

**Fermanian School of Business**  
**International Development Major PLO #E1 Assessment**  
**2023-2024**

**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

**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 <sup>1</sup>	Score
Spring 2019	9	66.5
Spring 2021	3	65
Spring 2022	3	62
Spring 2023	4	70.9
Spring 2024	5	67.5

<sup>1</sup> Number of Students Taking Test

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

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

No data was collected in Spring 2020 due to Covid.

For all five periods, the criteria for success were exceeded.

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

No changes are necessary at this time.

**Fermanian School of Business  
International Development Major PLO #E2 Assessment  
2023-2024**

**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
Spring 2022	6	3.00	3.17	3.17	3.33	3.17
Spring 2023	8	3.38	2.88	3.25	3.38	3.22
Spring 2024	10	3.80	3.50	3.70	3.90	3.73

**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 six of the seven semesters. The average student score met the criteria for success in five of the seven semesters in the areas of Measurements and Examples, with the last four semesters above 3.0 for both areas. The average student score in the area of Methods exceeded the criteria for success in the most recent semester but has fallen below in four of the seven semesters measured.

**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 4070 and other International Development major courses were made as deemed necessary. In addition, the instructor revised the assessment question to ensure alignment with the rubric. It appears that the changes made in AY 20-21 had a positive impact, as all four areas now meet the criteria for success.

As of AY23-24, no changes are needed, and data will continue to be collected and monitored. It should be noted that enrollment in this major is significantly lower than other majors within the School of Business. During AY24-25, the data will continue to be collected and monitored.

## 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	<b>Excellent 4</b>	<b>Meets Expectations 3</b>	<b>Needs Improvement 2</b>	<b>Does Not Meet Expectations 1</b>
<b>Mission in for-profit and non-profit environments</b>	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.
<b>Methods used in for-profit and non-profit environments</b>	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.
<b>Measurements used in for-profit and non-profit environments</b>	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.
<b>Examples used to illustrate decision-making in for-profit and non-profit environments</b>	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)

**Fermanian School of Business  
International Development Major PLO #E3 Assessment  
2023-2024**

**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
Spring 2022	6	3.17	3.17	3.17	3.17
Spring 2023	8	3.13	3.38	3.13	3.21
Spring 2024	10	3.50	3.70	3.40	3.53

**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 seven 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 six of the seven semesters, with the last five 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 five of the seven semesters, with the last five semesters above 3.0.

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

Instructions for the signature assignment were modified for clarity beginning in Spring 2019. No additional changes are necessary at this time.

## 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	<b>Excellent 4</b>	<b>Meets Expectations 3</b>	<b>Needs Improvement 2</b>	<b>Does Not Meet Expectations 1</b>
<b>Similarities in people and culture in Developed vs. Developing Countries</b>	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.
<b>Differences in Economic Conditions of Developed vs. Developing Countries</b>	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.
<b>First-hand Understanding of Similarities and Differences in Developed (e.g. USA) vs. Developing Countries</b>	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)