

**Fermanian School of Business
PLO #1 Assessment
2021-2022**

Learning Outcome:

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

Outcome Measure:

Peregrine Comprehensive Exit Exam Results

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	50
Strategic Management	55
Business Leadership	55
Economics (Macro/Micro)	52.5
Global Dimensions of Business	50
Information Mgt Systems	50
Legal Environment of Business	55
Management (OPS, HR, OB)	55
Marketing	57.5
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 of Business	Marketing	Quantitative Techniques/Stats
Criteria for Success	50	50	45	55	50	50	45	50	50	55	50	45	
Criteria for Success as of 21-22	50	50	50	55	55	52.5	50	50	55	55	57.5	45	
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
2018-2019	51.1	50.9	48.6	46.4	54.9	54.0	52.3	48.0	50.1	55.2	50.3	55.2	47.4
2019-2020	51.2	50.7	52.1	47.6	54.3	52.3	53.3	48.0	51.3	53.1	49.1	55.6	46.8
2020-2021	52.8	48.7	51.4	51.3	56.9	55.0	53.7	49.7	51.9	56.1	51.6	60.2	46.7
2021-2022	50.1	46.4	51.2	47.9	53.9	50.6	50.0	47.9	49.2	51.2	50.6	56.5	45.7

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

It is important to note that PLNU’s methodology of administering the Peregrine Comprehensive Exam is 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 format with time limits up to 48 hours. Therefore, criteria for success were determined considering: (a) average total score and average disciplinary area scores of National and Region 7 ACBSP schools, (b) the FSB’s undergraduate curriculum and (c) the FSB’s historical disciplinary area scores. Beginning AY 21-22, the criteria for success was increased in seven of the twelve areas: Finance, Strategic Management, Business Leadership, Economics, Global, Legal Environment, and Marketing as detailed in the above schedule.

During AY 16-17, 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 AY 17-18, 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.

During AY 18-19, the criteria for success were exceeded for nine of the twelve disciplinary areas. The average score in the area of Strategic Management was 0.1 points below the criteria for success. The average score in the area of Business Ethics was slightly below (within 1.4 points) the criteria for success. The average score in the area of Management was 4.7 points below the criteria for success.

During AY 19-20, the criteria for success were exceeded for ten of the twelve disciplinary areas. The average score in the area of Strategic Management was 0.7 points below the criteria for success. The average score in the area of Management was 5.9 points below the criteria for success.

During AY 20-21, the criteria for success were exceeded for ten of the twelve disciplinary areas. The average score in the area of Accounting was 1.3 points below the criteria for success. The average score in the area of Management was 3.4 points below the criteria for success.

During AY 21-22, the criteria for success (revised as of AY 21-22) were exceeded for two of the twelve disciplinary areas. For seven of the ten areas that did not meet the new criteria for success in AY 21-22 (Finance, Strategic Management, Leadership, Economics, Information Systems, Legal Environment and Marketing), the new criteria for success was met in AY 20-21. The three areas that did not meet the revised criteria for success in AY 21-22 and AY 20-21 were Accounting, Management and Global. The average score in the area of Accounting was 3.6 and 1.3 points below the revised criteria for success in AY 21-22 and AY 20-21, respectively. The average score in the area of Management was 4.6 and 3.4 points below the revised criteria for success in AY 21-22 and AY 20-21, respectively. The average score in the area of Global was 2.1 and 0.3 points below the revised criteria for success in AY 21-22 and AY 20-21, respectively.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Management has been recognized as an area needing improvement for several years. Scores in this area have been consistently below the criteria for success. Prior analysis regarding course content and related change have been made in prior years. Additional, analysis regarding MGT 2012 Principles of Management content will be done in Spring 2023 by management faculty, including the areas of human resources, operations management, and organizational behavior. Changes based upon this analysis is planned for Fall 2023. This area will continue to be closely analyzed in AY 23-24.

Accounting has been trending downward over the last six years and is below the criteria for success in AY 21-22 and AY 20-21. Beginning, Fall 2023, the course curriculum for the accounting program will be changed to conform with new AICPA Standards. The related PLOs will also be revised to reflect the new curriculum. As such, no additional changes are recommended at this time.

While the area of Global does not meet the revised criteria for success in AY 21-22, it was only 0.3 points below in AY 20-21. As such, no changes are recommended at this time; however, this area will continue to be monitored.

As discussed above, for seven of the ten areas that did not meet the new criteria for success in AY 21-22 (Finance, Strategic Management, Leadership, Economics, Information Systems, Legal Environment and Marketing), the new criteria for success was met in AY 20-21. There are no changes recommended at this time for these seven areas; however, these seven areas will continue to be monitored.

Fermanian School of Business (BBA)
PLO #2 Assessment
2021-2022

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

Criteria for Success:

1. Average score of all students will be above 60th percentile on the national COMP-XM Balanced Score Card Results
2. Average score of all students will be above 50th 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 (%)
Summer 2019	13	24.5	41.5
Summer 2020	N/A	N/A	N/A
Summer 2021	31	62	51
Spring 2022	44	57	51

¹ Number of Students Completing Module

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Beginning AY 21-22, the criteria for success was updates for both the

Balanced Scorecard Results (changed to 60th percentile) and for the Board Query Results (changed to 50th percentile).

Due primarily to the fact that the Summer 2020 term was fully remote (as a result of COVID-19), the Summer 2020 data is not reliable due to all students not completing all parts of the simulation and related assignments or students not being fully prepared for the simulation and related assignments; therefore, no Summer 2020 data is included above.

Scores on the COMP-XM Balanced Score Card exceeded the criteria for success in one of the three semesters. The trend has moved significantly upward since summer 2019; however, the most recent period is slightly below the criteria for success.

Scores on the COMP-XM Board Query exceeded the criteria for success in two of the three semesters, including the last two semesters. The trend has moved upward since summer 2019.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

A new faculty member began teaching Strategic Management in AY 18-19 and attended specialized training on the simulation after the summer 2019 period.

No changes at this time. Data will continue to be collected and monitored.

Fermanian School of Business (TUG)
PLO #2 Assessment
2021-2022

Learning Outcome:

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

Outcome Measure:

The CAPSIM Inbox GM Simulation provides comparative data on how each student performs against all other students taking the simulation at the same time nationally. The following result is used:

1. CAPSIM Inbox GM Simulation Results – Overall Score

Criteria for Success:

1. Average score of all students will be above **TBDth** percentile on the national CAPSIM Inbox GM Simulation 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	Inbox GM Simulation Results (%)
Fall 2021	27	45
Spring 2022	79	50

¹ Number of Students Completing Module

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The measure described above were implemented in the MGT 4088 course beginning Fall 2021. Criteria for success will be set after additional data is gathered in AY 22-23.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

No changes at this time. Data will continue to be collected and monitored.

Fermanian School of Business
PLO #3 Assessment
2021-2022

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/BBU 4089 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:

Course	Semester	# of assessments	Context and Purpose for Writing	Content Development	Genre and Disciplinary Conventions	Sources and Evidence	Control of Syntax and Mechanics	Total
BUS4089	Fall 2019	26	3.42	3.35	3.00	3.46	3.15	3.28
BUS/BBU 4089	Spring 2020	72	3.30	3.23	3.10	3.29	2.96	3.17
BUS4089	Summer 2020	40	3.08	3.28	2.70	3.15	2.75	2.99
BUS4089	Fall 2020	40	3.43	3.23	3.18	3.23	3.10	3.23
BUS/BBU 4089	Spring 2021	78	3.44	3.21	3.23	3.13	3.26	3.25
BUS4089	Spring Mini-Term 2021	30	3.80	3.23	3.27	3.80	3.00	3.42
BUS4089	Summer 2021	42	3.40	3.10	3.07	3.19	3.02	3.16
BUS4089	Fall 2021	38	3.66	3.61	3.66	3.39	3.39	3.54
BUS/BBU 4089	Spring 2022	80	3.69	3.62	3.64	3.31	3.45	3.54
BUS4089	Summer 2022	40	3.70	3.60	3.68	3.48	3.38	3.57

AACU Written Communication Value Rubric: Average Rubric Score

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
BUS4089	Fall 2019	26	3.35	3.35	3.31	3.35	3.12	3.30
BUS/BBU 4089	Spring 2020	72	3.25	3.06	3.23	3.22	3.05	3.16
BUS4089	Summer 2020	40	3.10	3.10	3.23	3.03	2.78	3.05
BUS4089	Fall 2020	40	3.30	3.03	3.20	3.25	3.23	3.20
BUS/BBU 4089	Spring 2021	78	3.36	3.09	3.10	3.21	3.32	3.22
BUS4089	Spring Mini-Term 2021	30	3.40	3.07	3.23	3.23	3.40	3.27
BUS4089	Summer 2021	42	3.10	3.12	3.07	3.14	3.14	3.11
BUS4089	Fall 2021	38	3.71	3.71	3.55	3.61	3.55	3.63
BUS/BBU 4089	Spring 2022	80	3.75	3.58	3.60	3.60	3.38	3.58
BUS4089	Summer 2022	40	3.80	3.75	3.78	3.68	3.68	3.74

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
BUS4089	Fall 2019	18	3.83	3.72	3.22	3.72	3.72	3.64
BUS4089	Spring 2020	28	3.64	3.36	3.07	3.36	3.33	3.35
BUS4089/ BBU4089	Summer 2020	70	3.33	3.11	2.94	2.86	3.15	3.08
BUS4089	Fall 2020	40	3.33	3.35	2.80	2.50	3.00	3.00
BUS4089	Spring 2021	40	3.74	3.39	3.11	2.84	3.30	3.28
BUS4089	Spring Mini-Term 2021	30	3.70	3.50	3.47	2.87	3.37	3.38
BUS4089/ BBU4089	Summer 2021	82	3.64	3.48	3.34	2.75	3.36	3.31
BUS 4089	Fall 2021	28	3.21	2.89	2.75	2.96	2.89	2.94
BUS 4089	Spring 2022	40	3.18	2.90	2.70	2.77	2.98	2.93
BUS4089/ BBU4089	Summer 2022	78	3.22	3.00	2.69	2.92	3.03	2.97

Conclusions Drawn from Data

Final Internship Research Report – Written Communication Rubric: The areas of Context and Purpose for Writing, Content Development, and Sources and Evidence show consistently high scores, with students scoring above the criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) in all ten semesters. Scores in the area of Genre and Disciplinary Conventions exceeded the criteria for success in nine of the ten semesters, with the last seven semesters above 3.0. Scores in the area of Control of Syntax and Mechanics exceeded the criteria for success in eight of the ten semesters, with the last seven semesters above 3.0.

Final Internship Research Report – Information Literacy Rubric: The criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) was met in each of the ten semesters on four of the rubric criteria areas, Determine the Extent of Information Needed, Access the Needed Information, Critically Evaluate Info and Sources, and Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose. The criteria for success was met in nine of the ten semesters on the rubric criteria areas of 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 all ten semesters on the rubric criteria area of Organization. The criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) was met in eight of the ten semesters on the rubric criteria areas of Language and Central Message. Both were below the criteria of success in two of the last semesters; however, only by a score of 0.11 or less. Scores in the rubric criteria area of Delivery fell below the criteria for success in five of the ten

semesters, including the three last semesters. Scores in the rubric criteria area of Supporting Material fell below the criteria for success in eight of the ten semesters, including all last eight semesters.

Changes to be Made Based on Data

Final Internship Research Report - Written Communication:

Given that the scores on the Written Communication rubric in the areas of Genre and Disciplinary Conventions and Control of Syntax and Mechanics were above 3.0 during the last seven semesters, no action is necessary at this time.

Final Internship Research Report - Information Literacy:

Scores on the Information Literacy rubric have consistently exceeded the criteria for success.

Video Cover Letter – Oral Communication:

Given that scores in the area of Delivery were below 3.0 during the last three semesters, this area will be closely monitored.

The area of Supporting Material has been below the criteria for success during the most recent eight periods. Based upon assessor feedback, the student instructions and the rubric do not appear to be in sync. The student instructions and the rubric for this area will be changes during AY 22-23.

Rubric Used

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



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		Benchmark 1
		3	2	
Context of and Purpose for Writing <i>Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).</i>	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 <i>Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields (please see glossary).</i>	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.

Rubric Used

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 (2)	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
2021-2022**

Learning Outcome:

PLO #4: Formulate decisions informed by ethical values.

Outcome Measure:

BUS4089 – Ethics Assignment - implemented Summer 2022

Criteria for Success:

The average score for each criteria of the PLO #4 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:

PLO #4 Rubric – Average Student Score:

Semester	# of Assessments	Economic Analysis	Legal Analysis	Ethical Duty Analysis	Final Recommendation	Total
Summer 2022	40	3.03	3.10	3.00	3.20	3.08

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The assessment of this PLO was moved to BUS 4089 beginning AY 21-22. The change resulted in a superior instrument being used to assess PLO #4. The criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) was met in all areas.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Data will continue to be collected and monitored in future semesters.

¹ Number of Students Completing Module

PLO #4 RUBRIC

Point Loma Nazarene University Program Learning Outcome #4: Formulate decisions informed by ethical values.

Criteria	Excellent 4	Meets Expectations 3	Needs Improvement 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Economic Analysis	Clearly identifies how a decision or action positively or negatively impacts all members of society, including stakeholders.	Identifies how a decision or action positively or negatively impacts all members of society, including stakeholders.	Briefly identifies on how a decision or action positively or negatively impacts all members of society, including stakeholders.	Does not identify how a decision or action positively or negatively impacts all members of society, including stakeholders.
Legal Analysis	Clearly addresses what the law says is right and wrong. Clearly supports claims by referencing constitutional laws, statutory laws, regulatory laws, contractual laws, organizational policy, organizational or professional code of conduct.	Addresses what the law says is right and wrong. Supports claims by referencing constitutional laws, statutory laws, regulatory laws, contractual laws, organizational policy, organizational or professional code of conduct.	Briefly addresses what the law says is right and wrong. Briefly supports claims by referencing constitutional laws, statutory laws, regulatory laws, contractual laws, organizational policy, organizational or professional code of conduct.	Does not address what the law says is right and wrong. Does not support claims by referencing constitutional laws, statutory laws, regulatory laws, contractual laws, organizational policy, organizational or professional code of conduct.
Ethical Duty Analysis	Clearly identifies objective and universal standards (based on reason rather than emotion) regarding what is right, just, and fair. Clearly references at least two ethical tools to support view. *Ethical Tools Include: Personal Virtue, Utilitarianism, Universalism, Distributive Justice, Contributive Liberty, and Eternal Law.	Identifies objective and universal standards (based on reason rather than emotion) regarding what is right, just, and fair. References at least two ethical tools to support view. *Ethical Tools Include: Personal Virtue, Utilitarianism, Universalism, Distributive Justice, Contributive Liberty, and Eternal Law.	Somewhat identifies objective and universal standards (based on reason rather than emotion) regarding what is right, just, and fair. Briefly references one to two ethical tools to support view. *Ethical Tools Include: Personal Virtue, Utilitarianism, Universalism, Distributive Justice, Contributive Liberty, and Eternal Law.	Does not identify objective and universal standards (based on reason rather than emotion) regarding what is right, just, and fair. Does not reference at least one ethical tool to support view. Ethical Tools Include: Personal Virtue, Utilitarianism, Universalism, Distributive Justice, Contributive Liberty, and Eternal Law.
Final Recommendation	Does an excellent job weaving together the economic, legal, and ethical duty analysis to derive at a compelling moral argument that is very difficult to refute.	Does a good job weaving together the economic, legal, and ethical duty analysis to derive at a compelling moral argument that is difficult for someone to refute.	Does a fair job weaving together the economic, legal, and ethical duty analysis to derive at a moral argument that is somewhat difficult to refute.	Does a poor job weaving together the economic, legal, and ethical duty analysis to derive at a moral argument that is difficult to refute.

Average Score: _____ (Total/# of criteria)

**Fermanian School of Business
PLO #5 Assessment (BBA)
2021-2022**

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 BMG4088 – Strategic Management in the Spring semester (Summer semesters prior to Spring 2022) using two different results:

1. CAPSIM Capstone Simulation Results
2. CAPSIM COMP-XM Knowledge of Teamwork Module Results

Indirect and summative data is gathered in BMG4088 in during the Spring semester (Summer semesters prior to Spring 2022) the following results:

3. CAPSIM Capstone Peer Evaluation Module Results

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
Summer 2019	14	47.0
Summer 2020	N/A	N/A
Summer 2021	31	83.8
Spring 2022	44	82.2

¹ Number of Students Completing Module

Knowledge of Team Module Results:

Semester	N ¹	Knowledge of Team Module Results (%)
Summer 2019	N/A	N/A
Summer 2020	N/A	N/A
Summer 2021	31	73
Spring 2022	44	80

Peer Evaluation Module Results:

Semester	N ¹	Self-Management/Accountability	Quality of Work and Contextual Performance
Summer 2019	9	4.77	4.84
Summer 2020	N/A	N/A	N/A
Summer 2021	31	4.81	4.82
Spring 2022	44	4.84	4.87

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Data was not collected in Summer 2019 for the Knowledge of Team Module Results due to miscommunications with the simulation set-up. Data was not collected for Summer 2020 for all three sets of scores due primarily to the fact that Summer 2020 term was fully remote (as a result of COVID-19), the Summer 2020 data is either: (1) not reliable due to all students not completing all parts of the simulation and related assignments or students not being fully prepared for the simulation and related assignments, or (2) was not collected due to a miscommunication with the simulation set-up. Therefore, no Summer 2020 data is included above for all three sets of scores.

Teams' scores on the CAPSIM Capstone Simulation exceeded the criteria for success (above the 75th percentile) in two of the three semesters, including the two most recent semesters.

Students' scores on the COMP-XM Knowledge of Teamwork Module met the criteria for success (above the 75th percentile) in one of the two semesters where data is available, including the most recent semester. Data for the prior semester missed the criteria for success by on 2 percent (73 versus 75 percent).

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 semesters in both areas of the module, Self-Management/Accountability and Quality of Work and Contextual Performance.

¹ Number of Students Completing Module

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

No changes are recommended at this time. Data will continue to be collected and monitored in AY 22-23.

¹ Number of Students Completing Module

**Fermanian School of Business
PLO #5 Assessment (TUG)
2021-2022**

Learning Outcome:

PLO #5: Collaborate effectively in teams.

Outcome Measure:

Direct and summative data for the School of Business Assessment of PLO #5 is gathered in MGT4088 – Strategic Management in the Fall and Spring semesters using the following results:

1. Team Member Evaluation (Consulting Project) – Evaluation by Business Partner

Indirect and summative data is gathered in MGT4088 in during the Fall and Spring semesters using the following results:

2. Team Member Evaluation (Consulting Project) – Evaluation by Student Peers

Criteria for Success:

1. Evaluation by Business Partner Results - Average team scores per the Business Partner survey results will be a 4.5 or higher on a 5.0 scale in all five areas.
2. Evaluation by Student Peer Results - Average team score per the Student survey results will be a 4.5 or higher on a 5.0 scale.

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

Business Partner Evaluation Results:

Semester	N ¹	Meeting Attendance	Quality of Work	Cooperation & Attitude	Communication & Timeliness	Contribution of Ideas
Fall 2021	21	4.62	4.64	4.72	4.17	4.89
Spring 2022	52	4.67	4.29	4.58	3.90	4.42

Student Peer Evaluation Results:

Semester	N ¹	Average Team Score
Fall 2021	33	4.66
Spring 2022	70	4.51

¹ Number of Students Evaluated

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The measures described above were implemented in the MGT 4088 course beginning Fall 2021.

Scores for the Evaluation by Business Partner Results met the criteria for success for both periods in the Meeting Attendance and Cooperation & Attitude areas for both periods. The criteria for success was met in one of the two periods (Fall 2021) in the Quality of Work and Contribution of Ideas areas; however, for Spring 2022, the criteria for success was not met by a range of only .08 to .21 out of 5.0. The criteria for success was not met in either period for the area of Communication & Timeliness.

Scores for the Evaluation by Student Peer Results met the criteria for success in both periods.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

As part of the Consulting Project instructions, the Instructor will further emphasize the importance of the student team communication and timeliness as it relates to the Consulting Projects and related Business Partners. Data will continue to be monitored in AY 22-23, especially in the area of Communication & Timeliness.

¹ Number of Students Evaluated