

**Fermanian School of Business
International Development Major PLO #E1 Assessment
2020-2021**

Learning Outcome:

International Development Major PLO #E1: Exhibit an in-depth knowledge of International Development theories and concepts.

Outcome Measure:

International Development Major-Specific Exit Exam Results – implemented Spring 2019

Criteria for Success:

Score at or above 60 on the International Development Major-Specific Exit Exam.

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:

International Development Major-Specific Exit Exam - Average Student Score:

Semester	N ¹	Score
Spring 2019	9	66.5
Spring 2021	3	65

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The International Development Major-specific Exit Exam was implemented in Spring 2019.

No data was collected in Spring 2020 due to Covid.

For both periods, the criteria for success was exceeded.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

The assessment committee will revisit the criteria for success in Fall 2022 once three periods of data are collected.

¹ Number of Students Taking Test

**Fermanian School of Business
International Development Major PLO #E2 Assessment
2020-2021**

Learning Outcome:

International Development Major PLO #E2: Compare approaches to decision making in for-profit and non-profit environments based on international development concepts.

Outcome Measures:

Final Exam Question in MGT4070 – Nonprofit Organization Management

Criteria for Success:

The average score for each criteria of the International Development Major PLO #E2 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:

International Development Major PLO #E2 Rubric – Average Student Score:

Semester	# of assessments	Mission	Methods	Measurements	Examples	Total
Fall 2016	6	3.33	3.00	3.17	3.33	3.21
Fall 2017	10	2.90	2.10	2.50	2.00	2.38
Spring 2019	18	3.94	2.33	2.22	1.44	2.48
Spring 2021	4	3.00	2.75	3.50	3.50	3.19

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The average student score met the criteria for success (average score of 3.0 out of 4.0) in the rubric criteria area of Mission in three of the four semesters. The average student score fell below the criteria for success in two of the four semesters in the area of Measurements and the area of Examples, with the recent semester above 3.0 for both areas. The average student score fell below the criteria for success in three of the four semesters in the area of Methods; however, the score significantly improved in the last semester compared to the prior two semesters.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

A thorough analysis of the development of the learning outcome throughout the International Development curriculum was conducted in AY 20-21, and changes to MGT 470 and other International Development major courses was made as deemed necessary. In addition, the instructor revised the assessment question to ensure alignment with the rubric. It appears that the described changes made in AY 20-21 had a positive impact as three of the four areas now meet the criteria for success, and the remaining area of Methods improved significantly. Given that the area of Methods is still slightly below the criteria for success, it will be closely monitored.

Draft 10.13.21
Approved by Assessment Committee 10.20.21
Approved by FSB Full Faculty 11.01.21

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT MAJOR PLO E2 RUBRIC

Point Loma Nazarene University International Development Major Learning Outcome E2: Compare approaches to decision making in for-profit and non-profit environments based on international development concepts.

Criteria	Excellent 4	Meets Expectations 3	Needs Improvement 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Mission in for-profit and non-profit environments	Directly identifies making a profit as central to the mission in a for-profit environment compared to the need to balance stakeholders opinions of mission in a non-profit environment. Clearly depicts for-profit organizations as having a clear mission and non-profit organizations having a more ambiguous mission due to complexity of reaching a consensus.	Generally points to making a profit as central to the mission in a for-profit environment compared to the need to balance stakeholders opinions of mission in a non-profit environment. Generally depicts for-profit organizations as having a clear mission and non-profit organizations having a more ambiguous mission due to complexity of reaching a consensus.	Vaguely mentions making a profit as central to the mission in a for-profit environment compared to the need to balance stakeholders opinions of mission in a non-profit environment. Vaguely depicts for-profit organizations as having a clear mission and non-profit organizations having a more ambiguous mission due to complexity of reaching a consensus.	Does not identify making a profit as central to the mission in a for-profit environment compared to the need to balance stakeholders opinions of mission in a non-profit environment. Does a poor job depicting for-profit organizations as having a clear mission and non-profit organizations having a more ambiguous mission due to complexity of reaching a consensus.
Methods used in for-profit and non-profit environments	Clearly describes the cost-benefit analysis as the central method to fulfilling mission in a for-profit environment. Clearly describes the complexity involved in balancing costs with the "ideal" of serving maximum number of people in need.	Generally describes the cost-benefit analysis as the central method to fulfilling mission in a for-profit environment. Generally describes the complexity involved in balancing costs with the "ideal" of serving maximum number of people in need.	Vaguely describes the cost-benefit analysis as the central method to fulfilling mission in a for-profit environment. Vaguely describes the complexity involved in balancing costs with the "ideal" of serving maximum number of people in need.	Does not describe the cost-benefit analysis as the central method to fulfilling mission in a for-profit environment. Lacks discussion of the complexity involved in balancing costs with the "ideal" of serving maximum number of people in need.
Measurements used in for-profit and non-profit environments	Identifies and explains the clear cut measure of success on making increased profits in a for-profit organization and the challenge of a non-profit to come to a consensus on the measure of success given the many interests of stakeholders.	Makes some reference to the clear cut measure of success on making increased profits in a for-profit organization and the challenge of a non-profit to come to a consensus on the measure of success given the many interests of stakeholders.	Vaguely mentions the clear cut measure of success on making increased profits in a for-profit organization and the challenge of a non-profit to come to a consensus on the measure of success given the many interests of stakeholders.	Does not point to the clear cut measure of success on making increased profits in a for-profit organization and the challenge of a non-profit to come to a consensus on the measure of success given the many interests of stakeholders.
Examples used to illustrate decision-making in for-profit and non-profit environments	Consistently provides appropriate examples that illustrate the difference in the decision making process in for-profit vs. non-profit environments.	Usually provides appropriate examples that illustrate the difference in the decision making process in for-profit vs. non-profit environments.	Sometimes provides appropriate examples that illustrate the difference in the decision making process in for-profit vs. non-profit environments.	Rarely, if at all, provides appropriate examples that illustrate the difference in the decision making process in for-profit vs. non-profit environments.

Average Score: _____ (Total/# of criteria)

Note 1: All criteria are weighted equally

**Fermanian School of Business
International Development Major PLO #E3 Assessment
2020-2021**

Learning Outcome:

International Development Major PLO #E3: Evaluate the similarities and differences of the economic conditions between developed and developing countries based on International Development knowledge.

Outcome Measures:

PLO #E3: MGT4070 Final Study Abroad Paper – Collected from graduating International Development Majors

Criteria for Success:

The average score for each criteria of the International Development Major PLO #E3 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:

International Development Major PLO #E3 Rubric – Average Student Score:

Semester	# of assessments	Similarities of People and Culture	Differences in Economic Conditions	First-hand Understanding of Similarities and Differences	Total
Spring 2016	2	2.00	3.00	3.50	2.83
Spring 2017	6	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.33
Spring 2019	10	3.40	3.20	3.70	3.43
Spring 2021	6	3.50	3.50	3.00	3.33

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) was met in the rubric criteria area of First-hand Understanding of Similarities and Differences in Developed vs. Developing Countries in all four semesters. The average student score met the criteria for success in the rubric criteria area of Differences in Economic Conditions of Developed vs. Developing Countries in three of the four semesters, with the last two semesters above 3.0. The average student score met the criteria for success in the rubric criteria area of Similarities of People and Culture in Developed vs. Developing Countries in two of the four semesters, with the last two semesters above 3.0.

**Draft 10.13.21
Approved by Assessment Committee 10.20.21
Approved by FSB Full Faculty 11.01.21**

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Instructions for the signature assignment were modified for clarity beginning Spring 2019.
Improvements are noted in all areas in Spring 2019 and Spring 2021.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT MAJOR PLO #E3 RUBRIC

Point Loma Nazarene University International Development Major Learning Outcome E3: Evaluate the similarities and differences of the economic conditions between developed and developing countries based on International Development knowledge.

Criteria	Excellent 4	Meets Expectations 3	Needs Improvement 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Similarities in people and culture in Developed vs. Developing Countries	Clearly identifies and explains all of the primary similarities in the people and culture in developed vs. developing countries.	Clearly identifies and explains most of the primary similarities in the people and culture in developed vs. developing countries.	Clearly identifies some of the primary similarities in the people and culture in developed vs. developing countries.	Identifies few, if any, of the primary similarities in the people and culture in developed vs. developing countries.
Differences in Economic Conditions of Developed vs. Developing Countries	Clearly identifies and explains all of the primary differences in the economic conditions of people in developed vs. developing countries.	Clearly identifies and explains most of the primary differences in the economic conditions of people in developed vs. developing countries.	Clearly identifies some of the primary differences in the economic conditions of people in developed vs. developing countries.	Identifies few, if any, of the primary differences in the economic conditions of people in developed vs. developing countries.
First-hand Understanding of Similarities and Differences in Developed (e.g. USA) vs. Developing Countries	Consistently demonstrates a clear understanding of similarities and differences based on first-hand experience in a developing country. Incorporates many appropriate examples from study abroad experience to support this understanding.	Often demonstrates a clear understanding of similarities and differences based on first-hand experience in a developing country. Incorporates several appropriate examples from study abroad experience to support this understanding.	Sometimes articulates a clear understanding of similarities and differences based on first-hand experience in a developing country. Incorporates very few appropriate examples from study abroad experience to support this understanding.	Rarely articulates a clear understanding of similarities and differences based on first-hand experience in a developing country. Few, if any, appropriate examples from study abroad are included to support this understanding.

Average Score: _____ (Total/# of criteria)