2019 Annual Assessment Report of
Student Learning Outcomes- Business Program

I. Program Assessment Meetings

During academic year, the department was unable to meet about the 2018-2019 Assessment Plan or Report as recommended in the 2018 Assessment Report. We did meet as a department several times throughout the year: August 31, 2018, September 20 and 26, 2018, October 31, 2018, November 28, 2018, and January 29, 2019 for approximately hour. During these meetings we discussed program changes related to teaching schedules, course/pre-requisite modifications, and a potential partnership with Monroe Community College (MCC). Full time faculty were in attendance in all meetings except Professor Miles was unable to attend the October meeting and Professor Dhameeth was unable to attend the November meeting. Our adjunct professor was invited to all meetings and attended all fall meetings except for the September 20th (meeting called by the Provost for full-time faculty); he was also unable to attend the January meeting due to a scheduling conflict.   Data for the 2019 Assessment Report was gathered via email in May 2019, as has been done in the past. It is our goal to meet in the fall of 2020 to discuss the 2019-2020 Assessment Plan and Report.

The report that follows assesses the two measurable learning outcomes associated with the Program Goals being evaluated in this report: Goal 3 (use of technology in business) and Goal 5 (being conscious of business ethics and social responsibility).   The Program Goals and Learning Outcomes are noted in Table 1 of the 2019-2020 Assessment Plan.

II. Closing the Loop

At this time we are generally unable to report on how the changes suggested in the 2018-2019 Assessment Plan were implemented or how we used data from the plan to make changes. One program change suggested in the 2018 Assessment Report that did occur was to modify courses to emphasize ethics and sustainable business. In fall 2018, Bus 365 (Business Sustainability and Social Responsibility) was taught. Bus 365 was last taught in 2015 and focuses solely on this topic). Topics on ethics and sustainable business were also addressed courses such as Bus 100, BUS 213, Bus 203, and Bus 250.

While we did not meet specifically about the 2018-2019 Assessment Plan and Report, we reviewed our courses to ensure pre-requisites were in alignment with course needs and implemented curriculum changes in during the 2018-2019 academic year. For example, we discussed how several courses labeled as "Introduction" or "Principles" had pre-requisites, but other introductory or upper level courses did not. During the year, we deleted pre-requisites for Bus 202, Bus 230, Bus 231 (as they are introductory courses) and revised pre-requisites for Bus 253, 302, 350, and 360.

We also met to discuss and develop a two-year teaching schedule to ensure that required courses were being taught regularly and electives rotated. This schedule did not include some required courses like Economics or Math, as those courses are taught in separate departments. While this

2019 Annual Assessment Report of
Student Learning Outcomes- Business Program

Program Goal	Learning Outcome	Class	Semester	Type of assignment	Assessment Data			Meet Success Criteria?	Notes
					A or higher	B or higher	C or higher		
					A or higher	B or higher	C or higher		
3	3.1.1	Bus 202	Spring 2019	Weekly written papers, individual research paper and presentation, midterm test (essay questions)	55%	25%	5%	Unclear	Reported that goal 3 was met, but not clear based on data and not assignment specific
3	3.1.1	Bus 250	spring 2019	Group presentation	83%	100%	0%	Yes	Students appear very comfortable with their oral presentation stills
3	3.1.1	Bus 250	spring 2019	Midterm written individual assignment	44%	83%	94%	Yes	One failed to turn in assignment and received an F
3	3.1.1	Bus 250	Fall 2018	Final Written assignment	54%	74%	100%	Yes	While all students passed, writing is something we could continue to work on.
3	3.1.1	Bus 302	Spring 2019	Weekly written papers, individual research paper and presentation, weekly in class research and presentations, midterm test (essay questions), and final group paper and group presentation	83%	0%	17%	Unclear	Reported that goal 3 was met, but not clear based on data and not assignment specific
3	3.1.1	BUS 365	Fall 2018	Written case analysis	19%	38%	50%	Unclear	Based on average scores of 5 assignments. Some students did not complete all the assignments. 50% received less than a C on this assignment. Poor grades are related to the writing quality component or not handing in.
3	3.1.1	Bus 402	Spring 2019	Final poster presentation	75%	95%	100%	Yes	Students appear very comfortable with their oral presentation stills
3	3.1.1	Bus 402	Spring 2019	Final written paper	63%	81%	100%	Yes	While all passed it took considerable individual work to help students meet the success criteria. Many struggled at first with synthesizing literature/data. Several had problems with writing quality and it took several iterations to help them improve their work.
					Assessment Data				
3	3.1.1	Bus 203	Spring 2019	Assignment 1	Low grade:0, High grade: 92, Average grade: 83			Unclear	Two students each failed to submit one of the assignments but demonstrated the proper skill development on other assignments. Average student met goal of earning 75% or better on each assignment
3	3.1.1	Bus 203	Spring 2019	Assignment 3	Low grade: 0, High grade: 98, Average grade: 84			Unclear	Two students each failed to submit one of the assignments but demonstrated the proper skill development on other assignments. Average student

2019 Annual Assessment Report of
Student Learning Outcomes- Business Program

Program Goal	Learning Outcome	Class	Semester	Type of assignment	Assessment Data			Meet Success Criteria?	Notes
									met goal of earning 75% or better on each assignment
3	3.1.1	Bus 203	Spring 2019	Pitch assignment	Low grade: 72, High grade: 95, Average grade: 86			Yes	Based on review of the written assignments and observations during the oral portion of the assignments, it appears that students generally have adequately developed presentations skills
3	3.1.1	Bus 203	Spring 2019	Oral presentation	Low Grade: 70, High Grade 95, Average grade: 85			Yes	Based on review of the written assignments and observations during the oral portion of the assignments, it appears that students generally have adequately developed presentations skills
3	3.1.1	Bus 303	Fall 2018	Quiz 3	Low grade: 66, High grade: 98, Average grade: 85			Yes	Students appear to have developed skills required for reading, writing and presentations. Average student met the goal of earning 75% or better on each assignment.
		Bus 303	Fall 2018	Mid-term exam	Low grade: 78, High grade: 98, Average grade: 86			Yes	Students appear to have developed skills required for reading, writing and presentations. Average student met the goal of earning 75% or better on each assignment.
3	3.1.1	Bus 303	Fall 2018	Canvas assignment	Low Grade: 77, High Grade 95, Average grade: 85			Yes	Students appear to have developed skills required for reading, writing and presentations. Average student met the goal of earning 75% or better on each assignment.
3	3.1.1	Bus 305	Fall 2018	Test 1	Low grade:68, High grade: 91, Average grade: 82			Yes	Students appear to have developed skills required for reading, writing and presentations. Average student met the goal of earning 75% or better on each assignment.
3	3.1.1	Bus 305	Fall 2018	Quiz 2	Low grade: 62, High grade: 100, Average grade: 84			yes	Students appear to have developed skills required for reading, writing and presentations. Average student met the goal of earning 75% or better on each assignment.
3	3.1.1	Bus 305	Fall 2018	Project Presentation	Low grade: 75, High grade: 98, Average grade: 86			Yes	Students appear to have developed skills required for reading, writing and presentations. Average student met the goal of earning 75% or better on each assignment.
					A or higher	B or higher	C or higher		
3	3.1.2	Bus 204	Fall 2018	Weekly challenging projects, midterm project, final project	11%	32%	32%	Unclear	Reported that goal 3 was met, but not clear based on data and was not assignment specific

2019 Annual Assessment Report of
Student Learning Outcomes- Business Program

Program Goal	Learning Outcome	Class	Semester	Type of assignment	Assessment Data			Meet Success Criteria?	Notes
3	3.1.2	Bus 203	Spring 2019	NA				Unclear	Discussed in class, but not assessed
3	3.1.2	Bus 303	Fall 2018	NA				Unclear	Discussed in class, but not assessed
3	3.1.2	Bus 305	Fall 2018	NA				Unclear	Discussed in class, but not assessed
3	3.1.2	Bus 402	Spring 2019	NA				Unclear	Discussed in class, but not assessed

Based on the data in Table 1, we have a mix of results for the two Learning Outcomes associated with Program Goal #3; some classes meet our success criteria (majority of students earn 70% or higher per assignment) and others indicate otherwise (or the data reported is unclear). Even if the courses meet the success criteria, faculty indicate (and based on the data provided) that we still need to focus on writing and presentation skills (Outcome 3.1.1) and use of technology (Outcome 3.1.2).

One example of the need to continue to assess Outcome 3.1.1 is shown in Bus 402. While all students passed the final paper or project, it took considerable effort with weekly, one on one meetings with students to ensure that their final products were sufficient. Several struggled with synthesizing articles and data. In some courses, many written homework reflections (not necessarily evaluated here) are graded as complete or not complete (or students fail to turn in), but we are not necessarily assessing the quality of writing in these assignments. Wells College created and instituted a new writing curriculum in fall 2018. Over the next few years we should see an improvement in writing skills as students receive help earlier in their time at Wells.

Oral skills (Outcome 3.1.1) evaluated in classes in Table 1 generally appear to meet our department's success criteria. Presentations are often required in many of our business classes. It was suggested in one course that some discussions were not up to the same level as in the past. In one class, based on student suggestions, additional time was spent instructing students on oral presentation and topic discussion skills. Also, at the suggestion of students, several additional short videos were added to the course and discussion and presentation techniques were discussed after the class viewed those presentations. Students indicated that the subsequent discussion significantly increased their understanding of problems, solutions and alternatives. We will continue to focus on oral presentation skills in our classes.

Learning Outcome 3.1.2 (use of technology to make efficient decisions) was discussed, demonstrated, and used by students in courses such as Bus 203, Bus 204, Bus 303, and Bus 402. In some courses, faculty focused on enhancing awareness of library technical resources and reviewing how to conduct research so students can better prepare assignments, papers and oral presentations. However, this learning outcome was not specifically assessed in some courses and there was no indication that students were having difficulty, as students in the classes demonstrated an understanding of the use of technology relative to the work and assignments that they submitted.

We will consider adding a means of assessment for Outcome 3.1.2 in appropriate classes and consider devoting more class time (particularly in the first four weeks) improve skill development.

III.b. Assessment of Program Goal 5

Table 2 below provides data from key assignments, projects, presentations, and papers for classes that are associated with Program Goal 5 (being conscious of business ethics and social responsibility). In Table 2, we report data from 6 classes for Outcome 5.1.1 (perform an understanding of business ethics and social responsibility when making business decisions at all levels (corporate, business, and operational) in organizations) and 3 classes for Outcome 5.1.2 (apply the understanding of business ethics and social responsibility when making sustainable investments as entrepreneurs regardless of the size of the organization). Rubrics provided by faculty for the assessment of Program Goal 5 are noted in Appendix A.

Table 2: Data Evaluating Program Goal 5 - Being Conscious Of Business Ethics and Social Responsibility

Program Goal	Learning Outcome	Class	Semester	`	Assessment Data			Meet Success Criteria?	Notes
					A or higher	B or higher	C or higher		
5	5.1.1	BUS 100	Fall 2018	Weekly chapter presentations, Midterm and final exams, weekly written papers	3%	34%	14%	Unclear	Same data reported for both goals- see above
5	5.1.1	BUS 201	Fall 2018	Chapter presentations, midterm test -oral, weekly written papers, final written paper, final presentation	15%	25%	15%	Unclear	Same data reported for both goals- see above
5	5.1.1	Bus 201	Spring 2019	Chapter presentations, midterm test -oral, weekly written papers, final written paper, final presentation	13%	29%	13%	Unclear	Same data reported for both goals- see above
5	5.1.1	Bus 202	Spring 2019	Weekly written papers, individual research paper and presentation, midterm test (essay questions)	55%	25%	5%	Unclear	Same data reported for both goals- see above
5	5.1.1	Bus 302	Spring 2019	Weekly written papers, individual research paper and presentation, weekly in class research and presentations, midterm test (essay questions), and final group paper and group presentation	83%	0%	17%	Unclear	Same data reported for both goals- see above

2019 Annual Assessment Report of
Student Learning Outcomes- Business Program

Program Goal	Learning Outcome	Class	Semester	`	Assessment Data			Meet Success Criteria?	Notes
					A or higher	B or higher	C or higher		
5	5.1.1	Bus 302	Spring 2019	Weekly written papers, individual research paper and presentation, weekly in class research and presentations, midterm test (essay questions), and final group paper and group presentation	83%	0%	17%	Unclear	Same data reported for both goals- see above
5	5.1.1	Bus 365	Fall 2018	Case leader presentation (group)	50%	88%	100%	Yes	
					Assessment Data				
5	5.1.1	Bus 203	Spring 2019	Assignment 1	Low grade:0, High grade 92, Average grade: 83			Unclear	Same data reported for both goals- see above
5	5.1.1	Bus 203	Spring 2019	Assignment 3	Low grade:0, High grade 98, Average grade: 84			Unclear	Same data reported for both goals- see above
5	5.1.1	Bus 203	Spring 2019	Assignment 4	Low grade: 0, High grade: 96, Average grade 81			Unclear	
5	5.1.1	Bus 203	Spring 2019	Pitch assignment	Low grade: 72, High grade: 95, Average grade 86			Unclear	Same data reported for both goals- see above
5	5.1.1	Bus 203	Spring 2019	Oral presentation	Low Grade: 70, High Grade 95, Average grade 85			Yes	Same data reported for both goals- see above
5	5.1.1	Bus 203	Spring 2019	Final paper	Low grade:73, High grade: 98, Average grade 85			Yes	Same data reported for both goals- see above
5	5.1.1	Bus 305	Fall 2018	Test 2	Low grade:69, High grade: 98, Average grade 84			Unclear	
5	5.1.1	Bus 305	Fall 2018	Quiz 4	Low grade:64, High grade: 98, Average grade 85			Unclear	
5	5.1.1	Bus 305	Fall 2018	Oral presentation	Low grade:75, High grade: 98, Average grade 86			yes	
5	5.1.1	Bus 305	Fall 2018	Final paper	Low grade: 75, High grade: 98, Average grade 87			Yes	
					A or higher	B or higher	C or higher		
5	5.1.2	WLLS 110	Spring 2019	Quiz question	54%	0%	0%	No	Needs work- only half the class who received the question got it correct (11 students). The question was either answered correctly or not-
5	5.1.2	Bus 203	Spring 2019	NA				Unclear	Discussed in class, but not assessed
5	5.1.2	Bus 305	Fall 2018	NA				Unclear	Discussed in class, but not assessed

Based on the data in Table 2, it appears we also have mixed results for Learning Outcomes 5.1.1 and 5.1.2. An understanding of business ethics and social responsibility is core to Bus 203, Bus 305, and Bus 365, but these topics are also integrated into other courses we offer. Based on the data in Table 2, it is unclear if we are meeting Outcome 5.1.1 overall, but for the classes focusing specifically on this topic it seems we meet the success criteria. In one class, three brainstorming sessions were incorporated into the course this semester and students indicated that the brainstorming and peer input significantly broadened their views and understanding of the social problems and possible solutions. In another class, students were expecting a lecture-based course, as in past years. The instructor introduced case studies and analysis and guest speakers that included, corporate business executives, attorneys, and an arbitrator. The students indicated they were able to learn the key concepts better as a result of case analysis and discussion with guest speakers. The Q&A time with guest speakers was increased as was case analysis and discussion. In addition, student led discussion and debate was found to be beneficial to the students.

For Outcome 5.1.2, students discussed and demonstrated a knowledge of investing in ethical and socially responsible businesses in a few classes, but were not directly assessed on their investment knowledge. In one class, this outcome was not met as the students received a quiz question related to social investments, but only half that received the question (as the quiz questions are random) answered correctly. We will explore ways to possibly incorporate lessons and assessments regarding ethical and socially responsible investing, as it relates to the courses. In addition, data was not provided for courses in which Outcome 5.1.2 are relevant (e.g., Bus 213, Bus 253, and Bus 310). These courses are taught by an adjunct professor. We will explore as a department how this outcome is being discussed and assessed in the pertinent courses in our program.

IV.   Program Changes for the Upcoming Year

Based on the data submitted and noted in Tables 1 and 2 in this report and program changes suggested in 2018 Report, our department will continue to ensure that all course syllabi include Student Learning Outcomes associated with the Program Goals. We will also work as a department to update Tables 1 and 2 in the 2018-2019 Assessment Plan as needed. Specifically, we will strive to identify ways to modify course syllabi and rubrics to help our students continue to improve on their writing and oral presentation skills (Outcome 3.1.1). We expect to see improvement over the next couple of years as Wells College implemented a new writing curriculum for first year students. Additional time in courses will be spent on Outcome 3.1.2 for relevant courses and we will identify rubrics/assignments to assess this outcome specifically. We will continue to ensure topics related to Outcome 5.1.1 are integrated and assessed in the appropriate courses and discuss how/if Outcome 5.1.2 is being assessed, particularly for the courses focused on investment. Finally, we will work with the Education Program Committee to better understand the data we should collect and report on in order to more clearly and consistently understand whether or not we are meeting our success criteria for the Program Goals and Outcomes being evaluated.

To ensure clear communication for advising, we will start to discuss a sample two- and four-year course schedule for the students and identify a suggested course sequence. While some introductory or 200 level courses have no pre-requisites, it still would be helpful for students to review a suggested sequence of courses before attending advising appointments. Not only will this guidance help ensure student academic success in courses, it could have a positive impact on retention. We will also continue to review our courses to ensure we have appropriate pre-requisites. In creating the two-year teaching schedule, we identified potential opportunities to create new courses or modify existing ones to meet the changing needs our students such as a new entrepreneurship course, a new sustainable business operations course (in collaboration with the Center for Sustainability) and modification of Bus 360 to include R programming. Finally, this year we added a research methods course (SS 294) to supplement our list of electives. This course will provide students with additional skills to design, implement, evaluate survey for their final paper/project in Bus 402, as well as prepare them for a career in marketing.

As recommended in the 2018 Assessment Report, we will continue to design and implement an exit survey for the seniors to supplement our data analysis. This survey will be implemented via Bus 402 class and/or other classes as identified by the department. Finally, we will also continue to explore establishing a mechanism to obtain post measurement data from the Center for Academic and Career Advising to evaluate future Program Goals and Outcomes.

V. Action Plan for the Upcoming Year

As noted in our 2019-2020 Assessment Plan, the Business faculty will continue to assess Program Goal #3 by collecting data from key assignments, tests, and projects from classes listed in Table 1 in the Business Assessment Plan. We will meet in the fall and spring to discuss data collection and program changes. While this is tentative, we will finish assessing Program Goal 3 in 2020-2021 and begin to assess Program Goal 1 in 2021-2022.

2019 Annual Assessment Report of
Student Learning Outcomes- Business Program

Appendix A- Rubrics/Assignments

Bus 365- Fall 2018 Rubric for Written Case Study Assignments

	STRONG (9-10 points)	AVERAGE (7-8.9 points)	DEVELOPING (0-6.9 points)	Weight	Score (1-10)	Weighted Score
Completeness - Analysis & Evaluation of Issues/ Problems	Presents an insightful and thorough analysis of all identified issues/problems; includes several examples and all necessary calculations, if applicable.	Presents a thorough analysis of *most* of the issues identified; missing some necessary calculations, if applicable. Missing some evidence and/or examples	Presents a superficial or incomplete analysis of some of the identified issues; omits necessary calculations (if applicable) and examples,	0.4		
Understand and Identification of Main Case Issues/Topics	Identifies and demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of the main issues/concepts in the case study.	Identifies and demonstrates a good understanding of *most* of the issues/concepts. May be missing some level of understanding	Identifies and demonstrates a less than acceptable understanding of some of the issues/concepts in the case study.	0.2		
Links to Course Readings & Additional Research	Makes appropriate and powerful connections between identified issues/ problems and the strategic concepts studied in the course readings and lectures; supplements case study with relevant documents. Cites all sources of information.	Makes appropriate but somewhat vague connections between identified issues/problems and concepts studied in readings and lectures; demonstrates limited command of the analytical tools studied; supplements case study with limited research. Cites some sources of information, or cites incorrectly.	Makes inappropriate or little connection between issues identified and the concepts studied in the readings; supplements case study, if at all, with incomplete research and documentation. No citations.	0.2		
Writing Mechanics & Formatting Guidelines	Demonstrates clarity, conciseness and correctness; formatting is appropriate and writing is free of	Occasional grammar or spelling errors, but still a clear presentation of ideas; lacks organization.	Writing is unfocused, rambling, or contains serious errors; poorly organized and	0.2		

	grammar and spelling errors.		does not follow specified guidelines.			

Bus 365- Fall 2018 – Case study leader presentation Rubric/Assignment

Below are the assignments for the case presentations. Each group must present a short (5-10 min) overview of and main take aways from the case. Make sure to connect how the case relevant to what we are learning in class and lead the class in thoughtful discussion of questions (not just yes/not, but ones that result in conversation- who, how and why questions). I expect a minimum of *three* questions per person in each group. I expect everyone in the group to participate and be able to answer any questions posed by myself or the class.

This assignment is graded out of 10 points for leading the case:
- 7 points for showing up and doing the powerpoint presentation, leading with any basic questions I may or may not provide and adding three questions per person in the group.
- 1 point if your questions are thought provoking and analytical and get the class to talk
- 1 point for creativity – videos/pod cast to give context to the case or to update it
- 1 point for adding concepts from previous class readings to support ideas
- Negative points for individual/group lack of preparation, distracting errors on the PPT, it is evident that it is not a group effort-all should participate), etc.

Case Leaders:	Case	Date
xxx	Hopworks (Sustainable Brews)	October 2
xxx	Zipcar	October 18*
xxx	Patagonia	October 23*
xxx	Ecovative	October 25*
xxx	Managing Social Acceptance of Wind Energy Projects	November 1
xxx	Alpha Motors Case	November 8
xxx	Lululemon	November 13
xxx	Seventh Generation	November 15

*please note that I may need to move things around depending on when our guest speaker is able to come to our class.

You are expected to do a write up of the case you are leading and it would be due two weeks after you present. More details on the writeups to come.

BUS 402 – Spring 2019 – Final Paper Rubric

Scored: 1 – less than adequate to 4 – beyond expectations

	Weight	Score (1-4)	Weighted Score
Quality of research in paper or project	0.3		
Completeness of project or paper components (including citations, intext/end ref)	0.2		
Quality of writing/grammar	0.2		
Quality of analysis or synthesis of literature	0.3		
Total Weighted Score:			

2019 Annual Assessment Report of
Student Learning Outcomes- Business Program

BUS 402 – Spring 2019 – Final Poster Presentation Rubric

Student Name: _____ Poster topic: _____

Feedback or overall comments:

Please provide a score for each category:

	4	3	2	1	Score:
Content of research or business plan	Fully described the purpose of their study, their research (or business plan), the data, and results.	Content and support for research (or business plan) is satisfactory.	Content and support for research (or business plan) is adequate with limited support for research or business plan.	Research (or business plan) content is less than adequate.	
Poster visual appeal and clarity	Poster is visually appealing, easy to read, Uses appropriate creativity with graphics/images, fonts, headings, colors, and white space. No grammatical errors	Adequate visual appeal with some images/graphics, but could improve effectiveness through better use of space, font sizes, colors, headings, white space etc. May have some grammatical issues	Poster was acceptable, but needs work to improve better utilization of fonts, colors, headings, white space, etc. Has several grammatical issues	Not visually effective or appealing and has serious grammatical issues	
Student knowledge	Demonstrates full grasp of the topic	Comfortable with the material	Limited knowledge of the subject/data.	Not appear to have a handle on the data or topic.	
Student communication	Demonstrates ease at answering questions. Speaks clearly and professionally	Answers most questions. Speaks clearly most of the time	Limited ability to answer questions or communicate about the subject/data.	Not an effective communicator	

Judge name:_____

2019 Annual Assessment Report of
Student Learning Outcomes- Business Program

Bus 250 Spring 2019 Midterm assignment

The goal of this midterm assignment to evaluate your understanding of the project challenge and the concepts we are discussing in class/readings. If our challenge is to ensure the success of the recycle mania program, find *research* (2-3 articles) to explain the problem we are currently facing with waste generation, global issues with how we can handle the recycled materials/waste, and/or consumer awareness/issues with existing recycling/waste diversion efforts. As part of this effort, I would also like you to *benchmark* with one additional school or community (can be a local government) on their recycling/composting/waste diversion program and how they communicate the program to their students/faculty/community members (signage, websites, collection containers etc.). Finally, I would like you to explain your understanding of design thinking and how you are currently applying the process to the challenge. You can write a short answer for each question below, but I expect each question should be answered in complete sentences.

The questions (and weight towards final grade) are as follows:

- 35% - Q1 - Research articles (at least 2) on waste generation/recycling to further support/explain the issues we are facing on campus and in the greater community. You can include information from articles that I posted on Moodle- but that doesn't count towards the number you need to find.

- 25% - Q2 - Research one other community or school and explain how they are sorting, collecting, and communicating their recycling/composting/waste diversion program. Make sure to identify the community, provide any data/statistics or even images and explain what can we learn from them (positive or negative).

- 40% - Q3 – Define the concept of design thinking, explain it in your own words, and identify how you are applying the concept to this particular challenge. For example, make sure to explain how you are defining the problem and give examples from your interviews and group work during class. Make sure to address each step (even if we haven't done them yet). Include who you will need to test your solutions with and what criteria you will use to evaluate the solution's effectiveness.

Citations using APA style are required- particularly for concepts/ideas/data that is not your own thought. If you are a having a problem with figuring out how to cite something (video), just do your best. The evaluation of your midterm is also based on how completely you answered each question, the quality of information/research provided, your ability to integrate the concepts/reading/videos from class, and overall grammar. Points will be taken off if you have many grammatical errors and/or fail to include intext citations and end references.

This is due before class on March 21, 2018 at 1:00 pm. No late submissions will be accepted.

Bus 250 Presentation Assignment Rubric- Spring 2019

2019 Annual Assessment Report of
Student Learning Outcomes- Business Program

Scored: 1 – less than adequate to 4 – beyond expectations (weighted equally)

	Score
Overall how effectively did they complete all aspects of the assignment	
How effectively did they address the content in the presentation (design thinking process)	
How effectively did they address the content in the presentation (sustainability assessment)	
Visually appeal of presentation	
Average total:	

Bus 250 Fall 2018 Final Paper Rubric

Scored: 1 – less than adequate to 4 – beyond expectations

	Weight	Score
Completeness of the assignment (how effective and completely did they respond to the final requirements)	30%	
Quality (writing quality and appropriate use of references)	25%	
Effective Understanding and Application of Design Thinking/Creative Problem-Solving concepts	35%	
Creative component inclusion of images, additional notes/materials	10%	
Total weighted score		

2019 Annual Assessment Report of
Student Learning Outcomes- Business Program

GENERAL MARKING CRITERIA Rubric Used for Bus 201, Bus 202, and Bus 302:

	Excellent work: 70%	Above satisfactory work: 60% - 69%	Satisfactory: 50 - 59%	Below satisfactory work: 40% - 49%	Failure: Below 40%
Relevance 30%	Excellent knowledge and understanding of material and an imaginative sense of its relevance across a range of issues, and context or policy situation; excellent use of course material and other relevant information to support argument	Very good use of course material and other information; well-chosen to support arguments relevant to question	Competent use of course materials and other information to support most arguments	Some use of appropriate course materials and experience to support arguments; capacity to identify relevance, but may be rather narrowly focused and miss out important areas	Little or no sign of relevance
Content 30%	Independent and creative, and demonstrates clear thinking; ability to analyses and critically evaluate material	Good knowledge and understanding of the material, across a broad spectrum, combined with an ability to evaluate, analyse and reflect on key issues	Reasonable knowledge of the material and ability to draw upon more than one source for ideas; uses key themes well.	Adequate understanding and use of course and other relevant material; mostly descriptive, but with some grasp of key course themes and issues and a capacity to discuss these in context	Very limited knowledge and understanding and the issues involved
Depth 30%	A sensitive awareness of conflicting arguments and ideas and of their provenance. Clear grasp of implications.	Well organized use of most of the major points with an ability to draw upon them creatively and critically; awareness of conflicting arguments and ideas and attempt to address them in context	Capacity to grapple with conflicting arguments and ideas; beginning to draw together and synthesize ideas and perspectives from a range of theory	Some attempt to address the conflicting arguments and ideas from the course, some signs of an attempt to take an evaluative, analytical and critical stance; some appropriate use of concepts, but with only limited evidence of independent thinking	Lack of awareness of conflicting arguments and ideas
Structure 10%	Excellent organization of material; clear, logical flow of	Good, clear framework and reasoned argument	Sensible use of major points integrated into the	Framework is apparent with an introduction, argument and	Little or no evidence of planned

argument; good signposting throughout	with evidence of careful thought	answer; logical flow of ideas is apparent	conclusion, but the logical flow and coherence is not always consistent and may be difficult to follow	structure and organization

Rubrics Used for Bus 204 Projects (total of 25 points):

15.0 pts Excellent	12.0 pts Good	9.0 pts Average	6.0 pts Below Average	3.0 pts Insufficient
R codes are easier to read, share, and verify. There are comments in the codes. There are no bugs in the script.	R codes are easier to read, share, and verify. There are few comments. There are less than 3 bugs in the script.	R codes could be read. There is no comment. There are less than 4 bugs in the script.	R codes are hard to read. There is no comment. There are more than 5 bugs in the script.	R codes are hard to read. There are no comments. There are more than 5 bugs in the script.

10.0 pts Excellent	8.0 pts Good	6.0 pts Average	4.0 pts Below Average	2.0 pts Insufficient
The data and model are accurately interpreted to justify the answer, and sufficient data and model is used to defend the main argument.	The data and model are accurately interpreted to justify the answer, and model is used to defend the main argument, but it might not be sufficient.	Data and model are used to defend the main argument, but does not accurately interpret the idea and model, and it might not be sufficient.	Data and model are used to defend the main argument, but it is insufficient.	Data and model are provided, but it is not used to defend the main argument.