Learning Outcome:
PLO #1: Demonstrate general knowledge of theories and practices in the core areas of business.

Outcome Measure:
Peregrine Comprehensive Exit Exam Results – implemented Fall 2015

Criteria for Success:
Score at or above the following:

Peregrine Undergraduate Comprehensive Exit Exam Criteria for Success	
Disciplinary Area	**Score**
Accounting	50
Business Ethics	50
Business Finance	45
Strategic Management	55
Business Leadership	50
Economics (Macro/Micro)	50
Global Dimensions of Business	45
Information Mgt Systems	50
Legal Enviornment of Business	50
Management (OPS, HR, OB)	55
Marketing	50
Quantitative Techniques/Stats	45

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

Longitudinal Data:

	Undergraduate Total	Accounting	Business Ethics	Business Finance	Strategic Management	Business Leadership	Economics (Macro/Micro)	Global Dimensions of Business	Information Mgt Systems	Legal Environment of Business	Management (OPS, HR, OB)	Marketing	Quantitative Techniques/Stats
Criteria for Success		50	50	45	55	50	50	45	50	50	55	50	45
2015-2016	50.9	57.2	48.5	49.8	56.3	49.0	55.1	46.0	54.0	49.2	52.6	48.8	44.6
2016-2017	50.2	54.6	48.3	48.5	54.9	47.9	52.2	44.8	53.6	49.1	51.0	49.6	47.1
2017-2018	49.8	53.9	47.1	49.8	51.5	48.9	50.1	45.6	51.9	51.5	50.9	53.3	43.5

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, 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 undergraduate curriculum focus.

The first implementation of the Peregrine Comprehensive Exam was during Fall 2015. 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.

During AY15-16, the criteria for success were exceeded for six of the twelve disciplinary areas. Scores in the areas of Quantitative Techniques and Statistics were slightly below (within 0.4 points) the criteria for success. Scores in the remaining five areas were below the criteria for success, including Business Ethics, Business Leadership, Legal Environment of Business, Management and Marketing as indicated in the table above.

During AY16-17, the criteria for success were exceeded for five of the twelve disciplinary areas. Scores in the areas of Strategic Management and Global Dimensions of Business were slightly below (within 0.2 points) the criteria for success. Scores in the remaining five areas were below the criteria for success, including Business Ethics, Business Leadership, Legal Environment of Business, Management and Marketing as indicated in the table above.

During AY17-18, the criteria for success were exceeded for seven of the twelve disciplinary areas. Scores in the areas of Business Leadership and Quantitative Techniques and Statistics were slightly below (within 1.5 points) the criteria for success. Scores in the remaining three areas were below the criteria for success, including Business Ethics, Strategic Management, and Management.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Business Ethics has been recognized as an area needing improvement. Beginning in Fall 2017, content relating to the study of various ethical models was included in MGT 212 Principles of Management.

Students taking MGT212 with this new content will begin graduating in Spring 2020, so increased scores in this area may be delayed.

Similarly, content in leadership and operations management was added to MGT212 Principles of Management beginning Fall 2017. Students taking this improved MGT212 course will begin graduating in Spring 2020. An increase in scores in the areas of Business Leadership and Management is expected in the next two to three years.

The average scores in the area of Quantitative Techniques and Statistics have fallen slightly below (within 1.5 points) the criteria for success in two of the three years. This area will be closely monitored over the next several academic years to determine if curricular changes are needed.

A negative trend is noted for the area of Strategic Management. These scores will be monitored over the next several academic years to determine if curricular changes are needed.

A positive trend is noted for the area of Marketing. Beginning Fall 2017, MKT332 Principles of Marketing was redesigned to improve content. It is believe this content shift, in addition to course re-design in the 400-level marketing courses, has already impacted the average scores in this area. It is expected that the full impact of these curriculum changes to MKT332 Principles of Marketing will be reflected in AY 2018-2019 and AY 2019-2020.

Fermanian School of Business
PLO #2 Assessment
2017-2018

Learning Outcome:
PLO #2: Critically analyze and apply business knowledge to solve complex business situations.

Outcome Measure:
The CAPSIM COMP-XM Management Simulation provides comparative data on how each student (and class) performs against all other students taking the simulation and exam at the same time nationally. Two results are used:
1. CAPSIM COMP-XM Balanced Score Card Results – Application-based
2. CAPSIM COMP-XM Simulation Board Query Results – Knowledge-based

This summative and direct data for the School of Business Assessment of PLO #2 is gathered in BUS488 – Strategic Management in both the Fall and Spring semesters.

Criteria for Success:
1. Average score of all students will be above 70th percentile on the national COMP-XM Balanced Score Card Results
2. Average score of all students will be above 55th percentile on the national COMP-XM Board Query Results

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

Longitudinal Data:

Semester	N[1]	Balanced Score Card Results	Board Query Results
Fall 2015	51	82	70
Spring 2016	59	71	60
Fall 2016	60	80	86
Spring 2017	68	80	71
Fall 2017	81	60	53
Spring 2018	56	82	64

[1] Number of Students Completing Module

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
Between Fall 2015 and Spring 2018, scores on the COMP-XM Balanced Score Card exceeded the criteria for success, ranging from 71 to 82, with an outlier in Fall 2017 when students averaged in the 60th percentile.

Between Fall 2015 and Spring 2018, scores on the COMP-XM Board Query exceeded the criteria for success, ranging from 60 to 86, with an outlier in Fall 2017 when students averaged in the 53rd percentile.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
At this time, no changes are recommended. The data will continue to be monitored for notable trends. It is important to note that the professor that has been teaching MGT488 Strategic Management is retiring in December 2018. The method of integrating the simulation in the course has been institutionalized to minimize the effects of the transition on the student simulation performance.

[1] Number of Students Completing Module

Fermanian School of Business
PLO #3 Assessment
2017-2018

Learning Outcome:
PLO #3: Demonstrate effective business communication through both written and verbal means.

Outcome Measure:
Two measures are collected from the senior level BUS 489 course:
1. Final Internship Research Report
2. Video Cover Letter

Criteria for Success:
1. Final Internship Research Report: Average score for each criteria of the AACU Written Communication Value Rubric will be a 3.0 or higher out of 4.0.
2. Final Internship Research Report: Average score for each criteria of the AACU Information Literacy Value Rubric will be a 3.0 or higher out of 4.0.
3. Video Cover Letter: Average score for each criteria of the AACU Oral Communication Value 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

Longitudinal Data – Final Internship Research Report:

AACU Written Communication Value Rubric: Average Rubric Score

Course	Semester	# of assessments	Context and Purpose for Writing	Content Develop-ment	Genre and Disciplinary Conventions	Sources and Evidence	Control of Syntax and Mechanics	Total
BUS489	Fall 2015	35	3.60	3.60	3.34	3.17	3.11	3.36
BUS489	Spring 2016	41	3.41	3.27	3.10	2.71	2.88	3.26
BUS489	Summer 2016	40	3.30	3.25	3.15	3.10	2.98	3.16
BUS489	Fall 2016	40	3.30	3.03	2.70	3.33	2.85	3.04
BUS489	Spring 2017	40	3.28	3.13	3.05	3.20	3.00	3.13
BUS489	Summer 2017	44	3.46	3.23	2.98	2.84	3.16	3.13
BUS489	Fall 2017	38	3.40	3.37	2.92	3.71	2.74	3.23
BUS489	Spring 2018	40	2.73	2.63	2.68	2.75	2.60	2.68
BUS489	Summer 2018	48	3.56	3.36	3.24	3.28	3.00	3.29

AACU Information Literacy Value Rubric: Average Rubric Score

Course	Semester	# of assessments	Determine Extent of Info Needed	Access Needed Info	Critically Evaluate Info and Sources	Use Info to Accomplish Purpose	Access and Use Info Ethically and Legally	Total
BUS489	Fall 2016	40	3.98	3.95	3.48	3.33	2.75	3.50
BUS489	Spring 2017	40	3.82	3.95	3.49	3.39	3.03	3.54
BUS489	Summer 2017	44	3.27	3.41	2.89	2.96	3.18	3.14
BUS489	Fall 2017	38	3.71	3.74	3.34	3.34	3.13	3.45
BUS489	Spring 2018	40	2.85	NA	2.55	2.70	2.63	2.68
BUS489	Summer 2018	48	3.49	3.39	3.39	3.39	3.18	3.37

Longitudinal Data – Video Cover Letter:

AACU Oral Communication Value Rubric – Average Rubric Score:

Course	Semester	# of assessments	Organization	Language	Delivery	Supporting Material	Central Message	Total
BUS489	Fall 2015	34	3.88	3.29	3.09	3.27	3.29	3.36
BUS489	Spring 2016	40	3.88	3.43	2.93	3.35	3.13	3.41
BUS489	Summer 2016	20	3.48	3.30	3.25	3.30	3.30	3.33
BUS489	Fall 2016	40	2.98	3.13	2.55	3.20	2.98	2.97
BUS489	Spring 2017	40	3.00	2.98	2.83	3.08	2.95	2.97
BUS489	Summer 2017	44	3.55	3.41	3.23	3.48	3.59	3.45
BUS489	Fall 2017	34	3.88	3.50	3.09	3.21	3.41	3.42
BUS489	Spring 2018	40	3.80	3.48	3.23	2.43	3.38	3.26
BUS489	Summer 2018	48	3.79	3.29	2.94	3.17	3.15	3.27

Conclusions Drawn from Data

Final Internship Research Report – Written Communication Rubric: The Spring 2018 semester is an outlier for all rubric criteria areas on the Written Communication rubric; therefore, Spring 2018 data has been excluded from this analysis. The areas of Context and Purpose for Writing and Content Development show consistently high scores, with students scoring above the criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) in all eight semesters. The criteria for success was met in six of the eight semesters in the area of Sources and Evidence. Scores in the area of Genre and Disciplinary Conventions were below the criteria for success in three of the eight semesters. Scores in the area of Control of Syntax and Mechanics were below the criteria for success in four of the eight semesters.

Final Internship Research Report – Information Literacy Rubric: The Spring 2018 semester is an outlier for all rubric criteria areas on the Information Literacy rubric; therefore, Spring 2018 data has been

excluded from this analysis. The criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) was met in each of the five semesters on two of the rubric criteria areas, Determine the Extent of Information Needed and Access the Needed Information. The criteria for success was met in four of the five semesters on the other three rubric criteria areas, Critically Evaluate Information and Sources, Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose and Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally.

Video Cover Letter – Oral Communication Rubric:
The criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) was met in eight of the last nine semesters on the rubric criteria areas of Organization, Language and Supporting Material. Scores in the rubric criteria area of Central Message met the criteria for success in seven of the nine semesters, with scores just slightly below the criteria for success, ranging from 2.95-2.98. For the rubric criteria area of Delivery, the criteria for success was met in five out of the nine semesters, with scores ranging from 2.83-2.97 and a score of 2.55 in Fall 2016.

Changes to be Made Based on Data

Final Internship Research Report - Written Communication: Some areas for improvement are as follows:
- APA format and content presentation will continue to be developed in BUS313 Administrative Communication and BUS489 Business Internship. In addition, APA format will be introduced and developed in MGT212 Principles of Management beginning Spring 2019. This should result in higher scores in the rubric criteria area of Genre and Disciplinary Conventions.
- Beginning Spring 2019, emphasis will be placed on syntax and mechanics in the directions and feedback on written assignments in MGT212 Principles of Management, BUS313 Administrative Communication and BUS489 Business Internship. This should result in higher scores in the rubric criteria area of Control of Syntax and Mechanics.

Final Internship Research Report - Information Literacy: The initial assessment using the AACU Information Literacy Value rubric in AY16-17 and AY17-18 yielded baseline scores. More data will be collected before any changes are recommended.

Video Cover Letter – Oral Communication: Refinement of the assignment and rubric clarification has resulted in overall positive trends in the scores on the Oral Communication rubric. The two out of twenty scores across all five rubric criteria areas that were below the criteria for success appear to be outliers. Data will continue to be collected to see if trends in the data arise.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

AAC&U Association of American Colleges and Universities

Definition: Written communication is the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

	Capstone 4	Milestones 3	Milestones 2	Benchmark 1
Context of and Purpose for Writing *Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).*	Demonstrates 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 tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(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 *Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields (please see glossary).*	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	Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.
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.

ORAL COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

Definition: Oral communication is a prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners' attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors. *Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.*

	Capstone (4)	Milestones (3)	Milestones (3)	Benchmark (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 within 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, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) 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.

Fermanian School of Business
PLO #4 Assessment
2017-2018

Learning Outcome:

PLO #4: Formulate decisions informed by ethical attitudes and values.

Outcome Measure:

The CAPSIM COMP-XM Management Ethics Simulation provides comparative data on how each student (and class) performs against all other students in the nation taking the applied simulation at the same time. This summative and direct data for the School of Business Assessment of PLO #4 is gathered in MGT488 – Strategic Management in both the Fall and Spring semesters, beginning in the Spring of 2016.

Criteria for Success:

Average score of all students will be above the 70th percentile on the national COMP-XM Ethics Module Results

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

Longitudinal Data:

Semester	N[1]	Ethics Module Results
Spring 2016	59	54
Fall 2016	60	80
Spring 2017	68	83
Fall 2017	81	74
Spring 2018	56	77

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The COMP-XM Ethics Module was implemented in Spring 2016. With an average score in the 54th percentile, the criteria for success was initially set at the 55th percentile. The criteria for success was raised to the 70th percentile beginning in Fall 2017 due to strong results in AY 2016-2017. Students exceeded the revised criteria for success in all semesters beginning Fall 2016.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Students continue to score high in business ethics application through the COMP-XM Ethics Module. Business ethics knowledge has been recognized as an area needing improvement through the Peregrine comprehensive exit exam (see Undergraduate Core PLO #1 Assessment Report). Beginning in Fall 2017, content relating to the study of various ethical models was introduced and developed in MGT 212 Principles of Management. Students taking MGT212 with this new content will begin taking MGT488 Strategic Management in Fall 2019; therefore, positive impacts due to this added content may be reflected beginning Fall 2019.

---

[1] Number of Students Completing Module

Learning Outcome:
PLO #5: Collaborate effectively in teams.

Outcome Measure:
The CAPSIM Capstone simulation provides comparative data on how each team of students performs against all other teams in the nation taking the simulation at the same time. Direct and summative data for the School of Business Assessment of PLO #5 is gathered in MGT488 – Strategic Management in both the Fall and Spring semesters using two different results:
1. CAPSIM Capstone Simulation Results
2. CAPSIM COMP-XM Knowledge of Teamwork Module Results (implemented Spring 2016)
Indirect and summative data is gathered in MGT488 in both the Fall and Spring semesters using the following results:
3. CAPSIM Capstone Peer Evaluation Module Results (implemented Spring 2016)

Criteria for Success:
1. Capstone Simulation Results - Average team score will be above the 75th percentile
2. COMP-XM Knowledge of Teamwork Module - Average student score will be above the 75th percentile
3. Capstone Peer Evaluation Module – Average student score will be a 4.5 or higher on a 5.0 scale in both areas of the module.

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

Longitudinal Data:

Capstone Simulation Results:

Semester	N[1]	Capstone Simulation Results
Fall 2015	51	79.2
Spring 2016	59	74.2
Fall 2016	60	76.5
Spring 2017	68	72.5
Fall 2017	81	71.8
Spring 2018	56	73.3

[1] Number of Students Completing Module

Knowledge of Team Module Results:

Semester	N[1]	Knowledge of Team Module Results
Spring 2016	59	81.0
Fall 2016	60	79
Spring 2017	68	68
Fall 2017	81	81
Spring 2018	56	83

Peer Evaluation Module Results:

Semester	N[1]	Self-Management/ Accountability	Quality of Work and Contextual Performance
Spring 2016	59	4.93	4.94
Fall 2016	30	4.74	4.75
Spring 2017	68	4.88	4.88
Fall 2017	81	4.79	4.78
Spring 2018	56	4.85	4.82

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Teams' scores on the CAPSIM Capstone Simulation exceeded the criteria for success (above the 75th percentile) in Fall 2015 and Fall 2016. Teams' scores fell slightly under the criteria for success in Spring 2016, scoring in the 74.2 percentile. Teams scored below the criteria for success in Spring 2017, Fall 2017 and Spring 2018, with scores ranging in the 71.8-73.3 percentiles.

Students' scores on the COMP-XM Knowledge of Teamwork Module met the criteria for success (above the 75th percentile) in all semesters except for Spring 2017, with students averaging in the 68th percentile.

Students' average scores on the CAPSIM Capstone Peer Evaluation Module met the criteria for success (average score of 4.5 out of 5.0) in each of the five semesters in both areas of the module, Self-Management/Accountability and Quality of Work and Contextual Performance.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

The FSB will hire a consultant to integrate strength's coaching in a team setting as part of MGT488 Strategic Management beginning Spring 2019. It is anticipated that this addition to the course will improve the students' ability to collaborate effectively in teams, which would be reflected in higher CAPSIM Capstone Simulation scores.

[1] Number of Students Completing Module