

**FERMANIAN SCHOOL OF BUSINESS**  
**Core Competencies**

**Learning Outcome:**

Critical Thinking: Students will be able to examine, critique and synthesize information in order to arrive at reasoned conclusions.

**Outcome Measure:**

ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

**Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):**

70% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Reading/Critical Thinking.

**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:**

|  | Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient |              |              |              |              |
|--|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|  | 2012-13                                       | 2013-14      | 2014-15      | 2015-16      | 2016-17      |
| <b>ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Critical Thinking</b> | <b>86.4%</b>                                  | <b>80.0%</b> | <b>62.8%</b> | <b>78.4%</b> | <b>74.2%</b> |

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

Fermanian School of Business (FSB) student scores on the Level 2 Critical Thinking portion of the ETS Proficiency Profile met the criteria for success (70% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Reading/Critical Thinking) in four out of the last five academic years. The AY14-15 scores fell below the criteria for success with 62.8% of students being marginal or proficient at Level 2 Reading/Critical Thinking. The other four academic years range from 74.2% to 86.4% of students being marginal or proficient.

It is believed that the drop in scores on the ETS exam in AY14-15 may have been due to the absence of the professor who typically sets up the expectations for the assessment, as this professor was on sabbatical. This professor returned from sabbatical in AY15-16, resulting in a notable rise in scores.

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

FSB Faculty will work to consistently motivate students and express the importance of the ETS exams each year. No changes are recommended at this time, as FSB student scores in Level 2 Reading/Critical Thinking are consistently exceeding the criteria for success.

**Rubric Used**

No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile test results.

**FERMANIAN SCHOOL OF BUSINESS**  
**Core Competencies**

**Learning Outcome:**

Written: Students will be able to effectively express ideas and information to others through written communication.

**Outcome Measure:**

ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

**Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):**

65% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Writing.

**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:**

|  | Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient |               |              |              |              |
|--|---|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|  | 2012-13                                       | 2013-14       | 2014-15      | 2015-16      | 2016-17      |
| <b>ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Writing</b> | <b>81.8%</b>                                  | <b>100.0%</b> | <b>68.8%</b> | <b>76.6%</b> | <b>71.8%</b> |

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

Fermanian School of Business (FSB) student scores on the Level 2 Writing portion of the ETS Proficiency Profile met the criteria for success (65% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Writing) in each of the last five academic years, ranging from 68.8% to 100% of students being marginal or proficient.

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

No changes are recommended at this time, as FSB students are exceeding the criteria for success in the area of Level 2 Writing consistently.

**Rubric Used**

No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile test results.

**FERMANIAN SCHOOL OF BUSINESS**  
**Core Competencies**

**Learning Outcome:**

Quantitative Reasoning: Students will be able to solve problems that are quantitative in nature.

**Outcome Measure:**

ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

**Outcome Measure:**

ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

**Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):**

75% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Math.

**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:**

|   | Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient |               |              |              |              |
|---|---|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|   | 2012-13                                       | 2013-14       | 2014-15      | 2015-16      | 2016-17      |
| <b>ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Math</b> | <b>86.4%</b>                                  | <b>100.0%</b> | <b>76.7%</b> | <b>82.9%</b> | <b>81.5%</b> |

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

Fermanian School of Business (FSB) student scores on the Level 2 Math portion of the ETS Proficiency Profile met the criteria for success (75% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Math) in each of the last five academic years, ranging from 76.7% to 100% of students being marginal or proficient.

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

No changes are recommended at this time, as FSB students are exceeding the criteria for success in the area of Level 2 Math consistently.

**Rubric Used**

No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile test results.

**Fermanian School of Business**  
**PLO #2 Assessment = Core Competency: Information Literacy**  
**2016-2017**

**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 70<sup>th</sup> percentile on the national COMP-XM Balanced Score Card Results
2. Average score of all students will be above 55<sup>th</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup> | Balanced Score Card Results | Board Query Results |
|-------------|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| Fall 2013   | 53             | 66                          | 63                  |
| Spring 2014 | 47             | 65                          | 51                  |
| Fall 2014   | 55             | 26                          | 25                  |
| Spring 2015 | 31             | 52                          | 47                  |
| Fall 2015   | 51             | 82                          | 70                  |
| Spring 2016 | 59             | 71                          | 60                  |
| Fall 2016   | 60             | 80                          | 86                  |
| Spring 2017 | 68             | 80                          | 71                  |

<sup>1</sup> Number of Students Completing Module

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

For Fall 2013 and Spring 2014, the average scores on the national COMP-XM Balanced Score Card results fell slightly below the criteria for success (above the 70<sup>th</sup> percentile). For Fall 2014 and Spring 2015, scores were below the criteria for success at 26 and 52, respectively. These low scores may have been due to the absence of the professor who typically sets up the simulation and the expectations, as this professor was on sabbatical. Beginning in Fall 2015 and continuing through Spring 2017, scores exceeded the criteria for success, ranging from 71 to 82.

For Fall 2013, the average score on the national COMP-XM Board Query results were above the criteria for success (above the 55<sup>th</sup> percentile); however, scores dropped slightly below the criteria for success in Spring 2014. In Fall 2014 and Spring 2015, scores were below the criteria for success at 25 and 47, respectively. Similarly to the COMP-XM Balanced Score Card results, these low scores may have been due to the absence of the professor who typically sets up the simulation. Beginning in Fall 2015 and continuing through Spring 2017, scores exceeded the criteria for success, ranging from 60 to 86.

The improvement in scores over the last two academic years for both the COMP-XM Balanced Score Card and Board Query results may be attributed to two items: (a) the return of the professor who sets up the simulation, and (b) the implementation of new curriculum in AY 13-14. Seniors completing the COMP-XM Simulation in Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 were the first class to enroll under the new curriculum.

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

At this time, no changes are recommended, as the change in curriculum and the return of the professor has resulted in scores consistently above the criteria for success. Additionally, the professor's approach to running the simulation will continue to be institutionalized so that other professors can effectively use the simulation in the future.

**Fermanian School of Business**  
**PLO #3 Assessment = Core Competency: Oral Communication**  
**2016-2017**

**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. 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:**

The FSB collected data at the junior level on a different writing assignment (Group Research Project) for many years for ACBSP assessment purposes. However, a new assignment (Final Internship Research Report) was implemented at the senior level in BUS 489 and data was collected beginning in the Spring of 2015.

**AACU Written Communication Value Rubric: Average Rubric Score**

| Course | Semester    | # of assessments | Context and Purpose for Writing | Content Development | Genre and Disciplinary Conventions | Sources and Evidence | Control of Syntax and Mechanics | Total |
|--------|-------------|------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|-------|
| BUS489 | Spring 2015 | 26               | 3.46                            | 3.50                | 3.27                               | 3.42                 | 3.19                            | 3.41  |
| 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  |

**Longitudinal Data – Video Cover Letter:**

The FSB collected data at the junior level on a speaking assignment (BUS 313 Research Proposal Presentation) for many years for ACBSP assessment purposes. However, a new assignment (Video Cover Letter) was implemented at the senior level in BUS 489 and data was collected beginning in the Spring of 2015.

**AACU Oral Communication Value Rubric – Average Rubric Score:**

| Course | Semester    | # of assessments | Organization | Language | Delivery | Supporting Material | Central Message | Total |
|--------|-------------|------------------|--------------|----------|----------|---------------------|-----------------|-------|
| BUS489 | Spring 2015 | 29               | 3.52         | 3.21     | 2.97     | 3.45                | 3.00            | 3.23  |
| 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  |

**Conclusions Drawn from Data**

**Final Internship Research Report:** The criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) was met in each of the last six semesters on two of the rubric criteria areas, Context and Purpose for Writing and Content Development. The criteria for success was met in five of the last six semesters on two of the other rubric criteria areas, Genre and Disciplinary Conventions and Sources and Evidence. For the rubric criteria area of Control of Syntax and Mechanics, the criteria for success was met three out of the six semesters; however, the scores below the criteria for success were just slightly lower, ranging from 2.85 to 2.98.

**Video Cover Letter:**

The criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) was met in each of the last six semesters on the rubric criteria area of Supporting Material. The rubric criteria areas of Organization, Language and Central Message met the criteria for success in four or five of the six 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 two out of the six semesters, with scores below the criteria for success from three semesters 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:** Some areas for improvement are as follows:

- Curricular: It is believed that the significant increase in scores for the rubric criteria area of Genre and Disciplinary Conventions from Fall 2016 to Spring 2017 is due to an APA activity that was incorporated into a pre-requisite course, Bus. 313. Having this APA citing activity strategically placed in the pre-requisite course may have contributed to the rise the scores in Spring 2017 – as students would have first had exposure to it in Fall 2016.

- **Rubric Clarification:** The assessors expressed some confusion over where APA should be evaluated, as the AACU Rubric on Communication does not clearly specify where APA would be assessed. The assessors decided to include it in the rubric criteria area of Genre & Disciplinary Conventions, as writing style is discussed in this section of the rubric. For consistency purposes, we will make a note moving forward that APA will be assessed under Genre & Literary Conventions.

**Video Cover Letter:** Some areas for improvement are as follows:

- **Assignment Directions:** The rubric criteria area of Delivery is an area that the average student scores consistently fall below the criteria for success. Assessors observed that the sample video given to students (implemented following AY15-16 Assessment) should better represent best practices, specifically related to background and lighting. The instructor will also add directions regarding lighting, so that the students consider visual clarity of the video. As recommended last year, the instructor for the course also set a lower time limit for the video, so as not to lose the viewers' interest.
- **Rubric Clarification:** Prior to AY16-17, assessors have not included background and lighting in the rubric criteria area of Delivery which may have slightly impacted scores. Moving forward, assessors will be given instruction to include these aspects when assessing the rubric criteria area of Delivery to ensure consistency.



## Rubric Used

# WRITTEN COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto: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<br>4   | Milestones  |  | Benchmark<br>1  |
|--|---|---|--|---|
|  |   | 3   | 2  |   |
| <b>Context of and Purpose for Writing</b><br><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). |
| <b>Content Development</b>   | Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.  | Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.  | Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.   | Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.  |
| <b>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions</b><br><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.  |
| <b>Sources and Evidence</b>  | Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing   | 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.   |
| <b>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</b>   | Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.   | Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.  | Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.  | Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.  |

Rubric Used

**ORAL COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC**

for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto: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.*

|                            | <b>Capstone (4)</b>   | <b>Milestones (3)</b>   | <b>Milestones (3)</b>   | <b>Benchmark (1)</b>   |
|----------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| <b>Organization</b>        | 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.  |
| <b>Language</b>            | 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.   |
| <b>Delivery</b>            | 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.   |
| <b>Supporting Material</b> | 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. |
| <b>Central Message</b>     | 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.  |