

Institutional Effectiveness Report

Name of Program/Department:	Bachelor of Business Administration
Year:	2019-2020
Name of Preparer:	Johnathan G. Munn

Covid-19 Related Preface:

The utility of this year's School of Business BBA IE Institutional Effectiveness Report is decreased significantly compared to our reporting in previous years. In mid-March, the Covid-19 pandemic forced the University transition to an online instruction paradigm. This shift forced all faculty off campus and necessitated that their focus for the remainder of the spring be on transitioning to new, and for many, unfamiliar pedagogical methods. In response, the School of Business curtailed unessential committee work and I made the decision to suspend all remaining Assurance of Learning (AOL) activities for the rest of the semester. This abrupt cessation of our normal functions came on the heels of a particularly busy time for the School.

In late February 2020, the School of Business was visited by the Continuous Review Team selected by AACSB, our accreditation body. Beginning the previous spring, the School's faculty spent a considerable amount of time preparing for this visit. Our focus was two-fold, thoroughly and accurately representing the School's programs over the previous five years and preparing a plan to present for the next five years. As part of this plan, the School reevaluated its Assurance of Learning program. As a result, the School updated its learning objectives and broadened its assessment methods. Both were implemented this spring. However, as mentioned above data collection was discontinued. Thus, this report contains assessment data from Fall 2019. It relates to the previous learning goals because it is the most recent data we've collected. I've included a copy of the new learning goals in the appendix and will outline the new assessment methods in next year's report.

As requested by the Components and Quick Facts guide and Rubric for Evaluating Program, the executive summary of this report is presented towards the end of this document on page 10. However, I highly recommend you read that section next before proceeding.

Program Mission Statement

The mission of the Francis Marion School of Business is to serve our region by offering high-quality educational programs at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional levels that prepare individuals to compete on a regional, national, and global level. We develop faculty whose teaching, service, and research benefit students, community members, and colleagues. We engage in student-focused educational experiences in order to develop a comprehensive foundation so that they may craft for themselves fulfilling successful careers and lives.

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

- Business Majors at FMU will apply critical and analytical skills to identify and solve problems, analyze information, synthesize and evaluate ideas.
- Business Majors at FMU will effectively communicate with and respond to varied audiences in written and spoken forms
- Business Majors at FMU will understand the global business environment and will be sensitive to different cultures
- Business Majors at FMU will be productive and engaged members of society, demonstrating personal responsibility, and community and social awareness and an understanding of the ethical issues arising out of business decisions
- Business Majors at FMU will be creative in their approach to business decisions
- Business Majors at FMU will have functional knowledge of areas in Business: Accounting, Economics, Management, Quantitative Business Analysis, Finance, Marketing, Legal and Social Environment, Information Systems, International Issues.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

The students in the BBA Program in the School of Business:

SLO 1.0: Eighty percent (80%) of students in BUS 458 will meet or exceed the expectations when analyzing a business case (baseline = 65% Spring 2019 data) by identifying a problem, acquiring the correct information, organizing the information and evaluating the business problem.

SLO 2.1: Eighty percent (80%) of students in BUS 458 will meet or exceed the expectations when making a presentation (baseline = 65% Spring 2019 data) by presenting the information in an organized manner, properly using business-related vocabulary, demonstrating proper eye-contact with audience, using effective body language, and communicating with minimal reference to notes.

SLO 2.2: Eighty percent (80%) of students BUS 458 will meet or exceed the expectations when submitting a written report when analyzing a business case (baseline = 70% Spring 2019) by presenting the information in an organized manner, properly using business-related vocabulary, demonstrating the proper use of grammar and spelling acumen, and demonstrating the ability to integrate into a finished document.

SLO 3.0: Eighty percent (80%) of students in BUS 458 will meet or exceed the expectations when analyzing a business case (baseline = 40% Spring 2019 data) by demonstrating the ability to relate business concepts within an international context, demonstrating a complex understanding of cultural appreciation, assessing the impact of cultural perceptions, and developing a plan to overcome obstacles created by cultural differences.

SLO 4.0: Eighty percent (80%) of students in BUS 458 will meet or exceed the expectations when analyzing a business case (baseline = 50% Spring 2019 data) by identifying the ethical dilemma, identifying direct and indirect stakeholders, identifying the implication, and recommending a response to the problem.

SLO 5.0: Eighty percent (80%) of students in BUS 458 will meet or exceed the expectations when analyzing a business case (baseline = 45% Spring 2019 data) by identifying multiple elements of a problem, analyzing the situation, and developing a solution.

SLO 6.0: Students in BUS 458 will perform above the national average in the ETS major field test in each of their functional areas in Business (baseline for each area will be from Spring 2019 data).

1. Accounting (baseline = 40)
2. Economics (baseline = 34)
3. Management (baseline = 54)
4. Quantitative Business Analysis (baseline = 34)
5. Finance (baseline = 44)
6. Marketing (baseline = 49)
7. Legal and Social Environment (baseline = 44)
8. Information Systems (baseline = 48)
9. International Issues (baseline = 36)

Assessment Methods

Direct

SLO 1.0: Eighty percent (80%) of students in BUS 458 will meet or exceed the expectations when analyzing a business case (baseline = 65% Spring 2019 data) by identifying a problem, acquiring the correct information, organizing the information and evaluating the business problem using a departmentally developed normed rubric.

SLO 2.1: Eighty percent (80%) of students in BUS 458 will meet or exceed the expectations when making a presentation (baseline = 65% Spring 2019 data) by presenting the information in an organized manner, properly using business-related vocabulary, demonstrating proper eye-contact with audience, using effective body language, and communicating with minimal reference to notes using a departmentally developed normed rubric.

SLO 2.2: Eighty percent (80%) of students BUS 458 will meet or exceed the expectations when submitting a written report when analyzing a business case (baseline = 70% Spring 2019) by presenting the information in an organized manner, properly using business-related vocabulary, demonstrating the proper use of grammar and spelling acumen, and demonstrating the ability to integrate into a finished document using a departmentally developed normed rubric.

SLO 3.0: Eighty percent (80%) of students in BUS 458 will meet or exceed the expectations when analyzing a business case (baseline = 40% Spring 2019 data) by demonstrating the ability to relate business concepts within an international context, demonstrating a complex understanding of cultural appreciation, assessing the impact of

cultural perceptions, and developing a plan to overcome obstacles created by cultural differences using a departmentally developed normed rubric.

SLO 4.0: Eighty percent (80%) of students in BUS 458 will meet or exceed the expectations when analyzing a business case (baseline = 50% Spring 2019 data) by identifying the ethical dilemma, identifying direct and indirect stakeholders, identifying the implication, and recommending a response to the problem using a departmentally developed normed rubric.

SLO 5.0: Eighty percent (80%) of students in BUS 458 will meet or exceed the expectations when analyzing a business case (baseline = 45% Spring 2019 data) by identifying multiple elements of a problem, analyzing the situation, and developing a solution using a departmentally developed normed rubric.

SLO 6.0: Students in BUS 458 will perform above the national average in the ETS major field test in each of their functional areas in Business (baseline for each area will be from Spring 2019 data) using the ETS major field test.

Indirect

Towards the conclusion of each semester the Dean meets with graduating seniors in small groups to gauge the impressions of their overall experience and their perceptions of the program's strengths and weakness.

Assessment Results

Direct

The students in the BBA Program in the School of Business will:

SLO 1.0: Sixty-five percent (65%) of students in BUS 458 met or exceeded the expectations when analyzing a business case (baseline = 65% Spring 2019 data) by identifying a problem, acquiring the correct information, organizing the information and evaluating the business problem. The benchmark was not achieved for SLO 1.0.

SLO 2.1: Unknown percent (?%) of students in BUS 458 met or exceeded the expectations when making a presentation (baseline = 65% Spring 2019 data) by presenting the information in an organized manner, properly using business-related vocabulary, demonstrating proper eye-contact with audience, using effective body language, and communicating with minimal reference to notes.

- The mechanics of evaluating this assessment is more complex relative to other SLOs. While Fall 2019 data for SLO 2.1 was collected, they have not been complied yet for reasons outlined in the preface. This process is currently underway.

SLO 2.2: Eighty percent (80%) of students BUS 458 met or exceeded the expectations when submitting a written report when analyzing a business case (baseline = 70% Spring 2019) by presenting the information in an organized manner, properly using business-related vocabulary, demonstrating the proper use of grammar and spelling acumen, and demonstrating the ability to integrate into a finished document. The benchmark was achieved for SLO 2.2.

SLO 3.0: Forty-five percent (45%) of students in BUS 458 met or exceeded the expectations when analyzing a business case (baseline = 40% Spring 2019 data) by demonstrating the ability to relate business concepts within an international context, demonstrating a complex understanding of cultural appreciation, assessing the impact of cultural perceptions, and developing a plan to overcome obstacles created by cultural differences. The benchmark was not achieved for SLO 3.0.

SLO 4.0: Thirty-five percent (35%) of students in BUS 458 met or exceeded the expectations when analyzing a business case (baseline = 50% Spring 2019 data) by identifying the ethical dilemma, identifying the direct and indirect stakeholders, identifying the implication, and recommending a response to the problem. The benchmark was not achieved for SLO 4.0.

SLO 5.0: Forty-five percent (60%) of students in BUS 458 met or exceeded the expectations when analyzing business case (baseline = 45% Spring 2019 data) by identifying multiple elements of a problem, analyzing the situation, and developing a solution. The benchmark was not achieved for SLO 5.0.

SLO 6.0: Students in BUS 458 will perform at or above the national average in the ETS major field test in each of their functional areas in Business. Spring 2019 data are also used as baselines for comparison.

Assessment Indicator Title	National Average	Fall 2019	Spring 2019
Accounting	43	40	40
Economics	40	36	34
Management	61	59	54
Quantitative Business Analysis	34	32	34
Finance	43	37	44
Marketing	50	50	49
Legal and Social Environment	47	42	44
Information Systems	51	48	48
International Issues	40	43	36

Table 1: ETS Major Field Test scores for the 41 BBA students tested in Fall 2019

National Average is taken from “The 2019 Comparative Data Guide – MFT for Business.” Students scored at or above the national average in two of the nine functional areas. The benchmark was not achieved for SLO 6.0

Indirect

Towards the conclusion of each semester the Dean meets with graduating seniors in small groups to gauge their impressions of their overall experience and their perceptions of the program’s strengths and weakness. In Spring 2020, the Dean meet virtually with a total of 56 graduating seniors. Pertaining to the learning objectives above, the students expressed a preference for more opportunities to work with outside companies to reinforce critical thinking skills by evaluating real-world business problems and develop deeper cultural appreciation through exposure to corporate cultures. Students also expressed a desire to further develop analytical skills through additional projects that involved software like excel, R, python and Tableau for Analytics.

Action Items

SLO 1.0: Sixty-five percent (65%) of students in BUS 458 met or exceeded the expectations when analyzing a business case (baseline = 65% Spring 2019 data) by identifying a problem, acquiring the correct information, organizing the information and evaluating the business problem. The benchmark of 80% was not achieved for SLO 1.0.

- Development and implementation of action items for this SLO was impeded in Spring 2020 for the reasons outlined in the preface.
- This SLO maps reasonably well to the new PLO 1.0 listed in the appendix. As such, in the fall the curriculum committee will evaluate whether to address this result through formal or informal curriculum changes and the area coordinators committee will recommend pedagogical modifications in related disciplines.

SLO 2.1: Unknown (?%) of students in BUS 458 met or exceeded the expectations when making a presentation (baseline = 65% Spring 2019 data) by presenting the information in an organized manner, properly using business-related vocabulary, demonstrating proper eye-contact with audience, using effective body language, and communicating with minimal reference to notes.

- The mechanics of evaluating this assessment is more complex relative to other SLOs. While Fall 2019 data for SLO 2.1 was collected, they have not been complied yet for reasons outlined in the preface. This process is currently underway.
- Given that the benchmark for this SLO has met in five of the previous six assessment periods, and additional demands on our faculty’s times due to the implementation of an updated AOL process and potential Covid-19 related disruptions, it is unlikely that any actions will be taken with respect to this SLO. However, in the fall the faculty still evaluate its this result once it is available as a part of our overall curriculum offering.
- This SLO maps reasonably well to the new PLO 2.0 listed in the appendix.

SLO 2.2: Eighty percent (80%) of students BUS 458 met or exceeded the expectations when submitting a written report when analyzing a business case (baseline = 70% Spring 2019) by presenting the information in an organized manner, properly using business-related vocabulary, demonstrating the proper use of grammar and spelling acumen, and demonstrating the ability to integrate into a finished document. The benchmark was achieved for SLO 2.2.

- Given that the benchmark for this SLO was met, and additional demands on our faculty's times due to the implementation of an updated AOL process and potential Covid-19 related disruptions, it is unlikely that any actions will be taken with respect to this SLO.
- This SLO maps reasonably well to the new PLO 3.0 listed in the appendix.

SLO 3.0: Forty-five percent (45%) of students in BUS 458 met or exceeded the expectations when analyzing a business case (baseline = 40% Spring 2019 data) by demonstrating the ability to relate business concepts within an international context, demonstrating a complex understanding of cultural appreciation, assessing the impact of cultural perceptions, and developing a plan to overcome obstacles created by cultural differences. The benchmark was not achieved for SLO 3.0.

- Development and implementation of action items for this SLO was impeded in Spring 2020 for the reasons outlined in the preface.
- This SLO does not directly map to any of the new PLOs listed in the appendix. However, in the fall the faculty still evaluate its this result as a part of our overall curriculum offering.
- Formal or informal curriculum changes and/or pedagogical modification decisions will be made at the discipline (i.e. major) level.

SLO 4.0: Thirty-five percent (35%) of students in BUS 458 met or exceeded the expectations when analyzing a business case (baseline = 50% Spring 2019 data) by identifying the ethical dilemma, identifying the direct and indirect stakeholders, identifying the implication, and recommending a response to the problem. The benchmark was not achieved for SLO 4.0.

- Development and implementation of action items for this SLO was impeded in Spring 2020 for the reasons outlined in the preface.
- This SLO maps reasonably well to the new PLO 4.0 listed in the appendix. As such, in the fall the curriculum committee will evaluate whether to address this result through formal or informal curriculum changes and the area coordinators committee will recommend pedagogical modifications in related disciplines.

SLO 5.0: Forty-five percent (60%) of students in BUS 458 met or exceeded the expectations when analyzing business case (baseline = 45% Spring 2019 data) by identifying multiple elements of a problem, analyzing the situation, and developing a solution. The benchmark was not achieved for SLO 5.0.

- This SLO does not directly map to any of the new PLOs listed in the appendix. However, in the fall the faculty still evaluate its this result as a part of our overall curriculum offering.
- Formal or informal curriculum changes and/or pedagogical modification decisions will be made at the discipline (i.e. major) level.

SLO 6.0: Students in BUS 458 did not perform above the national average in the ETS major field test in each of their functional areas in Business. Baseline for each area will be from Spring 2019 data.

1. Accounting (baseline = 40), the student average for SLO 6.1 was 40. The benchmark of 43 was not meet.
 - The latest revision of the School's AOL assessment process includes discipline related learning objectives. In Fall 2020, the Accounting faculty will reevaluate their discipline specific learning objectives and assessment methods. Implementation of updated assessment methods is expected to begin in Spring 2021. This renewed focus on discipline specific objectives is expected to have a positive effect on these results
2. Economics (baseline = 34), the student average for SLO 6.2 was 36. The benchmark of 40 was not meet.
 - The latest revision of the School's AOL assessment process includes discipline related learning objectives. In Fall 2020, the Economics faculty will reevaluate their discipline specific learning objectives and assessment methods. Implementation of updated assessment methods is expected to begin in Spring 2021. This renewed focus on discipline specific objectives is expected to have a positive effect on these results
3. Management (baseline = 54), the student average for SLO 6.3 was 59. The benchmark of 61 was not meet.
 - The latest revision of the School's AOL assessment process includes discipline related learning objectives. In Fall 2020, the Management faculty will reevaluate their discipline specific learning objectives and assessment methods. Implementation of updated assessment methods is expected to begin in Spring 2021. This renewed focus on discipline specific objectives is expected to have a positive effect on these results
4. Quantitative Business Analysis (baseline = 34), the student average for SLO 6.4 was 32. The benchmark of 34 was not meet.
 - Development and implementation of action items for this SLO was impeded in Spring 2020 for the reasons outlined in the preface.
 - This SLO maps reasonably well to the new PLO 1.0 listed in the appendix. As such, in the fall the curriculum committee will evaluate whether to address this result through formal or informal curriculum changes and the area

coordinators committee will recommend pedagogical modifications in related disciplines.

5. Finance (baseline = 44), the student average for SLO 6.5 was 37. The benchmark of 43 was not meet.
 - The latest revision of the School's AOL assessment process includes discipline related learning objectives. In Fall 2020, the Finance faculty will reevaluate their discipline specific learning objectives and assessment methods. Implementation of updated assessment methods is expected to begin in Spring 2021. This renewed focus on discipline specific objectives is expected to have a positive effect on these results
6. Marketing (baseline = 49), the student average for SLO 6.6 was 50. The benchmark of 50 was meet.
 - The latest revision of the School's AOL assessment process includes discipline related learning objectives. In Fall 2020, the Marketing faculty will reevaluate their discipline specific learning objectives and assessment methods. Implementation of updated assessment methods is expected to begin in Spring 2021. This renewed focus on discipline specific objectives is expected to have a positive effect on these results
7. Legal and Social Environment (baseline = 44), the student average for SLO 6.7 was 42. The benchmark of 47 was not meet.
 - Development and implementation of action items for this SLO was impeded in Spring 2020 for the reasons outlined in the preface. However, in the fall the faculty still evaluate its this result as a part of our overall curriculum offering.
8. Information Systems (baseline = 48), the student average for SLO 6.8 was 48. The benchmark of 51 was not meet.
 - An additional Management and Information Systems (MIS) faculty member has be hired.
 - The latest revision of the School's AOL assessment process includes discipline related learning objectives. In Fall 2020, the MIS faculty will reevaluate their discipline specific learning objectives and assessment methods. Implementation of updated assessment methods is expected to begin in Spring 2021. This renewed focus on discipline specific objectives is expected to have a positive effect on these results
9. International Issues (baseline = 36), the student average for SLO 6.9 was 43. The benchmark of 40 was meet.
 - No action is expected to be taken for this SLO.

Executive Summary of Report

For the most recent assessment period, the Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) program had six program learning outcomes (PLO) which included teaching students to think critically and logically, communicate effectively, understand the global business environment, understand the ethical issues arising out of business decisions, be creative in their approach to business decisions, and have functional knowledge of areas in Business. These six PLO's translate into seven student learning outcomes (SLO). SLO 1 measures student's critical and analytical thinking, SLO 2.1 measures student's oral communication skills, SLO 2.2 measures student's written communication skills, SLO 3.0 measures student's understanding of global business environment and cross cultural issues, SLO 4.0 measures student's understanding and ability to analyze ethical dilemmas they would face in business situations, SLO 5.0 measures student's ability to solve business problems with creatively and SLO 6.1 – 6.9 measures student's knowledge in different functional areas of business.

We measure SLOs 1, 2.2, 3, 4 and 5 directly by presenting graduating seniors a case asking them to analyze the business case. A random sample of 20 graduating seniors is selected and three faculty members evaluate their responses using a departmentally developed normed rubric. Faculty rate the students on multiple items for each SLO on a 5-point scale with 5 representing "Exceeding Expectations" and 1 representing "Below Expectations". The median score from the three evaluators is used. SLO 2.1 is measured directly by recording graduating seniors as they present their project in the Capstone Strategic Management class. Three faculty members evaluate the responses of a random sample of 20 students, using a departmentally developed normed rubric. Faculty rate the students on multiple items for each SLO on a 5-point scale with 5 representing "Exceeding Expectations" and 1 representing "Below Expectations". The median score is used. Our benchmark is that the overall average on the ratings will meet or exceed 80%. Finally, SLO 6.1 – 6.9 are evaluated using the scores in the ETS major field test in Business. The benchmark is that our students will perform above the national average. Indirect measures of the learning objectives are derived from exit interviews of graduating seniors conducted by the Dean. The benchmarks for SLO 1.0, 2.2, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.7, and 6.8 were not achieved.

This report differs from previous School of Business BBA Institutional Effectiveness Reports in several ways. First, some data is unreported due obstacles in assessment. Data that are reported from Fall 2019¹. Typically, the School reports spring assessment data. Most significantly, because of the impediments outlined above in the preface, this report does not contain detailed actions the School has taken to address learning goals for assessments that indicate below benchmark achievement. However, it does describe remediation plans where possible.

A side-note on language: This document uses the linguistic conventions put forth in the *Components & Quick Facts of an Institutional Effectiveness Report* (March 19, 2019). Specifically, the term *Baseline* refers to result from the past one to three years, the term

¹ Assessment results are presented for SLO 2.1. The videos used to assess this SLO are evaluated over the summer and results are not available by the IE report deadline.

Benchmark refers to the desired results for this academic year, and the term *Target* is the long-term goal that has been established. All Baselines presented here are from the previous academic year. Also, this year we aspired to obtain our long-term targets for each SLO during this academic year. Thus, our Benchmarks and Targets were the same. If the IE Committee continues to use these linguistic conventions, we may reevaluate that decision and list separate Benchmarks and Targets in the future.

Appendix

A.1 Case Administered in BUS 458

“You did what?” screamed Ajay Srinivasan, the Senior Systems Manager for HTL Inc., over his cell phone while walking to his office from the parking lot. It is 8 am and it is already a sweltering 110 degrees in New Delhi, and he has already started sweating profusely. “How could you promise them a product which is still in development? We need at least 8 months to finish it, and then we will have about 4 – 6 months for testing and bug fixing, if everything goes according to plan. In the best-case scenario, we are not going to be ready for about another 14 months, worst case 2 years. John, I suggest you go back and tell the client that it cannot be done. We cannot do this.”

John Wilson is on the other end of the call. He had been named the Vice President for Sales and Marketing South East Asia for HTL Inc. nine months ago and needed this deal to go smoothly. John knew he was a closer. He always had been. In college, John helped guide Northwestern University to its first Big Ten baseball title in 23 years. After Northwestern, John finished near the top of his class in Duke University’s internationally renowned MBA program. Given his success in the years since graduate school, he had come to terms with that fact that he did not actually finish first in his class.

John’s first job after graduate school was with Dell Computers in Austin, Texas. He became an essential part of moving the company into the newly emerging personal computer market. John’s first role in the company was to develop distribution networks with several big box electronic stores. His ability to quickly find new customers paired well with Dell’s ambitious expansion plan. Because Dell employed a lean and agile supply chain management system, there was never a concern that new orders could not be met. John’s first international experience came when he was asked to join a team tasked with scouting potential manufacturing sites in Asia. John loved the fact that everyday seemed to bring a new experience. In 1996, John moved to Bonn, Germany to head the European marketing division for Dell Computers’ chief rival Compaq Computer Corp. As the usage of personal computers soared across Europe in the late 1990’s, John became a rising star. He was later hired away by Acer Inc., a Taiwanese computer hardware company looking to expand into Europe and was headquartered in Paris, France. After only one year at Acer Inc., John realized that he had made a mistake. At Acer, John faced a consumer base already leery of his products due to quality control issues in the production process of the computer motherboards. To make matters worse, the marketing strategy that he inherited from his predecessor had no foundation or direction. Unable to significantly improve the company’s European sales, John was asked to resign after three years with the company. For the first time that he could remember, John was on the outside looking in. Then he received a phone call from Tim Norflake, CEO of HTL, Inc., a multi-billion-dollar software firm based in New York. Tim Norflake, the CEO of HTL Inc., is a serial entrepreneur. He was born in New York and did his Bachelor in Marketing and his MBA in Entrepreneurship at the Stern School of Business at New York University. He started HTL Inc. ten years ago and has very quickly built it into a multi-billion-dollar business. HTL Inc. has all of their software development done offshore in a development center in New Delhi.

Tim wanted John to head up sales and marketing for the Southeast Asian division of his software company. Tim’s offer included a relatively low base salary compared to his

previous jobs, but the financial incentives for bringing the firm new business were very generous. Initially John was hesitant about the offer. His area of expertise was Europe, and his last significant involvement in Asia seemed like a lifetime ago when he helped broker the Penang manufacturing plant deal in Malaysia for Dell Computers. Also, he had never dealt with software or software programmers before. His previous companies built personal computers and computer components, not the software that went on them. After some reflection and the realization that a better offer wasn't coming, John decided, "Sales is Sales." If he could sell computer hardware, then he could sell computer software.

Nine months into his new role at HTL, Inc., John began to have his doubts. The boyish charm that worked so well in the U.S. and Europe did not have the same effect on his Asian counterparts. He had expected that the large sales incentive package would more than supplement his salary. However, he had yet to make a significant deal, and he was beginning to face the prospect of selling his home or risk foreclosure. Pressure was also coming from Tim. John could sense the disappointment and frustration in Tim's voice every time they spoke.

That changed when John landed the TechPadu deal. It had taken John a month to get someone from TechPadu to return his calls and another month for them to read his proposal. Negotiations with TechPadu's executive team were prolonged and tenuous. TechPadu's executives were negotiating from a position of strength, and they knew it. It was the type of deal that could transform HTL, Inc. into a global power. If TechPadu decided to adopt HTL, Inc.'s software, it could pave the way for its software to become the industry standard in all of southeast Asia. HTL, Inc. needed the deal, and John had to promise the moon to get it. Personally for John, not only would the commission from the deal strengthen his personal finances, but it also would restore Tim's faith in him.

Still on the call with Ajay about the deal, John sighs, "Ajay, we have been trying to break into the market in Malaysia for the last year, and we have had no success. This is a fifty-million-dollar project. We need this to break into the market. Once this project is done, we will have multiple projects from this company and others. This is critical."

"The operative word is successful completion of the project, not just getting the project. You have promised TechPadu a product that is still under development." said Ajay.

"Where are we going to conjure up the product John?" "Well, I did tell them we are working out some of the kinks, and we should have it ready in 6 - 8 months." replied John.

The building's internal temperature is 55 degrees, which is optimal for the computers and servers. After coming in from 110 degrees outside, the sudden drop in temperature gives Ajay a blinding headache. "Six to eight months? It is not going to happen." replies Ajay. "Cancel the project or re-negotiate. Give me 14 months, and I will have a great product for you, I cannot do anything in 6 to 8 months." "I had a feeling you would say that Ajay. I have scheduled a teleconference for both of us with Tim Norflake in New York at 7 p.m. EST, which would be 9:30 a.m. your time. He will decide what needs to be done."

Last year, Tim Norflake decided that HTL Inc. should move from a project-based business model to creating and implementing software products. He decided that HTL Inc. was going to develop an Enterprise Resource Planning software product called HTL 3C. This product is a huge gamble for HTL Inc. as they are trying to move up the value chain from a project fee-based service to a product-based service. The key person during this transition is Ajay Srinivasan who was just hired specifically to head the team

developing HTL 3C. Ajay has had a great deal of experience in product development in other companies, and he was eager to join HTL Inc. to create a completely new product from scratch. Ajay was born in India and did his Bachelor in Engineering in Computer Science at the best engineering school in India and his Masters in Computer Science at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston. He has had extensive experience working with Microsoft and Cisco Systems on computer networks and was handpicked by Tim Norflake to head the development team of HTL Inc. and its new enterprise software HTL 3C.

Tim Norflake believes that people respond to incentives, and his company has the following incentive structure. They have two reviews in a year. At the half yearly review, if an employee has not met targets, he or she is warned about it, and at the end of the year, if they still have not met the targets, they are fired. On the other hand, if they have met or exceeded their targets, their bonus could be as much as their annual pay. A lot of top performers double their annual pay under this system. Employees are given monthly targets and are expected to meet them. Exceeding a target in the previous month cannot compensate for missing a target in the current month. This has created a high-pressure environment, which has people working late hours, and it is normal to see people working during weekends and holidays.

Ajay walks into his office with a splitting headache cursing under his breath. He starts his computer and opens a virtual conference window with his team. All of them are there. “Guys, I have some good and bad news,” he says. “First the good news, we have a fifty-million-dollar contract from TechPadu for the HTL 3C software suite.” He hears cheers from his team. “Now for the bad news, we have to deliver and implement it in six to eight months.” There is complete silence. Ajay continues “Can it be done?” There is a long pause. Tina Reddy his senior programmer replies, “We can try to do it, but eight months would just be enough for the alpha phase. We won’t even have it ready for beta testing, and all the bugs will still be there. Will that be all right?” Ajay replies, “No, of course that is not all right. We can’t implement a product with a whole bunch of bugs. How about if we all work on Saturdays and Sundays?” Tina responds, “Sir, most of us are already working twelve hours a day, and some of us work on the weekends. I am not sure how much more time we have.” Ajay responds, “But what if all of us work on Saturdays and Sundays, and put in extra time?” Krish Patel, another programmer, responds “It will be difficult, but I think we should be able to do it. There will be some bugs, but we can constantly update their package as we fix it.” Ajay says, “So then maybe if we negotiate for ten months to a year we can do it?” Krish says, “Yes I think we can,” and everyone else except Tina says yes. Ajay speaks to Tina, “Listen, I am going to fight to have the contract re-negotiated but I need to know the bottom line. Do you agree with Krish’s assessment?” Tina replies, “It is going to be very hard, but if everything goes right, we should be able to have a working product by one year. There will be bugs, and we will spend another two to three months working 100 hours a week to fix all of it. If the client expects us to have a bug free product in a year, then it is not possible, but if they are willing to work with some bugs, we should be able to do it.” Ajay says, “All right, so we have consensus in the team, we will be able to deliver this product in a year?” This time everyone agrees. “I am going to have a teleconference with Tim Norflake and John Wilson in half an hour, and I would like Tina and Krish to be available in case I have to patch you in to answer some questions on the product.” Ajay’s headache has receded, and he nervously waits for his meeting with Tim and John. It was a video conference over Skype. Tim, looking very affable and cheerful, comes

onto the screen. “This is a great coup for us Ajay. We have broken into the Malaysian market. That was a great job John.” Ajay frowns and replies, “It is a great opportunity, but I think there are some unrealistic expectations. We cannot possibly get this done in eight months. When you hired me, I gave you an estimate of two to three years. We are jumping the gun here. We have to go back to TechPadu and ask for more time. I think if we rush it through, we should be able to give them a good product in 18 months.” John jumps in, “Tim the only reason they chose us over SAP, IBM, or other bigger firms is that we promised a fast turnaround time.” Ajay snaps irritably, “SAP and IBM have existing products which are already working. How can you go about promising a faster turnaround time than them when we don’t even have a product?”

Tim interrupts, “Now now Ajay we are all under pressure. John is just trying to get us into the market, and you guys have already had one year of work. You told me that you would get this done in two years’ time. One year is over, so we should have a product ready in another year. This is a \$50-million-dollar contract. If it goes through, we crack open the market in Southeast Asia. TechPadu is big in Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, and Australia. They have firms they consult with, and if they like HTL 3G, they will use it in all those firms. So this is not just a one-time fifty-million-dollar project. It could be a continuing long-term partnership between us and them. It will be in the billions of dollars in the long run. Now, I can definitely talk to the CEO of TechPadu and ask them to extend it for twelve months. But if I go to him, I am putting my personal credibility on the line, and I want guarantees that we can get it done in twelve months. Tell you what, if we get this thing done successfully, I will double your annual bonus. All of you will get a bonus equal to twice your annual pay. Now, I know you can do this. I just need you guys to be positive and commit to it.” Ajay comes back, “Tim give us fourteen months, and we should have it ready.” John shakes his head, but Tim says, “Done, I am going to fly to Kuala Lumpur to meet with the CEO of TechPadu, I will offer to absorb the costs by \$10 million and give them a personal guarantee that it will be done in fourteen months. Now I want both Ajay and John there when I meet the CEO. They are going to ask us about the product Ajay. I want you tell them it is ready, but we need the time to study their processes and customize the product for their company.” Ajay looks alarmed. “Tim that’s not what we agreed on. Customizing our product for their company will take time. I don’t have the man power to create the product and then customize it for them.” Tim responds “How many people do you need? You have 20 programmers. We can double it, and you can get it done in 7 months.” Ajay responds, “That is not how it works, we have to train the programmers to our product, and that will take anywhere from 3 – 6 months. Then, we cannot do all the activities in parallel. Some of them have to be done before others can start. If we have to customize the product, it will take us another six months or so in the best-case scenario.” John jumps in, “Didn’t you tell me that you were using the best industry practices for our product, so if TechPadu’s business practices are different, we will tell them to change their practices to fit our product as our business practices are based on best practices worldwide.” Ajay sighs and responds, “Worldwide standards may not be applicable to Malaysia, and furthermore, there are legal issues to take into account. Any implementation of the product in a different country would require some customization, which could take anywhere from six months to a year.” Tim replies, “Come on Ajay, I hired you because I thought you were a go-getter. But you keep coming up with problems and not solutions. You asked for more time, and I am giving you more time. Fourteen months and we will deliver the product to TechPadu. You can manage their requirements and keep it to the minimum. I want you

in Kuala Lumpur. You are going to give them a demo of the product, but don't tell them it is a prototype. Let them think that it is a working product and that we need fourteen months to customize it for them." Ajay buckles under pressure and agrees. The video conference ends. Ajay calls his team into the conference room.

"So I have good news and bad news," says Ajay. Tina narrows her eyebrows and says "I would like to hear the bad news first." Ajay smiles and responds, "Well let me give you the good news first, we got fourteen months to finish the project, and Tim has promised to double our bonuses if we complete this project successfully." Everyone but Tina smiles. Tina says, "Well what is the bad news then?" Ajay sighs, "We can't tell the client we don't have a product already. I need to show them a demo of the product, and we have to say that the fourteen months is for product customization." Tina says quite angrily "That is impossible. We don't have a working version of our product that does not crash, and we need the fourteen months to finish all the features. If we do it right the first time, we will have it done in fourteen months. How are we going to include their customization?" Krish says, "So long as you show them the demo and don't let them handle it, we can avoid the crashes. They won't know that most of the product is not working. We will have to keep the changes and customizations to the minimum when we gather requirements, and we will have to work 14-hour days, 7 days a week to make this happen." Ajay says, "Pretty much, I will try and keep the customizations to the minimum, so it is not too burdensome. For the next year or so, please forget about any holidays or vacations. If you are not sleeping, you are going to be working. If we get this done, it will be a big break for us and probably a partnership with TechPadu, which could come to billions of dollars for the company."

"I don't see why we should break our backs, so Tim can reap the billions. We get our bonuses in rupees, which sounds a lot, but it is basically just twenty thousand dollars." mutters Tina. Ajay looks at her and says, "Tell you what, you get this thing done, and I will move you and anyone in this team to projects in places you like. Tina you wanted to go to London, since your husband is there on a long-term project for TESCO. I am pretty sure I can arrange for your transfer to London after this project is completed, may be even in the same project as your husband. So are we all agreed? We need to get this done in fourteen months." The entire team agrees.

Ajay flies to Kuala Lumpur to meet John and Tim. They make a successful presentation to the CEO of TechPadu, with Ajay successfully navigating the demo so that there are no crashes. The CEO of TechPadu seems quite happy and signs a \$50 million contract, with promises of a partnership after successful implementation of the product. Tim flies back to New York, and Ajay meets John for a drink at the Petronas Towers. "So are we going to get this thing done?" John asks. "You screwed us over John." Ajay says. "This is going to be touch and go." John replies, "I don't have a choice Ajay. You know how the incentives work here, and if I don't meet my targets, I am fired. With this I have met my target, now I have to look for the next sale." Ajay replies, "Don't you see that if we mess this project up, it does not matter if you had the sale. Successful completion of the project should be your focus, not just a sale." John shook his head. "That is your problem. I am being judged on my performance, which has to do with making the sale. Once I am done, I am out of the picture. This is your baby. Now it's your turn. If you feel so strongly about it, why did you not tell Tim it can't be done? You should have stood your ground." Ajay says, "He is my boss. We don't tell our bosses no in India. That would be rude. I tried telling him how difficult it was going to be, that it was dangerous, and that I needed more time. If he still insists we do it, then all we can do is try." John shook his head.

“Ajay, you have lived in the U.S. You should know better. He wasn’t listening to any of that. Every time you said I will try, he was hearing we can do this. Now you have made a commitment, and he is going to hold you and your team to it. There is no trying with Tim; you either do it or you don’t.” Ajay sighs and says, “Well I’ve got to get back to New Delhi, it’s going to be hell for the next fourteen months.”

Ajay and his team work around the clock for the next fourteen months. A typical work week is 100 hours and some weeks it is 120 – 130 hours. No one takes a break. Ajay tries his best to keep the customization requirements from TechPadu to a minimum, but there are some. The HTL 3G team is quite proud of their work ethic and their ability to deliver, but the task put before them is very difficult. Eight months later, Tim Norflake makes a trip New Delhi to visit the HTL Inc. development center. He meets with Ajay, and then, unable to sleep because of the time difference between New York and New Delhi, he walks into the development center at 1 a.m. in the morning. He sees Ajay, Tina, Krish, and the entire team there working. He walks up to them and says, “You guys couldn’t sleep either? I am jet lagged, what’s your excuse?” Tina says, “We haven’t been home for a couple of days now; we are really working hard to get this done.” The rest of the team chimes in to show Tim how hard they have been working. Tim lets them talk for ten minutes or so and then smiles and says, “Well guys, in business, hard work is appreciated, but it is results that are rewarded. So get this project done well and successfully, and all of you will go far in the company.” The team continues to work hard, and at the end of fourteen months, they have most of the work done. The product is completed and tested. There are no bugs in the main product, but there are about 200 or so bugs in all the customizations that TechPadu wanted. Ajay, under pressure from Tim, goes ahead with the implementation at Kuala Lumpur. He sends Tina to handle the implementation, as she is the most experienced programmer. The team back in New Delhi continues to work round the clock to fix the bugs, but as the bugs are being fixed, new ones surface. Tina does an excellent job in keeping the TechPadu employees happy with her explanations on why there seem to be some crashes and shows them workarounds. She also prioritizes the bugs back to the team in New Delhi, so that they can be fixed overnight. The patches are uploaded overnight, and TechPadu is still unaware that the team in New Delhi is still fixing bugs. Two more months pass, and the stress of doing this job tells on Tina. She has not seen her husband, who is London, for sixteen months now. She has not had a day off, and she talks to Ajay about a transfer to a different project. Ajay asks her to wait for a few more months, saying that they are nearly there, but Tina has had enough. She already has had an offer from another company with higher pay, and the only reason she was staying on here was because of the promised posting to London. The new company is already processing her visa for a project in London. She quits.

Ajay cannot spare anyone from the current development team, and John pulls someone working in Malaysia for HTL Inc. on another project to liaison with TechPadu. Satish has been in Kuala Lumpur for three years and has had fifteen years of experience in the software industry. He has been working with HTL Inc. since its incorporation. He, however, is not aware of the background of the situation of this project. John Wilson is focused on getting new projects and is not interested in a project that are already underway, and Ajay is under pressure to get this project done. Satish met with the TechPadu employees, and when asked why there are still these minor problems after implementation, he told them that HTL Inc. had finished the product but was still bug fixing on the customization requested by TechPadu. There were about 80 more bugs to

go. When asked why it was taking HTL Inc. sixteen months to get the modifications ready, he replied after looking at the internal documents that it took them fourteen months to finish the product, and the last two months was spent on creating and finishing the customizations. He assures them that all of it will be done in a month or so. The news reaches the CEO of TechPadu, who after talking to Satish, talks to his lawyer and threatens a law suit against HTL Inc. Tim Norflake, alarmed by this development, sends Harish Chandra over to Kuala Lumpur to talk to the CEO of TechPadu. Harish has an undergraduate degree in Computer Science and an MBA from the top schools in India and has had a very successful in turning around troubled projects. He flies over to meet with the CEO of TechPadu, John Wilson, Ajay Srinivasan, and the development team in New Delhi to analyze the situation and make his recommendations.

A.2 Case Evaluation Questions

SLO 1.0: Read the case and analyze it, identify one decision maker in this case, what are the issues and the dilemma for that decision maker. Identify the implications of the situation.

SLO 2.1 is not evaluated using this case study. It is evaluated using student presentations from the BUS 458 class.

SLO 2.2 is evaluated from the overall written composition of all answers to case study questions.

SLO 3.0: Given the information provided, explain any problems that might have arisen from the different cultural backgrounds of the principle characters and their impact on the ultimate success of the project. How might these issues have been better addressed?

SLO 4.0: Identify the ethical issues in the case. Who is impacted by these issues? Explain how they are impacted. Given your analysis of the ethical situation(s), and provide recommendations to address these ethical dilemma(s).

SLO 5.0: Recommend solution(s) to the problem(s) identified in question 1 and provide implications of the solution(s).

A.3 Case Evaluation Rubrics

SLO 1.0

Criteria	Identification of the problem	Analysis of the situation	Development of solution
Does not meet expectations Score: 1	Fails to provide sufficient information to indicate an understanding of the current problem	Does not included all relevant components of the situation and shows little understanding of the complexity of the problem	Solution to the problem is a minor change to the current situation or not likely to be perceived as being implemented as a solution to the problem
Score: 2			
Meets Expectations Score: 3	Provides sufficient information that indicates an understanding of the problem	Identifies all relevant components of the given situation and demonstrates an understanding of the complexity of the problem	Response has the potential for being implemented as a solution to the problem and reflects a solution that is not currently being used
Score: 4			
Exceeds Expectations Score: 5	Identifies multiple elements of the problem and elaborates on the problem in ways that show insights beyond the stated situation	Identifies components of the situation that are beyond the given information and identifies unanswered questions that are of consequence to the solution	Response transforms the assumptions of the situation and is easily visualized as being implemented as a solution to the problem

SLO. 2.1

Student	Organization	Use of vocabulary	Eye contact	Elocution	Mannerisms	Presentation of Information
Does not meet expectations Score: 1	Lacks logical sequence, may jump around and/or lose focus	Uses slang or inappropriate words	Has minimum/excessive/ no eye contact with the audience to the point that the audience is distracted	Mumbles; frequently uses words or sounds, such as “uhs,” “like”, “you know”; words are mispronounced	Frequently demonstrates distracting mannerisms, such as bad posture, shifting of feet, jingling of coins etc.	Reads information or appears to be uncomfortable with the information
Score: 2						
Meets Expectations Score: 3	Presents information in a logical sequence which audience can understand and easily follow	Uses appropriate vocabulary /grammar	Maintains and manages eye contact with audience the majority of the time	Voice is easily understood, delivery is mostly clear and natural without many inappropriate words such as: “uhs,” “like”, “you know”	Displays no or minimal distracting mannerisms	Refers to notes or presentation material minimally
Score: 4						
Exceeds Expectations Score: 5	Presents information that indicates understanding of the need to gain attention, keep attention and enhance the audience’s understanding Focus and linking of sections/information is easily followed by the audience	Vocabulary indicates knowledge and understanding of the business issues	Maintains and manages eye contact with total audience throughout the presentation	Voice is understandable to all audience, degree of inflection is appropriate	Uses body language effectively and naturally to maintain audience’s interest	Speaks with no referring to notes

SLO 2.2

Criteria	Use of vocabulary	Organization	Writing Mechanics	Depth of Discussion
Does not meet expectations Score: 1	Uses slang or inappropriate vocabulary	Writing lacks logical sequence, lack of linkages between concepts which causes the reader to become confused	Frequent grammar errors and/or misspellings	Few of the issues, recommendations and/or explanations are supported
Score: 2				
Meets Expectations Score: 3	Uses vocabulary relevant to the subject and information is readily understood by the reader	Presents information in a logical sequence which reader can understand and easily follow	Less than 2 grammar error and/or misspellings	Most of the issues, recommendations and/or explanations are relevant and supported
Score: 4				
Exceeds Expectations Score: 5	Vocabulary indicates understanding of the managerial issue	Definite flow of information with focus and linkage of sections/information	Free of grammatical errors and misspellings	All issues, recommendations and/or explanations are well integrated, relevant, and supported

SLO 3.0

Criteria	Application	Intercultural Competence (Analysis)	Evaluation	Synthesis
Does not meet expectations Score: 1	Unable to relate standard business concepts/frameworks/literature /models within an international context	Unable to identify any aspect of cultural diversity in an international setting	Unable to assess the impact that unique cultural perceptions and experiences have in international business environments	Unable to develop a plan to overcome cultural obstacles
Score: 2				
Meets Expectations Score: 3	Demonstrates some ability to relate standard business concepts/frameworks/literature /models within an international context	Demonstrates basic cultural appreciation by identifying basic differences and similarities among nations	Provides basic assessment of the impact that unique cultural perceptions and experiences have in international business environments	Able to develop a limited plan to overcome the obstacles created by unique cultural perceptions and experiences with some consideration for a few relevant factors
Score: 4				
Exceeds Expectations Score: 5	Demonstrates ability to clearly and accurately relate standard business concepts/frameworks/literature /models within an international context	Demonstrates a complex understanding of cultural appreciation by identifying multiple cultural differences and similarities (e.g. values, ethics, communication style, beliefs, thought processes, practices, and rituals) among nations	Provides clear, accurate, and detailed assessment of the impact of unique cultural perceptions and experiences in the international business environments	Able to develop a realistic plan to overcome the obstacles created by unique cultural perceptions and experiences that addresses most/all relevant factors

SLO 4.0

Criteria	Identification of the situation	Identification of stakeholders	Identification of implications	Recommended response
Does not meet expectations Score: 1	Does not correctly identify the dilemma	Identifies few of the critical stakeholders	Identifies few of the positive and negative consequences of the situation	Does not articulate a reasonably good response to the situation
Score: 2				
Meets Expectations Score: 3	Identifies and explains the main dilemma	Identifies most of the critical stakeholders	Identifies the positive and negative consequences of the issue for all direct stakeholders	Indicates a good response to the situation that demonstrates a consideration of positive and negative implications for the direct stakeholders
Score: 4				
Exceeds Expectations Score: 5	Identifies multiple elements of the issue(s) and specifically identifies the dilemma of the decision maker	Identifies and explains the relationship among direct and indirect stakeholders	Identifies the positive and negative consequences of the issue by explaining the implications for all direct and indirect stakeholders	Recommended response clearly indicates the desire to balance the positive and negative consequences of the situation for all direct and indirect stakeholders

SLO 5.0

Criteria	Identification of the problem	Analysis of the situation	Development of solution
Does not meet expectations Score: 1	Fails to provide sufficient information to indicate an understanding of the current problem	Does not include all relevant components of the situation and shows little understanding of the complexity of the problem	Solution to the problem is a minor change to the current situation or not likely to be perceived as being implemented as a solution to the problem
Score: 2			
Meets Expectations Score: 3	Provides sufficient information that indicates an understanding of the problem	Identifies all relevant components of the given situation and demonstrates an understanding of the complexity of the problem	Response has the potential for being implemented as a solution to the problem and reflects a solution that is not currently being used
Score: 4			
Exceeds Expectations Score: 5	Identifies multiple elements of the problem and elaborates on the problem in ways that show insights beyond the stated situation	Identifies components of the situation that are beyond the given information and identifies unanswered questions that are of consequence to the solution	Response transforms the assumptions of the situation and is easily visualized as being implemented as a solution to the problem

A.4 Updated Program Learning Goals

PLO 1: Students will be able to apply analytical thinking to solve business problems.

PLO 2: Students will be able to communicate business knowledge orally.

PLO 3: Students will be able to communicate business knowledge in written form.

PLO 4: Students will be able to evaluate business situations using an ethical decision-making framework.

PLO 5: Students will be able to identify and appreciate the value of various forms of diversity in the business environment.