<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Objective 2A: Students who graduate will understand and apply quantitative methods and tools in evaluating business problems and making effective business decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Redesigned AoL System</td>
<td>[n = 979]</td>
<td>[n = 919]</td>
<td>[n = 853]</td>
<td>[n = 831]</td>
<td>[n = 822]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adopted new assessment measure tool</td>
<td>[n = 311]</td>
<td>[n = 311]</td>
<td>[n = 311]</td>
<td>[n = 311]</td>
<td>[n = 311]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Actions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Background piloted Capsim program in BBA &amp; MBA to help students foundational knowledge and critical thinking skills. Weekly faculty, ÖBE staff and Capsim meetings held to address issues &amp; discuss implementation by faculty across sections; methodologies and techniques shared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Capsim campus visit seminar for faculty - Assist with better integration and use in class / Staff sent to Chicago for more in-depth training to support faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implemented in-class presentations to help students get up and running and provide support to faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Online faculty developed video to assist students online with Capsim simulation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Professor Wishnewski placed a class in the computer lab for open questions on business simulation and to aide team usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adjustments made to Capsim/Comp-XM module following feedback from faculty in Winter 2017 assessment meetings. Adjustments include removing HR module to better represent program curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Computer lab scheduling to be provided to all faculty to implement in-lab classes based on pilot program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning Objective 1B: Students who graduate will apply critical thinking skills to solve business problems. |

| 1. Redesigned AoL System | [n = 311] | [n = 311] | [n = 311] | [n = 311] | [n = 311] |
| 3. Adopted new assessment measure tool | [n = 311] | [n = 311] | [n = 311] | [n = 311] | [n = 311] |
| Improvement Actions: | | | | | |
| - Background piloted Capsim program in BBA & MBA to help students foundational knowledge and critical thinking skills. Weekly faculty, ÖBE staff and Capsim meetings held to address issues & discuss implementation by faculty across sections; methodologies and techniques shared. |
| - Capsim campus visit seminar for faculty - Assist with better integration and use in class / Staff sent to Chicago for more in-depth training to support faculty. |
| - Implemented in-class presentations to help students get up and running and provide support to faculty. |
| Improvement: | | | | | |
| - Online faculty developed video to assist students online with Capsim simulation. |
| - Professor Wishnewski placed a class in the computer lab for open questions on business simulation and to aide team usage |
| Improvement: | | | | | |
| - Adjustments made to Capsim/Comp-XM module following feedback from faculty in Winter 2017 assessment meetings. Adjustments include removing HR module to better represent program curriculum. |
| - Computer lab scheduling to be provided to all faculty to implement in-lab classes based on pilot program. |

Closing the Loop: Comparing the results from academic year 2016-17 to 2018-19 in the on-ground BSBA program, we observe measurable improvements across the semesters. We similarly observe improvements for BBA online program section comparisons, although we acknowledge the smaller sample size for online sections may provide less than optimum measurement data.

**Impressions:**
- We recommend all faculty across all CBE disciplines will be familiar with CAPSIM to reinforce the need to continually integrate topics with the broader expanse of business requirements.
- We recommend introducing the integrative requirements of business to CBE students in their junior year, using a truncated version of CAPSIM as a required element in a CBE core course.
- We recommend the Management department to require all online Capstone courses to implement CAPSIM. This will result in sufficient observations for our AOI assessments.

Learning Objective 2A: Students who graduate will understand and apply quantitative methods and tools in evaluating business problems and making effective business decisions.
Learning Objective 3B: Students who graduate will apply effective written communication skills in a diverse and global environment.

**Assessments:**
- Spring 2014: [n=48] 67% of students met expectations.
- Fall 2014: [n=60] 75% of students met expectations.

**Improvement Actions:**
- Faculty discussed and identified new assessment tools to use under new Assurence of Learning system.
- Revised rubric adopted to assess writing skills.

**Closing the Loop:**
- Results have not improved and have not met benchmarks. Improvements needed.

Learning Objective 3A: Students who graduate will apply effective oral communication skills in a diverse and global environment.

**Assessments:**
- Spring 2017: [n=42] 91% of students met expectations.
- Fall 2018: [n=50] 76% of students met expectations.
- Spring 2019: [n=32] 76% of students met expectations.

**Improvement Actions:**
- Adapting new rubric to assess oral communication skills.
- Meetings conducted with faculty teaching the course.

**Closing the Loop:**
- Results have met revised benchmark and stayed fairly consistent.

Learning Objective 3C: Students who graduate will apply technology to analyze data and provide solutions to business problems.

**Assessments:**
- Spring 2014: [n=60] 77% of students met expectations.
- Spring 2016: [n=60] 73% of students met expectations.
- Spring 2018: [n=40] 73% of students met expectations.

**Improvement Actions:**
- Faculty discussed and identified new assessment tools to use under new Assurence of Learning system.
- Revised rubric adopted to assess Use of Tech learning objective.
- Assessing and teaching faculty new process for “norming” rubric to establish consistent assessment of assignments across multiple sections of a course.
- Norming sessions were created to address issues of data discrepancies in the past due to different interpretations of problematic rubrics.

**Closing the Loop:**
- Results have not improved, and have not met benchmarks. Improvements needed.

Learning Objective 2B: Students who graduate will apply technology to analyze data and provide solutions to business problems.

**Assessments:**
- Spring 2014: [n=60] 77% of students met expectations.
- Spring 2016: [n=60] 73% of students met expectations.
- Spring 2018: [n=40] 73% of students met expectations.

**Improvement Actions:**
- Faculty discussed and identified new assessment tools to use under new Assurence of Learning system.
- Revised rubric adopted to assess Use of Tech learning objective.
- Assessing and teaching faculty new process for “norming” rubric to establish consistent assessment of assignments across multiple sections of a course.
- New rubric was created to address issues of data discrepancies in the past due to different interpretations of problematic rubrics.

**Closing the Loop:**
- Results have met revised benchmark and stayed fairly consistent depending on the assessment—perhaps a slight improvement. May consider raising the benchmark.

Learning Objective 3A: Students who graduate will apply effective oral communication skills in a diverse and global environment.

**Assessments:**
- Spring 2014: [n=60] 77% of students met expectations.
- Fall 2014: [n=60] 75% of students met expectations.
- Spring 2015: [n=60] 80% of students met expectations.
- Spring 2016: [n=60] 73% of students met expectations.
- Spring 2017: [n=60] 80% of students met expectations.
- Spring 2018: [n=60] 73% of students met expectations.
- Spring 2019: [n=60] 76% of students met expectations.

**Improvement Actions:**
- Faculty discussed and identified new assessment tools to use under new Assurence of Learning system.
- Revised rubric adopted to assess Oral Comm learning objective.
- Faculty discussed weaknesses identified pertaining to this learning objective and possible solutions at the course and program level.

**Closing the Loop:**
- Results have met revised benchmark and stayed fairly consistent.

Learning Objective 2A: Students who graduate will apply effective oral communication skills in a diverse and global environment.

**Assessments:**
- Fall 2018: [n=30] 78% of students met expectations.
- Fall 2019: [n=40] 80% of students met expectations.

**Improvement Actions:**
- Faculty discussed and identified new assessment tools to use under new Assurence of Learning system.
- Revised rubric adopted to assess Oral Comm learning objective.
- Faculty discussed weaknesses identified pertaining to this learning objective and possible solutions at the course and program level.

**Closing the Loop:**
- Results have met revised benchmark and stayed fairly consistent.

Learning Objective 1: Students who graduate will apply technology to analyze data and provide solutions to business problems.

**Assessments:**
- Spring 2014: [n=60] 77% of students met expectations.
- Spring 2016: [n=60] 73% of students met expectations.
- Spring 2018: [n=40] 73% of students met expectations.

**Improvement Actions:**
- Faculty discussed and identified new assessment tools to use under new Assurence of Learning system.
- Revised rubric adopted to assess Use of Tech learning objective.
- Assessing and teaching faculty new process for “norming” rubric to establish consistent assessment of assignments across multiple sections of a course.
- New rubric adopted for Q2S.

**Closing the Loop:**
- Results have not improved, and have not met benchmarks. Improvements needed.
Learning Objective 3C: Students who graduate will apply effective team skills to work in a diverse and global environment.

**Agent 4650**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Benchmark: 70% of students will meet expectations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Redesigned AoL System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adopted new assessment measure tool</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessments**

- Winter 2015: [n=50] 70% of students met expectations.
- Spring 2016: [n=60] 68% of students met expectations.
- Spring 2017: [n=60] + Online [n=12] Overall Rubric Score: 68% met expectations
- Winter 2018: [n=70] 70% of students met expectations
- Spring 2019: [n=60] + Online [n=12] Overall Rubric Score: 70% met expectations
- Spring 2020: [n=70] 70% of students met expectations

**Individual Rubric Traits:**

- Trait 1: Contributes, 84.5%; Trait 2: Facilitates, 73%; Trait 3: Organization, 77%; Trait 4: Language, 64%; Trait 5: Supportive Material, 68%; Trait 6: Constructive Climate, 63.5%

**Overall Rubric Score:** 62% met expectations

**Closing the Loop:**

- The scores have improved from 2015 (61% meets expectation), 2016 (68% meets expectation), and 2017 (57% meets expectation).
- It is recommended that team performances be incorporated into course grading schemes (especially trait 1 (contributing to team meetings) and trait 3 (contributing outside of team meetings)).
- It is recommended that the instructors adopt mechanisms (such as online team logs) to track individual contributions in teamwork.

Learning Objective 4A: Students who graduate will identify and assess ethical issues and properly articulate ethical decisions.

**Agent 4650**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Benchmark: 70% of students will meet expectations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Redesigned AoL System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adopted new assessment measure tool</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessments**

- Spring 2015: [n=50] 32% of students met expectations.
- Spring 2016: [n=60] 80% of students met expectations.
- Spring 2017: [n=60] Overall Rubric Score: 83% met expectations
- Spring 2018: [n=60] + Online [n=12] Overall Rubric Score: 83% met expectations
- Spring 2019: [n=60] + Online [n=12] Overall Rubric Score: 81% met expectations
- Spring 2020: [n=60] + Online [n=12] Overall Rubric Score: 83% met expectations

**Individual Rubric Traits:**

- Trait 1: Organization, 77%; Trait 2: Language, 64%; Trait 3: Supportive Material, 68%; Trait 4: Constructive Climate, 63.5%

**Overall Rubric Score:** 62% met expectations

**Closing the Loop:**

- The scores have improved from 2015 (61% meets expectation), 2016 (68% meets expectation), and 2017 (57% meets expectation).
- It is recommended that team performances be incorporated into course grading schemes (especially trait 1 (contributing to team meetings) and trait 3 (contributing outside of team meetings)).
- It is recommended that the instructors adopt mechanisms (such as online team logs) to track individual contributions in teamwork.

Notes:

- Spring may not add up to 100 due to rounding.
- Performance targets were simplified to focus on individual traits only rather than an overall score for the learning objective. This allowed for better faculty improvement discussions, by looking at assessment scores for specific areas of content, instead of one score for the overall learning objective. As a result, benchmarks were recalibrated based on proficiency for each rating trait rather than the overall learning objective. This was done while keeping open the possibility that the performance target may be raised in the future if it was found to be too low for the program.

*Credits may not add up to 100 due to rounding.*

*Performance targets were simplified to focus on individual traits only rather than an overall score for the learning objective. This allowed for better faculty improvement discussions, by looking at assessment scores for specific areas of content, instead of one score for the overall learning objective. As a result, benchmarks were recalibrated based on proficiency for each rating trait rather than the overall learning objective. This was done while keeping open the possibility that the performance target may be raised in the future if it was found to be too low for the program.*