

**Fermanian School of Business  
PLO #1 Assessment  
2020-2021**

**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:

<b>Peregrine Undergraduate Comprehensive Exit Exam Criteria for Success</b>	
<b>Disciplinary Area</b>	<b>Score</b>
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 Environment 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	
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

**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.

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.

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

Management has been recognized as an area needing improvement. Scores in this area have been consistently below the criteria for success; however, the recent AY 20-21 results indicate a positive trend. Content in operations management was added to MGT2012 Principles of Management beginning Fall 2017. Students taking this improved MGT2012 course began graduating in Spring 2020; however, the scores for AY 19-20 did not increase as a result; however, scores in AY 20-21 increased by 2.5 points compared to AY 19-20. Additional analysis regarding MGT 2012 Principles of Management content will be revisited in Spring 2022, including the areas of human resources, operations management, and organizational behavior.

Accounting has been trending downward over the last five years and has dropped slightly below the criteria for success in AY 20-21, for the first time in last 5-year period. This area will be closely monitored.

The criteria for success will be revisited by the assessment committee in Fall 2021. With ten of twelve scores above the criteria for success in AY 19-20 and AY 20-21, the FSB will consider increasing the criteria for success in areas deemed appropriate.

**Draft 10.12.21**

**Approved by Assessment Committee 10.20.21**

**Approved by FSB Full Faculty 11.01.21**

**Fermanian School of Business  
PLO #2 Assessment  
2020-2021**

**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 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 2016	60	80	86
Spring 2017	68	80	71
Fall 2017	81	60	53
Spring 2018	56	82	64
Fall 2018	64	65	72
Spring 2019	70	53	-
Summer 2019	13	24.5	41.5
Fall 2019	60	66	64
Spring 2020	54	58	42
Summer 2020	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fall 2020	64	58	55
Spring 2021	70	58	45
Summer 2021	31	62	51

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

Note: Board Query results not collected in Spring 2019

**Draft 10.12.21  
Approved by Assessment Committee 10.20.21  
Approved by FSB Full Faculty 11.01.21**

### **Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

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 three of the twelve semesters. A downward trend has been noted beginning Fall 2018, with students averaging between the 24<sup>th</sup> and 66<sup>th</sup> percentile.

Scores on the COMP-XM Board Query exceeded the criteria for success in six of the twelve semesters. However, four of the six most recent semesters have been below the criteria for success. Data was not collected in Spring 2019 due to a miscommunication with the instructor.

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

It is important to note that since December of 2018, new faculty have been teaching MGT4088 Strategic Management. The new faculty teaching Strategic Management have attended specialized training on the simulation. In addition, during AY 20-21 faculty reviewed and during AY 21-22 will continue to review the existing simulation modules used, adjust the specific modules used, and adjust the approach to applying the modules as necessary in MGT4088. Furthermore, the criteria for success will be reviewed by the assessment committee in Fall 2021 to ensure they are appropriate.

Note: Board Query results not collected in Spring 2019

**Draft 10.12.21**  
**Approved by Assessment Committee 10.20.21**  
**Approved by FSB Full Faculty 11.01.21**

**Fermanian School of Business  
PLO #3 Assessment  
2020-2021**

**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:**

**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	Fall 2018	24	3.33	3.08	3.17	3.00	3.00	3.12
BUS/BBU 489	Spring 2019	64	3.21	3.39	3.54	3.32	3.41	3.37
BUS489	Summer 2019	40	3.30	3.15	2.88	3.18	2.90	3.08
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

Draft 10.12.21

Approved by Assessment Committee 10.20.21

Approved by FSB Full Faculty 11.01.21

**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 2018	24	3.25	3.08	3.00	3.25	3.25	3.17
BUS/BBU 489	Spring 2019	64	3.28	3.33	3.22	3.10	3.43	3.27
BUS489	Summer 2019	40	3.28	3.18	2.95	3.13	3.13	3.13
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

**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	Fall 2018	28	2.57	2.86	2.82	2.46	2.64	2.67
BUS489	Spring 2019	40	2.88	3.05	2.95	2.85	3.15	2.98
BUS/BBU 489	Summer 2019	54	3.63	3.59	3.22	3.31	3.40	3.43
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	Summer 2021	44	3.64	3.48	3.34	2.75	3.36	3.31

Draft 10.12.21

Approved by Assessment Committee 10.20.21

Approved by FSB Full Faculty 11.01.21

## **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 seven of the ten semesters, with the last four semesters above 3.0. Scores in the area of Control of Syntax and Mechanics exceeded the criteria for success in six of the ten semesters, with the last four 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 three of the rubric criteria areas, Determine the Extent of Information Needed, Access the Needed Information, 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 and Critically Evaluate Info and Sources.

### **Video Cover Letter – Oral Communication Rubric:**

The criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) was met in nine of the ten semesters on the rubric criteria areas of Organization, Language, and Central Message. Scores in the rubric criteria area of Delivery fell below the criteria for success in four of the ten semesters; however, it was above 3.0 in the last three semesters. Scores in the rubric criteria area of Supporting Material fell below the criteria for success in seven of the ten semesters, including the last five 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 four semesters, no action is necessary at this time. These areas will be closely monitored.

### **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 above 3.0 during the last three semesters, no action is necessary at this time. This area will be closely monitored. The area of Supporting Material has been below the criteria for success seven out of the ten 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 reviewed by the instructors during Spring 2022.



## 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**  
**2020-2021**

**Learning Outcome:**

PLO #4: Formulate decisions informed by ethical 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.

**Criteria for Success:**

Average score of all students will be above the 70<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

**Longitudinal Data:**

Semester	N <sup>1</sup>	Ethics Module Results (%)
Spring 2016	59	54
Fall 2016	60	80
Spring 2017	68	83
Fall 2017	81	74
Spring 2018	56	77
Fall 2018	N/A	N/A
Spring 2019	N/A	N/A
Summer 2019	13	72
Fall 2019	60	74
Spring 2020	54	59
Summer 2020	N/A	N/A
Fall 2020	64	67
Spring 2021	70	61
Summer 2021	31	69

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

### **Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

The COMP-XM Ethics Module was implemented in Spring 2016. With an average score in the 54<sup>th</sup> percentile, the criteria for success was initially set at the 55<sup>th</sup> percentile. The criteria for success was raised to the 70<sup>th</sup> percentile beginning in Fall 2017 due to strong results in AY 2016-2017.

Data was not collected in Fall 2018 or Spring 2019 due to miscommunications regarding the simulation set-up. Due primarily to the fact that 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 part 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. The criteria for success has been met for six of the eleven periods with data.

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

Business ethics knowledge was recognized as an area needing improvement through the Peregrine comprehensive exit exam (PLO 1 – Business Ethics); however, the criteria for success was met for PLO 1 – Business Ethics in AY 19-20 and AY 20-21 (see Undergraduate Core PLO #1 Assessment Report). Beginning AY 21-22, the assessment for Ethics will be moved from MGT4088 to BUS4089. In addition, additional ethics content is being added to the BUS4089 course.

**Fermanian School of Business**  
**PLO #5 Assessment**  
**2020-2021**

**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 MGT4088 – 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

**Longitudinal Data:  
Capstone Simulation Results:**

Semester	N <sup>1</sup>	Capstone Simulation Results
Fall 2016	60	76.5
Spring 2017	68	72.5
Fall 2017	81	71.8
Spring 2018	56	73.3
Fall 2018	64	83.5
Spring 2019	70	65.4
Summer 2019	14	47.0
Fall 2019	60	82.9
Spring 2020	54	75.3
Summer 2020	N/A	N/A
Fall 2020	64	57.7
Spring 2021	70	68.1
Summer 2021	31	83.8

**Knowledge of Team Module Results:**

Semester	N <sup>1</sup>	Knowledge of Team Module Results (%)
Fall 2016	60	79
Spring 2017	68	68
Fall 2017	81	81
Spring 2018	56	83
Fall 2018	N/A	N/A
Spring 2019	N/A	N/A
Summer 2019	N/A	N/A
Fall 2019	60	85
Spring 2020	54	79
Summer 2020	N/A	N/A
Fall 2020	64	82
Spring 2021	70	77
Summer 2021	31	73

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

**Peer Evaluation Module Results:**

<b>Semester</b>	<b>N<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Self-Management/Accountability</b>	<b>Quality of Work and Contextual Performance</b>
Fall 2016	30	4.74	4.75
Spring 2017	68	4.88	4.88
Fall 2017	81	4.79	4.78
Spring 2018	56	4.85	4.82
Fall 2018	N/A	N/A	N/A
Spring 2019	N/A	N/A	N/A
Summer 2019	9	4.77	4.84
Fall 2019	60	4.74	4.78
Spring 2020	54	4.74	4.73
Summer 2020	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fall 2020	64	4.71	4.72
Spring 2021	70	4.62	4.68
Summer 2021	31	4.81	4.82

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

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 75<sup>th</sup> percentile) in five of the twelve semesters, including the most recent semester.

Students' scores on the COMP-XM Knowledge of Teamwork Module met the criteria for success (above the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile) in seven of the nine semesters. Data was not collected in AY 18-19 due to miscommunications with the simulation set-up.

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. Data was not collected in Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 due to miscommunications with the simulation set-up.

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

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

It is important to note that since December of 2018, new faculty have been teaching MGT4088 Strategic Management. The new faculty teaching Strategic Management received specialized training on the simulation.

In addition to the simulation training for faculty, a need was recognized to improve students' ability to collaborate effectively in teams as a result of the Capstone Simulation results. The FSB hired a consultant beginning in Spring 2019 to integrate strength's coaching in a team setting as part of MGT4088 Strategic Management. Data will continue to be collected and monitored in AY 21-22.