

**Fermanian School of Business  
PLO #1 Assessment  
2023-2024**

**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>	
Disciplinary Area	Score
Accounting	50
Business Ethics	50
Business Finance	50
Strategic Management	55
Business Leadership	55
Economics (Macro/Micro)	52.5
Global Dimensions of Business	50
Information Mgt Systems	50
Legal Environment of Business	55
Management (OPS, HR, OB)	55
Marketing	57.5
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
<b>Criteria for Success</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>57.5</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Criteria for Success as of 21-22</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>52.5</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>57.5</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>45</b>
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
2021-2022	50.1	46.4	51.2	47.9	53.9	50.6	50.0	47.9	49.2	51.2	50.6	56.5	45.7
2022-2023	50.3	47.4	51.6	46.8	56.7	51.2	49.9	47.5	49.9	50.7	50.4	56.8	45.3
2023-2024	52.2	47.0	55.2	48.9	55.2	58.0	52.8	48.0	52.7	52.0	50.4	56.7	49.9

**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, most schools that administer the Peregrine Comprehensive Exam do so in an un-proctored format with time limits of up to 48 hours. Therefore, criteria for success were determined considering (a) the 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. Beginning AY 21-22, the criteria for success were increased in seven of the twelve areas: Finance, Strategic Management, Business Leadership, Economics, Global, Legal Environment, and Marketing, as detailed in the above schedule.

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, including business ethics, strategic management, and management, were below the criteria for success.

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.

During AY 21-22, the criteria for success (revised as of AY 21-22) were exceeded for two of the twelve disciplinary areas. For seven of the ten areas that did not meet the new criteria for success in AY 21-22 (Finance, Strategic Management, Leadership, Economics, Information Systems, Legal Environment, and Marketing), the new criteria for success were met in AY 20-21. The three areas that did not meet the revised criteria for success in AY 21-22 and AY 20-21 were Accounting, Management, and Global. The average score in the area of Accounting was 3.6 and 1.3 points below the revised criteria for success in AY 21-22 and AY 20-21, respectively. The average score in the area of Management was 4.6 and 3.4 points below the revised criteria for success in AY 21-22 and AY 20-21, respectively. The average score in the area of Global was 2.1 and 0.3 points below the revised criteria for success in AY 21-22 and AY 20-21, respectively.

During AY 22-23, the criteria for success were exceeded for three of the twelve disciplinary areas - Business Ethics, Strategic Management, and Quantitative Techniques/Statistics. In the areas of Accounting, Business Leadership, Information Management Systems, and Marketing, despite the criteria for success not being met, increases in scores from AY 21-22 were seen. Information Management Systems is very close to meeting the criteria for success, being off only 0.1. Additionally, Economics (Macro/Micro), Global Dimensions of Business, Legal Environment of Business, and Management have almost the same scores as in AY 21-22. Business Finance has decreased consistently since AY 2020-2021, by 3.4 points from AY 2020-2021 to AY 2021-2022 and another 1.10 points from AY 2021-2022 to AY 2022-2023. Overall, Accounting, Business Finance, and Global Dimensions of Business are well below the criteria for success.

During AY 23-24, the criteria for success were exceeded for six of the twelve disciplinary areas - Business Ethics, Strategic Management, Business Leadership, Economics, Information Management Systems, and Quantitative Techniques. In the areas of Finance, Global Dimensions of Business, and Legal Environment of Business, despite the criteria for success not being met, increases in scores from AY 22-23 were seen. The remaining three areas - Accounting, Marketing, and Management - all had scores very similar to the prior year and have remained consistent over the past several years.

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

Management has been recognized as an area needing improvement for several years. Scores in this area have been consistently below the criteria for success. Prior analysis regarding course content and related changes have been made in prior years. In AY 24-25, a task force of management professors has been brought together to evaluate and recommend changes to the management curriculum. There has also been a turnover in faculty teaching MGT 2012. These changes will take several years to go into effect, and this area will continue to be closely monitored.

Accounting has been trending downward over the last seven years and is below the criteria for success since AY 20-21. Beginning in Fall 2023, the course curriculum for the accounting program was changed

to conform with the new AICPA Standards. The related PLOs were also revised to reflect the new curriculum. It will take a few years for these changes to be seen in exam scores. As such, no additional changes are recommended at this time.

All other disciplines either met the criteria for success, improved since the prior year, or are very close to meeting the criteria for success. Thus, no additional changes are recommended at this time, and data will continue to be monitored.

**Fermanian School of Business (BBA)**  
**PLO #2 Assessment**  
**2023-2024**

**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 60<sup>th</sup> percentile on the national COMP-XM Balanced Score Card Results
2. Average score of all students will be above 50<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 (%)
Summer 2019	13	24.5	41.5
Summer 2020	N/A	N/A	N/A
Summer 2021	31	62	51
Spring 2022	44	57	51
Spring 2023	25	59	67
Spring 2024	19	47	52
Summer 2024	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

Beginning AY 21-22, the criteria for success was updated for both the Balanced Scorecard Results (changed to 60<sup>th</sup> percentile) and for the Board Query Results (changed to 50<sup>th</sup> percentile).

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 one of the given semesters. The trend has moved significantly upward since the summer of 2019; however, the most recent period is quite below the criteria for success.

Scores on the COMP-XM Board Query exceeded the criteria for success in four of the five semesters, including the last four semesters. The trend has moved upward since the summer of 2019.

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

CAPSIM discontinued offering the COMP-XM Simulation in Summer 2024. Faculty will meet during the Fall 2024 semester to determine what to use to assess PLO 2 going forward.

No changes at this time.

**Fermanian School of Business (TUG)**  
**PLO #2 Assessment**  
**2023-2024**

**Learning Outcome:**

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

**Outcome Measure:**

The CAPSIM Inbox GM Simulation provides comparative data on how each student performs against all other students taking the simulation at the same time nationally. The following result is used:

1. CAPSIM Inbox GM Simulation Results – Overall Score

**Criteria for Success:**

1. Average score of all students will be above 45<sup>th</sup> percentile on the national CAPSIM Inbox GM Simulation 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>	Inbox GM Simulation Results (%)
Fall 2021	27	45
Spring 2022	79	50
Fall 2022	56	48
Spring 2023	77	37
Fall 2023	50	47
Spring 2024	65	42

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

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

The measures described above were implemented in the MGT 4088 course beginning Fall 2021. Criteria for success were set at 45 in AY 22-23. Criteria for success were met in four of the six semesters evaluated but fell short in Spring 2023 and Spring 2024.

The analysis identified that students are not spending ample time on the assignment.

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

A new professor is teaching MGT 4088 beginning in AY2023-24. This professor has been instructed to emphasize the importance of this assignment. The professor is also looking into revising the assignment in the future. No changes will be made at this time. Data will continue to be collected and monitored.



**Fermanian School of Business  
PLO #3 Assessment  
2023-2024**

**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
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
BUS4089	Fall 2021	38	3.66	3.61	3.66	3.39	3.39	3.54
BUS/BBU 4089	Spring 2022	80	3.69	3.62	3.64	3.31	3.45	3.54
BUS4089	Summer 2022	40	3.70	3.60	3.68	3.48	3.38	3.57
BUS4089	Fall 2022	32	3.81	3.72	3.75	3.66	3.69	3.73
BUS4089	Spring 2023	38	3.89	3.71	3.45	3.71	3.53	3.66
BUS4089	Summer 2023	38	3.63	3.45	3.24	3.50	3.42	3.45
BUS/BBU4 089	Fall 2023	30	3.33	3.20	3.13	3.23	3.27	3.23
BUS/BBU4 089	Spring 2024	52	3.10	3.10	3.17	3.04	2.98	3.08
BUS/BBU4 089	Summer 2024	76	3.46	3.16	3.30	3.25	3.16	3.27

**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
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
BUS4089	Fall 2021	38	3.71	3.71	3.55	3.61	3.55	3.63
BUS/BBU 4089	Spring 2022	80	3.75	3.58	3.60	3.60	3.38	3.58
BUS4089	Summer 2022	40	3.80	3.75	3.78	3.68	3.68	3.74
BUS4089	Fall 2022	32	3.84	3.69	3.66	3.63	3.69	3.70
BUS4089	Spring 2023	38	3.87	3.61	3.79	3.71	3.42	3.68
BUS4089	Summer 2023	38	3.53	3.63	3.47	3.58	3.24	3.49
BUS/BBU4089	Fall 2023	30	3.27	3.27	3.27	3.20	3.64	3.33
BUS/BBU4089	Spring 2024	52	N/A*	3.04	3.00	3.10	3.00	3.03
BUS/BBU4089	Summer 2024	76	N/A*	3.25	3.16	2.92	2.91	3.06

\*Determine extent of info needed criteria removed from rubric in Spring 2024.

### 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
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/B BU4089	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/B BU4089	Summer 2021	82	3.64	3.48	3.34	2.75	3.36	3.31
BUS 4089	Fall 2021	28	3.21	2.89	2.75	2.96	2.89	2.94
BUS 4089	Spring 2022	40	3.18	2.90	2.70	2.77	2.98	2.93
BUS4089/B BU4089	Summer 2022	78	3.22	3.00	2.69	2.92	3.03	2.97
BUS4089	Fall 2022	24	3.33	3.21	3.21	2.71	3.17	3.13
BUS4089	Spring 2023	40	3.20	3.13	2.70	2.60	3.03	2.93
BUS4089	Summer 2023	40	3.20	2.93	3.83	2.75	2.98	2.94
BUS/BBU40 89	Fall 2023	24	3.58	3.54	2.96	3.54	3.54	3.43
BUS/BBU40 89	Spring 2024	36	3.39	3.11	2.78	3.97	N/A*	3.06
BUS/BBU40 89	Summer 2024	98	3.41	3.24	2.93	3.13	N/A*	3.18

\*Central Message criteria eliminated from rubric in Spring 2024.

### 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 16 semesters. Scores in the Genre and Disciplinary Conventions exceeded the criteria for success in 15 of the 16 semesters, with the last 13 semesters above 3.0. Scores in Control of Syntax and Mechanics exceeded the criteria for success in 13 of the 16 semesters. The Spring 2024 score in this area fell slightly below 3.0 with a score of 2.98, but otherwise, the last 12 semesters have exceeded the criteria for success.

**Final Internship Research Report – Information Literacy Rubric:** To better reflect the assessment assignment, the rubric was revised slightly in Spring 2024, and the criteria of “Determine the Extent of the Information Needed” was eliminated. The criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) were met in each of the 16 semesters on three rubric criteria areas: Determine the Extent of Information Needed, Access the Needed Information, and Critically Evaluate Info and Sources. In the summer of 2024, the criteria for success were not met in Use of Information to Accomplish Purpose and Access and Use of Information Ethically and Legally. This appears to be an outlier, as the criteria for success were met in 15 of the 16 semesters in the Use Information to Accomplish Purpose section and 14 of the 16 semesters in the Access and Use of Information Ethically and Legally section.

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

The criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) were met in all 16 semesters in the rubric criteria area of organization. The criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) was met in 13 of the 16 semesters on the rubric criteria areas of Language and Central Message. To better reflect the assessment assignment, the rubric was revised slightly in Spring 2024, and the criteria of “Central Message” was eliminated. Language criteria was met in 13 of the 16 semesters, including the three most recent. Scores in the rubric criteria area of Delivery fell below the criteria for success in 9 of the 16 semesters, including the three most recent. Scores in the rubric criteria area of Supporting Material fell below the criteria for success in 11 of the 16 semesters, but met the criteria for success in the most recent three semesters.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data**

**Final Internship Research Report - Written Communication:**

Given that the scores on the Written Communication rubric in all areas except one semester control and syntax (which was only .02 below criteria) were above 3.0 during the last several semesters, no action is necessary at this time.

**Final Internship Research Report - Information Literacy:**

Scores on the Information Literacy rubric have historically exceeded the criteria for success. The exception is Summer 2024, where scores dipped slightly below the criteria for success. No action is necessary at this time, and data will continue to be monitored.

**Video Cover Letter – Oral Communication:**

Given that scores in the area of Delivery were below 3.0 during several semesters, this area will be closely monitored. An audit of where presentation skills are taught, and assignments that require presentations in all FSB Traditional Undergraduate classes will be conducted to better understand where presentation skills (Delivery) are currently highlighted and developed. This will help us determine if additional focus is needed. Additionally, starting in Spring 2025, PitchVantage, an AI Presentation

Coaching platform, will be integrated into the course to see if Delivery can improve by students having this feedback. Everything else will continue to be monitored.

The area of Supporting Material had been below the criteria for success for many semesters. The student instructions and rubric were revised to clarify this category in Spring 2024. It appears that these changes were successful, as the criteria for success were met in all three recent semesters.

**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.*

	<b>Capstone</b> Very Good (4)	<b>Milestones</b>		<b>Benchmark</b> Poor (1)
		Good (3)	Acceptable (2)	
<b>Purpose and Organization</b>	Demonstrates a clear understanding of the purpose and includes all parts of the report.	Demonstrates an understanding of the purpose and includes almost all parts of the report.	Demonstrates a fair understanding of the purpose and includes some parts of the report.	Demonstrates a lack of understanding and is missing most parts of the report.
<b>Content Development</b>	Consistently uses appropriate and relevant examples to support claims throughout the report.	Usually uses appropriate and relevant examples to support claims throughout the report.	Sometimes uses appropriate and relevant examples to support claims throughout the report.	Does not use appropriate and relevant examples to support claims throughout the report.
<b>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions</b> <i>APA Format, Headings, Title Page</i>	Consistently uses proper APA format to cite in-text (quote vs. paraphrase) and to list sources on the reference page.	Usually uses proper APA format to cite in-text (quote vs. paraphrase) and to list sources on the reference page.	Sometimes uses proper APA format to cite in-text (quote vs. paraphrase) and to list sources on the reference page.	Does not use proper APA format to cite in-text (quote vs. paraphrase) and to list sources on the reference page.
<b>Sources and Evidence</b>	Consistently demonstrates skillful use of relevant sources to develop ideas that are stated.	Usually demonstrates skillful use of relevant sources to develop ideas that are stated.	Sometimes demonstrates skillful use of relevant sources to develop ideas that are stated.	Does not demonstrate skillful use of relevant sources to develop ideas that are stated.
<b>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</b>	Uses 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 has few errors.	Uses language that sometimes conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	Does not use language that conveys meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and includes excessive errors.

## INFORMATION LITERACY VALUE RUBRIC

*for more information, please contact [value@acu.org](mailto:value@acu.org)*

**Definition:** The ability to know when there is a need for information, to be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and share that information for the problem at hand. - The National Forum on Information Literacy

*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</b> Very Good (4)	<b>Milestones</b> Good (3)	<b>Acceptable</b> (2)	<b>Benchmark</b> Poor (1)
<b>Access the Needed Information (included necessary paragraphs/content)</b>	Accesses information using effective, well-designed search strategies and most appropriate information sources	Accesses information using variety of search strategies and some relevant information sources. Demonstrates ability to refine search.	Accesses information using simple search strategies, retrieves information from limited and similar sources.	Accesses information randomly, retrieves information that lacks relevance and quality.
<b>Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically (Paragraphs 2 &amp; 3 - comparison of workplace to internship programs in article)</b>	Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies own and others assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).	Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labeling assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.
<b>Uses Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose (Quality of Examples)</b>	Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources to fully achieve a specific purpose, with clarity and depth.	Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources. Intended purpose is achieved.	Communicates and organizes information from sources. The information is not yet synthesized, so the intended purpose is not fully achieved.	Communicates information from sources. The information is fragmented and/or used inappropriately (misquoted, taken out of context, or incorrectly paraphrased, etc.), so the intended purpose is not achieved.
<b>Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally (Proper use of APA format for in-text citations and for listing sources on ref. page)</b>	Students use correctly all of the following: information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrate a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.	Students use correctly three of the following: information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrate a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.	Students use correctly two of the following: information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrate a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.	Students use correctly one of the following: information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrate a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.

**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) Very Good</b>	<b>Milestones (3) Good</b>	<b>Milestones (2) Acceptable</b>	<b>Benchmark (1) Poor</b>
<b>Organization</b>	Presentation is well-organized and clearly follows one of the organizational formats listed as an option.	Presentation is organized and follows one of the organizational formats listed as an option.	Presentation is somewhat organized and does attempt to follow one of the organizational formats listed as an option.	Presentation is not organized and does not follow one of the organizational formats listed as an option.
<b>Language</b>	Language choices are 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 partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are unclear and do not 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 somewhat interesting and speaker appears somewhat comfortable.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable.
<b>Supporting Material</b>	Examples clearly support the presentation or help establish the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Examples usually support the presentation or help establish the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Examples sometimes support the presentation or help establish the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Examples are absent or do not support the presentation nor help establish the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.



**Fermanian School of Business  
PLO #4 Assessment  
2023-2024**

**Learning Outcome:**

PLO #4: Formulate decisions informed by ethical values.

**Outcome Measure:**

BUS/BBU4089 – Ethics Assignment - implemented Summer 2022

**Criteria for Success:**

The average score for each criteria of the PLO #4 Rubric will be a 3.0 or higher out of 4.0.

**Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):**

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

**Initial Data:**

**PLO #4 Rubric – Average Student Score:**

Semester	# of Assessments	Economic Analysis	Legal Analysis	Ethical Duty Analysis	Final Recommendation	Total
Summer 2022	40	3.03	3.10	3.00	3.20	3.08
Fall 2022	26	3.31	3.27	2.96	3.42	3.24
Spring 2023	20	3.18	3.30	2.90	2.94	3.08
Summer 2023	40	3.23	3.20	3.98	3.13	3.13
Fall 2023	36	2.81	2.64	2.53	2.33	2.58
Spring 2024	48	2.42	2.50	2.25	2.29	2.36
Summer 2024	42	2.81	2.88	2.83	2.57	2.22

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

The assessment of this PLO was moved to BUS 4089 beginning AY 21-22. The change resulted in a superior instrument being used to assess PLO #4. The criteria for success (average of 3.0 or higher out of 4.0) was not met in any of the criteria in the last 3 semesters.

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

While AY 23-24 results were below the criteria for success, the exit exam scores (see PLO 1) did meet the criteria for success in the ethics category. As a result, data will continue to be collected and monitored to see if the trend continues into future semesters or if it was an outlier this academic year.

## PLO #4 RUBRIC

Point Loma Nazarene University Program Learning Outcome #4: Formulate decisions informed by ethical values.

Criteria	Excellent 4	Meets Expectations 3	Needs Improvement 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
<b>Economic Analysis</b>	Clearly identifies how a decision or action positively or negatively impacts all members of society, including stakeholders.	Identifies how a decision or action positively or negatively impacts all members of society, including stakeholders.	Briefly identifies on how a decision or action positively or negatively impacts all members of society, including stakeholders.	Does not identify how a decision or action positively or negatively impacts all members of society, including stakeholders.
<b>Legal Analysis</b>	Clearly addresses what the law says is right and wrong. Clearly supports claims by referencing constitutional laws, statutory laws, regulatory laws, contractual laws, organizational policy, organizational or professional code of conduct.	Addresses what the law says is right and wrong. Supports claims by referencing constitutional laws, statutory laws, regulatory laws, contractual laws, organizational policy, organizational or professional code of conduct.	Briefly addresses what the law says is right and wrong. Briefly supports claims by referencing constitutional laws, statutory laws, regulatory laws, contractual laws, organizational policy, organizational or professional code of conduct.	Does not address what the law says is right and wrong. Does not support claims by referencing constitutional laws, statutory laws, regulatory laws, contractual laws, organizational policy, organizational or professional code of conduct.
<b>Ethical Duty Analysis</b>	Clearly identifies objective and universal standards (based on reason rather than emotion) regarding what is right, just, and fair. Clearly references at least two ethical tools to support view. *Ethical Tools Include: Personal Virtue, Utilitarianism, Universalism, Distributive Justice, Contributive Liberty, and Eternal Law.	Identifies objective and universal standards (based on reason rather than emotion) regarding what is right, just, and fair. References at least two ethical tools to support view. *Ethical Tools Include: Personal Virtue, Utilitarianism, Universalism, Distributive Justice, Contributive Liberty, and Eternal Law.	Somewhat identifies objective and universal standards (based on reason rather than emotion) regarding what is right, just, and fair. Briefly references one to two ethical tools to support view. *Ethical Tools Include: Personal Virtue, Utilitarianism, Universalism, Distributive Justice, Contributive Liberty, and Eternal Law.	Does not identify objective and universal standards (based on reason rather than emotion) regarding what is right, just, and fair. Does not reference at least one ethical tool to support view. Ethical Tools Include: Personal Virtue, Utilitarianism, Universalism, Distributive Justice, Contributive Liberty, and Eternal Law.
<b>Final Recommendation</b>	Does an excellent job weaving together the economic, legal, and ethical duty analysis to derive at a compelling moral argument that is very difficult to refute.	Does a good job weaving together the economic, legal, and ethical duty analysis to derive at a compelling moral argument that is difficult for someone to refute.	Does a fair job weaving together the economic, legal, and ethical duty analysis to derive at a moral argument that is somewhat difficult to refute.	Does a poor job weaving together the economic, legal, and ethical duty analysis to derive at a moral argument that is difficult to refute.

Average Score: \_\_\_\_\_ (Total/# of criteria)

**Fermanian School of Business  
PLO #5 Assessment (TUG)  
2023-2024**

**Learning Outcome:**

PLO #5: Collaborate effectively in teams.

**Outcome Measure:**

Direct and summative data for the School of Business Assessment of PLO #5 is gathered in MGT4088 – Strategic Management in the Fall and Spring semesters using the following results:

1. Team Member Evaluation (Consulting Project) – Evaluation by Business Partner

Indirect and summative data is gathered in MGT4088 in during the Fall and Spring semesters using the following results:

2. Team Member Evaluation (Consulting Project) – Evaluation by Student Peers

**Criteria for Success:**

1. Evaluation by Business Partner Results - Average team scores per the Business Partner survey results will be a 4.5 or higher on a 5.0 scale in all five areas.
2. Evaluation by Student Peer Results - Average team score per the Student survey results will be a 4.5 or higher on a 5.0 scale.

**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

**Business Partner Evaluation Results:**

Semester	N <sup>1</sup>	Meeting Attendance	Quality of Work	Cooperation & Attitude	Communication & Timeliness	Contribution of Ideas
Fall 2021	21	4.62	4.64	4.72	4.17	4.89
Spring 2022	52	4.67	4.29	4.58	3.90	4.42
Fall 2022	38	4.74	4.87	4.84	4.47	4.84
Spring 2023	52	4.96	4.96	4.96	4.90	4.94
Fall 2023	22	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.77	5.00
Spring 2024	30	4.93	4.87	5.00	4.62	4.83

<sup>1</sup> Number of Students Evaluated

**Student Peer Evaluation Results:**

Semester	N <sup>1</sup>	Average Team Score
Fall 2021	33	4.66
Spring 2022	70	4.51
Fall 2022	53	4.62
Spring 2023	67	4.68
Fall 2023	59	4.68
Spring 2024	69	4.71

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

The measures described above were implemented in the MGT 4088 course beginning Fall 2021.

Scores for the Evaluation by Business Partner Results met the criteria for success for all periods in the Meeting Attendance and Cooperation & Attitude areas. The criteria for success were met in five of the six periods in the Quality of Work and Contribution of Ideas areas, including the most recent two semesters. The criteria for success were met in the three most recent periods.

Scores for the Evaluation by Student Peer Results met the criteria for success in all periods.

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

In AY 22-23, as part of the Consulting Project instructions, the Instructor further emphasized the importance of the student team communication and timeliness as it relates to the Consulting Projects and related Business Partners. Since all criteria were met in AY23-24, no action is needed at this time. Further, a new professor started teaching MGT 4088 in the Fall of 2024 and revised the assessment assignment being used.

**Fermanian School of Business  
PLO #5 Assessment (BBA)  
2023-2024**

**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 BMG4088 – Strategic Management in the Spring semester (Summer semesters prior to Spring 2022) using two different results:

1. CAPSIM Capstone Simulation Results
2. CAPSIM COMP-XM Knowledge of Teamwork Module Results

Indirect and summative data is gathered in BMG4088 in during the Spring semester (Summer semesters prior to Spring 2022) the following results:

3. CAPSIM Capstone Peer Evaluation Module Results

**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
Summer 2019	14	47.0
Summer 2020	N/A	N/A
Summer 2021	31	83.8
Spring 2022	44	82.2
Spring 2023	26	79.5
Summer 2023	16	72.14
Spring 2024	19	78.0
Summer 2024	7	75.0

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

### Knowledge of Team Module Results:

Semester	N <sup>1</sup>	Knowledge of Team Module Results (%)
Summer 2019	N/A	N/A
Summer 2020	N/A	N/A
Summer 2021	31	73
Spring 2022	44	80
Spring 2023	25	79
Summer 2023	16	76
Spring 2024	19	82
Summer 2024	7	N/A*

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

\*As of Summer 2024, the new version of CAPSIM being utilized no longer includes the Knowledge of Team Module. A new measure of teamwork will be implemented in the 24-25 AY.

### Peer Evaluation Module Results:

Semester	N <sup>1</sup>	Self-Management/Accountability	Quality of Work and Contextual Performance
Summer 2019	9	4.77	4.84
Summer 2020	N/A	N/A	N/A
Summer 2021	31	4.81	4.82
Spring 2022	44	4.84	4.87
Spring 2023	25	4.53	4.62
Summer 2023	16	4.45	4.54
Spring 2024	19	4.83	4.92
Summer 2024	7	4.54	4.57

### Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Data was not collected in Summer 2019 for the Knowledge of Team Module Results due to miscommunications with the simulation set-up. Data was not collected for Summer 2020 for all three sets of scores 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 seven semesters. It was above the criteria for success in the two most recent semesters.

Students' scores on the COMP-XM Knowledge of Teamwork Module met the criteria for success (above the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile) in four of the five semesters where data is available. As of Summer 2024, the new version of CAPSIM being utilized no longer includes the Knowledge of Team Module. A new measure of teamwork will be implemented in the 24-25 AY.

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 semester in both module areas, Self-Management/Accountability and Quality of Work and Contextual Performance.

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

No changes to the CAPSIM Capstone Simulation or Peer Evaluation Module are recommended at this time. Data will continue to be collected and monitored in AY 24-25. The faculty who teach BMG 4088 will work to find another way to assess teamwork in the future.