1: All criteria are weighted equally
Note 2: This rubric was adapted from the AAC&U Ethical Impacts Value Rubric

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

**Outcome Measure:**
Two measures are collected in the capstone BUS695 course:
1. Final Written Case
2. Final Presentation

**Criteria for Success:**
1. BUS 695 Final Written Case: 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.
2. BUS695 Final Presentation: The average total score and the average score for each criterion of the Oral 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:**
**Final Written Case - 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 |
| Fall 2016 | 22 | 3.27 | 3.23 | 3.23 | 2.77 | 3.09 | 3.12 |
| Summer 2017 | 34 | 3.30 | 3.18 | 2.76 | 3.21 | 3.27 | 3.14 |

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

**Final Presentation - Oral Communication Rubric – Average Student Score:**

| Semester | N | Organization | Language | Delivery | Supporting Material | Central Message | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Summer 2017 | 44 | 3.30 | 3.21 | 3.05 | 3.23 | 3.18 | 3.19 |

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

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**
**Final Written Case - Written Communication Rubric:** The average total score on the Written Communication Rubric for all semesters exceeded the criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0). Scores on three of the five rubric criteria areas exceeded the criteria for success for all semesters. In the area of Genre and Disciplinary Conventions, scores exceeded the criteria for success in three of the four semesters. In one rubric criteria area, Sources and Evidence, the score fell below the criteria for success in two of the four semesters.

**Final Presentation - Oral Communication Rubric:** The average total score and average scores for each rubric criteria area on the Oral Communication Rubric exceeded the criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) in Summer 2017.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**
**Final Written Case - Written Communication Rubric:** Sources and Evidence has previously been recognized as an opportunity for improvement. As of AY15-16, all papers in the MBA Program are required to be cited using proper APA format. Beginning AY16-17, the use of proper APA format and citations will be covered in BUS655 Marketing Management, as this is an early course in the sequence of classes. Additionally, full-time faculty were provided APA guidelines and APA guidelines were incorporated into MBA orientations.

Other than the implementation of APA format, no major curriculum changes will be made at this time. Data will continue to be collected and results will be monitored to determine if changes are needed.

**Final Presentation - Oral Communication Rubric:** Oral Communication was first assessed using the BUS695 Final Presentations in Summer 2017. This initial assessment yielded base line scores for each rubric criteria area, all of which exceeded the criteria for success. Data will continue to be collected before any conclusions are made.

# 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Context of and Purpose for Writing** | 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). |
| **Content Development** | 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. |
| **Genre and Disciplinary Conventions** | 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. |
| **Sources and Evidence** | 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. |
| **Control of Syntax and Mechanics** | 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

# ORAL 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Organization** | Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive. | Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation. | Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation. | Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable in the presentation. |
| **Language** | Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience. | Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience. | Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience. | Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is not appropriate to audience. |
| **Delivery** | Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, professional dress, and vocal expressions) make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident. | Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, professional dress, and vocal expressions) make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable. | Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, professional dress, and vocal expressions) make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative. | Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, professional dress, and vocal expressions) detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable. |
| **Supporting Material** | A variety of types of supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic. | Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic. | Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that partially supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic. | Insufficient supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make reference to information or analysis that minimally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic. |
| **Central Message** | Central message is compelling, precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported. | Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material. | Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable. | Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation. |

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

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

**Outcome Measure:**
1. MarkStrat 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 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% |
| Fall 2016 | 8 | 100% |
| Spring 2017 | 5 | 60% |
| Summer 2017 | 8 | 50% |

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 |
| **Fall 2016** | 26 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| **Spring 2017** | 15 | 3.56 | 3.64 | 3.67 | 3.64 | 3.69 |
| **Summer 2017** | 17 | 3.68 | 3.64 | 3.51 | 3.71 | 3.70 |

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

**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 Summer 2017, 50% of the teams increased the SPI. For Fall 2015 and Spring 2017, 60% of the teams increased the SPI. For Spring 2016, 75% of the teams increased the SPI. For Summer and Fall 2016, 100% of the teams increased the SPI. For three of the six semesters, the criteria for success was met.

The Peer Evaluation Survey is an indirect measure of how each student works within their team. Scores for each rubric criteria area exceeded the criteria for success (average of 3.5 or higher out of 4.0).

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**
The faculty teaching BUS655 Marketing Management are currently in the process of revising the use of the MarkStrat simulation in the course. In order to create time for additional content in the course, a more condensed version of the simulation was implemented which included fewer simulation rounds, resulting in fewer opportunities for teams to work together. It is expected that a lower percentage of teams will increase SPI using the condensed version of the simulation. As such, the criteria for success will be reviewed in AY17-18 once more data points are collected using the new simulation.

# 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Contributes to Team Meetings** | 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. |
| **Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members** | 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. |
| **Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings** | 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. |
| **Fosters Constructive Team Climate** | Supports a constructive team climate by doing all of the following:<br>• Treats team members respectively by being polite and constructive in communication<br>• Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.<br>• Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.<br>• Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members. | Supports a constructive team climate by doing any three of the following:<br>• Treats team members respectively by being polite and constructive in communication<br>• Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.<br>• Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.<br>• Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members. | Supports a constructive team climate by doing any two of the following:<br>• Treats team members respectively by being polite and constructive in communication<br>• Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.<br>• Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.<br>• Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members. | Supports a constructive team climate by doing any one of the following:<br>• Treats team members respectively by being polite and constructive in communication<br>• Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.<br>• Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.<br>• Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members. |
| **Responds to Conflict** | 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