



The J. Whitney Bunting College of Business

Academic Assessment Outcomes

2016/2017
(7/01/2016 – 6/30/2017)

December, 2017



**The J. Whitney Bunting College of Business
Academic Assessment Outcomes, 2016/2017**

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	2
Introduction, Undergraduate Programs, Mission & Goals.....	3
Assurance of Learning Outcomes – Undergraduate Programs	
• BBA Programs.....	4
• BA & BS Program Economics.....	7
• BS Computer Science.....	8
Major-specific Assessment Outcomes, BBA Degree	
• Accounting Major.....	9
• Management Major.....	11
• Management Information Systems Major.....	12
• Marketing Major.....	13
Assurance of Learning Outcomes – Graduate Programs	
• Master of Business Administration Programs.....	15
• Master of Accounting.....	16
• Master of Logistics and Supply Chain Management	16
• Master of Management Information Systems.....	19
College-Wide Assurance of Learning Activities	
• College of Business Assessment Meeting, August 13, 2014.....	20
Appendices	
• Appendix I: Assessment Calendar.....	21
• Appendix II: College of Business Assessment Hierarchy.....	22

**College of Business, Georgia College & State University
Academic Assessment Outcomes, 2016/2017**

Executive Summary

Business faculty have developed learning objectives for the BBA and MBA programs, along with means of assessing the accomplishment of each objective, so they can measure outcomes and continually improve undergraduate and graduate programs. Learning objectives are measured for the common business core as well as the majors in the BBA, and for the BS, BA, MBA, MACC, MLSCM, and MMIS programs in the college.

Key program assurance of learning outcomes for AY 2017 follow.

- Students do a good job identifying and evaluating ethical issues.
- Students consistently have difficulty meeting expectations for analytical techniques in ACCT 2101 and FINC 3131.
- The ETS results showed students exceeded the 50th percentile in all areas except finance in 14-15, 15-16, and 16-17.
- Management majors continue performed well on a pre-test, post-test assessment assuring they have a general understanding of human resource management principles.

Key actions taken as a result of assessment are listed below.

- Additional exercises will be added to CSCI 4320 software Engineering to enable students to apply design and development principles better.
- A custom book will be created for CSCI 3213 in order to assure that all the topic areas are being addressed.
- Master of Logistics and Supply Chain Management students will have clearer assignment instructions in LOGS 6650 Purchasing and Materials Management.

Program-specific assessment activities were reported for the BA and BS in Economics and the BS in Computer Science. Major-specific assessments were carried out for BBA majors in accounting, management, management information systems, and marketing. The common business core courses were assessed for all BBA majors. The graduate programs (MACC, MLSCM, and MMIS) all had program-specific assessment activities.

The university goals, college goals, and program goals as well as student learning objectives are available through the Compliance Assist software to all College of Business faculty members. Therefore, each goal, objective, result, and modifications are not explained in this report. This report summarizes the key findings and reports on the assessment activities and results not stored in Compliance Assist. The Georgia WebMBA reports assessment information in a separate report.

The J. Whitney Bunting College of Business Academic Assessment Outcomes, 2016/2017

Introduction

This Assessment Outcomes report, along with the information available in Compliance Assist for the college of business, describes assurance of learning outcomes for the academic year 2016/2017, which:

- Enable faculty members to measure outcomes and continually improve undergraduate and graduate programs.
- Comply with the assessment cycle of Georgia College.
- Demonstrates to the college's external accreditation agencies, AACSB, ABET, and SACS, that students in every program are achieving program-level learning goals.

Undergraduate Programs in the College of Business

The college offers the following undergraduate programs: Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA), BA and BS in Economics, and a BS in Computer Science. There are several different majors within the BBA degree (e.g., marketing, accounting, and management). Undergraduate degrees offered by the college comply with the major area exit exam policy of the university (see Section 3.04.10 of the GCSU Academic Affairs Handbook). The overarching learning goals of each undergraduate program are driven by the mission statement and goals of the college.

Graduate Programs in the College of Business

The college of business offers the following graduate programs:

- Master of Business Administration (MBA)
- Master of Accountancy (MACC)
- Master of Logistics and Supply Chain Management (MLSCM)
- Master of Management Information Systems (MMIS)
- Georgia WebMBA

Mission and Goals of the College of Business

Faculty members in the college build on the foundation of a liberal arts education by creating undergraduate learning outcomes relating to the study of organizations and commerce. Graduate students come into the college from a variety of backgrounds to participate in general management (i.e., MBA, WebMBA) and specialized (i.e., MMIS, MLSCM, and MACC) masters programs. Each of these programs is driven by the mission of the college. The college faculty ratified the new mission and strategic objectives on March 11, 2016.

The mission of the J. Whitney Bunting College of Business is to develop business professionals who embrace intellectual inquiry through critical and analytical thinking, quantitative reasoning, and effective communication, while building upon the attributes of a liberal arts education.

Implications of the Mission

The faculty of the J. Whitney Bunting College of Business defines a liberal arts education as an ethos that develops capable intellectual processes beyond vocational skills. Our student-faculty interactions foster attributes such as openness to inquiry and discovery, considering difficult questions, and re-assessing one's position based on fact. These attributes are embedded across the curriculum. Our goal is to prepare students to compete by developing their intellectual processes. We teach our students to effectively think, communicate, and analyze within a global context.

Guiding Values: We value the following hallmarks of a Georgia College liberal arts education: Respect for others, Open and transparent communication, Ethical behavior, Diversity and inclusiveness, Social responsibility.

College-Wide Objectives, Assessment Measures, and Outcomes

To support the mission of the university and the college, the faculty and staff of the College of Business at Georgia College, in partnership with constituencies such as our advisory board, alumni, and university advancement, will

Objective One: Enhance the quality of the College's academic programs and the learning experience of our students.

1. Leverage the University's liberal arts foundation as measured by assurance of learning in developing students' analytical and communication skills, understanding of diversity, global and cross-cultural awareness, and ethical behavior.
2. Review the business core, undergraduate majors, and graduate programs based on assessment outcomes and changing market forces.
3. Enhance student engagement in professional development, career preparation, and leadership.
4. Enhance feedback on performance of academic programs through alumni, employer, and student placement surveys.

Objective Two: Enhance the local, state, national, and international visibility of the College's quality programs, student successes, and faculty and staff achievements.

1. Use of the College of Business website, social media, and "Make Your Next Move" online graduate programs platform.
2. Use of Georgia College print and electronic publications.

Objective Three: Enhance resource generation and operational efficiency to support programmatic needs.

1. Develop a culture of philanthropy and resource generation to support programmatic needs and diversify revenue streams.
2. Fiscal stewardship in the alignment of resources to fulfill the College's mission.

Objective Four: Enhance engagement with and impact of with various stakeholders through alumni relations, advisory boards, community partnerships, and outreach efforts.

1. Enhance engagement and outreach activities throughout the College.
2. Enhance relations with alumni, donors, and friends of the College.
3. Improve visibility of outreach from the Centers in the College of Business.

Objective Five: Enhance faculty and staff development and recognition.

1. Monitor faculty (tenure-track, non-tenure track, and adjunct) recruitment, retention, development, and support to ensure high academic standards and rigorous instruction.
2. Be purposeful regarding staff professional development.
3. Create faculty and staff recognition activities in support of the teaching, research, and service mission of the College.

Objective One is the one that may be measured by assessing program goals through student learning outcomes. The details for objective one are located in Compliance Assist, and summary information is presented in this report. Academic year 16-17 is the first year with these strategic objectives.

Assurance of Learning Outcomes for the BBA Program – 2016/2017

The student learning goals are taken directly from the college's objectives, but they are written as assessable student learning goals. At the completion of the BBA degree, the student will:

1. Identify and evaluate ethical issues and their resolution
2. Evaluate the effect of globalization and cross-culturalism in a business environment
3. Apply appropriate analytical techniques in business environments

4. Communicate effectively through written and oral media
5. Demonstrate basic functional abilities across core business subjects¹

All BBA students must obtain common business knowledge (CBK) through the common business core courses that all BBA students take. The student learning goals for the CBK are given below with the assessment results.

BBA Objective 1: Identify and evaluate ethical issues and their resolution.

Student learning outcomes related to ethics from LENB 3135 Legal Environment of Business were used to assess this objective. Complete details are available in Compliance Assist, but in general, students were correctly able to identify and evaluate ethical issues. In LENB 3135 in spring 16, only 82% met or exceeded expectations. The ethics assignment changed in spring 16 to require additional independent research. The lower score reflects this change. This assessment was repeated in 16-17 to see if the lower achievement level was appropriate for the new, more challenging assignment. 87% of the students achieved expectations in 16-17. This exceeded the target rate of 85%. This class will not be used in 17-18. This learning outcome will be assessed differently in BUAD 2172 Business Ethics and CBIS 2220 Principles of Information Systems.

While the numbers are too small to be a representative sample of all BBA students, cases of recognizing and knowing how to handle ethical situations are reported in the internship reports completed by students taking for-credit internships. The department chairs review these reports as they are completed, and the students who recognize ethical dilemmas appear to be handling them appropriately.

BBA Objective 2: Evaluate the effect of globalization and cross-culturalism in a business environment.

This objective was not assessed in 16-17. It will be assessed in BUAD 2172 Business Ethics and BCOM 4283 Global and Intercultural Business Communication in 17-18.

BBA Objective 3: Apply appropriate analytical techniques in business environments

This was the third time that this course (ACCT 2101) was used for this assessment. The target level was 75% and only 50% met the target. As accounting is typically an area on the ETS exam that is lower than other areas, this is not surprising. An interactive classroom tool was employed to illustrate these concepts in 16-17. There was a smaller sample size in 16-17 (64 compared to 142 the year before), and this could have contributed to the lower percentages. More review before the exam will be incorporated next year. This assessment will be repeated again next year.

FINC 3131, a junior/senior level class for all business majors, has been used to assess analytical techniques since 13-14. In 16-17, 82.53% of students met expectations compared to 84.25% in 15-16. This assessment is scheduled again in 17-18.

BBA Objective 4: Communicate effectively through written and oral media

BCOM 2285, an Area F course for business majors, was used to assess written skills. 92% of students met or exceeded expectations in 16-17 while 82% exceeded expectations. This exceeded the target rate of 80%. The students can write properly when pushed to do so. This assessment will be continued next year while using a different text book.

MGMT 4195, the senior capstone class for all business majors, was used to assess oral skills through the final presentations. In 15-16, the target was 85%, and 83% or more met the target on all but one item: avoided excessive note reading and "back-to-the-audience" reading of the presentation screen. In 16-17, 83% met the target on all except two items. In addition to the one last year (67% met on avoided excessive note reading and "back-to-the-audience" reading of the presentation screen), 50% had issues with avoiding slang expressions, inappropriate language, and the use of fillers. It was fillers that gave most of these students problems. We will continue to assess with these items. Next year, we will add

¹ Previously, these student learning goals were numbered 1.1, 1.2, 2.1.2.2, and 2.3. They are now numbered 1-5.

assessment of the Elevator Pitch competition in MKTG 3161 to additionally assess oral communication skills.

BBA Objective 2.3: Demonstrate basic functional abilities across core business subjects

Because this goal covers a large area of knowledge, two courses taken by all business majors was assessed in addition to using the ETS exam as an overall assessment.

2.3.3135 discuss the laws that relate to contracts, including the UCC.

2.3.3161 identify key marketing concepts and apply them to real-world business problems.

LENB 3135 was used to assess how well students could discuss the laws that relate to contracts, including the UCC. In 15-16, fall semester was 74% and spring semester was 72%. In 16-17, it dropped to 66%. The professor completing this assessment left so this specific assessment can no longer be completed. Therefore, the undergraduate curriculum committee discussed this and decided that this assessment was no longer needed. This student learning outcome will not be assessed in 17-18.

MKTG 3161 was used to assess how well students identify key marketing concepts and apply them to real-world business problems. In 15-16, the target of 80% was met, and in 16-17, it was again met. The undergraduate curriculum committee discussed this and decided that this assessment was no longer needed. This student learning outcome will not be assessed in 17-18.

The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee decided that only the ETS will be used in the future to assess core business knowledge so the LENB 3135 and MKTG 3161 assessments will not be repeated next year.

The assessment of student knowledge of core business concepts (including accounting, finance, creation and marketing of value, organizational behavior, global & domestic economic environments) is demonstrated by completion of a normed test (ETS).

The goal is the student average for each area to be at the 50th percentile of greater. In 15-16, the 50th percentile was achieved in every area except finance (34th percentile) so the goal of 50th percentile in each area was almost met. The highest area was management (90th percentile). In 16-17, all areas were again met except finance (36%) The undergraduate curriculum committee discussed the fact that we do not have a major in finance, while most colleges do, which contributes to the lower average in this area. The highest area this year was quantitative business analysis (93%) followed by marketing (92%). The ETS will continue to be used as an overall assessment of the areas of business knowledge.

ETS MAJOR FIELD TEST, MGMT 4195, Summer & Fall 16, Spring 17

	<u>GC</u>
Number of students tested	255
Range of individual scale scores	135–184
Individual scale score mean	156
National mean	151.8
Range of individual percentile scores	2% - 98%, more or less

Assessment Indicator Title	GC Mean Percent Correct	GC Percentile	National Institutional Means
Accounting	47	74	43.2
Economics	44	68	40.6
Management	70	87	61.5
Quantitative Business Analysis	43	93	34.0
Finance	42	36	43.3
Marketing	59	92	50.2

Legal and Social Environment	49	62	46.8
Information Systems	53	54	51.5
International Issues	45	83	40.0

Assurance of Learning Outcomes for the Majors

Complete assessment information for every major is located in Compliance Assist. Summary information is provided in this document. ***The summaries for each program were written by each program's assessment coordinator and are located in Compliance Assist as well.***

BA & BS Programs in Economics

The BS/BA degree programs with a major in Economics are designed to develop students that have the capacity to think critically, reflectively, and flexibly so as to be successful in a variety of business/government sector fields or to pursue graduate/professional studies in economics, business, or law.

Economics Program Goal 1.1: *Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge of global economic issues.*

Assessment showed that student performance did not meet expectations during AY 2016-17. This was due to a change in the content area of the "international issues" component of the ETS economics exam. This year's more equal weighting between international trade and international finance questions on the exam caused our students to score lower relative to the performance displayed by students in the past. Their below par performance is due to the fact that an international finance course is not part of the required economics curriculum while international trade is required. Given that our students performed well on the international trade questions, existing teaching methods will continue for AY 2017-18 and an evaluation of continuing to use this assessment tool going forward will be undertaken.

Economics Program Goal 2.1.1: *Students will be able to demonstrate analytical reasoning through applications of micro-economic principles.*

Assessment for AY 2016-17 found that seventy-nine percent (79.3%) of students met or exceeded student analytical reasoning performance (desired achievement level is 75% overall competency—meets or surpasses expectations). This shows a significant increase over last year's 70.1% and student performance has improved consistently for the past few years. To promote continuing success in this area, actions previously undertaken will remain in effect for academic year 2018: supplemental online assignments designed specifically to develop student analytical skills, weekly practice quizzes that contain questions that require analytical thinking skills, and stricter attendance policies to hopefully expose more students to analytical techniques that are taught during classes.

Economics Program Goal 2.1.2: *Students will be able to produce written assignments that demonstrate the ability to think critically, reflectively, and flexibly while analyzing real-world economic events.*

For AY 2016-17, students performed marginally below expectations in five of the six traits assessed. The trait assessed that met expectations was an "identifiable question to be answered" while the rest of the assessed traits "analysis of topic", "usage of data", "ability to draw reasoned conclusions", "application of economic terms", and "application of economic concepts and theories" were judged by department faculty to be slightly below expectations. The student papers reviewed this year showed continued improvement on the technical/analytical aspects of their research papers, especially in their "analysis of the topic" and an "identifiable question to be answered." As has been true in previous years, students are not sufficiently grounding and building their senior thesis on a foundation of sound economic theory. To improve student performance in these areas economics instructors now provide more examples in class that show how to use economic theory to motivate and guide research. Because these efforts have improved performance in recent years, we plan to maintain the same strategies for AY 2017-18.

Economics Program Goal 2.2.1: *Students will be able to produce written research assignments that demonstrate the ability to organize a research paper.*

For AY 2016-17 students performed slightly below expectations on all three traits evaluated (acceptable format, correct spelling and grammar, and acceptable citations and bibliography). Actions implemented

in previous years to help with these skills have led to improvements based on previous assessment results. Therefore, modifications implemented initially in academic year 2013 will be maintained for AY 2018 along with peer review of paper drafts during senior seminar (ECON 4990). (Note, it is the viewpoint of review committee members that grading of papers has become more rigorous over the years. So while this year's assessment finds student performance to be below expectations, the same performance in earlier assessment cycles would have likely met expectations.)

Economics Program Goal 2.3.1: *Students will demonstrate comprehension of micro- and macro-economic principles.*

AY 2016-17 assessment results again show very good overall student performance in the areas evaluated. Students continue to perform very well on the "total- and micro-economics" components of the ETS exam. However, performance on the "macro-economics" component of the exam declined slightly this year to the 48th percentile. For AY 2017-18 macroeconomics topic review sessions will be continued as part of the Senior Seminar class (ECON 4990) in an effort to maintain student performance above the 50th percentile. Additionally, department faculty will regularly examine the general content of the macroeconomics portion of the ETS exam to ensure that review sessions contain relevant information for students taking the exam. (Note: the Georgia College economics program is microeconomics focused and the economics curriculum requires only two courses in macroeconomics – principles and intermediate. For most students, the macro courses are completed during the fall semester of their junior year while ETS testing is taken during the spring of their senior year.)

BS Program in Computer Science (CS)

The BS in Computer Science provides students with an understanding of the key principles and practices of computing and the underlying mathematical and scientific principles. It also provides students with the knowledge, skills, and experiences that enable them to enter the workforce in various fields of computer science and information technology or to pursue graduate studies in computer science.

We assessed Goals 2, and 4. Each program goal has two principal indicators:

Goal 2: An ability to apply design and development principles in the construction of software systems.

PI 1: Students will be able to recognize design and development principles.

CSCI4320, Software Engineering is used to assess PI 1. Eight Multiple Choice questions on Final Exam related to Design Patterns are assessed based on the goal. The desired standard of achievement is that 80% of the students should solve the question correctly. However, the outcome has not been met. There were 8 questions and 14 students were in the class. 80% of 14 students is 11.2. Only 3/8 (37.5%) questions were solved correctly by more than 11 students. 6/8 (75%) of questions were solved correctly by at least 11 students. In the coming semester, additional exercises will be added.

PI 2: Students will be able to implement the designed solution for a given problem

CSCI 3410 is selected to assess the PI 2. This outcome was assessed through a given assignment that provides a design and asks students to implement it. In this particular, the students were asked to implement a doubly linked list with a specific API. The desired standard of achievement is that 60% of the students earn a passing grade. The outcome has been met. For a total of 25 students in two sections of CSCI 3410 during spring 2017, 16 earned at least a passing grade. That is 64%, exceeding the assessment goal of 60%.

Goal 4: An understanding of professional, ethical, legal, security and social issues and responsibilities

PI 1: Students will be able to identify professional, ethical, legal, security, and social issues.

CSCI2800 is selected to assess PI 1. Students will be able to identify professional, ethical, legal, security, and social responsibility. Questions from Chapter 5 are used for assessment.

Desired Standard of Achievement is that 90% of students can correctly answer 90% of the questions. All students actually scored above 90. This outcome was met. There are nineteen students in the class. All of them correctly answers 90% of the questions. Overall, students did quite well for chapter 5. We will continue to evaluate the other aspects of the student outcome.

PI 2. An understanding of professional, ethical, legal, security, and social issues and responsibilities.

CSCI 3343: Computer Security was chosen to assess this goal. Students were asked a multiple choice question about the legal environment related to constitutional law and disk encryption. Desired Standard of Achievement 75% of students should answer question correctly. Result: 87% (13/15) answered the question correctly (Maybe). The expectation of 75% was reached. We will assess more than one multiple choice question next time.

Overall Goal: Students will demonstrate the knowledge of the principles of computer science.

Exit Exam is used to assess this goal. This goal was assessed using the National ETS Exam. Students took the ETS as part of CSCI 4320 – Software Engineering. In 16-17, our average was 150 while the national average was 149. The computer science faculty discussed the results. One student failed the exam and had to retake it. He was told to study again and had to pay for the second test. (Score of 128 was brought up to 142). Students scored low on some algorithm questions. We recently changed the textbook – we used to overlap material in Data Structure, Algorithms and Discrete structures. The new book may alleviate this. It is recommended that the students should take the exam later in the semester. (After the meeting: Testing Center was contacted and agreed to offer the exam the 1st week in November instead of in Sept/Oct). We will continue to use the ETS test.

BBA Programs

Accounting Major

Program Goal 1

Students will be able to demonstrate competency in the technical accounting knowledge necessary to produce, analyze, and communicate financial information for both internal and external users.

Assessments of this program goal started in FY14 in ACCT 3101 and included a sample size of approximately 60 students with only approximately 50-55% of students meeting expectations. The desired standard of achievement determined by the accounting faculty was 70% of students would score 70% or higher on an accounting topic problem given on an exam during the course. The problem used in the assessment has been consistent each year and contains a question about treatment of bonds. In FY15 improvements were made in assessment results by instructors reviewing bond problems in class. Unfortunately the desired standard of achievement was still not met that year with only 65% of students meeting the desired standard of achievement. In FY16 the faculty decided to adopt a new textbook from Pearson Publishing that includes a homework software program. Students seem to like these types of programs because they allow for repeat practice of homework problems. A tutoring program was also implemented. This program included meeting twice per week with an additional instructor with special sessions before exams. Attendance was voluntary, but highly suggested. FY16 assessment results met the desired standard of achievement with 75% of students assessed meeting expectations. Because that was the first year of assessment results meeting expectation, the faculty decided to continue to assess this program goal in FY17 in the ACCT 3101 course with the same bond problem. While the results for FY17 were a little lower than FY16, (71% of students met expectations) the faculty felt that results were not statistically significant because of the small number of students assessed each year. Because of these results, this program goal will be assessed using a student learning outcome from another course in FY18.

Program Goal 2

Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge of the functional areas of business and how they relate to each other.

This program goal has been assessed during MGMT 4195 with the ETS exam. The desired standard of achievement for accounting majors is to score 80% or higher in the area of accounting and 50% or higher on all other sections of the exam. This expectation was met in FY15 and FY16. The results of the ETS exam for FY17 are expected to be similar to past year's results, but are currently unavailable.

Area	AY11	AY12	AY13	AY14	AY15	AY16
------	------	------	------	------	------	------

Accounting	97	99	99	98	97	99
Economics	85	63	77	88	92	97
Management	90	88	99	92	89	87
Quantitative Business Analysis	72	41	50	95	82	99
Finance	88	69	90	81	79	71
Marketing	95	89	94	86	61	83
Legal and Social Environment	96	95	97	88	95	94
Information Systems	92	95	95	94	97	66
International Issues	90	81	98	86	89	93
Overall	89	80	89	90	87	76

Program Goal 3

Students will be able to identify, formulate, and solve business problems using appropriate methodologies and tools.

For FY16 ACCT 3106, Accounting Information Systems, was assessed with an accounting cycle problem given to students as a final exam in the course. The desired standard of achievement was determined to be 80% of students completing the accounting cycle problem with a score of 80% or higher.

Students were tasked with taking unstructured accounting information from a hypothetical business enterprise and entering this data into an accounting software package and produce the financial statements for a period of time.

Even though the desired standard of achievement was met for FY16, it was decided to assess this program goal again in FY17. Unfortunately the faculty member teaching this course left the university before reporting FY17 assessment results. The faculty will discuss assessing this program goal again with a similar assignment in FY18.

Program Goal 4

Students will be able to recognize and respond appropriately to ethical dilemmas.

In FY14 this program goal was assessed in the business ethics course BAUD 2172 with 46 accounting majors. The desired standard of achievement that 75% of students assessed would score 80% or higher on a free response assignment was met. The results showed that 86% of assessed students met expectations. This program goal was not assessed since FY14 because the percentage of students meeting expectations was so high and a similar program goal is assessed in the CBK.

Program Goal 5

Students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of global business issues.

In FY14 this program goal was assessed in the business ethics course BAUD 2172 with 46 accounting majors. The desired standard of achievement that 75% of students assessed would score 80% or higher on a free response assignment was met. Results showed that 89% of assessed students met expectations. This program goal was not assessed since FY14 because the percentage of students meeting expectations was so high and a similar program goal is assessed in the CBK.

Program Goal 6

Students will be able to communicate effectively.

This program goal has been assessed in ACCT 4135 in past years. During FY12 and FY13 the instructor assessed this goal with a written memo assignment using the college of business rubric. The results showed 81% - 91% of assessed students met expectations. Because of those results, the faculty decided to assess this program goal using an oral communication assignment using the college of business rubric in FY14 and FY15. Only 45% of assessed students met expectations in all areas of the CoB rubric during FY14. Areas of concern included: lack of eye contact, excessive note reading, and the use of slang expressions. Because of these results this course was again assessed in FY15 with the instructor focusing on these skills with smaller oral assignments before the assessed oral presentation. The FY15 results met faculty expectations in all areas of the CoB rubric with the most problematic area still being the use of slang expressions and inappropriate language. Since this program goal has been assessed for

several years and faculty expectations have been met, the department did not assess this goal in FY17. The faculty will discuss assessing this program goal again with a written memo assignment in FY18.

Program Goal 7

Students will be able to enter the accounting profession in a wide range of careers.

This program goal was assessed for the first time in FY14 with a survey of seniors during their last semester. The desired standard of achievement for this goal is 50% of students actively seeking employment receive interviews or offers of employment before graduation. Because the faculty wanted to improve student's interview skills and employment opportunities, a professionalism course was added to the curriculum in FY14. The course targeted sophomores and was designed to give students the opportunity to practice job search and networking skills through the development of a job search portfolio. Since the course was implemented in FY14 results have improved. In FY15 61% of students seeking employment had attended interviews, received a job offer or had accepted a job offer. These results have continued to improve with this year, FY17, reporting 80% of students seeking employment meeting expectations of attending interviews, receiving job offers or accepting job offers. We will continue to assess this program goal in FY18.

Program Goal 8

Students will be able to enter graduate school.

This program goal was assessed for the first time in FY14 with a survey of seniors during their last semester. The desired standard of achievement for this goal was 50% of BBA graduates would enter graduate school after graduation. Usually results of the survey reports 60-65% of graduating students are accepted to a graduate school programs. FY16 results were lower than expected but appear to be an anomaly, as the results for FY17 are again consistent with past survey reports at 64% of graduating students reporting acceptance to a graduate school program. We will continue to assess this program goal in FY18.

Management Major

The assessment results in FY16 led program faculty to discuss and develop new program objectives to be assessed. We now have six program objectives. We assessed three of them in FY17.

Management Program Objective 1: Students will demonstrate a general understanding of business analytics.

Student Learning Outcome 1.1: Students will develop an understanding of business analytics process. The assessment results in FY16 led program faculty to develop this new learning outcome. Students' knowledge of business analytics process was assessed with seven course embedded exam questions. Four of the seven questions were above the 70% standard, ranging from 74% to 97%. The other three questions were below the 70% standard. Management students who did not meet expectations had access to additional problems. We plan to assess this student learning outcome again in FY18. The instructor will go back to the textbook used previously. Methods from earlier modules will also be reemphasized prior to exam.

Student Learning Outcome 1.2: Students will demonstrate an understanding of business analytics. We used the FY17 ETS reports to assess this student learning outcome. The ETS results show that our percentage correct exceeded the national average for 86% of the 14 individual exam items in the business analytics category, which exceeded the 50% standard. Because it is a new student learning outcome we assessed for the first time, longitudinal data need to be obtained to ensure enough students have understood the concepts. We will continue to use it to monitor student performance in FY18.

Management Program Objective 2: Students will demonstrate a general understanding of organizational behavior principles.

Student Learning Outcome 2.1: Students will demonstrate a general understanding of job attitudes and values.

The assessment results in FY16 led program faculty to use a new measurement to assess this student learning outcome and add additional chapter quizzes between exams. In FY17 students' knowledge of

job attitudes and values was assessed with course embedded exam questions. Results from answers to eight questions on the student exam covering an understanding of job attitudes and values show that the measures were met at the 74% level, which exceeded the standard of 70% correct on the measures. Management students who did not meet expectations had access to additional problems. Because it is a new management program objective, we will continue to assess this learning outcome to monitor student performance longitudinally. We will add/revise the assessment questions and assess this student learning outcome again in FY18 to establish trends.

Student Learning Outcome 2.2: Students will demonstrate an understanding of organizational behavior. We used the FY17 ETS reports to assess this student learning outcome. The ETS results show that our percentage correct exceeded the national average for 100% of the seven individual exam items in the organizational behavior category, which exceeded the 50% standard. The student learning outcome was met. Because it is our first time to assess this important student learning outcome in the Management program, we will continue to use this measurement to monitor student performance in FY18 to obtain longitudinal data.

Management Program Objective 3: Students will demonstrate a general understanding of human resource management principles.

Student Learning Outcome 3.1: Students will understand the laws that govern employment in the United States.

The results in FY16 led program faculty to update assessment questions and assess this student learning outcome again. In FY17, students' understanding of the laws that govern employment in the U.S. was assessed with the pretest vs. posttest method. The department reviewed the standard as set by the assessors and deemed 70% improvement from pretest to posttest to be reasonable for benchmarking purposes. The assessment results show that there was a 332% increase from pre-test to post-test, which exceeded the standard of 70% increase. There was 88% correct on post-test. This clearly indicates increased knowledge and understanding of the topic. We have assessed employment laws two years in a row and they both exceeded the expectations. We thus plan to assess a new learning outcome in FY18.

Student Learning Outcome 3.2: Students will understand the underlying principles and administration of a performance appraisal system.

It was the first time we assessed students' understanding of a performance appraisal system. This new learning outcome was assessed with the pretest vs. posttest method. The assessment results show that there was a 289% improvement from pretest to posttest, which exceeded the standard of 70% improvement. There was 78% correct on post-test. Because it is an important learning outcome that we assessed for the first time in the management program, we will continue to use it to monitor student performance longitudinally. We will revise assessment questions and assess this new student learning outcome again in FY18 to establish trends.

Management Information Systems (MIS) Major

Last year we did not propose implementing any changes or modifications to two of the courses assessed. We did however assess these courses this year. This year, we made sure to recommend changes or modifications as to align with the assessment efforts at the university level.

Here are our three goals:

1. MIS students will be able to determine requirements a business information system.
2. MIS students will be able to design and create a well-designed, database driven web site.
3. MIS students will be able to design, implement, and maintain information technology infrastructure.

Student Outcome 1.3210 - Students will be able to: analyze business processes and procedures and develop solutions using modeling techniques.

Last year we discussed moving this course to the junior year instead of senior year. This course used to be CBIS 4212. We did implement the changes. The course is now CBIS 3210. We also assessed this course over three classes (two sections in fall semester 2016 and one section in spring 2017) using three homework assignments and one exam. The three homework assignments included two DFD homework assignments and one ERD homework assignment. The exam used was the second exam which deals with modeling. Yes, there was an impact. 84% of the students met or exceeded expectations. The outcome was not met but it is close to reach the 85% of the outcome. Following those results, we plan on providing an additional class session on modeling during the course of the semester.

Student Outcome 2.3214 - Students will be able to: use structured query language to retrieve, edit and store information to a database.

Last year we discussed changing the textbook and allowing students more time with the instructor on specific SQL issues within the application. We did implement the changes. The course now uses an interactive textbook and faculty are teaching with the “flipped” classroom teaching method. We did see an impact with this change. Students were assessed with specific SQL assignment. 100% of the students met the target of a 70% or better (only 3 of the students were in the 70s). We will continue to monitor the new approach to see if the teaching methods and textbook (software) help the students achieve the desired outcome.

Student Outcome 2.4210 - Students will be able to: demonstrate the fundamentals of programming structures.

No changes were proposed last year to this course. We did however continue to assess this course. The assessment was given as part of the final exam which required the students to program a decision and iteration control structure. Only 11 of 35 students met or exceeded expectations and 24 of 35 needed improvement. The question not only included both decision and iteration control structures, but it also included arrays. Many students may have understood control structures but did not do well on the question because of the arrays. Arrays are covered last in the class, and students do not get enough time to become completely familiar with them. Next time a question needs to be used that includes both control structures but not arrays too.

Student Outcome 3.3213 - Students will be able to: demonstrate a working knowledge of networking media, protocols and hardware.

No changes were proposed last year to this course. However, this year we did a different assessment on the students. Students were given an assessment questionnaire consisting of 15 questions. Questions were specific to protocols, network media and difference in networking hardware. Only 2 of 45 students had perfect scores. 29 of 45 met the 70% or better.

Since we combined three courses (hardware, networking, and system administration) we have not been able to find an adequate textbook or resources for the course. However, we have contacted publishers and will create a custom book so students will have a more formal method of studying for assignments and exams. Currently students are given resources to go over from video sources like Lynda.

Marketing Major

To set the table for where we've been, where we are, and where we're going it's helpful to review our mission. As noted in our FY17 report we strive to stress the impact of modern marketing on business. To do that we give students real world opportunities that enrich their learning experiences, and as I believe we can show here, improve their learning outcomes. This direct involvement is seen in the level of interaction that our students have with our faculty, and also with the projects that are an important part of most marketing courses. These basic fundamentals tie back to the College level mission of creating business professionals who have student-faculty interactions that enhance students' learning and stress quantitative reasoning and communication skills. These, of course, tie back to the core University

foundation of deepening students learning and understanding through engaged, student centered programs that extend beyond the classroom.

Overall performance - There have been four assessment items that the major has considered over the past several years. In the FY14 cycle we met all of our objectives and really felt that our students were demonstrating functional skill in the tested areas. In FY14 we proposed changes so FY15 would be honed down to the four key areas we considered foundational and having met all of our goals really revisited whether they were challenging enough. In FY15, with that revised set the discipline did not meet for mastery of the topic, nor were they able to meet our goal for effective communications. At the time we were not sure if it was a blip in the data or a matter of tightening our standards or an indication of the program needing improvement. To address it we increased emphasis on communication skills throughout our program, with a particular emphasis on additional communication requirements for the capstone, and we stressed, both in our foundational Principles course, and in its subsequent courses, those key marketing fundamentals. In FY16 there was improvement, but it wasn't clear that our changes had fully impacted what we were hoping to accomplish. However, students do stay in major courses for several years, so we also realized that it might take until this cycle to fully see the results of those changes. As we continued we also looked for ways to improve upon these goals, particularly the communications goal because of the importance of effective communication skills to success in this business area.

Ethics – The outcome we're seeing for Ethics has been a strong area for the department and one of the things we've consistently seen from year to year is an above expectation performance in this item and continues to be a good indication that we are achieving this goal. This is something we stress in every class and despite having done well in this metric, both historically and in this cycle, we continue to push to emphasize how critical this is to the discipline. It is stressed not just in the course where we measure it, but in every aspect of our program.

Cross-cultural marketing – While cross-cultural marketing continues to be stressed in most classes within the major, during the FY17 cycle the International Marketing class, the natural home course for assessment of this metric, which had been coming back positively for the discipline, changed to an only online presentation. When that happened one of the things we found was that the numbers coming back on assessment metrics were more a function of students completing the online assignments because in an International class, given the material that was covered, the students who completed it were successful in conveying the international nature of the discipline. Which is to say that it became more a measure of whether someone DID the assignment because the people who did met that expectation. At that point the Marketing faculty agreed to pull this assessment item. That is why it is not measured in this cycle and why this goal will not be reported in FY18. We continue to be confident we are conveying this knowledge and continue to stress it throughout the major.

Effective communications – This crucial goal is indicated by the outcome of the metric measured in our capstone course by means of an independently judged individual elevator pitch. In FY15 we were at only the 70% of expectation level. Through stressing the importance of presentation in all upper level major classes, and stressing the importance of the elevator pitch starting in our Principles classes, we ramped up both the emphasis and training we have been providing on this item. In FY16 we just cleared the 80% threshold with 81%. In FY17 our results have come back at 86% with breakouts each of the two semesters measured above the 80% threshold (all marketing majors are assessed on this item).

Broad mastery of the discipline – The goal of discipline mastery is overarching. Determining appropriate ways to measure outcomes for that goal are where the assessment team is really focused right now. Several years ago we were meeting expectation, but this year our reporting measures for the ETS exam weren't given in a way that we can map directly back to our goal. Because the reporting has changed, we as an assessment team, have taken the new data and both looked at it to get a clear idea of whether we are going in the right direction, and we are using the reporting as guidance for crafting a goal for the FY18 cycle that adequately takes the data and gives us both an quantitative means of assessing our performance, as well as clear guidance toward areas that we need to improve upon or give greater stress to within our courses. At this point the team is looking at the ETS individual subject breakout scores. Our

majors performed above the national average in 12 of the 15 marketing breakout categories and the team examined the ones at which we're really exceeding, as well as the ones where we are just exceeding, as well as the ones in which we are below national average. Despite not having data in a goal measurable fashion one of the things we've already learned from this analysis is that we would benefit by putting greater emphasize on Services Marketing. The team also believes that part of the reason for our performance in that area is that we were down two faculty and have recently taken on a new member that will allow us to offer Services Marketing in our course rotation again. Another area that came up was Organizational Marketing. There are other programs that have this as their focus, but that isn't really where our major lives. This is one that as a department we don't feel we should move our program just to meet a metric. We will continue to stress B2B marketing when it's appropriate, but we aren't fundamentally changing the way we address this area. The last item was Strategic Planning. While we were below the average it was by 2% (we were typically above by 5%-10% or more). Strategic Planning is a key area in a number of courses. Professors have been made aware of the need to continue our focus, and reemphasize it where we have the opportunity, but at only a 2% off difference this may merely be a blip in the data. We will, of course, be following that in FY18 as we revise and revisit this goal.

To summarize (the summary) we had two goals not only strongly meet expectation, but really show traction in solidly indicating that we're conveying the knowledge we want students to have and that the changes we've undertaken to improve those metrics has done what we hoped it would. We dropped one assessment item from our FY18 reporting because the course we were evaluating it in changed enough that we felt it wasn't measuring what it needed to measure to be part of our assessment planning. And lastly, our overall measure changed, so as a team we're looking at both the reporting that we've got and informing our class knowledge with that, and coming up with a metric for FY18 that will examine that data in a way we can use consistently going forward. The richness of the ETS and the category specific data that we're obtaining really appear to be able to inform us well going forward. This was an extremely positive year, which was up from FY16 which was up from FY15, and in which we have a clear focus of where as a faculty we want the program to be going forward. We are using the outcomes we've gotten from this year as an additional way to inform potential changes in the foundational structure of our major, so our assessments aren't only looking at the outcomes and goals we have, but we are also using this data as we assess our overall course requirements and offerings.

This year, even more than in previous years, we really aren't closing the loop so much as spiraling up. This year went better than last, which went better than the year before that. We are looking at the data from this year in order to better inform our choices for FY18. In assessment terms the discipline faculty are very satisfied that the assessment process is informing and shaping our actions in the classroom.

Assurance of Learning Outcomes for Graduate Programs

Master of Business Administration Programs

The part-time MBA is being eliminated. It is being taught out in Warner Robins, but it will cease to exist soon. The online WebMBA will be the only MBA offered by Georgia College. Due to this, fewer classes with typical class sizes of less than 10 are being offered as the final students complete the degree. Many part-time faculty are actually teaching the courses that are offered. Therefore, assessment data is difficult to obtain and virtually meaningless. Even the ETS exam was not given after spring 16. Therefore, there is nothing to report because no assessments were carried out in 16-17.

Georgia WebMBA® Program

The Georgia WebMBA® is a 30 semester hour program offered by a consortium of six AACSB-accredited Colleges within the state. All courses are taught on-line by graduate faculty. The targeted population is students who have an undergraduate business degree but who need the flexibility offered by an on-line program. Georgia College, Columbus State University, Georgia Southern University, Kennesaw State University, State University of West Georgia, and Valdosta State University offer courses and admit

students who follow a common curriculum. GC currently employs course-level assessment of its WebMBA® offerings, and the WebMBA® program creates its own assessment report. This data is **not** located in Compliance Assist.

Master of Accounting Program

The mission of the Master of Accountancy program is to provide students with quality professional accounting education. The MACC goals are:

1. Students should be able to demonstrate advanced knowledge of accounting theories and practice.
2. Students should be able to critically analyze accounting issues.
3. Students should be able to identify, formulate, and solve business problems using appropriate methodologies and tools.
4. Students should be able to recognize and respond appropriately to ethical and professional dilemmas.
5. Students should be able to demonstrate an understanding of global business issues.
6. Students should be able to communicate effectively.
7. Students should be able to enter the accounting profession in a wide range of careers.

For the academic year 2016-2017, all learning outcomes assessed for the Master of Accountancy program were met. Learning outcomes were assessed using embedded questions, written assignments, and placement rates. Placement of graduates from the MAcc program continues to be highly successful with 100% placed within 90 days of graduation. Assessment of the ethics learning outcome produced similarly positive results.

The one area for concern relates to written communication skills. While the assessment goal was met, the faculty are concerned about the poor writing skills demonstrated by our graduate students. Given that the majority of the students in the MAcc program are Georgia College graduates, we can trace the lack of skill development back to their undergraduate experience. The accounting department has previously assumed that writing skills will be developed in the core curriculum and also in the business core class (Business Communications). Based on the results of this assessment item for the past two years, the faculty are committed to increasing the focus on the development of writing skills within the undergraduate accounting major courses. The assessment plan for AY 2017-2018 will continue to focus on written communication skills and placement rates. Assessment of one or two new goals will also be considered for the coming year.

Master of Logistics and Supply Chain Management Program

Moving into FY2017, the faculty adjusted the assessment goals (from 3 to 4) and desired outcomes to align more clearly with the goals and content of the program. This allowed us to adjust some of the course descriptions to align more specifically with the content and goals of each class, and we gained greater input from each professor that is leading and developing the curriculum for each course. These adjustments allowed us to improve our delivery and assessment of the program curriculum as we adjusted for online delivery and had consistent faculty teaching the courses. We also created a schedule for when we would assess each outcome over the next four years. The schedule is at the bottom of the summary. The following section will provide a summary for each Program Objective and Learning Outcome that was assessed this year.

MLSCM Program Objective 1: Students will demonstrate an ability to identify appropriate management techniques to solve logistics/supply chain problems. In FY 2017, LOGS 6650 and LOGS 6647 assessed outcomes tied to this objective.

Student Learning Outcome 1.3: Students will be able to analyze a common supply chain-purchasing problem and determine the appropriate strategy

In LOGS 6650, the outcome was assessed through a project assignment; individual assessment based on peer assessment of group participation and was graded by rubric. The goal was that 80% of students should meet expectations. Results demonstrate that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations, however, there was room for improvement.

During the process some students were confused on the project. It is designed to be open ended, requiring dialogue between the team members as well as the faculty. This did change, but not without too much effort and distress. Students were unclear of the project and coming up with a coherent strategy.

To change in the future, three things have been done. First, the syllabus is much clearer and provides additional guidance as to successfully completing the assignment. Second, the deadline for picking a topic and submitting it for approval has been moved in 3-4 weeks. This will give them more time to work on the project. Finally, I plan on completing WebEx sessions with each team to discuss their project a few weeks after the topic has been approved.

Student Learning Outcome 1.4: Students will be able to assess real world organizational logistics strengths and weaknesses via case study methodology.

In LOGS 6647, the outcome was assessed through each student will critically analyzing case studies that build over the course of the semester into a comprehensive case study at the end. The students turned in a written analysis of each case, which was graded according to a rubric that measures that ability of the student to develop a comprehensive analysis of the case. The goal was that 80% of students should meet expectations. Results demonstrate that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations and as such, the method of assessment will continue as it currently stands.

MLSCM Program Objective 2: Students will demonstrate an understanding of analytics and an ability to use quantitative management techniques to solve logistics/supply chain problems. In FY 17, LOGS 6654 and LOGS 6649 assessed the outcomes tied to this objective.

Student Learning Outcome 2.1: Students will be able to analyze a common supply chain inventory management problem.

This outcome was assessed in LOGS 6654 with an individual case analysis which involves the calculation of EOQ, associated inputs, and an evaluation of the implementation of various inventory management processes, and graded with rubric. The goal was that 80% of students should meet expectations. The results show that one class met the expectations and a second class did not meet expectations. The results demonstrate that in a more recent semester at least 80% of the students understood how to calculate EOQ, identify the correct associated inputs and evaluate the benefit of this type of inventory model compared to others for a real world situation. In an earlier semester, the results demonstrate that less than 80% of students understood how to do a full inventory analysis as called for by the assignment.

The case study process allows students to take information regarding a real world situation and apply their own analysis on the inventory problem. They are asked to act as consultants in this situation and run an analysis on EOQ as well as make recommendations to bring costs down in a production/manufacturing environment. While a major portion of this case study involve the application of quantitative techniques in inventory management, the students must also interpret their results to solve the case problem. The results suggest that the method of assessment is working as expected.

From fall 2016 to spring 2017, changes were made within the class to better prepare students to conduct the inventory analysis required by the assignment/case study. The results increased from 69% of students meeting expectations to 96% of students meeting expectations. Some of the changes made between fall 2016 and spring 2017 classes included:

Preparation: deliberate discussion of the case study situation was brought up earlier in the semester, make sure a stronger link was articulated between the learning of the technique and how it could apply to future situations

Support: a requirement was instituted to have students check in to discussion during the time they were working on the case study. Before, they were not required to check in which may have resulted in too much time passing before the student realized that they did not have a strong grasp of the materials. The required check-in to discussion forced students to review the case study requirements earlier and address concerns earlier.

Student Learning Outcome 2.3 Students will be able to quantitatively formulate, solve, and interpret mathematical solutions.

In FY2016 this outcome was assessed with course embedded exam questions. The desired standard of achievement was that 80% of students should meet expectations. The results demonstrate that 84% of the students who took the exam understood how to use the analytical and mathematical concepts to solve the problems given to them. Right now, it seems that the current methods of teaching and assessment are successful according to the data. However, since the outcome of successful students was 84%, that still leaves room for improvement. Curiously, the class performed worse on the two easiest questions, identifying the name of the method and the coefficient of determination. The other questions, which require applying the model to a management decision showed much better results. Since this is the first time I have assessed the regression problem, I believe we should use these results as a benchmark and look to evaluate them for both courses next year. In light of this, there will be minimal changes in the course and assessment format.

MLSCM Program Objective 3: Students will demonstrate a general understanding of business logistics and supply chain management principles. This objective was assessed in LOGS 6650 and LOGs 6654 in FY 2017.

Student Learning Outcome 3.1: Student will be able to understand the role and impact of purchasing and materials management within the broader context of logistics and supply chain management.

This outcome was assessed in LOGS 6650 through having students work in a group setting to analyze the procurement process within a company to determine which sourcing strategy was chosen. Students analyzed the market to determine opportunities for improvement. Each student was assessed within the group framework for their understanding and ability to communicate their analysis and suggestions for the company to improve. A dual rubric was applied; one by the instructor on the students' comprehensive presentation skills and one that allows the students group peers to evaluate each member. The goal was that 80% of students should meet expectations. Results demonstrate that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations.

However there is room for improvement. During the process some students were confused on the project. It is designed to be open ended, requiring dialogue between the team members as well as the faculty. This did change, but not without too much effort and distress. Students were unclear of the project and coming up with a coherent strategy.

To change in the future, three things have been done. First, the syllabus is much clearer and provides additional guidance as to successfully completing the assignment. Second, the deadline for picking a topic and submitting it for approval has been moved in 3-4 weeks. This will give them more time to work on the project. Finally, WebEx sessions will be scheduled with each team to discuss their project a few weeks after the topic has been approved.

Student Learning Outcome 3.4: Identify core inventory and distribution issues within supply chain management

This outcome was originally scheduled to be assessed in this particular assessment cycle in LOGS 6654. However, after examining the question used to assess the outcome, the instructor realized that the assessment criteria is not properly aligned with the actual outcome and could be more aligned with another program objective. So, the decision was made to move the assessment for 3.4 to FY 19 & 20 to allow the instructor to re-do the class assignments in future terms to incorporate this assessment.

MLSCM Program Objective 4: Students will demonstrate a general understanding of global logistics and supply chain issues. This objective was assessed in LOGS 6647 in FY17.

Student Learning Outcome 4.2: Students will be able to analyze and evaluate the global logistics strategy for a large, consumer product organization.

This outcome was assessed in LOGS 6647, through a project that requires each student to work within a group setting to analyze the logistics and supply chain strategy a company is using to compete in various markets and industries around the world. Each student will be assessed within the group framework for their understanding and ability to communicate their analysis and suggestions for the company to improve. A dual rubric will be applied; one by the instructor on the students comprehensive presentation skills and one that allows the students group peers to evaluate each member. The goal was that 80% of students should meet expectations. Results demonstrate that more than 80% of the students met or exceeded expectations. The results suggest that the method of assessment is successful at this time. However, in order to push students further into the material and critical thinking, the plan is to modify the final to require an individual write-up of one aspect of the problem chosen. This will enable the instructor to differentiate the level of understanding. Team presentation requires all to speak but some read their notes and if notes were separate the presentation could be more fluid and concise.

Overall, the MLSCM is in much better shape than it has been in the past regarding a sound assessment strategy and plan moving forward. Our program goals and student outcomes are much more aligned with the nature of the program than they have been in the past. We have made much progress and are seeing the results of our assessment strategies through the success of the students. As seen in the report above, the faculty members are continually in discussion regarding better assessment approaches and strategies, so continuous improvement is at the forefront of the program.

Master of Management Information Systems Program

The mission of the MMIS program is to develop graduate-level information technology consultants, analysts, and managers having the knowledge and skills to apply information technology solutions to the problems in business and society and to also prepare students for terminal degree candidacy.

The MMIS program teaches required classes over a two year cycle. Therefore, the exact student learning outcome assessments cannot be compared from year to year. The goals were reduced from five to three in the August 2016 MMIS assessment meeting. Each goal will be assessed in two of the six required MMIS classes. Therefore, students are assured that there are two places in the curriculum that each program goal is covered.

1. Students will be able to evaluate how information systems planning, management, and strategy influence the organization.

This was originally scheduled to be assessed in MMIS 6293 in spring 17. However, a part-time faculty member taught the course, and it was not assessed. Because of the increase in student numbers, it is being taught again in spring 18. It will be assessed at that time. It will be assessed in 6298 in summer 17 as well.

2. Students will be able to analyze information systems industry best practices and apply the appropriate best practices to the information systems function in the organization.

This was assessed through MMIS 6295 in spring 17. The students took a certification exam at the end of the class for networking and security issues. Passage of this exam ensures that the students understand and can use the best practices. The class had an 87.5% pass rate exceeding the 85% target as well as the 66.84% national pass rate and the 68.69% college pass rate. The areas that the students did not do as well in will be covered more thoroughly the next time this class is taught. This assessment will be used again in spring 19 when this class next taught. Another assessment for this goal will be used in MMIS 6198 in fall 17.

3. Students will be able to investigate ethical issues relating to information systems and their resources, and formulate the proper action policy of the organization in dealing with identified ethical issues. This goal was assessed in MMIS 6296 in fall 16. The students met the target rate of 85% being able to describe and explain ethical considerations in the areas of data security, data privacy, data usage, data analysis, and data ownership. It was thought that many students knew the answers but simply stopped short of describing and explaining as many issues as were needed. Therefore, the exam question will be clarified the next time this class is taught in fall 18. This goal will also be assessed in MMIS 6299 in spring 18.

College-wide Assurance of Learning Activities

College of Business Assessment Meetings Wednesday, August 16, 2017

Faculty members teaching in the common business knowledge courses (CBK) met on the university's annual assessment day to discuss the results of 2016-2017 assessment and changes needed for 2017-2018. Faculty members in each program, led by the COB Assessment Coordinator and program assessment coordinators, met and discussed each program's goals, assessments, and results.

The summaries from each of these meetings were presented at the annual fall COB assessment meeting.

Friday, October 13, 2017

Twenty-three faculty members attended the annual COB fall assessment meeting to be briefed on summary program assessment reports. Each major reported back to College of Business faculty on assessment activities during the 2016-2017 academic year.

Each report addressed three questions:

- What assessment activities were completed in AY 2017?
- What did you learn from those activities?
- What will you change as a result of the assessment?

Included in the reports were the specific goals that each major assessed. Reports were given for the following undergraduate majors: accounting, management, marketing, management information systems, computer science, and economics. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee reported on the assessment from the common business core courses. Reports were also presented from the MACC, MMIS, and MLSCM..

Summaries from these reports were presented earlier in this document, and details are located in Compliance Assist. Feedback on each summary in Compliance Assist was provided to each program coordinator by the University Assessment Team (UAT). UAT consists of the University Assessment Coordinator, the college coordinators, the library coordinator, and the coordinator from student affairs. This feedback was used to make needed changes for 17-18.

Appendix I: Assessment Calendar

Georgia College regularly reviews all programs (see Section 3.05 of the GCSU Academic Affairs Handbook). In addition, all colleges within the university system of Georgia (USG) are required to conduct periodic comprehensive review of all degree programs (see Section 2.03.05 of the BOR Academic Affairs Handbook). The college also complies with the assurance of learning expectations of the AACSB, as well as the expectations of SACS. The schedule below incorporates the expectations of these different program review activities and accreditation boards and agencies.

Table 1: Assessment Calendar, The J. Whitney Bunting College of Business

Date	Activity	Responsible Party
Fall/spring	Programs & majors in the College collect and assess student work.	Individual faculty Assessment Coordinators
Aug-Sept	Faculty meet to discuss assessment data collected the previous year and to update assessment plans for the upcoming academic year for each program. Assessment Coordinators update the Compliance Assist for the year just ended with assessment data.	Individual faculty Assessment Coordinators
September	The College reviews assessment results from the previous year along with plans for programs & majors to insure execution during the spring term. Summaries for each program are entered into Compliance Assist	Dean Associate Dean Department Chairs Assessment Coordinators Individual faculty
June-Oct	On-cycle programs submit GC Comprehensive Program Review reports, using Compliance Assist information from the previous year as well as data collected in the year just ended.	Associate Dean Department Chairs
October	A Report of Institutional Effectiveness is completed and submitted to the Board of Regents.	Provost/Deans
Oct-Feb	The University Assessment Team reviews each program's assessment data and provides feedback to Assessment Coordinators. Assessment Coordinators update Compliance Assist for the coming academic year, reflecting changes made as a result of the previous year's feedback process.	Department Chairs Assessment Coordinators Individual Faculty

Appendix II: College of Business Assessment Hierarchy Georgia College & State University

Operating Principles:

- All activities in the college are driven by our mission statement and mission implications
- Assurance of learning is a product of the college's mission and continuous improvement objectives; it is not an outcome of mandates from accrediting associations or state agencies
- A culture of assessment leads to annual, systematic reporting and curriculum evaluation rather than the development of special/periodic reports for various reporting entities

Assessment activities are one component of the college's continuous improvement efforts

Level of Reporting	Measures	Actions and Linkages	Reporting Entity	Reporting Cycle
Degree BBA, MBA, MMIS, MACC, MLSCM	All activities are mission driven	Must demonstrate a recurring cycle of faculty-led assessment, reporting, and review/change to curriculum based on assessment outcomes	AACSB Data collected annually & presented in maintenance of accreditation report	5 Year, plus annual reports
	4 college-wide goals; specific assessment activities for each goal	Faculty qualifications are established by AQ/PQ standards		
		Portfolio of faculty research productivity must match relative emphasis areas as stated in mission		
BS CS	specific assessment activities for each goal	Must demonstrate a recurring cycle of faculty-led assessment, reporting, and review/change to curriculum based on assessment outcomes	ABET	6 Year
Program /Major	<u>Costs</u>	Each major must remain viable and productive	CPR: Comprehensive Program Review reported to the USG	5 Year *
	<u>Viability</u> – # of majors			
	<u>Productivity</u> - # of grads	Majors must demonstrate to the state they are producing high-quality outcomes (graduates)	Data collected via annual progress & planning review	
	<u>Inputs</u> – faculty qualifications & scholarship (AQ/PQ)	<u>Outcome examples:</u> Benchmarking, accreditation criteria, external indicators such as license & certification results, graduate college & job placement, awards/honors		
Course	<u>Outputs</u> – student learning outcomes			
	Individual course objectives & course-embedded assessment	Course-level objectives must contribute to the objectives for the major Department should demonstrate that course objectives are carried out in each course Degree-level and program-level assessment may be carried out within individual courses College must document the qualifications of faculty for each course taught	SACS Data collected via Compliance Assist	5 Year

* Programs can be triggered for early review by CPR if they fall below the thresholds set by the state for either viability or productivity.