

**Fermanian School of Business
Management Major PLO #F2 Assessment
2015-2016**

Learning Outcome:

Management Major PLO #F2: Apply management theories to effectively address challenging business scenarios.

Outcome Measure:

MGT 320 – Consulting Signature Assignment (assessed every Spring beginning Spring 2016)

Criteria for Success:

The average score for each criteria of the Management Major PLO #F2 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:

Management Major PLO #F2 Rubric – Average Student Score:

Semester	# of assessments	Summary of Case Includes All Relevant Factors	Analysis of OB Issues	Recommendations with Support	Total
Spring 2016	40	2.90	3.23	2.75	2.96

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Scores for students in the area of “Analysis of OB Issues” met the criteria for success by yielding 3.25. Students fell slightly below the criteria for success in the area of “Summary of Case Includes All Relevant Factors” with an average score of 2.90 and in the area of “Recommendations with Support” with an average score of 2.75. While these scores were close to our target for success, the assessors had several recommendations for improvement regarding the rubric and the assignment directions. These will be shared in the next section.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

This was the first time we assessed this assignment and this process brought to light clear ways to fine-tune the content and instruction of this assignment. During the assessment process, the two assessors noted that very few students included research articles to support their recommendations. In order to receive a 2, 3, or 4 in this category, the rubric reveals that research articles should be referenced.

However, when the assessors consulted with the professor who gives the assignment, it was concluded that the students are encouraged to include examples and not specifically research articles, as examples are more appropriate for a paper of this nature. In light of this, the assessors recommend changing rubric regarding the use of additional research articles to examples:

To achieve a score of a 4: "Three or more relevant examples are incorporated"

To achieve a score of a 3: "At least two relevant examples are incorporated"

To achieve a score of a 2: "At least one relevant example is incorporated"

To achieve a score of a 1: "No relevant examples are incorporated"

The assessors have also recommended to the instructor to include in the student instructions that relevant examples should be used to support their recommendations.

Additionally, the assessors have recommended that the instructor add to the student instructions the use of headings throughout the paper. The use of headings would allow for all relevant parts of the case to stand out, as well as, enhance the organization and ease of reading. Since students are instructed on the use of headings in Bus. 313 Administrative Communication, the instructor in Bus. 313 also plans to stress the use of headings not just for papers in her class, but for reports in all of the students' classes.

MANAGEMENT MAJOR PLO #F2 RUBRIC

Point Loma Nazarene University Management Major Learning Outcome F2: Apply management theories to effectively address challenging business scenarios.

Criteria	Very Good 4	Good 3	Acceptable 2	Poor 1
Summary of case includes all relevant factors	Summary clearly explains issue, primary individuals involved, and describes the context (personal journey, a startup, a department, and a financial institution). All key factors are included to clearly understand the case.	Summary mentions issue, most individuals involved, and describes the context (personal journey, a startup, a department, and a financial institution). Most key factors are included to understand case.	Summary mentions issue, but does not clearly explain some of the factors, such as: individuals involved and context (personal journey, a startup, a department, and a financial institution). Minimal key factors are included to understand case.	Summary mentions issue but leaves out most or all key factors required to understand case.
Analysis of OB Issues	OB issues are clearly identified. Includes an in-depth analysis from the perspective of Individuals, Groups, Structures, and the Environment from which they are found.	Most OB issues are identified. Includes an fairly thorough analysis from the perspective of Individuals, Groups, Structures, and the Environment from which they are found.	Some OB issues are identified. Includes an analysis from most of the perspectives (Individuals, Groups, Structures, and the Environment from which they are found).	Very few OB issues are identified. Lacks a clear analysis from the perspective of Individuals, Groups, Structures, and the Environment from which they are found.
Recommendations with support	Primary issues are identified and appropriate recommendations are made with support from two or more academic research articles. Consistent use of proper citations.	Most of the primary issues are identified and appropriate recommendations are made with support from at least two academic research articles. Frequent use of proper citations.	Several of the primary issues are identified and most recommendations are made with support from 1-2 academic research articles. Minimal use of proper citations.	Very few primary issues are identified and few recommendations are made with support from two or more academic research articles. Inconsistent or no use of proper citations.

Average Score: _____ (Total/# of criteria)

Note 1: All criteria are weighted equally