

# Program-Level Assessment Plan

Program: **Leadership and Organizational Behavior** Degree Level (e.g., UG or GR certificate, UG major, master's program, doctoral program): **UG Major**  
 Department: **NA** College/School: **School for Professional Studies**  
 Date (Month/Year): **May 2021** Primary Assessment Contact: **Katie Devany**

Note: Each cell in the table below will expand as needed to accommodate your responses.

| # | Student Learning Outcomes   | Curriculum Mapping  | Assessment Methods  |   | Use of Assessment Data  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|   |   |   | Student Artifacts (What)  | Evaluation Process (How)  |   |
|   | What do the program faculty expect all students to know or be able to do as a result of completing this program?<br><br>Note: These should be measurable and manageable in number (typically 4-6 are sufficient). | In which courses will faculty intentionally work to foster some level of student development toward achievement of the outcome? Please clarify the level (e.g., introduced, developed, reinforced, achieved, etc.) at which student development is expected in each course. | 1. Which student artifacts will be used to determine if students have achieved this outcome?<br><br>2. In which courses will these artifacts be collected?  | 1. What process will be used to evaluate the student artifacts, and by whom?<br><br>2. What tool(s) (e.g., a rubric) will be used in the process?<br><br>Note: Please include any rubrics as part of the submitted plan documents.  | 1. How and when will analyzed data be used by faculty to make changes in pedagogy, curriculum design, and/or assessment work?<br><br>2. How and when will the program evaluate the impact of assessment-informed changes made in previous years?  |
| 1 | Analyze data to formulate evidence-based decisions.   | ORLD 1500 (I)<br>ORLD 2500 (D)<br>ORLD 2700 (R)<br>ORLD 4960 (A)  | Artifacts such as final research paper (ORLD 1500), financial plan assessment (ORLD 2500), organizational assessment final project (ORLD 2700), and applied organizational analysis (ORLD 4960) are designed to elicit direct measurement of student development toward this outcome. | 1: An assessment survey will be completed by each instructor at the end of the course in which this program learning outcome exists. This survey will inquire about: A) Specific artifact(s) used to demonstrate achievement, B) Strengths/weakness in student performance towards this outcome, C) Number of students who achieved/partially achieved/not achieved the outcome, D) Suggestions on potential changes to the | 1: Every other year, typically in the spring. The Program Director in cooperation with the full-time and adjunct faculty will analyze assessment data and make changes to pedagogy and/or curriculum.<br><br>2: In the fall, Program Directors will follow up on action items from the previous year to determine impact and possible refinements or enhancements moving forward. |

|   |   |  |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|
|   |   |  |   | curriculum/pedagogies/artifacts/assessment methods.<br>2: Assignment rubrics are used to assess the artifacts.   |   |
| 2 | Apply fundamental competencies from business functions. | ORLD 2000 (I)<br>ORLD 2500 (D)<br>ORLD 2700 (R)<br>ORLD 4960 (A) | Artifacts such as financial plans (ORDL 2500), organizational assessment final project (ORLD 2000, ORLD 2700) and applied organizational analysis (ORLD 4960) are designed to elicit direct measurement of student development toward this outcome. | 1: An assessment survey will be completed by each instructor at the end of the course in which this program learning outcome exists. This survey will inquire about: A) Specific artifact(s) used to demonstrate achievement, B) Strengths/weakness in student performance towards this outcome, C) Number of students who achieved/partially achieved/not achieved the outcome, D) Suggestions on potential changes to the curriculum/pedagogies/artifacts/assessment methods.<br>2: Assignment rubrics are used to assess the artifacts. | 1: Every other year, typically in the spring. The Program Director in cooperation with the full-time and adjunct faculty will analyze assessment data and make changes to pedagogy and/or curriculum.<br>2: In the fall, Program Directors will follow up on action items from the previous year to determine impact and possible refinements or enhancements moving forward. |
| 3 | Evaluate organizational behavior at multiple levels.    | ORLD 1800 (I)<br>ORLD 3300 (D)<br>ORLD 4000 (R)<br>ORLD 4960 (A) | Artifacts such as assessment of case studies (ORLD 1800, ORLD 4000) and applied organizational analysis (ORLD 3300, ORLD 4960) are designed to elicit direct measurement of student development toward this outcome.                                | 1: An assessment survey will be completed by each instructor at the end of the course in which this program learning outcome exists. This survey will inquire about: A) Specific artifact(s) used to demonstrate achievement, B) Strengths/weakness in student performance towards this outcome, C) Number of students who achieved/partially achieved/not achieved the outcome, D) Suggestions on   | 1: Every other year, typically in the spring. The Program Director in cooperation with the full-time and adjunct faculty will analyze assessment data and make changes to pedagogy and/or curriculum.<br>2: In the fall, Program Directors will follow up on action items from the previous year to determine impact and possible refinements or enhancements moving forward. |

|   |  |  |  |   |  |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|
|   |  |  |  | <p>potential changes to the curriculum/pedagogies/artifacts/assessment methods.</p> <p>2: Assignment rubrics are used to assess the artifacts.</p>  |  |
| 4 | Apply leadership principles in multiple contexts.                | <p>ORLD 1000 (I)</p> <p>ORLD 3800 (R)</p> <p>ORLD 4960 (A)</p>   | <p>Artifacts such the leadership development plan (ORLD 1000), organizational analysis (ORLD 3800), and applied organizational analysis (ORLD 4960) are designed to elicit direct measurement of student development toward this outcome.</p>  | <p>1: An assessment survey will be completed by each instructor at the end of the course in which this program learning outcome exists. This survey will inquire about: A) Specific artifact(s) used to demonstrate achievement, B) Strengths/weakness in student performance towards this outcome, C) Number of students who achieved/partially achieved/not achieved the outcome, D) Suggestions on potential changes to the curriculum/pedagogies/artifacts/assessment methods.</p> <p>2: Assignment rubrics are used to assess the artifacts.</p> | <p>1: Every other year, typically in the spring. The Program Director in cooperation with the full-time and adjunct faculty will analyze assessment data and make changes to pedagogy and/or curriculum.</p> <p>2: In the fall, Program Directors will follow up on action items from the previous year to determine impact and possible refinements or enhancements moving forward.</p> |
| 5 | Evaluate ethical implications in organizational decision making. | <p>ORLD 1000 (I)</p> <p>ORLD 1800 (D)</p> <p>ORLD 3800 (D)</p> <p>ORLD 4000 (R)</p> <p>ORLD 4960 (A)</p> | <p>Artifacts such the leadership development plan (ORLD 1000), organizational analysis (ORLD 3800), applied organizational analysis (ORLD 4960), and assessment of case studies (ORLD 1800, ORLD 4000) are designed to elicit direct measurement of student development toward this outcome.</p> | <p>1: An assessment survey will be completed by each instructor at the end of the course in which this program learning outcome exists. This survey will inquire about: A) Specific artifact(s) used to demonstrate achievement, B) Strengths/weakness in student performance towards this outcome, C) Number of students who achieved/partially achieved/not achieved the</p>  | <p>1: Every other year, typically in the spring. The Program Director in cooperation with the full-time and adjunct faculty will analyze assessment data and make changes to pedagogy and/or curriculum.</p> <p>2: In the fall, Program Directors will follow up on action items from the previous year to determine impact and possible refinements or enhancements moving forward.</p> |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  | outcome, D) Suggestions on potential changes to the curriculum/pedagogies/artifacts/assessment methods.<br><br>2: Assignment rubrics are used to assess the artifacts. |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

### Additional Questions

1. On what schedule/cycle will faculty assess each of the program's student learning outcomes? (Please note that it is not recommended to try to assess every outcome every year.)

### Program Assessment Schedule

The following schedule provides an annual timeline for assessing the program's student learning outcomes. The assessment schedule will be reviewed annually and modified to address emerging evidence needs for assessment of a particular SLO.

|                   | SLO1                                       | SLO2                                       | SLO3                                       | SLO4                            | SLO5  |
|-------------------|--|--|--|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>AY 2021-22</b> | ORLD 1500, ORLD 2500, ORLD 2700, ORLD 4960 |  |  | ORLD 1000, ORLD 3800, ORLD 4960 |   |
| <b>AY 2022-23</b> |  | ORLD 2000, ORLD 2500, ORLD 2700, ORLD 4960 | ORLD 1800, ORLD 3300, ORLD 4000, ORLD 4960 |                                 | ORLD 1000, ORLD 1800, ORLD 3800, ORLD 4000, ORLD 4960 |
| <b>AY 2023-24</b> | ORLD 1500, ORLD 2500, ORLD 2700, ORLD 4960 |  |  | ORLD 1000, ORLD 3800, ORLD 4960 |   |
| <b>AY 2024-25</b> | ORLD 1500, ORLD 2500, ORLD 2700, ORLD 4960 |  |  | ORLD 1000, ORLD 3800, ORLD 4960 |   |

2. Describe how, and the extent to which, program faculty contributed to the development of this plan.

The Program Director in cooperation with the full-time and adjunct faculty are involved in the development of the courses and their application to each program learning outcome within the plan. These faculties are highly invested in ensuring that course projects and other associated artifacts are created in ways that student performance toward the learning outcome can be distinguished and evidence towards achievement reported.

**IMPORTANT: Please remember to submit any rubrics or other assessment tools along with this plan.**

**Please see rubrics and assessment tools included below.**

## ORLD 1500 Final Research Paper Rubric

| TITLE PAGE (1 page)                                     |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| <i>1 Point</i>  | <b>Poor</b>  | <b>Acceptable</b>   | <b>Excellent</b>   |
| <b>APA Style<br/>(1 Point)</b>                          | <u>0 Points</u><br>Majority of page has formatting errors.   | <u>.5 Points</u><br>Few formatting errors.  | <u>1 point</u><br>Only one or two minor formatting errors.   |
| INTRODUCTION (2-3 pages)                                |  |   |  |
| <i>6 Points</i>   | <b>Poor</b>  | <b>Acceptable</b>   | <b>Excellent</b>   |
| <b>APA Style &amp;<br/>Argumentation<br/>(6 Points)</b> | <u>0 Points</u><br>Lacks a clear idea or point. Fails to connect studies to the main idea. Lacks transitions and flow from general to specific points. Does not state hypotheses and rarely cites studies. Numerous grammatical and formatting errors. | <u>3 Points</u><br>Cites relevant scholarly literature, but largely fails to address their importance and implications. Does little to tie the literature together. Good transitions and flow from general to specific points. Clearly states the hypotheses. Does not support hypotheses with research. Few grammatical and formatting errors. | <u>6 Points</u><br>Not only cites relevant scholarly literature, but critically analyzes and addresses their importance and implications. Excellent transitions and flow from general to specific points. Hypotheses are well founded and supported. Almost no grammatical errors. |

| METHOD (2-3 pages)   |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
| 6 Points   | Poor   | Acceptable   | Excellent   |
| <b>APA Style: Content, Structure, &amp; Format (1 Point)</b> | <u>0 Points</u><br>Incomprehensible. Several study characteristics are missing or not easily identifiable. Contains several minor and major APA structure and formatting errors.       | <u>.5 Points</u><br>Poorly organized and difficult to follow. Some study characteristics are not easily identifiable or missing. Contains several minor or one major APA structure and/or formatting errors. | <u>1 Point</u><br>Well-organized and leaves little doubt as to what the participant sample, materials, and procedures are. Contains only one or two minor structure and/or formatting errors. |
| <b>Participant Sample (2 Points)</b>                         | <u>0 Points</u><br>Most or all required sample and sampling information, as per the Journal Article Reporting Standards (JARS), is missing or inappropriate for the research question. | <u>1 Point</u><br>Some required sample and sampling information, as per the Journal Article Reporting Standards (JARS), is included, though sometimes inappropriate for the research question.               | <u>2 Points</u><br>Most or all required sample and sampling information, as per the Journal Article Reporting Standards (JARS), is included and appropriate for the research question.        |
| <b>Measures &amp; Materials (1 Point)</b>                    | <u>0 Points</u><br>Most or all required measures and materials, as per the Journal Article Reporting Standards (JARS), is missing or inappropriate for the research question.          | <u>.5 Points</u><br>Some required measures and materials, as per the Journal Article Reporting Standards (JARS), are included, though sometimes inappropriate for the research question.                     | <u>1 Point</u><br>Most or all required measures and materials, as per the Journal Article Reporting Standards (JARS), are included and appropriate for the research question.                 |

|                                 |   |  |   |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---|
| <b>Procedure<br/>(2 Points)</b> | <u>0 Points</u><br>Most or all required design and implementation, as per the Journal Article Reporting Standards (JARS), are missing or inappropriate for the research question. | <u>1 Point</u><br>Some required design characteristics or procedures, as per the Journal Article Reporting Standards (JARS), are included, though sometimes inappropriate for the research question. | <u>2 Points</u><br>Most or all required design and implementation information, as per the Journal Article Reporting Standards (JARS), are included and appropriate for the research question. |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---|

### RESULTS (1-2 pages)

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| <b>6 Points</b>                            | <b>Poor</b>  | <b>Acceptable</b>   | <b>Excellent</b>   |
| <b>APA Style<br/>(1 Point)</b>             | <u>0 Points</u><br>Incomprehensible. Several necessary components are missing or not easily identifiable. Contains several APA structure and formatting errors.        | <u>5 Points</u><br>Poorly organized and difficult to follow. Some necessary components are missing or are not easily identifiable. Contains a few APA formatting errors.                                | <u>1 Point</u><br>Well-organized. Most or all necessary components are clearly identifiable. Adheres to APA structure and formatting, with only one or two formatting errors.  |
| <b>Statistical Analyses<br/>(3 Points)</b> | <u>0 Points</u><br>None of the required inferential statistical analysis choices are included and/or no justification for selection of analytical methods is provided. | <u>1.5 Point</u><br>Some of the required inferential statistical analyses choices are included and are appropriate. Some justification for selection of analytical methods is provided and appropriate. | <u>3 Points</u><br>Most or all of the required inferential statistical analyses are included and appropriate for the research question. Most or all justification for selection of analytical methods is provided and appropriate. |



| <b>Findings<br/>(2 Points)</b> | <u><b>0 Points</b></u><br>None of the required information regarding findings from null hypothesis testing are presented. | <u><b>1 Point</b></u><br>Some of the required statistical analysis and hypothesis testing results are included and/or appropriate for the research question. | <u><b>2 Points</b></u><br>Most or all of the required statistical analysis and hypothesis testing results are included and appropriate for the research question. |
|--------------------------------|---|--|---|
|--------------------------------|---|--|---|

| <b>DISCUSSION (2-3 pages)</b>   |   |   |  |
|---------------------------------|---|---|--|
| <b>5 Points</b>                 | <b>Poor</b>   | <b>Acceptable</b>   | <b>Excellent</b>   |
| <b>APA Style<br/>(2 Points)</b> | <u><b>0 Points</b></u><br>Discussion is incomprehensible. Several necessary components are missing or not easily identifiable. The section contains several APA structure and formatting errors.  | <u><b>1 Point</b></u><br>Discussion is organized poorly and difficult to follow. Some necessary components are not easily identifiable or are missing. The section contains a few APA formatting errors.                      | <u><b>2 Points</b></u><br>Discussion is well-organized, and most or all necessary components are clearly identifiable. The section adheres to APA structure and formatting, with only one or two formatting errors.                |
| <b>Quality<br/>(3 Points)</b>   | <u><b>0 Points</b></u><br>Most or all of the Discussion section contains information that is inconsistent with other parts of the paper and/or discusses the research project with insufficient accuracy, breadth, and comprehensiveness. | <u><b>1.5 Points</b></u><br>Some of the Discussion section contains information that is consistent with other parts of the paper and discusses the research project with sufficient accuracy, breadth, and comprehensiveness. | <u><b>3 Points</b></u><br>Most or all of the Discussion section contains information that is consistent with other parts of the paper and discusses the research project with sufficient accuracy, breadth, and comprehensiveness. |

| REFERENCES (1 page)                       |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
| 2 Points                                  | Poor   | Acceptable   | Excellent   |
| References & In-text Citations (2 Points) | <u>0 Points</u><br>Often does not cite sources or misplaces those that are cited. Frequently uses wrong APA formatting. Cites less than four scholarly articles in-text. | <u>1 Point</u><br>Understands the basics of citations and makes efforts to cite literature, but the citations are somewhat regularly misplaced or written incorrectly. Cites at least four scholarly articles in-text. | <u>2 Points</u><br>Uses correct APA style format and correct citation formats with few errors. Cites at least eight scholarly articles in-text. |

| DEVELOPMENT / IMPROVEMENT                    |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| 4 Points                                     | Poor  | Acceptable   | Excellent  |
| Overall Complexity (2 Points)                | <u>0 Points</u><br>Fails to demonstrate thoughtful, complex thinking and to integrate course material effectively.                | <u>1 Point</u><br>Demonstrates thoughtful, complex thinking at times. Integrates course material effectively some of the time. | <u>2 Points</u><br>Demonstrates thoughtful, complex thinking consistent with effective argumentation. Integrates course material effectively most of the time. |
| Feedback Integration and Learning (2 Points) | <u>0 Points</u><br>Fails to successfully integrate all or most instructor feedback. Does not demonstrate improvement across time. | <u>1 Point</u><br>Successfully integrates some instructor feedback. Demonstrates some improvement across time.                 | <u>2 Points</u><br>Successfully integrates most or all instructor feedback. Demonstrates substantial improvement across time.                                  |

# ORLD 2000 Final Paper Rubric

Final Company Paper

| Criteria   | Ratings  |   |  |   |   | Pts      |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|----------|
| This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Readability | 10.0 pts<br>Excellent<br>Text is easy to read; the reader can understand sentences clearly when reading at a normal pace and does not have to reread any passages. The reader isn't distracted by any problems with grammar, spelling, and/or punctuation. | 7.5 pts<br>Above Average<br>Text is easy to read in most places; reader understands sentences clearly when reading at normal pace; seldom has to reread any passages. Isolated problems with grammar, spelling, and/or punctuation distract reader in a few places. | 5.01 pts<br>Average<br>Text is easy to read in some places; reader can understand some sentences clearly when reading at a normal pace, though may have to reread several passages. Recurring problems with grammar, spelling, and/or punctuation distract the reader in several places. | 2.5 pts<br>Below Average<br>The reader has consistent difficulty understanding sentences when reading at a normal pace; the reader consistently has to reread passages. Recurring problems with grammar, spelling, and/or punctuation distract the reader repeatedly. | 0.0 pts<br>Poor<br>Recurring problems with grammar, spelling, and/or punctuation interfere with the reader's ability to understand the text's lines of reasoning. | 10.0 pts |
|  |  |   |  |   |   |          |

| Criteria   | Ratings  |   |   |   |  |          | Pts |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|----------|-----|
| This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome APA Style and Organization            | 10.0 pts<br>Excellent  | 7.5 pts<br>Above Average  | 5.01 pts<br>Average   | 2.5 pts<br>Below Average  | 0.0 pts<br>Poor  |          |     |
|  | Correct use of APA formatting throughout 95% of document and reference pages including appropriate citation of direct and indirect quotes. The paper is structured in a way that sections, and paragraphs within sections, flow easily and naturally; the organization of the paper is clear and logical; paper is clearly structured in a manner consistent with the assignment. Use of headers and subheaders in APA style. Includes an APA well-formatted Cover page. | Uses correct APA formatting throughout 85% of the document and reference pages including appropriate citation of direct and indirect quotes. The paper is generally structured logically and clearly; paper is generally structured in a manner consistent with assignment requirements; however, some paragraphs within sections may not flow smoothly or naturally, or some ideas may seem out of place in a given section. Use of headers and subheaders in APA is consistent in most part of the the document. Includes a Cover page with most of APA requirement | Uses correct APA formatting throughout 75% of the document and reference pages. Mostly correct citation of direct and indirect quotes. There may be greater organization issues; there may be several instances of poor transition from one idea or section to another; use of headings to separate sections may not be easily identifiable; still contains all of the sections required. Use of headers and subheaders in APA is consistent in some parts of the the document. Includes a Cover page | Contains incorrect APA formatting throughout parts of the document and reference pages (65% correct). Some errors in citation of direct and indirect quotes. Substantial organizational issues exist; use of headings to separate sections may be non-existent; paper may not be organized according to assignment specifications; major transition problems may be observed. Use of headers and subheaders in APA is inconsistent in most part of the the document. Includes a Cover page with little to no APA's requirements | Contains incorrect APA formatting throughout the majority of the document and reference pages (less than 50% correct). Numerous errors in direct and indirect quotes. Major organizational issues exist; paper may lack several sections required by the assignment; there appears to be little flow among sections; headings typically not used. No use of headers and subheaders or used without APA formatting. Includes a Cover with no APA's formatting or no cover page. | 10.0 pts |     |
| This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Completeness & Depth of SWOT analysis | 10.0 pts<br>Excellent  | 7.5 pts<br>Above Average  | 5.01 pts<br>Average   | 2.5 pts<br>Below Average  | 0.0 pts<br>Poor  |          |     |
|  | Fully answers in sufficient depth all the questions of the SWOT section. Includes a table with four-   | Answers all the questions of the assignment poses, most in sufficient depth for the SWOT section. Includes a  | Answers all the questions the assignment poses, some in sufficient depth, for   | Does not respond coherently to some of the questions of the SWOT analysis. Does   | Does not respond coherently to most of the questions the assignment poses for  | 10.0 pts |     |

| Criteria  | Ratings  |  |  |  |   | Pts      |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|----------|
|   | quadrants, one for each of the SWOT components. Components are well developed in content by providing an in-depth analysis . Components meet all requirements of the checklist.  | table with four-quadrants, one for each of the SWOT components. Analysis and content are developed but have room for improvement. Components meet most of requirements of the checklist.   | the SWOT section. Includes a table with four-quadrants, one for each of the SWOT components. Components meet at least half of the requirements of the checklist.                                 | not include a table with the SWOT section, four-quadrants or SWOT components are missing. SWOT components meet at least one fourth of the requirements of the checklist.       | does not include a table or quadrants are missing. The checklist with requirements was not followed.  |          |
| This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Completeness & Depth of Conclusion         | 10.0 pts<br>Excellent<br>Fully answers in sufficient depth all the questions of the Conclusion section. Conclusion is well developed in content by providing an in-depth analysis. Conclusion meets all requirements of the checklist. | 7.5 pts<br>Above Average<br>Answers all the questions the assignment poses, most in sufficient depth for the conclusion section. Analysis and content are developed but have room for improvement. Conclusion meets most of requirements of the checklist. | 5.01 pts<br>Average<br>Answers all the questions the assignment poses, some in sufficient depth for the Conclusion section. Conclusion meets at least half of the requirements of the checklist. | 2.5 pts<br>Below Average<br>Does not respond coherently to some of the questions of the Conclusion. Conclusion meets at least one fourth of the requirements of the checklist. | 0.0 pts<br>Poor<br>Does not respond coherently to most of the questions the assignment poses for the Conclusion section. The checklist with requirements for the conclusion was not followed. | 10.0 pts |
| This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Incorporation of Feedback into Final Paper | 10.0 pts<br>Excellent<br>Paper incorporates all feedback from instructor that is provided on company assignments.  | 7.5 pts<br>Above Average<br>Paper incorporates at least about 90% of feedback from instructor on previous company assignments.   | 5.01 pts<br>Average<br>Paper incorporates at least about 75% of feedback from instructor on previous company assignments.  | 2.5 pts<br>Below Average<br>Paper incorporates at least about 50% of feedback from instructor on previous company assignments.   | 0.0 pts<br>Poor<br>Paper has little to none incorporation of feedback from instructor on previous company assignments.  | 10.0 pts |
| This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome References                                 | 10.0 pts<br>Excellent<br>Student referenced between 12 to 14 sources with a minimum of   | 7.5 pts<br>Above Average<br>Student referenced at least 10 sources, with a minimum of 4 non-   | 5.01 pts<br>Average<br>Student referenced at least 9 sources, with a minimum of 4 non-   | 2.5 pts<br>Below Average<br>Student referenced at least 5 sources, with a minimum of 2 non-  | 0.0 pts<br>Poor<br>Student referenced less than 3 sources or reference page is  | 10.0 pts |

| Criteria           | Ratings                |                  |                  |                  |          | Pts |
|--------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|----------|-----|
|                    | 5 non-website sources. | website sources. | website sources. | website sources. | missing. |     |
| Total Points: 70.0 |                        |                  |                  |                  |          |     |

### ORLD 3800 Final Presentation Rubric

#### Presentation Content: Strategy and/or Strategic Planning Recommendations--

Levels of Achievement:

☐ Exceptional 3 (10%) points

Provided strategy and/or strategic planning recommendations based on the prior organizational analysis; and clearly and accurately applied the course readings, materials and/or lectures

☐ Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Strategy and strategic planning recommendations are not fully developed or supported by organizational analysis; and/or failure to clearly or accurately apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

☐ Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Does not provide strategic and/or strategic planning recommendations; or not based on the prior organizational analysis; or does not apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

#### Presentation Content: Structure & Design Elements Recommendations--

Levels of Achievement:

☐ Exceptional 3 (10%) points

Provided structure and design recommendations based on the prior organizational analysis; and clearly and accurately applied the course readings, materials and/or lectures

☐ Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Structure and design recommendations are not fully developed or supported by organizational analysis; and/or failure to clearly or accurately apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

☐ Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Does not provide structure and design recommendations; or not based on the prior organizational analysis; or does not apply the course readings, materials

and/or lectures

### **Presentation Content: People Strategy Recommendations--**

Levels of Achievement:

- ☐ Exceptional 3 (10%) points

Provided people strategy recommendations based on the prior organizational analysis; and clearly and accurately applied the course readings, materials and/or lectures

- ☐ Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

People strategy recommendations are not fully developed or supported by organizational analysis; and/or failure to clearly or accurately apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

- ☐ Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Does not provide people strategy recommendations; or not based on the prior organizational analysis; or does not apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

### **Presentation Content: Culture/ethics/values Recommendations--**

Levels of Achievement:

- ☐ Exceptional 3 (10%) points

Provided culture/ethics/values recommendations based on the prior organizational analysis; and clearly and accurately applied the course readings, materials and/or lectures

- ☐ Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Culture/ethics/values recommendations are not fully developed or supported by organizational analysis; and/or failure to clearly or accurately apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

- ☐ Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Does not provide culture/ethics/values recommendations; or not based on the prior organizational analysis; or does not apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

### **Presentation Quality--**

Levels of Achievement:

- ☐ Exceptional 4 (13.33%) points

Presentation recording was good quality in a format easy to use by the viewer; presentation was well-rehearsed and flows well; the pace and tone of the presenter were appropriate; length of presentation was 6-8 minutes

- ☐ Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Presentation recording was poor quality; and/or format was not easy to use by the viewer; and/or presentation was not well-rehearsed and did not flow well;

and/or the pace and tone of the presenter were not appropriate; and/or length of presentation was not within 6-8 minutes

☐ Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Presentation recording was poor quality; and/or format was not easy to use by the viewer; and presentation was not well-rehearsed and did not flow well; and the pace and tone of the presenter were not appropriate; and/or length of presentation was not within 6-8 minutes

### **Slide Quality--**

Levels of Achievement:

☐ Exceptional 3 (10%) points

Presentation slides were visually attractive, creative and interesting; slides contained the appropriate amount of text using a readable font size; tables and figures were clearly visible

☐ Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Presentation slides were not visually attractive, creative and/or interesting; and/or slides did not contain the appropriate amount of text or font size; and/or tables and figures were blurry

☐ Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Presentation slides were not visually attractive, creative and/or interesting; and slides did not contain the appropriate amount of text or font size; and tables and figures were blurry

### **Organization and Readability--**

Levels of Achievement:

☐ Exceptional 4 (13.33%) points

Presentation slides were well-organized and free of formatting, typographical, grammatical errors; and included title slide, objectives, and a reference slide

☐ Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Presentation slides were not well-organized and/or had some formatting, typographical, grammatical errors; and/or one of the following was missing: title, objective or reference slide

☐ Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Presentation slides were not well-organized and/or had numerous formatting, typographical, grammatical errors; and/or two of the following were missing: title, objective or reference slide

### **Support, Analysis, & Critical Thinking--**

Levels of Achievement:

☐ Exceptional 4 (13.33%) points

Critically analyzed and applied the course readings, lectures and interview with at least 5 direct/indirect citations



☐ Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Failed to critically analyze and/or apply the course readings; and/or relied heavily on personal examples or poorly supported evidence; and/or made 3-4 direct/indirect citations

☐ Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Failed to critically analyze and/or apply the course readings; and relied heavily on personal examples or poorly supported evidence; and made 0-2 direct/indirect citations

### **APA Style and Citations--**

Levels of Achievement:

☐ Exceptional 3 (10%) points

Presentation slides were free of APA errors; accurately used citations (direct and indirect quotes)

☐ Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Presentation slides had some APA errors; and/or did not accurately use citations (direct and indirect quotes)

☐ Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Presentation slides had numerous APA errors; and did not accurately use citations (direct and indirect quotes)

**Saint Louis University School for Professional Studies**  
**Program Assessment Model**

---

The School for Professional Studies has adopted the model described in this document for programmatic assessment. Starting with new programs, the model will be phased in for all SPS programs.

The model is designed to illustrate alignment among School, program and course student learning outcomes as well as an ongoing, cyclical assessment process.

