

**Fermanian School of Business  
PLO #1 Assessment  
2015-2016**

**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 average total score and the average disciplinary area scores of all national ACBSP schools.

**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:**

Peregrine Comprehensive Exam Results - Average	Fall 2015 PLNU	Spring 2016 PLNU	ACBSP National (2015/2016)
<b>Undergraduate Total</b>	51.9	50	51.3

Peregrine Comprehensive Exam Results – Disciplinary Areas	Fall 2015 PLNU	Spring 2016 PLNU	ACBSP National (2015/2016)
Accounting	58.6	55.9	51.4
Business Ethics	49.2	47.8	53.5
Business Finance	51	48.8	44.7
Business Integration and Strategic Management	62	51.4	54.1
Business Leadership	48.6	49.3	50.7
Economics (Macro/Micro)	59.2	51.5	48.7
Global Dimensions of Business	43.3	48.3	46
Information Management Systems	55.7	52.5	59
Legal Environment of Business	50.2	48.3	55.8
Management (Operations, HRM, & Organizational Behavior)	48.6	55.9	56.9
Marketing	48.8	48.8	45.8
Quantitative Techniques/Statistics	47.8	41.7	46.3

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

Overall, we met our goal in exceeding the average total score by 0.6 points in Fall of 2015; however, we fell slightly below the average total score by 1.3 points in the Spring of 2016. Furthermore, results indicate that Fermanian School of Business students scored above the national ACBSP scores in six of the twelve disciplinary areas in Fall 2015 and five of the twelve disciplinary areas in Spring 2016. Even though the national scores were not met or exceeded in all twelve disciplinary areas, the results are promising and show that we have the potential to meet our goal in the future.

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

Since undergoing a major curriculum change three years ago, new and/or revised lower and upper division courses have been offered. As our professors have and will continue to refine these courses, we anticipate an increase in learning and thus, an increase in the scores on the Peregrine exam in the major discipline areas moving forward. An area that needs improvement is Business Ethics. In order to provide a stronger foundation to build upon throughout our entire business core, we will be adding additional ethics content to MGT 212 Principles of Management. Specifically, beginning Spring 2017, we will be adding course content relating to the study of various ethical models. Information Management Systems and Legal Environment of Business were outliers as well, and will be closely monitored over the next academic year to determine if curricular changes are needed. Business Integration and Strategic Management, Leadership, Global Dimensions of Business, Management, and Quantitative Techniques/Statistics were very close to the target scores, if not exceeding the target scores one semester, and will be closely monitored in the future to determine if any action is needed as well.

**Fermanian School of Business  
PLO #2 Assessment  
2015-2016**

**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

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

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

Our simulation results are at or above our 70% target for both Fall 2015 and Spring 2016. With a 56 point increase in average scores from Fall 2014 to Fall 2015 and a 19 point increase in average scores from Spring 2015 compared to Spring 2016, we are very satisfied with these results. In our last report, we explained the drop in scores last year 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. However, this particular instructor returned from sabbatical this academic year, so the rise in scores may be due to his return and more importantly, due to the way in which the simulation is set up, including high expectations set by the professor.

Similarly, the Board Query results show our students both Fall 2015 semester and Spring 2016 semester met our target (average score of all students falling at 55% or above). With a 45 point increase in scores from Fall 2015 compared to Fall 2016 and a 13 point increase in scores from Spring 2015 compared to Spring 2016, we feel we are on track.

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

We expect the changes in undergraduate curriculum that were implemented three years ago in academic year 13-14 will continue to benefit us as such curriculum continues to be implemented and refined. The continued implementation of such curriculum changes should enable us to maintain or increase our scores in the CAPSIM COMP-XM Balanced Score Card Results, and especially in the CAPSIM COMP-XM Board Query Results. Furthermore, in order to maintain or increase our scores in both areas, we recognize that we will need to continue to be diligent about stressing to students the importance of the simulations and setting high expectations for them. Finally, we will ensure that the professor's approach to using this simulation is institutionalized and can be taught by other professors effectively in the future.

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

**Fermanian School of Business  
PLO #3 Assessment  
2015-2016**

**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. Please find below our longitudinal data beginning Spring 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	20	3.30	3.25	3.15	3.10	2.98	3.16

**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. Please find below our longitudinal data beginning Spring 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

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

**Final Internship Research Report:** According to the data, the students met our criteria for success (average of a 3.0 or above out of 4.0) on all criteria listed on the AACU Written Communication Rubric for Fall 2015, met our criteria for success on all but two criteria for Spring 2016, and met our criteria for success in all but one area for Summer 2016. The two criteria they fell below a 3.0 average in Spring 2016 include: “Sources and Evidence” and “Control of Syntax and Mechanics.” The one criterion they fell below a 3.0 average in Summer 2016 includes: “Control of Syntax and Mechanics.” Although the scores were close to 3.0, the FSB has a few recommended changes in light of these scores. We were pleased to see high marks especially in the areas of “Content and Purpose for Writing” and “Content Development.”

**Video Cover Letter:** Based on the data, students met or exceeded the criteria for success (average score of 3.0 out of 4.0) on all criteria listed on the AACU Oral Communication Rubric in Fall 2015, on all but one criterion for Spring 2016, and in all criteria for Summer 2016. Overall, we were very pleased with these findings. However, the assessors for this assignment recommended a few changes moving forward in the area that fell below the 3.0 target score in Spring 2016. The area that fell below the threshold in Spring 2016 was “Delivery” - which received a score of 2.93 – just slightly under the target score.

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

**Final Internship Research Report:** Being a new assignment, the assessment process really helped to highlight mechanical issues in need of improvement. Based on feedback from assessors, the content was strong, but the citing and syntax needed some work. To address this, use of proper APA format will be reinforced by incorporating an APA citing activity in the pre-requisite course, BUS 313. Also, full-time faculty will be provided APA guidelines and taught proper APA format by the librarian. Additionally, the

directions for the Final Internship Research Report will be slightly revised to include an emphasis on proper grammar and sentence structure. Finally, students will be encouraged to proofread their reports before submitting them.

**Video Cover Letter:** As a fairly new assignment, the assessment process for the video cover letter will help fine-tune and clarify the content and delivery requirements moving forward. Based on feedback from the assessors, the content was satisfactory, but the format was in need of improvement. For instance, the assessors noted that the videos varied in length from 45 seconds to 5 minutes. The time limit given was not specific enough and therefore, the time will be clearly noted on video cover letter directions as “not to exceed one minute.” Additionally, the link to an excellent video cover letter by a student from Spring 2016 will be sent out to future students as an example (upon permission of the student). The example will demonstrate proper lighting, background, delivery, organization of content, and timing. These steps should help ensure our students have a clear understanding of the video cover letter expectations moving forward.

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 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1
		3	2	
<b>Context of and Purpose for Writing</b> <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> <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.

**Fermanian School of Business  
PLO #4 Assessment  
2015-2016**

**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 simulation and exam 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 55<sup>th</sup> 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

**Initial Data:**

Semester	N <sup>1</sup>	Ethics Module Results
Spring 2016	59	54

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

Since this is a new module, we had no historical data to draw from regarding a target score. However, based on our students' average performance (54<sup>th</sup> percentile), we feel a target of above the 55<sup>th</sup> percentile would be challenging, yet within reach for our students moving forward.

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

Based on the score above, we have set our target score at above the 55<sup>th</sup> percentile moving forward. We intentionally weave ethics into all of our core business courses. However, in order to provide a stronger foundation to build upon throughout our entire business core, we will be adding additional ethics content to MGT 212 - Principles of Management. Specifically, beginning Spring 2017, we will be adding course content relating to the study of various ethical models.

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

**Fermanian School of Business  
PLO #5 Assessment  
2015-2016**

**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 75<sup>th</sup> percentile
2. COMP-XM Knowledge of Teamwork Module - Average student score will be above the 75<sup>th</sup> 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

**Initial Data:**

**Capstone Simulation Results:**

Semester	N <sup>1</sup>	CAPSIM Simulation Results
Fall 2015	51	79.2
Spring 2016	59	74.2

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

### Knowledge of Team Module Results:

Semester	N <sup>1</sup>	Knowledge of Team Module Results
Spring 2016	59	81.0

### Peer Evaluation Module Results:

Semester	N <sup>1</sup>	Self-Management/Accountability	Quality of Work and Contextual Performance
Spring 2016	59	4.93	4.94

### Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The Fall 2015 CAPSIM results reveal FSB students met our criteria for success (above the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile) on the National CAPSIM by scoring in the 79<sup>th</sup> percentile. In Spring 2016, the students fell slightly below the criteria for success by scoring in the 74<sup>th</sup> percentile. Spring 2016 was the first time using the “National Capstone Knowledge of Teams” and our students met our criteria for success (above the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile) by scoring in the 81<sup>st</sup> percentile. They also exceeded our criteria for success (average score of 4.5 out of 5.0) in both areas of the Peer Evaluation Module which includes “Self Management / Accountability” (4.93) and “Quality of Work and Contextual Performance” (4.94). Please note that Fall 2015 students did not participate in the Team Module or Peer Evaluation Module results, as we just began these modules in Spring 2016.

### Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Since this is our first semester implementing the teamwork modules in CAPSIM, we plan to use the Spring 2016 scores as a baseline. We plan to wait and view next year’s results before making any adjustment to our curriculum or to the target score.

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