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# Learning Goal Assessment Guide

This guide documents the assessment process for one of the four learning goals in the Master of Science in Enterprise Project Management (EPM) program. The assessment process is done in accordance of the Assurance of Learning (AoL) plan for the EPM program.

# Learning Goals

The Learning Goals for the EPM program are listed below. The first two learning goals cover general skills and are common across the following programs within the Howe School: MS in Management, MS in Information Systems, MS in Telecommunications Management, MS in Technology Management and the MBA. The last two goals are program-specific and cover topics related to project management.

1. Our students can communicate effectively in writing and oral presentations.
2. Our students will interact effectively in teams.
3. Student understands and is able to develop a plan that shows how an enterprise project creates value for its stakeholders.
4. Student understands how to influence and lead enterprise projects.

An ethics lecture is included as part of MGT 609 *Project Management Fundamentals*. The lecture covers both general business ethics issues as well as issues specifically faced by project managers.

# Learning Goal Introduction

This guide covers Learning Goal #3 for the MGT610 course: Student understands and is able to develop a plan that shows how an enterprise project creates value for its stakeholders.

**This goal is assessed in MGT 610, Strategic Perspectives on Project Management**. This goal requires students to thoroughly understand the basic concepts of project and value management, how these concepts are used to develop a strategic project plan with the clear focus on value creation for a project’s stakeholders.

**There is one primary method of assessment:** Eachstudent has to develop a document called project value statement. The components of the statement are defined.The assessment reviews the submitted documents.

**To complete this exercise successfully, students need to** have mastered project management terminology and methodology and they need to fully understand the business assumptions a project is implemented upon. In addition, they need to bring much of their learning in the entire project management curriculum to bear on developing a comprehensive project value statement as it combines a business perspective with a methodological perspective.

# Learning Objectives and Traits

The following table shows the objectives and traits to assess goal 3 of the EPM program.

**Learning Goal #3: Student understands and is able to develop a plan that shows how an enterprise project creates value for its stakeholders**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Objective 1:** *Student is able to apply project management methodology.* | |
| **Traits** |  |
| Trait 1: | Ability to appropriately formulate a project mission statement. |
| Trait 2: | Ability to analyze and recognize the basic constraints of a project. |
| Trait 3: | Ability to analyze and recognize the basic assumptions of a project. |
|  |  |
| **Objective 2:** *Student is able to integrate a business perspective into a project plan.* | |
| **Traits** |  |
| Trait 1: | Ability to formulate an appropriate project vision statement. |
| Trait 2: | Ability to formulate specific project objectives and metrics reflecting the value focus. |

# Rubrics

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective 1** | *Student is able to apply project management methodology.* | | | | |
|  | **Trait** | **Poor** | **Good** | **Excellent** | **Score** |
|  | **Value** | **0** | **5** | **10** |  |
| Trait 1: | Ability to appropriately formulate a project mission statement. | Project Mission is poorly defined: It has omissions or does not address business needs. | Project mission is formulated but is too lengthy or does not clearly address the business needs of the stakeholders and includes mainly technical requirements. | Project mission is well defined and reflects the business needs of the project and is clearly communicated to its stakeholders. |  |
| Trait 2: | Ability to analyze and recognize the basic constraints of a project. | Misunderstanding of project constraints | Major constraints are identified | Constraints are defined and linked to value strategy |  |
| Trait 3: | Ability to analyze and recognize the basic assumptions of a project. | Misunderstanding of project assumptions | Major project assumptions are identified | Assumptions are defined and linked to value strategy |  |
| **Criterion:** | **Does not meet expectations: 0 – 10; Meets: 10 - 20 ; Exceeds: 20 - 30** |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective 2** | *Student is able to integrate a business perspective into a project plan.* | | | | |
|  | **Trait** | **Poor** | **Good** | **Excellent** | **Score** |
|  | **Value** | **0** | **5** | **10** |  |
| Trait 1: | Ability to formulate an appropriate project vision statement. | No value perspective focus | Value proposition identified but lacks a business perspective | Value proposition identified and is integrated into the business |  |
| Trait 2: | Ability to formulate specific project objectives and metrics reflecting the value focus. | Missing value perspectives or unclear objectives and mixed targets and measures | All perspectives defined some minor issues with objectives (specification) and some ill-defined initiatives | No major issues with value perspectives |  |
| **Criterion:** | **Does not meet expectations: 0 – 5; Meets: 5 - 15 ; Exceeds: 15 - 20** |  |  |  |  |

# Assessment Process

A representative sample of EPM students will be assessed in MGT 610 *Strategic Perspectives in Project Management*.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Where & When Measured?** | **How Measured?** |
| Embedded in final assignment required in course **MGT 610: Strategic Perspectives on Project Management** | Sampling: Students enrolled in EPM program.  Description: Scoring submitted final assignments in MGT 610 course. |

Course assignment: Final Project: Case

The final case report should use the concepts discussed within this course to develop a realistic project value statement for a finished or ongoing project. Please discuss the following questions:

1. Start with a brief description of the project. Use a table to summarize the major facts about the project. (max. 2 pages)

2. Develop a practicable project value statement following the outline presented in the class. (max. 4 pages)

3. What are the major strategic differences to the original project plan? (max. 1 page)

Answer each question in detail. Apply the appropriate concepts from this class to develop a practical and realistic project value statement. Answers to each question will be evaluated using the following criteria:

* Logic of the answer,
* Appropriate references to literature,
* Uniqueness of own ideas and own point of views
* Responsiveness in addressing the assigned questions.

# Results of Learning Goal Assessment - Introduction

The results of the learning goal assessments carried out to date are included below.

**Explanation**

The learning goal #3 has two learning objectives and performance on each objective is measured using a rubric that in turn contains a number of desired “traits”. Students are scored individually on each trait.

The assessments of each individual final assignment for each student are used to develop a Summary Results Sheet for each learning goal objective. A selection of these Summaries is included below.

The first table in the Summary Results Sheet for a learning objective and trait gives the counts of students falling in each of the three categories:

- Does not meet expectations  
- Meets expectations  
- Exceeds expectations

The right-hand column in the table is used to record the average score of the students on each trait. This table provides an indication of the relative performance of students on each trait.

The second table on each sheet provides the numbers of students who fall into each of the above three categories for the overall learning objective.

The person conducting the assessment provides explanatory comments and recommendations on the bottom of the Results Summary Sheet. The recommendations improve content or pedagogy changes for the next time the course is given.

# Results of Assessment: Spring 2013

**PROGRAM: EPM**

**LEARNING GOAL #3: Student understands and is able to develop a plan that shows how an enterprise project creates value for its stakeholders.**

**Overall Evaluation**

In the Spring of 2013, two sections of MGT610 were offered and all sections participated in the assessment process. The results of both sections were aggregated.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE # 1:** *Student is able to apply project management methodology***.**

**ASSESSMENT DATE: Spring 2013 ASSESSOR: Thomas Lechler**

**NO. OF STUDENTS ASSESSED: 32**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meet Expectations** | **Exceed Expectations** | **Avg. Grade** |
| **1. Ability to appropriately formulate a project mission statement.** | **2** | **6** | **24** | **8.48** |
| **2. Ability to analyze and recognize the basic constraints of a project.** | **3** | **5** | **24** | **8.33** |
| **3. Ability to analyze and recognize the basic assumptions of a project.** | **1** | **9** | **24** | **8.33** |
| **TOTAL GRADE** | | | | **25.14** |

**Criterion: Does not meet expectations: 0 – 12; Meets: 12-21; Exceeds: 21-30**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Students by Category**  (Based on Average score across all traits) | **Not meet expectations** | **Meet Expectations** | **Exceed Expectations** |
|  | **3** | **5** | **24** |

**COMMENTS:**

Exceeds expectations near upper end of range.

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

None at the moment, the program is still in startup phase.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE # 2:** *Student is able to integrate a business perspective into a project plan.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE: Spring 2013 ASSESSOR: Thomas Lechler**

**NO. OF STUDENTS TESTED: 32**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expecta-tions** | **Meet Expecta-tions** | **Exceed Expecta-tions** | **Aver. Grade** |
| 1. Ability to formulate an appropriate project vision statement. | **1** | **10** | **21** | **8.18** |
| 2. Ability to formulate specific project objectives and metrics reflecting the value focus. | **3** | **9** | **21** | **7.73** |
| **TOTAL GRADE** | | | | **15.91** |

**Criterion: Does not meet expectations: 0 – 7; Meets: 8-12; Exceeds: 13-20**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Students by Category**  (Based on Average score across all traits) | **Not meet expectations** | **Meet Expectations** | **Exceed Expectations** |
|  | **0** | **2** | **4** |

**COMMENTS:**

Exceeds expectations of achieving learning objectives.

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

No action is suggested at this point. More data is necessary to better understand underlying issues that are not yet visible.

# Results of Assessment: Fall 2013

**PROGRAM: EPM**

**LEARNING GOAL #3: Student understands and is able to develop a plan that shows how an enterprise project creates value for its stakeholders.**

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE # 1:** *Student is able to apply project management methodology***.**

**ASSESSMENT DATE: Fall 2013 ASSESSOR: Thomas Lechler**

**NO. OF STUDENTS ASSESSED: 29**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expectations** | **Meet Expectations** | **Exceed Expectations** | **Avg. Grade** |
| **1. Ability to appropriately formulate a project mission statement.** | **0** | **6** | **23** | **8.97** |
| **2. Ability to analyze and recognize the basic constraints of a project.** | **4** | **6** | **19** | **7.59** |
| **3. Ability to analyze and recognize the basic assumptions of a project.** | **1** | **5** | **23** | **8.79** |
| **TOTAL GRADE** | | | | **25.35** |

**Criterion: Does not meet expectations: 0 – 9; Meets: 10-24; Exceeds: 25-30**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Students by Category**  (Based on Average score across all traits) | **Not meet expectations** | **Meet Expectations** | **Exceed Expectations** |
|  | **1** | **9** | **19** |

**COMMENTS:**

Exceeds expectations of achieving learning objectives.

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

None at the moment, the program is still in startup phase and the results are satisfying. More data is necessary to better understand underlying issues that are not yet visible.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE # 2:** *Student is able to integrate a business perspective into a project plan.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE: Fall 2013 ASSESSOR: Thomas Lechler**

**NO. OF STUDENTS TESTED: 29**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expecta-tions** | **Meet Expecta-tions** | **Exceed Expecta-tions** | **Aver. Grade** |
| 1. Ability to formulate an appropriate project vision statement. | **0** | **8** | **21** | **8.62** |
| 2. Ability to formulate specific project objectives and metrics reflecting the value focus. | **0** | **12** | **17** | **7.73** |
| **TOTAL GRADE** | | | | **16.35** |

**Criterion: Does not meet expectations: 0 – 5; Meets: 6-14; Exceeds: 15-20**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Students by Category**  (Based on Average score across all traits) | **Not meet expectations** | **Meet Expectations** | **Exceed Expectations** |
|  | **0** | **4** | **25** |

**COMMENTS:**

Exceeds expectations of achieving learning objectives.

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

None at the moment, the program is still in startup phase and the results are satisfying. More data is necessary to better understand underlying issues that are not yet visible.

Overall the 29 students did considerably well in both learning objectives (see raw data in Appendix).

**Specific Steps Taken in Fall 2013**

N.A. (Program was offered first time)

# Results of Assessment: SPRING 2014

**PROGRAM: EPM**

**LEARNING GOAL #3: Student understands and is able to develop a plan that shows how an enterprise project creates value for its stakeholders.**

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE # 1:** *Student is able to apply project management methodology***.**

**ASSESSMENT DATE: Spring 2014 ASSESSOR: Thomas Lechler**

**NO. OF STUDENTS ASSESSED: 34**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expecta-tions** | **Meet Expecta-tions** | **Exceed Expecta-tions** | **Aver. Grade** |
| **1. Ability to appropriately formulate a project mission statement.** | **0** | **11** | **23** | **8.38** |
| **2. Ability to analyze and recognize the basic constraints of a project.** | **9** | **8** | **17** | **6.18** |
| **3. Ability to analyze and recognize the basic assumptions of a project.** | **9** | **4** | **21** | **6.76** |
| **TOTAL GRADE** | | | | **21.32** |

**Criterion: Does not meet expectations: 0 – 9; Meets: 10-24; Exceeds: 25-30**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Students by Category**  (Based on Average score across all traits) | **Not meet expectations** | **Meet Expectations** | **Exceed Expectations** |
|  | **3** | **10** | **21** |

**COMMENTS:**

Exceeds expectations of achieving learning objectives.

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

None at the moment, the program is still in startup phase and the results are satisfying. More data is necessary to better understand underlying issues that are not yet visible.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE # 2:** *Student is able to integrate a business perspective into a project plan.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE: Spring 2014 ASSESSOR: Thomas Lechler**

**NO. OF STUDENTS TESTED: 34**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expecta-tions** | **Meet Expecta-tions** | **Exceed Expecta-tions** | **Aver. Grade** |
| 1. Ability to formulate an appropriate project vision statement. | **0** | **7** | **27** | **8.97** |
| 2. Ability to formulate specific project objectives and metrics reflecting the value focus. | **0** | **0** | **34** | **10.00** |
| **TOTAL GRADE** | | | | **18.97** |

**Criterion: Does not meet expectations: 0 – 5; Meets: 6-14; Exceeds: 15-20**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Students by Category**  (Based on Average score across all traits) | **Not meet expectations** | **Meet Expectations** | **Exceed Expectations** |
|  | **0** | **0** | **34** |

**COMMENTS:**

Exceeds expectations of achieving learning objectives.

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

None at the moment, the results are satisfying. More data is necessary to better understand underlying issues that are not yet visible.

Overall the 21 students did exceptionally well in both learning objectives (see raw data in Appendix).

**Specific Steps Taken in SPRING 2014**

None. The learning results are satisfying and the lack of data does not allow to identify specific weaknesses in the learning outcomes.

# Results of Assessment: SUMMER 2014 - CUFE

**PROGRAM: EPM at CUFE (CENTRAL UNIVERSITY OF FINANCE AND ECONOMICS CHINA)**

**LEARNING GOAL #3: Student understands and is able to develop a plan that shows how an enterprise project creates value for its stakeholders.**

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE # 1:** *Student is able to apply project management methodology***.**

**ASSESSMENT DATE: SUMMER 2014 ASSESSOR: Thomas Lechler**

**NO. OF STUDENTS ASSESSED: 19**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expecta-tions** | **Meet Expecta-tions** | **Exceed Expecta-tions** | **Aver. Grade** |
| **1. Ability to appropriately formulate a project mission statement.** | **2** | **7** | **10** | **6.92** |
| **2. Ability to analyze and recognize the basic constraints of a project.** | **8** | **5** | **6** | **5.00** |
| **3. Ability to analyze and recognize the basic assumptions of a project.** | **8** | **8** | **3** | **4.23** |
| **TOTAL GRADE** | | | | **16.15** |

**Criterion: Does not meet expectations: 0 – 9; Meets: 10-24; Exceeds: 25-30**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Students by Category**  (Based on Average score across all traits) | **Not meet expectations** | **Meet Expectations** | **Exceed Expectations** |
|  | **1** | **11** | **7** |

**COMMENTS:**

Meets expectations of achieving learning objective.

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

None at the moment, the program is still in startup phase and the results are satisfying. More data is necessary to better understand underlying issues that are not yet visible. This is the first data set collected in China at CUFE.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE # 2:** *Student is able to integrate a business perspective into a project plan.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE: Fall 2014 ASSESSOR: Thomas Lechler**

**NO. OF STUDENTS TESTED: 19**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expecta-tions** | **Meet Expecta-tions** | **Exceed Expecta-tions** | **Aver. Grade** |
| 1. Ability to formulate an appropriate project vision statement. | **2** | **5** | **12** | **8.07** |
| 2. Ability to formulate specific project objectives and metrics reflecting the value focus. | **0** | **4** | **15** | **8.84** |
| **TOTAL GRADE** | | | | **16.92** |

**Criterion: Does not meet expectations: 0 – 5; Meets: 6-14; Exceeds: 15-20**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Students by Category**  (Based on Average score across all traits) | **Not meet expectations** | **Meet Expectations** | **Exceed Expectations** |
|  | **0** | **9** | **10** |

**COMMENTS:**

Meets expectations of achieving learning objective.

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

None at the moment, the results are satisfying. More data is necessary to better understand underlying issues for the China program.

Overall 7 students did exceptionally well in both learning objectives (see raw data in Appendix).

# RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: FALL 2014

**PROGRAM: EPM at CUFE (CENTRAL UNIVERSITY OF FINANCE AND ECONOMICS CHINA)**

**LEARNING GOAL #3: Student understands and is able to develop a plan that shows how an enterprise project creates value for its stakeholders.**

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE # 1:** *Student is able to apply project management methodology***.**

**ASSESSMENT DATE: Fall 2014 ASSESSOR: Thomas Lechler**

**NO. OF STUDENTS ASSESSED: 13**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expecta-tions** | **Meet Expecta-tions** | **Exceed Expecta-tions** | **Aver. Grade** |
| **1. Ability to appropriately formulate a project mission statement.** | **1** | **4** | **8** | **7.7** |
| **2. Ability to analyze and recognize the basic constraints of a project.** | **1** | **1** | **11** | **8.8** |
| **3. Ability to analyze and recognize the basic assumptions of a project.** | **0** | **2** | **11** | **9.2** |
| **TOTAL GRADE** | | | | **25.7** |

**Criterion: Does not meet expectations: 0 – 9; Meets: 10-24; Exceeds: 25-30**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Students by Category**  (Based on Average score across all traits) | **Not meet expectations** | **Meet Expectations** | **Exceed Expectations** |
|  | **0** | **2** | **11** |

**COMMENTS:**

Exceeds expectation. All students meet or exceed expectations of understanding the project methodology.

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

None, the results are satisfying.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE # 2:** *Student is able to integrate a business perspective into a project plan.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE: Fall 2014 ASSESSOR: Thomas Lechler**

**NO. OF STUDENTS TESTED: 13**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expecta-tions** | **Meet Expecta-tions** | **Exceed Expecta-tions** | **Aver. Grade** |
| 1. Ability to formulate an appropriate project vision statement. | **1** | **0** | **12** | **9.2** |
| 2. Ability to formulate specific project objectives and metrics reflecting the value focus. | **0** | **2** | **11** | **9.6** |
| **TOTAL GRADE** | | | | **18.8** |

**Criterion: Does not meet expectations: 0 – 5; Meets: 6-14; Exceeds: 15-20**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Students by Category**  (Based on Average score across all traits) | **Not meet expectations** | **Meet Expectations** | **Exceed Expectations** |
|  | **0** | **0** | **13** |

**COMMENTS:**

All students exceeded expectations of achieving learning objective.

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

None, the results are satisfying.

# RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: FALL 2016

**PROGRAM: EPM**

**LEARNING GOAL #3: Student understands and is able to develop a plan that shows how an enterprise project creates value for its stakeholders.**

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE # 1:** *Student is able to apply project management methodology***.**

**ASSESSMENT DATE: Fall 2016 ASSESSOR: Thomas Lechler**

**NO. OF STUDENTS ASSESSED: 34**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expecta-tions** | **Meet Expecta-tions** | **Exceed Expecta-tions** | **Aver. Grade** |
| **1. Ability to appropriately formulate a project mission statement.** | **1** | **11** | **23** | **8.5** |
| **2. Ability to analyze and recognize the basic constraints of a project.** | **1** | **11** | **23** | **7.5** |
| **3. Ability to analyze and recognize the basic assumptions of a project.** | **2** | **12** | **20** | **8.1** |
| **TOTAL GRADE** | | | | **24.12** |

**Criterion: Does not meet expectations: 0 – 9; Meets: 10-24; Exceeds: 25-30**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Students by Category**  (Based on Average score across all traits) | **Not meet expectations** | **Meet Expectations** | **Exceed Expectations** |
|  | **1** | **9** | **24** |

**COMMENTS:**

Exceeds expectation. All students meet or exceed expectations of understanding the project methodology.

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

None, the results are satisfying.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE # 2:** *Student is able to integrate a business perspective into a project plan.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE: Fall 2016 ASSESSOR: Thomas Lechler**

**NO. OF STUDENTS TESTED: 34**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expecta-tions** | **Meet Expecta-tions** | **Exceed Expecta-tions** | **Aver. Grade** |
| 1. Ability to formulate an appropriate project vision statement. | **4** | **18** | **12** | **8.7** |
| 2. Ability to formulate specific project objectives and metrics reflecting the value focus. | **0** | **20** | **14** | **8.8** |
| **TOTAL GRADE** | | | | **15.66** |

**Criterion: Does not meet expectations: 0 – 5; Meets: 6-14; Exceeds: 15-20**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Students by Category**  (Based on Average score across all traits) | **Not meet expectations** | **Meet Expectations** | **Exceed Expectations** |
|  | **0** | **13** | **21** |

**COMMENTS:**

All students exceeded expectations of achieving learning objective.

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

None, the results are satisfying.

# RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: Fall 2017

**PROGRAM: EPM**

**LEARNING GOAL #3: Student understands and is able to develop a plan that shows how an enterprise project creates value for its stakeholders.**

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE # 1:** *Student is able to apply project management methodology***.**

**ASSESSMENT DATE: Fall 2017 ASSESSOR: Thomas Lechler**

**NO. OF STUDENTS ASSESSED: 28**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expecta-tions** | **Meet Expecta-tions** | **Exceed Expecta-tions** | **Aver. Grade** |
| **1. Ability to appropriately formulate a project mission statement.** | **2** | **5** | **21** | **9.32** |
| **2. Ability to analyze and recognize the basic constraints of a project.** | **24** | **0** | **4** | **5.71** |
| **3. Ability to analyze and recognize the basic assumptions of a project.** | **24** | **0** | **4** | **5.71** |
| **TOTAL GRADE** | | | | **20.74** |

**Criterion: Does not meet expectations: 0 – 9; Meets: 10-24; Exceeds: 25-30**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Students by Category**  (Based on Average score across all traits) | **Not meet expectations** | **Meet Expectations** | **Exceed Expectations** |
|  | **0** | **0** | **28** |

**COMMENTS:**

Exceeds expectations near upper end of range.

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

No remedial actions are necessary the results are satisfying.

**PROGRAM: EPM**

**LEARNING GOAL #3: Student understands and is able to develop a plan that shows how an enterprise project creates value for its stakeholders.**

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE # 2:** *Student is able to integrate a business perspective into a project plan.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE: Fall 2017 ASSESSOR: Thomas Lechler**

**NO. OF STUDENTS TESTED: 28**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expecta-tions** | **Meet Expecta-tions** | **Exceed Expecta-tions** | **Aver. Grade** |
| 1. Ability to formulate an appropriate project vision statement. | **1** | **9** | **18** | **9.14** |
| 2. Ability to formulate specific project objectives and metrics reflecting the value focus. | **1** | **6** | **21** | **9.5** |
| **TOTAL GRADE** | | | | **18.64** |

**Criterion: Does not meet expectations: 0 – 5; Meets: 6-14; Exceeds: 15-20**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Students by Category**  (Based on Average score across all traits) | **Not meet expectations** | **Meet Expectations** | **Exceed Expectations** |
|  | **0** | **20** | **8** |

**COMMENTS:**

Meets expectations of achieving learning objectives.

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

No action is suggested at this point.

# SPECIFIC STEPS TAKEN IN SPRING 2018

None

# RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: Fall 2018

**PROGRAM: EPM**

**LEARNING GOAL #3: Student understands and is able to develop a plan that shows how an enterprise project creates value for its stakeholders.**

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE # 1:** *Student is able to apply project management methodology***.**

**ASSESSMENT DATE: Fall 2018 ASSESSOR: Thomas Lechler**

**NO. OF STUDENTS ASSESSED: 35**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expecta-tions** | **Meet Expecta-tions** | **Exceed Expecta-tions** | **Aver. Grade** |
| **1. Ability to appropriately formulate a project mission statement.** | **0** | **10** | **25** | **9.3** |
| **2. Ability to analyze and recognize the basic constraints of a project.** | **2** | **22** | **11** | **7.8** |
| **3. Ability to analyze and recognize the basic assumptions of a project.** | **2** | **25** | **8** | **7.7** |
| **TOTAL GRADE** | | | | **24.8** |

**Criterion: Does not meet expectations: 0 – 3; Meets: 4-7; Exceeds: 7-10**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Students by Category**  (Based on Average score across all traits) | **Not meet expectations** | **Meet Expectations** | **Exceed Expectations** |
|  | **0** | **13** | **22** |

**Criterion: Does not meet expectations: 0 – 9; Meets: 10-24; Exceeds: 25-30**

**COMMENTS:**

Exceeds expectations for two thirds of class population.

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

No remedial actions are necessary the results are satisfying.

**PROGRAM: EPM**

**LEARNING GOAL #3: Student understands and is able to develop a plan that shows how an enterprise project creates value for its stakeholders.**

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE # 2:** *Student is able to integrate a business perspective into a project plan.*

**ASSESSMENT DATE: Fall 2018 ASSESSOR: Thomas Lechler**

**NO. OF STUDENTS TESTED: 35**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Students** | | |  |
| **Learning Goal Traits** | **Not Meet Expecta-tions** | **Meet Expecta-tions** | **Exceed Expecta-tions** | **Aver. Grade** |
| 1. Ability to formulate an appropriate project vision statement. | **0** | **13** | **22** | **8.4** |
| 2. Ability to formulate specific project objectives and metrics reflecting the value focus. | **0** | **2** | **33** | **8.8** |
| **TOTAL GRADE** | | | | **17.28** |

**Criterion: Does not meet expectations: 0 – 3; Meets: 4-7; Exceeds: 8-10**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Students by Category**  (Based on Average score across all traits) | **Not meet expectations** | **Meet Expectations** | **Exceed Expectations** |
|  | **0** | **2** | **33** |

**Criterion: Does not meet expectations: 0 – 5; Meets: 6-14; Exceeds: 15-20**

**COMMENTS:**

Exceeds expectations for two thirds of class population.

**REMEDIAL ACTIONS:**

No action is suggested at this point.

# OUTCOMES: EPM Learning Goal #3 after Seven Rounds of Assessments

The following table shows the average scores on each learning objective for learning goal #3 over four semesters.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Objective 1  Understand project methodology | Objective 2  Integrate a business perspective into a plan |
| SPRING 2013 | 25.15 | 15.91 |
| FALL 2013 | 25.52 | 16.35 |
| SPRING 2014 | 21.32 | 18.97 |
| SUMMER 2014 | 16.15 | 16.92 |
| FALL 2014 | 25.76 | 18.84 |
| FALL 2016 | 24.12 | 15.66 |
| FALL 2017 | 20.74 | 18.64 |
| FALL 2018 | 24.80 | 17.28 |

The data show no significant changes in the comparison across eight semesters taught at Stevens but the China students perform significant lower. The deviation of the China program needs to be further explored in the coming semesters.

# OVERVIEW: EPM LEARNING GOAL # 3

**After Seventh Assessment Fall 2018**

Though the sample does not only consist of students who are enrolled in the EPM program it is evident from the results and the student comments that the students learned from integrating business knowledge with project management methodological knowledge.

The 35 students did considerably well in both learning objectives (see Table in Appendix.)

# Close the Loop PROCESS – Continuous Improvement Record

**Assurance of Learning**

**Assessment/Outcome Analysis**

**Close Loop Process - Continuous Improvement Record Goal 3**

**Program:** Master of Science in Enterprise Project Management

**Goal 3:** Student understands and is able to develop a plan that shows how an enterprise project creates value for its stakeholders.

**Goal Owner:** Thomas Lechler

**Where Measured:** Embedded in final assignment required in course **MGT 610: Strategic Perspectives on Project Management**

**How Measured:** **Sampling:** Students enrolled in EPM program.

**Description:** Scoring submitted final assignments in MGT 610 course.

**Closing the Loop: Actions taken on specific objectives**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Objective 1** | *Student is able to apply project management methodology***.** |
| **When**  **Assessed** | *Fall 2018* |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | None the results are satisfying. |
| **Outcome from Previous assessment:** | Meets expectations of achieving learning objective. |
| **When**  **Assessed** | *Fall 2017* |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | None the results are satisfying. |
| **Outcome from Previous assessment:** | Meets expectations of achieving learning objective. |
| **When**  **Assessed** | *Fall 2016* |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | None the results are satisfying. |
| **Outcome from Previous assessment:** | Meets expectations of achieving learning objective. |
| **When**  **Assessed** | *Fall 2014* |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | None the results are satisfying. |
| **Outcome from Previous assessment:** | Exceeds expectations of achieving learning objective. |
| **When**  **Assessed** | *Summer 2014 (CUFE)* |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | None at the moment, the program is still in startup phase and the results are satisfying. More data is necessary to better understand underlying issues that are not yet visible. This is the first data set collected in China at CUFE. |
| **Outcome from Previous assessment:** | *This is the first time this course has been taught in this joint school curriculum. Remedial actions from other sections were applied but we will need to assess what is needed with this unique group.* |
| **When Assessed:** | *Spring 2014* |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | None at the moment, the program is still in startup phase and the results are satisfying. More data is necessary to better understand underlying issues that are not yet visible. |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | Exceeds expectations of achieving learning objectives. |
| **When Assessed:** | *Fall 2013* |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | None at the moment, the program is still in startup phase.  *Though the sample does not only consist of students who are enrolled in the EPM program it is evident from the results and the student comments that the students had sufficient knowledge of the project management methodology.*  *The 29students did considerably well and exceeded the expectations.* |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | *The assessment in the spring semester 2013 did not indicate any necessity for program changes to achieve objective 1.* |
| **When Assessed:** | *Spring 2013* |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | *None at the moment, the program is still in startup phase.* |
|  |  |
| **Objective 2** | *Student is able to integrate a business perspective into a project plan.* |
| **When**  **Assessed** | *Fall 2018* |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | None at the moment, the results are satisfying. |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | Meets expectations of achieving learning objective. |
| **When**  **Assessed** | *Fall 2017* |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | None at the moment, the results are satisfying. |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | Meets expectations of achieving learning objective. |
| **When**  **Assessed** | *Fall 2016* |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | None at the moment, the results are satisfying. |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | Meets expectations of achieving learning objective. |
| **When**  **Assessed** | *Fall 2014* |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | None at the moment, the results are satisfying. |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | Exceeds expectations of achieving learning objective. |
| **When**  **Assessed** | *Summer2014 (CUFE)* |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | None at the moment, the results are satisfying. More data is necessary to better understand underlying issues for the China program.  Overall 7 students did exceptionally well in both learning objectives (see raw data in Appendix). |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | *This is the first time this course has been taught in this joint school curriculum. Remedial actions from other sections were applied but we will need to assess what is needed with this unique group.* |
| **When Assessed:** | *Spring 2014* |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | None at the moment, the results are satisfying. More data is necessary to better understand underlying issues that are not yet visible.  Overall the 21 students did exceptionally well in both learning objectives (see raw data in Appendix). |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | Exceeds expectations of achieving learning objective. |
| **When Assessed:** | *Fall 2013* |
| **Remedial**  **Action** | None at the moment, the program is still in startup phase.  *Though the sample does not only consist of students who are enrolled in the EPM program it is evident from the results and the student comments that the students had sufficient knowledge to integrate business knowledge into the project plan.*  *The 29 students did considerably well and exceeded the expectations.* |
| **Outcome from previous assessment:** | *The assessment in the spring semester 2013 did not indicate any necessity for program changes to achieve learning objective 2.* |
| **When Assessed:** | *Spring 2013* |
| **Remedial Action** | *None at the moment, the program is still in startup phase.* |

# 

# APPENDIX A: – Assessment Raw Data Spring 2013

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Last name | **Trait 1** | **Trait 2** | **Trait 3** | **Total 1** | **Trait 4** | **Trait 5** | **Total 2** |
| Abdolrazek | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Adrar | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Baker | 10 | 10 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Binjubeir | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Carrazza | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Deng | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Diaz | 10 | 10 | 5 | 25 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Gao | 5 | 10 | 10 | 25 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| Gonzalez | 5 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| He | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 5 | 15 |
| Holder | 10 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Jie | 10 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Jin | 5 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Li | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Meng | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Nogueira Dorigo | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Pan | 5 | 10 | 10 | 25 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Powell | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rojukhirdu | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Sattiraju | 10 | 10 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Si | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Smith | 5 | 10 | 10 | 25 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Soliman | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| Trinh | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| Wasserman | 10 | 10 | 5 | 25 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Wiest | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Xu | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Zhang | 10 | 10 | 5 | 25 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Zhao | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Zhou | 5 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Zhou | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Zhou | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Zhuang | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| **Average** | **8.48** | **8.33** | **8.33** | **25.15** | **8.18** | **7.73** | **15.91** |

# APPENDIX B: – Assessment Raw Data Fall 2013

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Mission | Vision | Scorecard |  | Constraints | Assumptions | |
| First name | Last name | **Trait 1** | **Trait 2** | **Trait 3** | **Total 1** | **Trait 4** | **Trait 5** | **Total 2** |
| Fwaz | Radwan | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Marissa | Douglas | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Sha | Li | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Yadan | Shi | 10 | 10 | 5 | 25 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| Jing | Wang | 10 | 10 | 5 | 25 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| Mona | Karkadan | 10 | 10 | 5 | 25 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| Jingqing | Zhang | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Xia | Hua | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Anthony | Montufar | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Sara | Budar | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Andrew | Anderson | 5 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Hardick | Shobhawat | 5 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Xingyao | Zhou | 5 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Xin | He | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Wanyin | Liu | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Ashley | Montufar | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| David | Felli | 5 | 5 | 5 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Garrett | Dean | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Ivanova | Desislava | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Eden | Jacob | 5 | 5 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Jaclyn | DeAngelis | 10 | 10 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Joanne | O’Rourke | 10 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Karen | Koch | 5 | 5 | 5 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kevin | Gonzalez | 10 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Margaret | Goldstein | 10 | 10 | 5 | 25 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Michael | Berhang | 10 | 10 | 5 | 25 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Ryan | Nepveux | 10 | 10 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| Tobin | Varghese | 10 | 10 | 5 | 25 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Tracy | Spataro | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
|  | **Average** | **8.97** | **8.62** | **7.93** | **25.52** | **7.59** | **8.79** | 16.38 |

# APPENDIX c: – Assessment Raw Data Spring 2014

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | MISSION | VISION | SCORECARD |  | CONSTRAINTS | ASSUMPTIONS | |
| First Name | Last Name | **Trait 1** | **Trait 2** | **Trait 3** | **Total 1** | **Trait 4** | **Trait 5** | **Total 2** |
| Anaitte | Aguirre | 5 | 10 | 10 | 25 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Kelly | Cardozo | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Yue | Chai | 5 | 10 | 10 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Caitlin | Chamberlain | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Yunhan | Chen | 5 | 10 | 10 | 25 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Tejas | Desai | 5 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| Denise | Drabick | 10 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Ross | Gerlack | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Guannan | Hu | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Ran | Hu | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lauren | Hurley | 5 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Zhiyi | Jiang | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| Kseniya | Kuprienko | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Miaoqi | Li | 5 | 10 | 10 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Yang | Li | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nicole | Lim | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Carol | Long | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| Melissa | Matos | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Eric | Mikos | 10 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Jiajun | Mu | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Elizabeth | Ormaza | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Mamta | Patel | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fuzhen | Qin | 5 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Roberto | Rivera | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Yili | Shen | 5 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Yaning | Sun | 5 | 10 | 10 | 25 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Victoria | Tran | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Michael | Villani | 10 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Shuang | Wang | 5 | 10 | 10 | 25 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Xiaoyi | Wang | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| Xiaodi | Wang | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| Shunzhi | Xu | 5 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Meng | Xu | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Chen | Yang | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | **AVERAGE** | 8.38 | 8.97 | 10 | 27.5 | 6.18 | 6.76 | 12.94 |

# APPENDIX D: – Assessment Raw Data Summer 2014 - CUFE

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | MISSION | VISION | SCORECARD |  | CONSTRAINTS | ASSUMPTIONS | |
| First Name | Last Name | **Trait 1** | **Trait 2** | **Trait 3** | **Total 1** | **Trait 4** | **Trait 5** | **Total 2** |
| Yongxu | Chen | 5 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Yunjie | Gao | 5 | 5 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Han | Jinzuo | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| He | Bin | 5 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Huang | Lili | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ji | Shuye | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 5 | 15 |
| Yining | Li | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Fan | Li | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Yiyang | Liu | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Zhaohe | Liu | 5 | 10 | 5 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lou | Wang | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| Luan | Xingying | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Lin | Shao | 5 | 10 | 5 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Song | Tandi | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Tao | Xiaodan | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 5 | 15 |
| **Lan** | **Wang** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wang | Yi | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Yin | Xu | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 5 | 15 |
| Zeng | Qiang | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 5 | 15 |
| Ruinan | Zhao | 5 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Xinyu** | **Zhao** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lin | Zhou | 5 | 5 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
|  | **AVERAGE** | 6 | 7 | 7.66 | 20.66 | 4.33 | 3.66 | 8 |

# APPENDIX E: – Assessment Raw Data Fall 2014

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Mission | Vision | Scorecard |  | Constraints | Assumptions | |
| **First Name** | **Last Name** | **Trait 1** | **Trait 2** | **Trait 3** | **Total 1** | **Trait 4** | **Trait 5** | **Total 2** |
| **Barcelos** | **Felipe** | 5 | 10 | 10 | 25 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| **DeCirce** | **Mark** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| **Desiraju** | **Swetha Manasa** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| **Felberbaum** | **Avi** | 0 | 10 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| **Kirkland** | **Nicole Alicia** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Lazovski** | **Dmitri** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 5 | 15 |
| **Li** | **Shengnan** | 5 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| **Luo** | **Youyou** | 5 | 10 | 10 | 25 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| **Pandaliano** | **Alice Margaret** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| **Patel** | **Payal** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 5 | 15 |
| **Qian** | **Suxing** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| **Ramirez** | **Orlando** | 5 | 10 | 10 | 25 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| **Wang** | **Lian** | 10 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| **Yang** | **Mohan** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
|  | **Average** | 7.69 | 9.23 | 9.61 | 26.15 | 8.84 | 9.23 | 18.07 |

# APPENDIX F: – Assessment Raw Data Fall 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MGT610 A |  | | | MISSION | VISION | | SCORECARD | |  | | CONSTRAINTS | | ASSUMPTIONS | | | | |  |  |  |
| First Name | Last Name | | | **Trait 1** | **Trait 2** | | **Trait 3** | | **Total 1** | | **Trait 4** | | **Trait 5** | | | **Total 2** | |  | **Objective 1** | **Objective 2** |
| Bai | Kun | | | 5 | 5 | | 5 | | 15 | | 5 | | 5 | | | 10 | |  | 15 | 10 |
| Bangera | Dhiraj | | | 10 | 10 | | 10 | | 30 | | 10 | | 10 | | | 20 | |  | 30 | 20 |
| Chen | Dong | | | 5 | 5 | | 5 | | 15 | | 5 | | 5 | | | 10 | |  | 15 | 10 |
| Dabee | Anurag | | | 10 | 10 | | 5 | | 25 | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | |  | 10 | 15 |
| Deng | Chuxiang | | | 10 | 10 | | 10 | | 30 | | 10 | | 10 | | | 20 | |  | 30 | 20 |
| Gomes | Viviana | | | 10 | 10 | | 10 | | 30 | | 10 | | 10 | | | 20 | |  | 30 | 20 |
| He | Xi | | | 10 | 10 | | 10 | | 30 | | 10 | | 10 | | | 20 | |  | 30 | 20 |
| Kaspar | Michael | | | 10 | 10 | | 10 | | 30 | | 10 | | 10 | | | 20 | |  | 30 | 20 |
| Li | Shenghui | | | 10 | 10 | | 10 | | 30 | | 10 | | 10 | | | 20 | |  | 30 | 20 |
| Li | Silong | | | 5 | 5 | | 5 | | 15 | | 5 | | 5 | | | 10 | |  | 15 | 10 |
| Markwana | Heet | | | 10 | 10 | | 10 | | 30 | | 10 | | 10 | | | 20 | |  | 30 | 20 |
| Niu | Fang | | | 5 | 5 | | 5 | | 15 | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | |  | 5 | 10 |
| Rao | Dan | | | 10 | 10 | | 10 | | 30 | | 10 | | 10 | | | 20 | |  | 30 | 20 |
| Singh | Ravi | | | 10 | 10 | | 10 | | 30 | | 10 | | 10 | | | 20 | |  | 30 | 20 |
| Su | Ang | | | 5 | 5 | | 5 | | 15 | | 10 | | 10 | | | 20 | |  | 25 | 10 |
| Su | Lin | | | 10 | 10 | | 10 | | 30 | | 10 | | 10 | | | 20 | |  | 30 | 20 |
| Wu | Jingru | | | 5 | 5 | | 5 | | 15 | | 10 | | 10 | | | 20 | |  | 25 | 10 |
| Yan | Liyi | | | 5 | 5 | | 5 | | 15 | | 10 | | 10 | | | 20 | |  | 25 | 10 |
| Zhang | Siming | | | 5 | 5 | | 5 | | 15 | | 5 | | 5 | | | 10 | |  | 15 | 10 |
| Zhou | Yanhua | | | 10 | 10 | | 10 | | 30 | | 10 | | 10 | | | 20 | |  | 30 | 20 |
|  | **AVERAGE** | | | 8 | 8 | | 7.75 | | 23.75 | | 8 | | 8 | | | 16 | |  | 24 | 15.75 |
|  | |  | MISSION | | | VISION | | SCORECARD | | | | CONSTRAINTS | | ASSUMPTIONS | | |
| First Name | | Last Name | **Trait 1** | | | **Trait 2** | | **Trait 3** | | **Total 1** | | **Trait 4** | | **Trait 5** | **Total 2** | |
| Alic | | Damir | 10 | | | 10 | | 10 | | 30 | | 10 | | 10 | 20 | |
| Altongy | | Joseph | 10 | | | 5 | | 5 | | 20 | | 10 | | 10 | 20 | |
| Charleston | | Pamela | 10 | | | 5 | | 10 | | 25 | | 10 | | 10 | 20 | |
| Grunther | | Kevin | 5 | | | 5 | | 10 | | 20 | | 10 | | 10 | 20 | |
| Jimenez | | Julian | 10 | | | 5 | | 8 | | 23 | | 10 | | 10 | 20 | |
| Johnson | | Georgia | 10 | | | 10 | | 10 | | 30 | | 7 | | 8 | 15 | |
| Lazarus | | Jaclyn | 10 | | | 8 | | 9 | | 27 | | 8 | | 10 | 18 | |
| Lombardi | | Donata | 10 | | | 10 | | 10 | | 30 | | 10 | | 10 | 20 | |
| Nawrot | | Thomas | 5 | | | 5 | | 7 | | 17 | | 7 | | 7 | 14 | |
| Nechamkin | | William | 10 | | | 8 | | 8 | | 26 | | 10 | | 10 | 20 | |
| Patty | | Michael | 10 | | | 8 | | 9 | | 27 | | 10 | | 10 | 20 | |
| Quintos | | Donabel | 10 | | | 7 | | 9 | | 26 | | 10 | | 10 | 20 | |
| Rahey | | Evan | 5 | | | 5 | | 8 | | 18 | | 10 | | 10 | 20 | |
| Wright | | Robert | 10 | | | 7 | | 7 | | 24 | | 10 | | 10 | 20 | |
|  | | **AVERAGE** | 8.928571 | | | 7 | | 8.571429 | | 24.5 | | 9.428571 | | 9.642857 | 19.07143 | |

# APPENDIX G – Assessment Raw Data Fall 2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Mission | Vision | Scorecard |  | Constraints | Assumptions | |
| Last name | First name | **Trait 1** | **Trait 2** | **Trait 3** | **Total 1** | **Trait 4** | **Trait 5** | **Total 2** |
| **Chang** | **Xiandong** | 10 | 8 | 5 | 23 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| **Coley** | **Laura** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| **Colgan** | **Justin** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| **Daley** | **Dierdre** | 8 | 5 | 8 | 21 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| **Doshi** | **Megha** | 10 | 8 | 10 | 28 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| **Eifler** | **Kyle** | 10 | 8 | 10 | 28 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| **Flores** | **Ashley** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 5 | 15 |
| **Frontera** | **Janice** | 10 | 10 | 9 | 29 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| **Jin** | **Tianye** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 5 | 15 |
| **Kang** | **Neixin** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| **Klein** | **Ian** | 10 | 8 | 10 | 28 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| **Krantz** | **Jake** | 8 | 8 | 10 | 26 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| **Liao** | **Huang-Jyun** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| **Martinez** | **Valeria** | 9 | 8 | 9 | 26 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| **Nasti** | **Cristina** | 8 | 8 | 9 | 25 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| **Palazzolo** | **Victoria** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| **Pickell** | **Alexis** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| **Qi** | **Lubin** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| **Ramani** | **Vishal** | 10 | 10 | 7 | 27 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| **Smiriglio** | **Dante** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| **Tambra** | **Mohammad** | 8 | 8 | 9 | 25 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| **Wang** | **Min** | 5 | 10 | 10 | 25 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| **Wei** | **Xiao** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 5 | 15 |
| **Wu** | **Hang** | 5 | 10 | 10 | 25 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| **Zhang** | **Zeyu** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 8 | 5 | 13 |
| **Zhao** | **Cheng** | 10 | 7 | 10 | 27 | 10 | 5 | 15 |
| **Zhao** | **Yuhao** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| **Zhao** | **Jiancheng** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 7 | 5 | 12 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# APPENDIX G – Assessment Raw Data Fall 2018

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Mission | Vision | Scorecard | Constraints | Assumptions |  |  |
| Last name | First name | **Trait 1** | **Trait 2** | **Trait 3** | **Trait 4** | **Trait 5** | **Total 1** | **Total 2** |
| **Amari** | **Frank** | 10 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 25 | 18 |
| **Bonelli** | **Joseph** | 10 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 26 | 16 |
| **Brown** | **Lauren** | 10 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 26 | 16 |
| **Chang** | **Shang** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 28 | 20 |
| **Chen** | **Jun** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 20 |
| **Duffus Williams** | **Sheryl** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 26 | 20 |
| **Elbiche** | **Louay** | 10 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 27 | 18 |
| **Fayngersh** | **Toni** | 10 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 27 | 18 |
| **Ge** | **Ge** | 10 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 26 | 17 |
| **Gherardi** | **Donald** | 10 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 18 |
| **Gong** | **Zhihao** | 10 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 24 | 18 |
| **Grassullo** | **Peter** | 10 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 18 |
| **Kumor** | **Kumor** | 10 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 27 | 15 |
| **Li** | **Yichao** | 10 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 24 | 18 |
| **Lu** | **Yali** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 28 | 20 |
| **Mu** | **Lingzhi** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 20 |
| **Patel** | **Rohitbai** | 10 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 24 | 12 |
| **Pellegrino** | **Joseph** | 8 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 24 | 17 |
| **Prajapati** | **Vanditkumar** | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 22 | 15 |
| **Ren** | **Xueqi** | 7 | 8 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 21 | 18 |
| **Rochette** | **Paul** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 20 |
| **Shah** | **Jash** | 10 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 27 | 18 |
| **Sherman** | **Samuel** | 8 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 22 | 10 |
| **Thakur** | **Manisha** | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 22 | 15 |
| **Thomas** | **Petrina** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 24 | 20 |
| **Tirabassi** | **Katherine** | 10 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 18 |
| **Toke** | **Anna** | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 22 | 15 |
| **Tuojian** | **Qingyu** | 7 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 25 | 15 |
| **Wang** | **Xiaoyu** | 7 | 8 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 21 | 18 |
| **Wang** | **Chen** | 7 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 25 | 15 |
| **Wu** | **Tuojian** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 20 |
| **Xu** | **Zhiyuan** | 10 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 26 | 17 |
| **Yang** | **Zhibo** | 7 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 25 | 15 |
| **Zhang** | **Yue** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 28 | 20 |
| **Zhou** | **Dingchen** | 10 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 26 | 17 |