

Georgia Southwestern State University
School of Business Administration



REPORT OF THE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
ANNUAL REPORT

Academic Year
2019-2020

Prepared by:
Dr. Gaynor Cheokas
Interim Dean of the School of Business Administration

And the faculty members of the School of Business Administration

Purpose of the Report

During the academic year 2019-2020, the Assessment Committee concentrated in three main issues:

- 1) To verify that we keep the commitment of continuous improvement in our learning objectives,
- 2) To report the result of the assessed learning goals during this academic year, and
- 3) To report the activities that support our commitment for Innovation, Impact, and Engagement.

Actions during the academic year 2019-2020

1. Keep the strong collaboration inside the SOBA committees and the better flow of information.
2. Continue the process for the Continuous Improvement Review data for 2025 visit.
3. Update technology for faculty to increase the use of video in online courses.
4. Continue giving stipends to professors that innovate in online courses.

Results for the Academic Year 2019-2020

The results were submitted and evaluated by the assessment committee. The targets are as follow:

- At least 80% of the students should meet or exceed the goal. Compute the average for each student for all the items considered in assessing the goal (the range for this number is between 1 and 3):
 - If the average is lower than 2 then the student is considered as “Fail”.
 - Between 2 and below 2.5 is considered as “Meet”,
 - And between 2.5 and 3, the score is considered as “Exceed”.
- The total average for each item for the goal should be at least 2.0
- The overall score for the goal has to be at least 2.0

When the professors use the range of assessment between 1 and 4 the goals are as follows:

- If the average is lower than 2, the student is considered as “Fail”.
- Between 2 and less than 3, is considered as “Meet”
- And between 3 or more and 4 is considered as “Exceed”.
- The total average per item should be at least 2.5.
- The overall score for the goal has to be at least 2.5

UNDERGRADUATE

The following table gives the information of the learning goals assessed during the academic year 2019-2020 in Online courses (O) and In-class (I).

Undergraduate Learning Goals 2019-2020

GOAL					
Communication – Oral				IO	
Communication – Written				O	
Critical Thinking/ Analytical Skills		IO			
Use of Information technology			I		
Ethical Reasoning					O

Assessment Results

The following table shows the goals assessed in each one of the courses.

The assessment committee's recommendations for areas where the targets were not reached can be found in a later section in this report.

MFAT Assessment Results

As suggested by the AOL Committee, this year we re-implemented the use of the MFAT standardized test in the Strategic Management course. MFAT test considers 120 questions that are applied nationally to students from School of Business around the country, so we can have some comparable position with the rest of the country. Although we cannot make a comparison with the previous year, this is the overall results from the test. Next year we will be able to do the comparison.

The year 2020 was extremely challenging for the students and faculty. We need to go online in the middle of the semester for the COVID-19 situation. But we all worked hard to fulfill the learning goals.

Comparing by discipline the percentage of correct answers from GSW and National is as follows:

Percent Correct	Percent Correct	Percent Difference	Discipline
GSW	National		
40	44.6	(4.6)	Accounting
34	41.9	(7.9)	Economics
54	60.7	(6.7)	Management
33	35.9	(2.9)	Quant
38	46.8	(8.8)	Finance
51	52.9	(1.9)	Marketing
42	47.6	(5.6)	Legal
50	52.6	(2.6)	Info Systems

We are slightly below average in every discipline compared to the national results. Additionally, the individual question analysis gives the following: in 30 out of the 120 question items we had higher than the national; and the 70% or higher percentage correct by GSW we have 15 out of 120 questions, compared with the national of 22 out of 120 questions.

RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

UNDERGRADUATE

Results:

The main concern, in previous years was the differences between online and in-class results. This year most of the learning goals assessed in online classes met the expectations. That was influenced by the faculty effort to include additional tools, such as videos and publishers' online learning tools to keep promoting students' participation.

The only learning goal that did not meet the expectations in the inclass modality was Information Technology in the MGNT 3700 class.. This is the first year that this learning goal did not meet the expectations.

For the online modality, only Critical Thinking in HRMT 4790 class did not meet the expectations. However, in the other classes that this learning goal was assessed, we meet the expectations.

Recommendations for online classes:

1. Keep innovating in the way we teach online courses
 - a. Offer internal training.
 - b. Increase teacher-student interaction
 - c. Promote group/collaborative activities among students
 - d. Include other learning tools such as podcasts, external videos, or activities beyond reading the book.
2. Consider adoptions of books that are focused on distance learning students and providing material that can be used to assure the complete understanding of the material even when the student-professor interaction is limited.
3. Keep investing in technology to maintain our teaching standards.
4. Keep the communication channel open with students to know their opinion to be more effective in the learning process.
5. Keep developing best practices for online courses, and implementing evaluation tools for assessing online classes.
6. Send the Management committee the specific concerns in the learning goals that did not meet the expectations, and let them decide the proper set of actions to attack these opportunity areas.

Recommendations for in-class classes:

1. Send the Management committee the specific concerns in the information technology and ethical reasoning learning goals that did not meet the expectations, and let them decide the proper set of actions to attack this opportunity area.

General Recommendations

1. In order to warranty the validity of our assessment instruments, we propose to re-do this year in the next academic year the use of the MFAT standardized test for

the Strategic Management course students. By getting the results for this academic year, we now can compare with previous year's results.

MFAT Assessment Results

As suggested by the AOL Committee, this year we re-implemented the use of the MFAT standardized test in the Strategic Management course. MFAT test considers 120 questions that are applied nationally to students from School of Business around the country, so we can have some comparable position with the rest of the country. Although we cannot make a comparison with the previous year, this is the overall results from the test.

Comparing by discipline the percentage of correct answers from GSW and National is as follows:

Percent Correct	Percent Correct		
GSW	National		
40.7	44.6	-3.84	Accounting
37.4	41.9	-4.53	Economics
58.7	60.7	-1.99	Management
32.8	35.9	-3.10	Quant
42.4	46.8	-4.47	Finance
49.5	52.9	-3.39	Marketing
44.9	47.6	-2.78	Legal
51.3	52.6	-1.23	Info Systems

We are slightly below average in every discipline compared to the national results. Additionally, the individual question analysis gives the following: in 35 out of the 120 question items we had higher than the national; and the 70% or higher percentage correct by GSW we have 20 out of 120 questions, compared with the national of 24 out of 120 questions.