



**Middle Georgia
State University**

Title.

Middle Georgia State University Academic Program Assessment

Instructions. This form collects assessment information for all academic programs at Middle Georgia State University. Program directors, chairs, or deans, should submit one form each year (or semester) for each academic program and for each site the academic program is offered (https://www.mga.edu/institutional-research/docs/Programs_by_Location.pdf) (i.e. if a program is offered in Macon and Cochran, separate assessments unique to the students enrolled at each location should be submitted). It is essential that improvements based on the assessment are also clearly identified and that the department keeps evidence of those improvements (i.e. new exams, syllabi, instructional tools) when an improvement is identified and implemented. Major changes to curriculum must go through the Academic Affairs process. Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) should match the Assessment Plan and Curriculum Maps found here:

<https://www.mga.edu/provost/program-histories.php>; if they don't please contact OIRDS to update them.

NOTE: All fields are required, please place NA or O in response field ONLY if SLO is not being utilized, otherwise full responses are required. Provide ALL necessary information requested to the fullest extent possible, such that a peer reviewer is not required to assume any information not provided. Utilize the provided assessment scoring rubric drafting guideline to evaluate your report prior to submission.

https://www.mga.edu/institutional-research/docs/IEB_Academic_Program,_Student_Support,_Advising_Scoring_Card.pdf

****Please SUBMIT the form within 30 minutes of opening this page. If you wait too long to submit you may lose your work**** In the event that you need to edit your submission, you may contact the Director of Institutional Effectiveness to secure a custom link to edit and resubmit.

Q1. Submitters Email

marc.miller@mga.edu

Q2. For which program is this assessment being submitted? An academic program for this purpose is defined as a major within a degree program (i.e. Bachelor of Arts with a major in English, Bachelor of Science with a major in Chemistry, Associates in Occupational Therapy Assistant).

BSBA-Macon

Q3. For which campus is this program assessment being submitted? Note: A separate assessment report is needed for each location a program is offered.

Cochran

Macon

- Eastman
- Dublin
- Warner Robins
- Online

Q4. In which College is this program located?

- Arts and Letters
- Aviation
- Health and Natural Sciences
- Business
- Computing
- Education and Behavioral Sciences

Q5. Program Type

- Graduate
- Undergraduate
- Certificate

Q6. Which semester were the data collected and analyzed? If across multiple semesters, select the latest semester of data.

- Summer 2022
- Fall 2022
- Spring 2023

Q7. Approximately how many students are enrolled in this program at this location?

700

8. SLO 1: What is the first Student Learning Outcome for this support area? Student Learning Outcomes should be stated in measurable terms (i.e. students will be able to.....)

Students will recognize the importance of ethical business practices

9. SLO 1: What instrument (assessment type) was used to measure student's ability to demonstrate mastery of this learning outcome? (i.e. test, survey, etc) and provide specific details of the instrument (e.g. name, content areas, link etc.)

Direct: Legal and Social Environment Questions on Major Field Test Given in the Fall and Spring Embedded Questions in Legal Environment of Business course
Indirect: Survey of student awareness of importance of Ethical considerations

10. SLO 1: What target performance level would a student need to achieve on the assessment instrument to demonstrate mastery of this learning outcome? (i.e. 80% of all students will earn an average grade of 75% or better on....)

Direct: 50% of better mean correct on MFT Indirect: 70% of students feel capable of understanding ethical dilemma's.

11. SLO 1: Provide details for your target performance level established (i.e. accreditation requirement, past performance data, peer program review, etc)

This was our first time in determining these target levels. Hence, we used a number of different methods including national scores on multiple MFT, focus group interviews with faculty, and literature of student self-efficacy measures.

12. SLO 1: During this assessment cycle, what percent of the students who participated in this assessment demonstrated mastery of this learning outcome? (this should be a number between 0-100)

70%

13. SLO 1: Improvement Plans and Evidence of Changes Based on Performance Analysis: How does the analysis of students' performance on this Student Learning Outcome inform the implementation of improvement plans, and what evidence is collected and documented to support these changes?

Overall, we have increased coverage of Ethical Dilemmas in several courses in all degree programs. This would include the following courses taught in Cochran or online: Principles of Management Principles of Marketing Strategic Management Principles of Finance Legal and Ethical Environment of Business

14. SLO 2: What is the second Student Learning Outcome for this support area? Student Learning Outcomes should be stated in measurable terms (i.e. students will be able to.....)

Can the student employ empirical approaches to problem solving? (i.e. data driven decision making).

15. SLO 2: What instrument (assessment type) was used to measure student's ability to demonstrate mastery of this learning outcome? (i.e. test, survey, etc) and provide specific details of the instrument (e.g. name, content areas, link etc.)

Direct: Quantitative Business Analysis Questions on Major Field Test Given in the Fall and Spring Indirect: Survey of student self-efficacy for data driven decision making.

16. SLO 2: What target performance level would a student need to achieve on the assessment instrument to demonstrate mastery of this learning outcome? (i.e. 80% of all students will earn an average grade of 75% or better on....)

National mean on MFT: 35% Self-efficacy 70% or better indicating that the student felt that they had the ability to apply DDDM principles.

17. SLO 2: Provide details for your target performance level established (i.e. accreditation requirement, past performance data, peer program review, etc)

This was our first time in determining these target levels. Hence, we used a number of different methods including national scores on multiple MFT, focus group interviews with faculty, and literature of student self-efficacy measures.

18. SLO 2: During this assessment cycle, what percent of the students who participated in this assessment demonstrated mastery of this learning outcome? (this should be a number between 0-100)

38%

19. SLO 2: Improvement Plans and Evidence of Changes Based on Performance Analysis: How does the analysis of students' performance on this Student Learning Outcome inform the implementation of improvement plans, and what evidence is collected and documented to support these changes?

Increased coverage of Data Driven Decision making (DDDM) in all courses including courses that are taught exclusively in Cochran or online: Principles of Management Principles of Marketing Principles of Finance In addition, selected courses at the senior level have been targeted to increase coverage of DDDM: Human Resource Management Innovation Management Organizational Behavior Finally, courses in Production and Operations Management as well as Principles of Accounting 1 and 2 have had increased coverage of DDDM.

20. SLO 3: What is the third Student Learning Outcome for this support area? Student Learning Outcomes should be stated in measurable terms (i.e. students will be able to.....)

Can the student exhibit professional written and verbal communication skills?

21. SLO 3: What instrument (assessment type) was used to measure student's ability to demonstrate mastery of this learning outcome? (i.e. test, survey, etc) and provide specific details of the instrument (e.g. name, content areas, link etc.)

We examined grammar and writing style targets for Written Communication in Microsoft Word Editor including Flesch Reading Ease Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Percent of passive voice Clarity Conciseness Formality

22. SLO 3: What target performance level would a student need to achieve on the assessment instrument to demonstrate mastery of this learning outcome? (i.e. 80% of all students will earn an average grade of 75% or better on.....)

Flesch Reading Ease: 60-80 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level: 7-10 Percent of passive voice: Less than 10% Clarity: 3 or less errors Conciseness 3 or less errors Formality 3 or less errors

23. SLO 3: Provide details for your target performance level established (i.e. accreditation requirement, past performance data, peer program review, etc)

After much deliberation and review of past performance, the AOL committee determined that these would be acceptable levels for first examination.

24. SLO 3: During this assessment cycle, what percent of the students who participated in this assessment demonstrated mastery of this learning outcome? (this should be a number between 0-100)

Flesch Reading Ease: 82 Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level: 8 Percent of passive voice: 12% Clarity: average of 3 Conciseness average of 2 Formality average of 2

25. SLO 3: Improvement Plans and Evidence of Changes Based on Performance Analysis: How does the analysis of students' performance on this Student Learning Outcome inform the implementation of improvement plans, and what evidence is collected and documented to support these changes?

Improvement in Writing is currently being assessed by the UG Curriculum Committee. We are improving relationships with Writing Center to concentrate on these metrics We are adding coverage of writing in a number of courses at the UG level.

26. SLO 4: What is the fourth Student Learning Outcome for this support area? Student Learning Outcomes should be stated in measurable terms (i.e. students will be able to.....)

Understand and apply core concepts in business effectively.

27. SLO 4: What instrument (assessment type) was used to measure student's ability to demonstrate mastery of this learning outcome? (i.e. test, survey, etc) and provide specific details of the instrument (e.g. name, content areas, link etc.)

Score on ETS Major Field Test for all subscores and overall score

28. SLO 4: What target performance level would a student need to achieve on the assessment instrument to demonstrate mastery of this learning outcome? (i.e. 80% of all students will earn an average grade of 75% or better on....)

Sub Area National Accounting 40.6 Economics 50.2 Management 56.7 Quant Analysis. 34.3 Finance 41.4 Marketing 52.1 Legal Env 50.6 Infor Systems 40.9 International 44.5 Overall score: Based on percentile. Scaled score range of 165-169 is in the 90th

29. SLO 4: Provide details for your target performance level established (i.e. accreditation requirement, past performance data, peer program review, etc)

Score on Nationally administered ETS Major Field Exam

30. SLO 4: During this assessment cycle, what percent of the students who participated in this assessment demonstrated mastery of this learning outcome? (this should be a number between 0-100)

Sub Area MGA1 MGA2 National Accounting 42 36 40.6 Economics 48 46 50.2 Management 57 60 56.7 Quant Analysis. 32 29 34.3 Finance 39 42 41.4 Marketing 54 50 52.1 Legal Env 56 55 50.6 Infor Systems 42 40 40.9 International 44 39 44.5 Percentage at 40th percentile or better: 20%

31. SLO 4: Improvement Plans and Evidence of Changes Based on Performance Analysis: How does the analysis of students' performance on this Student Learning Outcome inform the implementation of improvement plans, and what evidence is collected and documented to support these changes?

At this time, the UG Curriculum committee is considering improvements to the curriculum including the following: 1. Increase and integrate coverage of quant topics across the curriculum 2. Increase accounting coverage at several senior level courses. 3. Include a face to face required course in International Management (hybrid or F2F).

Q41. List each program concentration or track within the larger academic program and clearly articulate the expected learning outcomes. (If distinct note them distinctly, if common restate).

BSBA with Majors in Accounting Entrepreneurship Financial Economics Management Marketing Supply Chain Management All concentrations/majors/tracks have the same Learning Outcomes: Ethical and Legal Orientation Can the student identify and deliberate an ethical dilemma? Quantitative Reasoning and Problem Solving Can the student employ empirical approaches to problem solving? Communication Can the student exhibit professional written and verbal communication skills? Technology Can the student apply technology to specific problems? Business Content or Health Services Content Can the student demonstrate an understanding of the field in their concentration of study?

Q42. How do you collect and report data on the achievement of these learning outcomes for each program concentration or track?

We collect data with both direct and indirect methods including Major Field Test Embedded questions on exams in various subject areas Case assignments Analysis of projects and writing samples

Q43. Report and analyze the learning outcomes associated with each program concentration or track

All program concentrations share the same learning outcomes under the BSBA umbrella. See individual reports previously reported.

32. How many students participated in the assessment of these learning outcomes, in this program, for this assessment cycle at this location? (Provide Number)

98

33. Based on your goals and objectives listed above please indicate their connection with MGA's Strategic Plan (https://www.mga.edu/about/docs/Strategic_Plan_Overall_DB.pdf) by checking all associated and relevant Imperatives / Strategies from the list below. (Check all the apply)

- Grow Enrollment with Purpose 1. Expand and enrich the face to face student experience
- Grow Enrollment with Purpose 2. Expand and enrich online instruction into new markets
- Own Student Success 3. Develop academic pipelines and expand degrees
- Own Student Success 4. Expand student engagement and experiential learning
- Build Shared Culture 5. Attract talent and enhance employee development and recognition
- Build Shared Culture 6. Sustain financial health through resourceful fiscal management
- Build Shared Culture 7. Cultivate engagement with its local communities

34. Please indicate which of the following actions you have taken as a result of the 2021/2022 Assessment Cycle (Note: These actions are documented in reports, memos, emails, meeting minutes, or other directives within the reporting area)(Check all the apply)

- Disseminating/Discussing Assessment Results/Feedback to Appropriate Members of the Campus Community
- Disseminating/Discussing Assessment Results/Feedback to Appropriate External Stakeholders
- Faculty or Staff Support: Professional Development Activities, Trainings, Workshops, Technical Assistance
- Process Changes: Improve, Expand, Refine, Enhance, Discontinue, etc Operational Processes
- Request for Additional Financial or Human Resources
- Customer Service Changes: Communication, Services, etc
- Making Improvements to Teaching Approach, Course Design, Curriculum, Scheduling, other
- Evaluating and/or Revising the Reporting Lines Internal Assessment Processes
- Other

35. Please indicate (if appropriate) any local, state, or national initiatives (academic or otherwise) that are influential in the operations, or goals, and objectives of your unit. (Complete College Georgia, USG High Impact Practice Initiative, LEAP, USG Momentum Year, Low-Cost No-Cost Books, etc)

36. Please provide a comprehensive narrative outlining how assessment results are utilized for continuous improvement in this field. Your narrative should address the past, present, and future aspects of assessment, with specific emphasis on how these results inform decision-making and drive improvement efforts.

We are dedicated to Continuous Improvement in all that we do. We strive to create a culture of dedication to never ending improvement of our programs and processes which drive the strategic, tactical and operational decisions of the School of Business. We start with our mission statement and core values which emphasize the need for constant improvement based on the intentional study of our core practices and processes. Our organizational structure and faculty governance processes enable core processes of: • Program and Curriculum Review • Annual Assessment of Learning Outcomes • Program Delivery Methods Review • Faculty Review, Development, and Support Program and Curriculum Review: There are three main committees that perform Program and Curricular Review: The Undergraduate AOL Committee, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, and Graduate Council. Our current mission is primarily undergraduate hence, the Graduate Council subsumes both AOL and Curriculum functions. These committee comprise the structures which conduct program reviews to assess the effectiveness and relevance of our curriculum. Based on the findings, the school updates and enhances its programs to ensure they align with emerging trends, industry demands, and the changing needs of students. The school promotes an agile curriculum that adapts to market demands and prepares students for current and future challenges. In the case of the undergraduate review, the relationship between the two committees is that the AOL Committee assesses the PLO's through an intentional and rigorous assessment of learning outcomes. This information is passed to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee who deliberates the findings and recommendations and ultimately makes recommendations for changes and improvements to the curriculum. The UG Curriculum Committee will also examine feedback from community and industry stakeholders, conducts benchmarking exercises with peer institutions, and evaluates the efficacy of the program and course learning outcomes. At the graduate level, the review is similar however it all takes place under the auspices of one committee: the Graduate Council. Program and Curriculum Review is an ongoing process. The results of these reviews are used for both internal process and content changes as well as compliance efforts for SACS CoC reviews of degree programs. Thus, we also rely on input and feedback from governance within the university and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research within the provost's office. Institutional accreditation serves as a validation of the school's adherence to rigorous academic standards and continuous improvement practices. We are committed to overall quality and high impact outcomes of our programs. Annual Assessment of Learning Outcomes. We deploy a systematic process assess and ensure the achievement of desired learning outcomes and the continuous improvement of our programs. We have defined broad learning outcomes (stated above) for both graduate and undergraduate programs. These outcomes reflect the knowledge, skills, and competencies that students are expected to acquire upon completion of the program. The AOL committee then translate these PLOs into clear and measurable learning outcomes that have been mapped to the course structure of the programs. Curriculum mapping ensures that the program provides opportunities for students to develop and demonstrate the desired knowledge and skills. For each PLO, we will measure a direct and indirect assessment at least twice during a five-year review cycle. That is, the PLO is measured, the results are sent to the Curriculum Committee who implements an improvement, and the PLO is measured again to assess the effectiveness of the improvement and to suggest future modifications.

37. Optional: The following upload portal is available to supplement your report with supportive documentation should you wish to provide any (instruments, data, etc).