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

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

Criteria for Success:
Score at or above the following:

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

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):
1.   Specialized Knowledge
2.   Broad Integrative Knowledge
3.   Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4.   Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5.   Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

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

N= number of students completing the exam

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
It is important to note that PLNU's methodology of administering the Peregrine Comprehensive Exam is delivered in a face-to-face format, proctored and students are given a two-hour time limit to complete the test. According to Peregrine, a majority of the schools who administer the Peregrine Comprehensive Exam do so in an un-proctored online format with time limits higher than two hours. Therefore, criteria for success were determined considering: (a) average total score and average disciplinary area scores of National and Region 7 ACBSP schools, and (b) the FSB's undergraduate curriculum focus.

The first implementation of the Peregrine Comprehensive Exam was during Fall 2015. Prior to AY 15-16, The ETS exam was administered. The initial results on the Peregrine Comprehensive Exam from AY15-16 and AY16-17 allow for a baseline measurement.

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

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

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
Since undergoing a major curriculum change in AY13-14, new and/or revised lower and upper division courses are being offered. As the professors continue to refine these courses, an increase in learning and thus, an increase in the scores is anticipated on the Peregrine exam in the major discipline areas moving forward.

One area that needs improvement (as noted above) is Business Ethics. In order to provide a stronger foundation to build upon throughout the entire business core, additional ethics content will be added to

BUS100 Introduction to Business. Specifically, beginning Fall 2017, content relating to the study of various ethical models will be taught. This same content will be reinforced in MGT 212 Principles of Management.

Historically, MGT212 Principles of Management has emphasized organizational behavior and human resources, with minimal content devoted to leadership and operations management. Beginning Fall 2017, this course will be redesigned to include emphasis on all four areas. Due to these curriculum changes, an increase in scores in the areas of Business Leadership and Management is expected in the next two to three years.

Beginning Fall 2017, MKT332 Principles of Marketing will be redesigned to improve content. Due to these curriculum changes, an increase in the score in the area of Marketing is expected in the next two years.

The average scores in the area of Legal Environment of Business were within 0.9 points of the criteria success for both periods; therefore, scores for this area will be closely monitored over the next several academic years to determine if curricular changes are needed.

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

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

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

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

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):
1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

Semester	N[1]	Balanced Score Card Results	Board Query Results
Fall 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

[1] Number of Students Completing Module

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

For Fall 2013 and Spring 2014, the average scores on the COMP-XM Balanced Score Card results fell slightly below the criteria for success (above the 70th 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 COMP-XM Board Query results were above the criteria for success (above the 55th 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.

[1] Number of Students Completing Module

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

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

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

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):
1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data – Final Internship Research Report:

AACU Written Communication Value Rubric: Average Rubric Score

Course	Semester	# of assessments	Context and Purpose for Writing	Content Develop-ment	Genre and Disciplinary Conventions	Sources and Evidence	Control of Syntax and Mechanics	Total
BUS489	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
BUS489	Summer 2017	44	3.46	3.23	2.98	2.84	3.16	3.13

AACU Information Literacy Value Rubric: Average Rubric Score

Course	Semester	# of assessments	Determine Extent of Info Needed	Access Needed Info	Critically Evaluate Info and Sources	Use Info to Accomplish Purpose	Access and Use Info Ethically and Legally	Total
BUS489	Fall 2016	40	3.98	3.95	3.48	3.33	2.75	3.50
BUS489	Spring 2017	40	3.82	3.95	3.49	3.39	3.03	3.54
BUS489	Summer 2017	44	3.27	3.41	2.89	2.96	3.18	3.14

Longitudinal Data – Video Cover Letter:

AACU Oral Communication Value Rubric – Average Rubric Score:

Course	Semester	# of assessments	Organization	Language	Delivery	Supporting Material	Central Message	Total
BUS489	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
BUS489	Summer 2017	44	3.55	3.41	3.23	3.48	3.59	3.45

Conclusions Drawn from Data

Final Internship Research Report – Written Communication Rubric: The criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) was met in each of the last seven 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 seven 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 four out of the seven semesters; however, the scores below the criteria for success were just slightly lower, ranging from 2.85 to 2.98.

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 three semesters on two of the rubric criteria areas, Determine the Extent of Information Needed and Access the Needed Information. The criteria for success was met in two of the three semesters on the other three rubric criteria areas, Evaluate

Information and its Sources Critically, Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose and Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally.

Video Cover Letter – Oral Communication Rubric:
The criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) was met in each of the last seven 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 five or six of the seven 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 three out of the seven 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 - Written Communication: 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. Given that scores dropped below the criteria for success in two of the seven semesters, scores in the rubric criteria areas of Genre and Disciplinary Conventions and Sources and Evidence will be monitored; however, no curricular changes will be made at this time.
- Rubric Clarification: The assessors expressed some confusion over where APA should be evaluated, as the AACU Written Communication Value rubric 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 & Disciplinary Conventions.

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

Video Cover Letter – Oral Communication: 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.

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 3	Milestones 2	Benchmark 1
Context of and Purpose for Writing *Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).*	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).
Content Development	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.
Genre and Disciplinary Conventions *Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields (please see glossary).*	Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task (s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices	Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices	Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation	Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation.
Sources and Evidence	Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing	Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.	Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.

ORAL COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC
for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

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

	Capstone (4)	**Milestones (3)**	**Milestones (3)**	**Benchmark (1)**
Organization	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the presentation.
Language	Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is not appropriate to audience.
Delivery	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable.
Supporting Material	A variety of types of supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that partially supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Insufficient supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make reference to information or analysis that minimally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.
Central Message	Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.)	Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material.	Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable.	Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation.

Fermanian School of Business
PLO #4 Assessment
2016-2017

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

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

Criteria for Success:
Average score of all students will be above the 55th percentile on the national COMP-XM Ethics Module Results

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):
1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

Semester	N[1]	Ethics Module Results
Spring 2016	59	54
Fall 2016	60	80
Spring 2017	68	83

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
The COMP-XM Ethics Module was implemented in Spring 2016. With an average score in the 54th percentile, the criterion for success was set at the 55th percentile moving forward. Results indicate that students far exceeded the criteria for success, as the average score for Fall 2016 was in the 80th percentile and the average score for Spring 2017 was in the 83rd percentile.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
Based on the data, the criteria for success will be raised to the 70th percentile for the COMP-XM Ethics Module. In light of students' scores to date, this is believed to be a reasonable target moving forward. In order to provide a stronger foundation to build upon throughout the entire business core, additional ethics content will be added to BUS100 Introduction to Business. Specifically, beginning Fall 2017, content relating to the study of various ethical models will be taught. This same content will be reinforced in MGT 212 Principles of Management. This addition to the curriculum could further increase scores on the COMP-XM Ethics Module in future years.

[1] Number of Students Completing Module

Fermanian School of Business
PLO #5 Assessment
2016-2017

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

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

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

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):
1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

Capstone Simulation Results:

Semester	N[1]	CAPSIM Simulation Results
Fall 2015	51	79.2
Spring 2016	59	74.2
Fall 2016	60	76.5
Spring 2017	68	72.5

[1] Number of Students Completing Module

Knowledge of Team Module Results:

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

Peer Evaluation Module Results:

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

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
Teams' scores on the CAPSIM Capstone Simulation exceeded the criteria for success (above the 75th percentile) in Fall 2015 and Fall 2016. Teams' scores fell slightly under the criteria for success in Spring 2016, scoring in the 74.2 percentile. Teams scored in the 72.5 percentile in Spring 2017.

On the COMP-XM Knowledge of Teamwork Module, students' scores met the criteria for success (above the 75th percentile) in Spring 2016 and Fall 2016, but fell below the criteria for success in Spring 2017 scoring in the 68th percentile.

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

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
No changes are recommended at this time. Although scores in Spring 2017 dropped below the criteria for success for the CAPSIM Capstone Simulation and the COMP-XM Knowledge of Teamwork Module, more data is needed before implementing curricular changes, so these scores will be closely monitored in the future.

[1] Number of Students Completing Module