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**Recommendation:** Continuation of the program with identification of the program for resource development

**Rationale:** (If you recommend a program for resource development identify all areas for specific development)

The BBA in Management is a strong degree in its own right and as a provider of service courses within the College of Business and to programs across campus. The number of management majors has grown steadily over the past four years from 188 principal majors and a total of 219 majors, second majors, and minors in 2008-2009, to 374 principal majors and a total of 465 majors, second majors, and minors in 2011-2012. Multiple programs in multiple colleges use several management courses as both required courses in their plans of study and electives. The strength and the importance of the discipline are evidenced by the demand for the degree, demand for the individual courses, and the wide array of well-paying high-demand career opportunities directly or indirectly involving management (Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupational Outlook Handbook). As part of the College of Business, Management was awarded continuation of accreditation by AACSB International in January 2012.

The request for resource development includes:

1. Additional resources to increase faculty salaries. Management has to rely heavily on adjuncts, in large part due to the inability to attract qualified faculty because of noncompetitive salaries. Although the problem of noncompetitive salaries is not unique to management, it has reached a critical state for the discipline as evidenced by a failed search three years in a row, and a second failed search now entering its second year. Adding to the problem, even with nearly 400 principal majors and many overloaded classes, the Division Head was informed the past two years he/she could not hire any more adjuncts. Increasing salaries to that of our peer institutions would enable management to hire qualified, terminally degreed faculty; thereby better serving our students and reducing the risk of losing accreditation. The latter should not be taken lightly, especially given the anticipated passage of the new AACSB standards. Additional faculty lines also are needed and are being requested through normal budget request procedures.

2. Additional space allocation. Full-time faculty and adjuncts alike are in need of office space. Storage space is needed, as well. Literally all former storage rooms and all open spaces in the Division have already been converted into office space. In spite of the conversions, some adjuncts have been forced to use GA desks adjacent to the secretary’s area.

3. Upgrade of the audio-visual equipment in the negotiations breakout rooms. The breakout rooms for the negotiations course (the main classroom is also used for other courses) are
in the same condition as when Corbly Hall opened in the early 1980s. The audio-visual equipment is outdated and in disrepair from use over the years. An instructor flat screen with multiple viewing segments, new breakout room cameras, and updated audio equipment is needed.

4. Resources for research. Resources for research in management are available, but not adequate. Research productivity is an expectation in the COB, and faculty must use their own personal funds to supplement funds for database access, computer upgrades, software, and other needs.

Deanna Mader__________________ ___October 15, 2012______
Signature of the Dean                                             Date
Marshall University  
Program Review

For purposes of program review, the academic year will begin in summer and end in spring.

Program: BBA in Management

College: College of Business

Date of Last Review: Academic Year 2012 - 2013

I. Accreditation Information

1. Name of Accrediting Organization

The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business – International (AACSBI). The AACSBI, founded in 1916, is the leading accrediting body for business programs worldwide. Only about 30 percent of all business programs, worldwide, have earned AACSBI accreditation.

2. Date of Most Recent Self-Study and Accreditation Visit

The college’s most recent accreditation visit took place November 6-8, 2011. The Peer Review Team (PRT) consisted of four individuals, led by an experienced Chair who had been a member of the PRT during our last accreditation visit (Fall 2006).

During its visit the PRT evaluated the College of Business’s performance in terms of Strategic Planning, Faculty Sufficiency & Qualifications, and Outcomes Assessment (AOL, or Assurance of Learning), over the five-year period ending in Spring 2011.

3. Accreditation Status: (regular, probationary, etc.)

Regular

4. Accrediting Organization’s Report: This should include and most recent action taken by the program’s accrediting body. Also, provide any significant findings from your most recent self-study and accreditation visit. If weaknesses or deficiencies were noted, please explain how these are being addressed. After its November, 2011 visit, the PRT recommended to the AACSBI Board that the college remain fully accredited. In December 2011 the AACSBI’s Maintenance of Accreditation Committee concurred with this recommendation, and this recommendation was officially ratified by the AACSBI Board of Directors in January 2012. The College of Business has earned full accreditation for all degree programs for another five-year period. Our next accreditation visit is scheduled for academic year 2016-17.
One area that the PRT and AACSBI urged the college to focus on heavily, across all programs, during the upcoming five-year accreditation cycle is Outcomes Assessment (i.e., AOL). Since 2004 the AACSBI has made Outcomes Assessment a priority in the accreditation and reaccreditation processes. Deficiencies in Outcomes Assessment, in fact, are currently the number one reason why accredited schools get placed on probation. The fact that we earned full accreditation means that our Outcomes Assessment programs meet current AACSBI standards. But, as the PRT noted, our BBA-level assessment programs are not as mature as AASCBI would like. To finalize this program and to develop concrete plans for improving this program over time, we made heavy use of the university-wide HLC Open Pathways Demonstration Project. Full details, again, are provided in the Assessment Information Section of this review.

II. Adequacy of the Program

5. Assessment Information: NOTE: This section is a summary of your yearly assessment reports.

   a. Provide summary information on the following elements. Please include this information in Appendix IV.
      • Your Program’s Student Learning Outcomes
      • The assessment measures used to assess student performance on these outcomes
      • The standards/benchmarks your program has set for satisfactory performance on the outcomes
      • The results/analysis, i.e. actual student performance on each outcome
      • Actions your program has taken to improve student learning based on the aforementioned results/analysis.

The College-Wide Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes

In accord with the dictates of the AACSB (the COB’s accrediting body), in the Fall of 2006 the faculty of the COB established a set of four Program Learning Outcomes that apply to all undergraduate (BBA-level) degree programs—including Management. These are:

#1: Oral Communications: The student will be able to communicate orally in an effective and professional manner.

   • To assess this general Outcome we focus on the students’ attainment of five Measurable Objectives:

      1. Topic & Organization: Given purpose, time constraints, and audience, the student will deliver a well-organized, focused presentation moving logically from an introduction to a coherent conclusion.
      2. Audience Appropriateness & Grammar: The student will use grammatically correct language that is clear and appropriate for the audience.
      3. Vocal Quality, Body Language, Eye Contact: The student will enhance his/her delivery with the appropriate use of his/her voice as well as nonverbal communication.
4. **Communication Aids**: The student will choose communication aids that enhance the message.
5. **Personal Appearance**: Given the audience and topic, the student will dress professionally as defined by the instructor.

- **The Assessment Instrument**: The *BBA Oral Communications Rubric*, which was developed by COB faculty in consultation with members of the Communication Studies faculty.

#2: **Written Communications**: The student will be able to communicate effectively in writing within a business environment.

- To assess this general Outcome we focus on the students’ attainment of four Measurable Objectives:
  1. **Purpose**: The student’s writing will clearly indicate its purpose.
  2. **Tone**: The student will adopt a level of formality, including language choice and usage that is appropriate for the intended audience.
  3. **Organization**: The student will write in a logical, coherent fashion so that the reader can always follow the line of reasoning.
  4. **Grammar & Mechanics**: The student will demonstrate correct use of punctuation, spelling, and English grammar.

- **The Assessment Instrument**: The *BBA Written Communications Rubric*, which was developed by COB faculty in consultation with Marshall’s Director of Writing Across the Curriculum.

#3: **Problem Solving & Critical Thinking**: The student will develop the thought processes necessary to use logic, information, and assumptions to successfully solve problems.

- To assess this general Outcome we focus on the students’ attainment of three Measurable Objectives:
  1. **Logic**: The student will be able to use inductive and deductive reasoning to identify appropriate conclusions based on available evidence.
  2. **Information**: The student will be able to identify relevant evidence and assess its credibility in relation to a given situation.
  3. **Assumptions**: The student will be able to differentiate between facts and conjecture relative to a given situation.

- **The Assessment Instrument**: A nationally known standardized test: the *Cornell Critical Thinking Test*.

#4: **General/Core Knowledge**: The student will acquire the general or core knowledge required to understand the environment within which business operates.

- To assess this general Outcome we focus on the students’ attainment of ten Measurable Objectives, which we specify in the following way: *By the end of the BBA Core Curriculum, the student will be aware of, and understand the impact on business of, the following features of the world within which business operates:*

  1. The operations of a market *economy*;
  2. The physical and biological *environment*;
  3. The *ethics* of decision-making in the private and public sectors;
  4. The *global economic context*;
  5. The application of *Information Systems* and information management;
  6. The fundamental concepts, principles and rules of *law* that apply to business transactions and the
laws, statutes, and regulations affecting commercial operations and behavior;
7. The multiculturalism and the multiple dimensions of diversity that characterize people around the world today;
8. The political institutions of the country, and the processes by which political and policy decisions are made;
9. The social environment and the importance of cultural norms, group dynamics, behavioral change, and human resource management for business activity;
10. The nature, pace, and pattern of technological progress and technological innovation.

- The Assessment Instrument: The BBA Core Knowledge Exam, which is written by the COB faculty—including all Management faculty—who teach in the BBA Core Curriculum.

2. During the Program Review period, the faculty of the COB completed two assessment cycles for Oral Communications, Written Communications, and Problem-Solving & Critical Thinking. One assessment cycle was completed for the General/Core Knowledge Learning Outcome.

#1: Oral Communications Assessment at the BBA level:

A. Cycle 1, Calendar Year 2010

1. The Assessment Sample: 108 upper-division students, including Management majors.
2. The Student Achievement Benchmark: 75% of the sample will score Proficient or Excellent on each Measurable Objective.
3. Results: The Benchmark was not met for any Objective. Students had the most trouble with Objectives 3 and 4 (Vocal Quality, Body Language, Eye Contact; Communication Aids). Performance was also relatively weak on Objective 1 (Topic & Organization). Performance was best on Personal Appearance, but the faculty was disappointed with student attire.
4. Actions taken in response to these results are reported in Appendix IV.

B. Cycle 2, Calendar Year 2011

1. The Assessment Sample: 73 upper-division students.
2. The Student Achievement Benchmark: 75% of the sample will score Proficient or Excellent on each Measurable Objective.
3. Results: Student performance on all Measurable Objectives improved significantly. The Benchmark was met for Objectives 1, 2, 4, and 5. Performance was best on Objective 4 (Communication Aids). Performance was weakest on Objective 3 (Vocal Quality, Body Language, Eye Contact). The rubric score for Vocal Quality was unchanged from Cycle 1; Body Language and Eye Contact improved sharply but remained below the Proficient level.
4. Actions taken in response to these results are reported in Appendix IV.

#2: Written Communications Assessment at the BBA level:

A. Cycle 1, Fall 2006 – Spring 2009

1. The Assessment Sample was collected during academic year 2006-07. It consisted of 78 upper-division students.
2. The Student Achievement Benchmark: 75% of the sample will score Proficient or Excellent on each Measurable Objective.
3. Results: The COB faculty reviewed the data at the Assessment Day Writing Workshop in April 2009. The Benchmark was not met for any Objective. Student performance on Objectives 1 and 2 (Purpose and Tone) was relatively strong, but fell just short of the Benchmark. Performance on Objectives 3 and 4 (Organization; Grammar & Mechanics) was relatively weak: roughly 50% of
the sample scored at the Proficient level and above on these Objectives. Overall, across all four Objectives in the aggregate, student performance fell short of Proficient.

4. One outcome of the Assessment Day Writing Workshop was a refinement of the assessment instrument to capture more precisely student attainment of the Measurable Objectives.

5. Actions taken in response to these results are reported in Appendix IV.

B. Cycle 2, Fall 2009 – Spring 2011

1. The Assessment Sample was collected during academic year 2009-10. It consisted of 173 upper-division students.
2. The Student Achievement Benchmark: 75% of the sample will score Proficient or Excellent on each Measurable Objective.
3. Results: The COB faculty reviewed the data at the Assessment Day Writing Workshop in April 2011. Student performance was broadly similar to that recorded in Cycle 1. Performance on Objectives 3 and 4 (Organization and Grammar & Mechanics) improved, but our students continued to struggle with these aspects of writing: 54% of the students scored at the Proficient level or above on Organization; 58% of the students scored at the Proficient level or above on Grammar & Mechanics. Students performed best on Tone, with 70.5% of the students scoring at the Proficient level or above. Overall, across all four Objectives in the aggregate, student performance was nearly identical to that in Cycle 1.
4. Actions taken in response to these results are reported in Appendix IV.

#3: Problem Solving & Critical Thinking Assessment at the BBA level:

A. Cycle 1, Spring 2009 – Spring 2010

1. The Assessment Sample: 317 seniors (from all COB degree programs, including Management majors) who took the BBA Program Capstone Course (MGT 460 - required of all undergraduates) from Spring 2009 through Spring 2010.
2. The Assessment Instrument: the Cornell Critical Thinking Test Level Z.
3. Results: The COB faculty reviewed the data at the Assessment Day Critical Thinking Assessment Workshop in April 2010. Our students performed well below national User Norms for Seniors, slightly below a national sample of Juniors & Seniors, and roughly on a par with entry-level undergraduates. The instructors of the BBA Program Capstone Course (MGT 460) observed that students generally stopped putting forth effort partway through the test. They concluded that the difficulty of the test led students to disengage from it. The faculty of the COB concluded, therefore, that the Level Z test did not provide us with useful, actionable data on our students’ Problem-Solving & Critical Thinking abilities.
4. Actions taken in response to these results are reported in Appendix IV.

B. Cycle 2, Summer 2010 – Fall 2011

1. The Assessment Sample: 225 seniors (from all COB degree programs, including Management majors) who took the BBA Program Capstone Course (MGT 460 - required of all undergraduates) during Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011.
2. The Assessment Instrument: the Cornell Critical Thinking Test Level X.
3. The Student Achievement Benchmark: The relevant National User Norms (for samples of students at undergraduate levels similar to those in our sample) for the Level X test.
4. Results: Overall, our students performed at a level in between the lower-division undergraduate User Norm and the graduate-student User Norm. This makes sense, given that we administer the Level X test in the BBA Program Capstone. Our students performed relatively well on Objective 1 (Logic), but were relatively weak on Objectives 2 and 3 (Information; Assumptions). In sum, our students showed weakness with respect to “information literacy”: the ability to employ observation and assumptions to evaluate the credibility and usefulness of information.
5. Actions taken in response to these results are reported in Appendix IV.

#4: **General/Core Knowledge Assessment at the BBA level**: December 2006 – Spring 2010

1. The Assessment Sample: 463 seniors (from all COB degree programs, including Management majors) who took the BBA Program Capstone Course (MGT 460 - required of all undergraduates) from Fall 2006 through Summer 2009.
2. The Assessment Instrument: the Core Knowledge Exam.
3. The Student Achievement Benchmark: The median score on the Exam will be at least 70%.
4. Results: The Benchmark was not met: the median score on the Exam was only 62%.
5. Actions taken in response to these results are reported in Appendix IV.

### b. Other Learning and Service Activities: Provide a summary of learning and service activities not covered explicitly in Section a.

Several management courses provide hands-on learning opportunities for students including practice in conflict resolution, negotiating, and writing business plans.

### c. Plans for Program Improvement: Based on assessment data, provide a detailed plan for program improvement. The plan **must** include a timeline.

Assurance of Learning (AOL) efforts will be maintained and refined to ensure continuous improvement within our core BBA program. However, the weak link in our current assessment process is at the program/major level. AACSBI focuses heavily at the BBA level in its assessment (AOL) endeavors. We need to strengthen our efforts at the major level. For the Management major, the Open Pathways project should provide the initiative to develop a comprehensive assessment of skills each student should have at the class and degree program level. The goals will be to identify necessary skills, build those skills explicitly into the course, and then develop the mechanism to measure student competence. Phase two of the Open Pathways project is to be completed this calendar year with subsequent iterations completing the process over the next few years.

The BBA AOL Program Schedule
for the 5-Year period November 2011 – November 2016

1. The **General/Core Knowledge** Learning Goal
   
   **A. Current Loop (3): Fall 2010—Spring 2013**
   
   1. Data collected Fall 2010, Spring 2011, Spring 2012
   2. Data Prepared for Faculty Review: Summer 2012
   3. Faculty Review Data & Close the Loop: 2012/13
B. Loop 4: 2013/4—Fall 2015
   1. Data collected during 2013/4 and 2014/5
   2. Faculty Review Data & Close the Loop: Fall 2015

2. The Written Communications Learning Goal
   A. Loop 3: Fall 2011–Fall 2013
      1. Collect Data during Fall 2011–Spring 2013
      2. Assessment Day Workshop April 2013: Review and discuss the Writing for the Workplace course and the new English 201 Gen Ed course for all LCOB students
      3. Generate aggregate sample results: Summer 2013
      4. Faculty Review Data & Close the Loop: Fall 2013
   B. Loop 4: Spring 2014–Spring 2016
      1. Close the Loop at the Spring 2016 Assessment Day Writing Workshop

3. The Oral Communications Learning Goal
   A. Loop 3: Calendar Year 2012
      1. Collect data in Spring 2012 in MGT 460 (BBA Capstone), ECN Capstone, and others
      2. Generate aggregate sample results: Summer 2012
      3. Faculty Review the Data: Fall 2012
      4. Close the Loop: BBA Capstone Instructors AOL Meeting, Fall 2012
   B. Loop 4: Calendar Year 2014
      1. Collect data in Spring 2014 in MGT 460 (BBA Capstone), ECN Capstone, and others
      2. Generate aggregate sample results: Summer 2014
      3. Faculty Review the Data: Fall 2014
      4. Close the Loop: BBA Capstone Instructors AOL Meeting, Fall 2014

4. The Problem-Solving & Critical Thinking Learning Goal
   A. Loop 3: Fall 2011-Spring 2013
      2. Collect data in MGT 460 in Fall 2011 and Fall 2012
      3. Generate aggregate sample results: Spring 2013
      4. Faculty Review Data & Close the Loop: Spring 2013, at the Assessment Day CT Assessment Workshop
   B. Loop 4: Fall 2013-Spring 2015
      2. Collect data in MGT 460 in Fall 2013 and Fall 2014
      3. Generate aggregate sample results: Spring 2015
      4. Faculty Review Data & Close the Loop: Spring 2015, at the Assessment Day CT Assessment Workshop

d. Graduate Satisfaction: Provide evidence and results of follow-up studies to indicate graduate satisfaction with the effectiveness of the educational experience they received in your program. Indicate the number of individuals surveyed or contacted and the number of respondents.
Recent surveys of graduating Management majors (n=80 over past three years) showed that students feel well prepared for their careers, feel they have gained strong public speaking skills, and that coursework has helped them develop critical thinking skills. Although they feel that effective writing skills have been gained, this characteristic was rated lower than the above, suggesting we must redouble our efforts to improve students’ true written communication skills and their perceptions of those skills.

e. Attach the previous five years of evaluations of your assessment reports provided by the Office of Assessment. Letters from the Assessment Office are included in Appendix VIII.

6. Previous Reviews: State the last program review action by the Marshall University Board of Governors.

   At its meeting of April 23, 2008, the Marshall University Board of Governors recommended that the BBA in Management continue at its current level of activity.

7. Identify weaknesses and deficiencies noted in the last program review and provide information regarding the status of improvements implemented or accomplished.

   In its review, submitted in academic year 2007 – 2008, the BBA in Management identified one of its major challenges as the fluctuating make-up of management classes. Basically, they argued that the needs of management majors, minors, and students neither majoring nor minoring in management were different. They further argued that increasing enrollments, especially among non-management majors, led to significant course overloads. A second weakness the program noted was the outdated nature of classrooms in Corbly Hall. The program noted the outdated nature of both faculty computers and those for student use. The program suggested that the shortage of faculty made it difficult to offer management electives in areas such as leadership, decision making, negotiations, and high performance management techniques.

   Information regarding status of improvements.

   Differing needs of students and course overloads continue to be problems. As other colleges have developed business-based tracks to make their students more marketable, pressure for overloads has continued. Discussions have taken place about moving to business-only sections and reinstating prerequisites to ensure more homogeneous classes, but no action has been taken.

   Development and continued expansion of the Technology Enhanced Classroom Initiative (TECI) has greatly improved the instructional efficiency of faculty.
Continued expansion and upgrading of this program are essential for recruiting new faculty and providing students a competitive classroom experience. In addition, by Summer 2013, a refurbished and outfitted Corbly Hall 242 (the primary Distance Learning capable room in the building) should be available.

Recruiting and retaining faculty continue to be problematic. Salaries and facilities not on par with those of our peer institutions leave us at a serious competitive disadvantage. Unfortunately, the temporary solution, hiring term contract non-terminally qualified individuals makes recruiting even more difficult as tenure track applicants begin to question the long term commitment of the university to staffing.

8. **Current Strengths/Weaknesses:** Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the program. Describe program plans for removing the weaknesses.

Strengths of the program include the following:

Addition of a new major in Energy Management has been received with open arms by a business sector of great importance to WV;

Addition of a course in Green Management suggests awareness of the environmental stewardship concerns of all businesses today;

An initiative to further develop the Entrepreneurship minor for business majors is in line with the national need for economic development;

Plans to develop an interdisciplinary minor in Entrepreneurship for non-business students broadens that initiative;

Commitment to the rapidly changing healthcare sector by hiring a faculty member to strengthen the Healthcare Management program;

A broad, yet traditional, exposure to thought and practices in Management for all Management majors.

 Weaknesses of the program (and plans to eliminate them) include the following:

No formal structure to measure students’/graduates’ perceptions;

Availability of the Qualtrics system will better allow us to survey majors to gauge their perception at the program/major level.

Lack of a formal system to assure ongoing relevancy of courses;

Management faculty will incorporate a “skills-based” approach
for course development and rejuvenation.

Need to strengthen analytical skills;

Examine current statistical offerings and then restructure existing offerings or add new advanced options.

Other programs/disciplines use space in Corbly Hall, thereby severely restricting use of space by Management and the COB in general.

The COB requires a space that can be uniquely identified as the College. As a result COB space could be subdivided into unique spaces for COB disciplines.

III. Viability of the Program: Provide a narrative summary in each of the following sections in addition to the appendices.

1. Program Enrollment: Summarize data indicating the number of new students admitted, number of principal majors enrolled from your college, number of second majors, the number of students enrolled as majors from other colleges (i.e., College of Education specialization majors), the number of minors, and the number of graduates for the program for each of the past five years. (Appendix VI, which supports this section, will be supplied to you by the Office of Assessment, in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Research).

Any way you slice it, the numbers of management majors, second majors, and minors are up dramatically during the review period. The number of Management principal majors is up over 62% (from 230 to 374) during the review period; over 98% (from 188 to 374) since the 2008-2009 academic year. Likewise, Health Care principal majors have increased from 31 to 50 (over 61%) during the review period; from 24 to 50 (over 100%) since the 2008-2009 academic year. Management as a second major has shown a steady increase from one in 2007-2008 to 19 in 2011-2012. Management as a minor has increased from one in the 2008-2009 year to 21 in the 2011-2012 academic year. In the 2011-2012 academic year, Management had been reported as a third major in one case. Finally, the total number of students enrolled in the program has increased by 77% (from 263 to 465) during the review period; over 112% (from 219 to 465) since the 2008-2009 academic year.

Service Courses: Over 13,000 students have completed Management classes during the review period. An increasing percentage of that total is derived from providing Service classes both inside and outside of the COB. Management provides three courses (Business Statistics, Principles of Management, and Strategic Management) that are taken by every COB student. Increasingly, pressure is coming from the outside. Required or short-listed choices in degree
programs such as Sport Management and Marketing also pressure availability. All of those majors take our Business Statistics and Principles of Management. Depending on the track chosen, they may also take Introduction to Entrepreneurship, Organizational Behavior, Human Resource Management, Operations Management, and Organizational Development. The clusters concept incorporated in the new College of Health Professions degree, likewise, may add more pressure.

2. **The Office of Assessment will provide trend lines for total number of students enrolled in the program and number of graduates (Figure 1) for the period of the review.**

The relative position of the trend lines during the review period are reflective of the lag of changes in the Number of Graduates relative to changes in the Total Enrollment. Total Enrollment declined through the 2008-2009 academic year and then began its meteoric rise during the rest of the review period. The Graduates line declines through the 2010-2011 academic year and then jumps dramatically. This trend should continue, as it will reflect the massive rise in majors and minors during the last two years of this review period.

IV. **Necessity of the Program:** Provide a narrative summary for each of the following items in addition to requested appendices.

1. **Graduates:** Provide information on graduates in terms of places of employment, starting salary ranges (where appropriate and known), number employed in field of specialization, and/or acceptance into baccalaureate or graduate programs. (NOTE: Do not identify students by name.) Include this information in Appendix VII. During the review period graduates have found career positions in human resource departments of manufacturing, wholesaling, retailing, health care and other service organizations. Most graduates entered Management Training programs for careers in general management in those same categories of organizations. Due to economic conditions, many graduates have immediately pursued graduate degrees; most seeking the Master of Business Administration, Master of Health Care Administration, or Master of Human Resource Management degrees. Though data from specific individuals is scarce, entry level salaries have typically ranged from the mid-$30,000s to mid-$40,000s. Outliers exist on both ends, with a few graduates beginning in the $60,000 range.

2. **Job Placement:** If the job placement rate reported above is low, can a course of action be identified that would improve this situation? Provide a summary of procedures utilized by the institution to help place program graduates in jobs or additional educational programs. Include activities supported by both the student's academic department as well as the institution's placement office. This
summary should include the institution’s procedures and program organization for continuing contact and follow-up with graduates.

Clearly, our job placement is not low. We believe this to be true, in part, because of the emphasis put on beginning the career search early in their educational program. Like other BBA candidates, Management majors are required to participate in Career Services Center activities. In addition, networking (the primary source today for entry-level positions) is encouraged throughout the curriculum. Also, Management majors are encouraged to join and take leadership positions in discipline-specific and fraternal business organizations. In addition, Internships are strongly encouraged since they give students career-specific experience.

V. RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (If applicable)

Please prepare the following materials: 1) Program vision and mission statements with a strategic plan to achieve the program’s vision and mission, and 2) a specification of the resources needed to accomplish the program’s vision, with an evidence-based rationale as why these resources are needed and how they will help the program to accomplish its vision. The mission and vision statements, strategic plan, and needed resources with evidence-based rationale must be included in the program review when submitted. Additionally, the chair and dean must make an additional presentation to either the Academic Planning Committee or to the Graduate Council before final votes are taken.

1) The vision and mission statements for the BBA in Management are the same as for the entire College of Business.

Vision – The vision of the College of Business is to ensure that our students are successful in business careers.

Mission – The mission of the College of Business is to be a leading state institution for the education of business students, and a contributor to the region’s economic development. The College is committed to an overall balance among teaching, scholarly activity, and service. The COB is dedicated to graduating individuals who possess the communication, critical thinking, and problem solving skills necessary to meet the Tri-State area’s needs for the demands of the global marketplace.

Strategic Plan – The College of Business Strategic Plan is being revised by the COB’s Strategic Planning Committee. The revision, to be reviewed and voted on by the COB faculty, will include both strategic and tactical components. All degree programs, including Management, will fall under the COB Strategic Plan.
The vision and mission statements will remain the same as in the current Strategic Plan, but Shared Values will be added to include: Student Success, Spirit of Inquiry, Community Interaction, Continuous Improvement, Inclusiveness, Ethical Behavior, and Respect and Civility.

New (proposed) COB Strategic Plan Goals include: Academic Success, Scholarly and Creativity Activities, Academic Service, Community Service, and Faculty Development

2) The request for resource development includes:

1. Additional resources to increase faculty salaries. Management has to rely heavily on adjuncts, in large part due to the inability to attract qualified faculty because of noncompetitive salaries. Although the problem of noncompetitive salaries is not unique to management, it has reached a critical state for the discipline as evidenced by a failed search three years in a row, and a second failed search now entering its second year. Adding to the problem, even with nearly 400 principal majors and many overloaded classes, the Division Head was informed the past two years he/she could not hire any more adjuncts. Increasing salaries to that of our peer institutions would enable management to hire qualified, terminally degreed faculty; thereby better serving our students and reducing the risk of losing accreditation. The latter should not be taken lightly, especially given the anticipated passage of the new AACSB standards. Additional faculty lines also are needed and are being requested through normal budget request procedures.

2. Additional space allocation. Full-time faculty and adjuncts alike are in need of office space. Storage space is needed, as well. Literally all former storage rooms and all open spaces in the Division have already been converted into office space. In spite of the conversions, some adjuncts have been forced to use GA desks adjacent to the secretary’s area.

3. Upgrade of the audio-visual equipment in the negotiations breakout rooms. The breakout rooms for the negotiations course (the main classroom is also used for other courses) are in the same condition as when Corbly Hall opened in the early 1980s. The audio-visual equipment is outdated and in disrepair from use over the years. An instructor flat screen with multiple viewing segments, new breakout room cameras, and updated audio equipment is needed.

4. Resources for research. Resources for research in management are available, but not adequate. Research productivity is an expectation in the COB, and faculty must use their own personal funds to supplement funds for database access, computer upgrades, software, and other needs.
Appendix I

Required/Elective Course Work in the Program: BBA in Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses Required in Major (By Course Number and Title)</th>
<th>Total Required Hours</th>
<th>Elective Credit Required by the Major (By Course Number and Title)</th>
<th>Elective Hours</th>
<th>Related Fields Courses Required</th>
<th>Total Related Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Courses in Business Core Requirements:</td>
<td></td>
<td>These mgt courses can serve as mgt electives:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt 218 – Business Statistics</td>
<td>30 hours</td>
<td>Mgt 350 – Health Care Mgt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt 320 – Principles of Mgt</td>
<td></td>
<td>MGT 354 – HealthCare Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt 420 – Operations Mgt</td>
<td></td>
<td>MGT 429 – Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt 460 – Strategic Mgt</td>
<td></td>
<td>MGT 445 – International MGT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Requirements:</td>
<td></td>
<td>MGT 446- Green MGT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt 360 – Intro to Entrepreneur</td>
<td></td>
<td>MGT 461 – New Venture Dynamic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt 419 – Business/Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mgt 480 – Special Topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt 422 – Organization Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mgt 486 – Independent Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt 423 – Organization Develop</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mgt 490 – Internships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt 424 – Human Resource Mgt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students can also choose from selected upper division courses in one of the other business majors: Mls/ /Mkt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt 428 – Negotiations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional society that may have influenced the program offering and/or requirements: AACSB I
## Appendix II

Students’ Entrance Abilities for Past Five Years of Graduates: BBA in Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean High School GPA</th>
<th>Mean ACT</th>
<th>Mean SAT Verbal</th>
<th>Mean SAT Quantitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 – 2008</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>21.14 (n = 95)</td>
<td>485.91 (n = 22)</td>
<td>513.64 (n = 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 – 2009</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>20.94 (n = 73)</td>
<td>483.20 (n = 28)</td>
<td>502.50 (n = 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 – 2010</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>21.19 (n = 72)</td>
<td>488.12 (n = 21)</td>
<td>483.37 (n = 72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 – 2011</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>21.06 (n = 67)</td>
<td>488.28 (n = 23)</td>
<td>486.97 (n = 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 - 2012</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>20.45 (n = 91)</td>
<td>477.25 (n = 33)</td>
<td>465.49 (N = 33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix III
Exit Abilities for Past Five Years of Graduates: BBA in Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean GPA</th>
<th>Licensure Exam Results</th>
<th>Certification Test Results</th>
<th>Other Standardized Exam Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 – 2008</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 – 2009</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 – 2010</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 – 2011</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 - 2012</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix IV

**Assessment Summary: Component Area/Program/Discipline: BBA in Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program’s Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Measures (Tools)</th>
<th>Standards/Benchmark</th>
<th>Results/Analysis</th>
<th>Action Taken to improve the program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communications</td>
<td>The BBA Oral Communications Rubric</td>
<td>75% of the students will score Proficient or Excellent on each of the five Measurable Objectives highlighted in the Rubric</td>
<td>A. Assessment Cycle 1 (Calendar 2010): Benchmark not met for any Objective. Performance best on Objective 5 (Personal Appearance); Performance weakest on Objectives 3 and 4 (Vocal Quality, Body Language, Eye Contact and Communication Aids). Performance also relatively weak on Objective 1 (Topic &amp; Organization). See the Narrative section of this Review.</td>
<td>Management faculty have adopted the Oral Communication Rubric for evaluation of student oral communication capabilities. Prior to development of oral presentations, the rubric is shared with students so they understand characteristics important in effective oral communication. More cooperation between our required communication course objectives and the BBA rubric is currently being examined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communications</td>
<td>The BBA Written Communications Rubric</td>
<td>75% of the students will score Proficient or Excellent on each of the four Measurable Objectives highlighted in the Rubric</td>
<td>B. Assessment Cycle 2 (Calendar 2011): (1) Significant improvement in the BBA Sample: The Benchmark was met for Objectives 1, 2, 4, and 5. Performance was best on Objective 4 (Communication Aids); Performance was weakest on Objective 3 (Vocal Quality, Body Language, Eye Contact)—although improved over Cycle 1, it was still below Proficient. Personal Appearance (Objective 5) was also relatively weak.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Assessment Cycle 1: The Benchmark was not met for any Objective. Overall, across all Objectives, the BBA Sample scored below Proficient. Performance on Objectives 1 and 2 (Purpose and Tone) was relatively strong; Performance on Objectives 3 and 4 (Organization, Grammar & Mechanics) was relatively weak. See Narrative.

B. Assessment Cycle 2: The Benchmark was not met for any Objective. Overall, across all Objectives, the BBA Sample scored below Proficient. Performance on Objective 2 (Tone) was strongest, but just short of the Benchmark. Performance on Objectives 3 and 4 (Organization, Grammar & Mechanics) improved, but remained below the Benchmark.

A. The COB faculty worked with the English Department to design a new writing course for COB students: ENG 204 (Writing for the Workplace), which would carry Writing Intensive course credit. This will address our students’ specific weaknesses and introduce our students to the kinds of writing done at the upper level in the COB and in the business world. Management faculty served as Consultants during the initial development phase. ENG 204 was first offered in Fall 2010.

B. (1) The COB AOL Committee (Assurance of Learning, or Assessment) worked with the instructor of ENG 204 to redesign the syllabus for Fall 2011. The instructor also chose a different book, focused in a more direct and user-friendly way on the business writing our students must learn to do.

(2) Starting Fall 2011, the English Department agreed to staff four sections of ENG 204 per semester. Starting in Spring 2012 the Registrar restricted enrollment in ENG 204 to COB students only (specifically for COB students, targeting the kinds of writing our students need to do in the COB curriculum. The new ENG 201
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Solving &amp; Critical Thinking</th>
<th></th>
<th>See Narrative.</th>
<th>course will not substitute for Writing for the Workplace, but rather serve as a required lead-in to ENG 204.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A. For Assessment Cycle 1 we implemented the Cornell Level Z test. The BBA Sample performed, overall, below the relevant national User Norms. The faculty concluded, based on observations of the students taking the test, that most students stopped putting forth effort partway through the test. We concluded that the Level Z test did not provide an accurate test of our students’ abilities, and hence did not give us useful, actionable data on our students’ Problem-Solving & Critical Thinking skills. See Narrative.

B. For Assessment Cycle 2 we implemented the Cornell Level X test. The BBA sample performed in line with national User Norms: our sample of seniors scored in between the lower-division undergraduate User Norm and the graduate-student User Norm. Our students performed relatively well on Objective 1 (Logic), but were relatively weak on Objectives 2 and 3 (Information and Assumptions). This means that our students are not strong in “information literacy” (the ability to employ observation and assumptions to evaluate the credibility and usefulness of

| Problem Solving & Critical Thinking | The Cornell Critical Thinking Test | The relevant national User Norms on this test, for samples of students at undergraduate levels similar to those in our sample. | A. The faculty of the COB decided to switch to the Cornell Level X test, in hopes of obtaining a more accurate reading of our students’ strengths and weaknesses in Problem-Solving and Critical Thinking. We implemented the Level X test during Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011. See the Narrative section for more details. |

B. (1) The COB faculty agreed to create a User’s Guide to Teaching and Assessing Critical Thinking Skills during the Summer of 2011. The purposes of this Guide are to help faculty learn: a) what dimensions of Critical Thinking are being assessed via the Cornell Test; b) how the university is addressing Critical Thinking in the new Core Curriculum; c) from each other how to teach Critical Thinking skills, via a set of “best practices” assignment examples collected from COB faculty. The first version of this Guide was disseminated during Fall 2011. One of the two Co-Authors of this Guide was a member of the Management Faculty.

(2) Individual faculty across the COB, including members of the Management faculty, agreed to implement new, specific Problem-
| General/Core Knowledge (BBA): up through Spring 2010 | The BBA Core Knowledge Exam (see Narrative section) | The median score on the Exam will be at least 70% | The Benchmark was not met: the median score on the Exam was only 62%. The COB faculty agreed to revisit the Exam, and their respective Core Courses, to address areas of weakness. | Management faculty have reexamined Core Courses to address weak areas. Core knowledge exams are not producing specific assessment information that correspond to our courses. Faculty are now looking at developing our own test. | Solving & Critical Thinking-based assignments in their Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 courses. |
# Appendix V

## Program Course Enrollment: BBA in Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Required Elective/Service</th>
<th>Delivery Method</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year 1 2007-2008</th>
<th>Year 2 2008-2009</th>
<th>Year 3 2009-2010</th>
<th>Year 4 2010-2011</th>
<th>Year 5 2011-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Intro. to Bus</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>Hunt., SC</td>
<td>54 45</td>
<td>58 32</td>
<td>39 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Diversity in Bus.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>Hunt.</td>
<td>10 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281-283</td>
<td>Sp. Topics</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>Hunt.</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>23 5</td>
<td>2 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Prin. of Mgt.</td>
<td>R + S</td>
<td>Td + E</td>
<td>Hunt., SC</td>
<td>66 298 297 73 281 289 65 303 270 69 244 331 48 298 293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Health Care Mgt.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>Hunt.</td>
<td>28 13 37 33 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>Health Care Del. Systs.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 10 18 23 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>Intro. to Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>E + S</td>
<td>Td + E</td>
<td>Hunt.</td>
<td>34, 71, 80, 52, 77, 73, 17, 86, 79, 16, 91, 80, 17, 81, 79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>Bus. &amp; Society</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>Hunt.</td>
<td>54, 62, 53, 34, 66, 66, 82, 53, 68, 58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>Organizational Beh.</td>
<td>R + S</td>
<td>Td + E</td>
<td>Hunt., SC</td>
<td>23, 93, 70, 10, 66, 69, 61, 90, 8, 70, 74, 17, 71, 78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>Organizational Devel.</td>
<td>E + S</td>
<td>Td + E</td>
<td>Hunt., SC</td>
<td>32, 93, 70, 10, 66, 69, 61, 90, 8, 70, 74, 17, 71, 78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>Industrial Relations</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>Hunt.</td>
<td>10, 36, 40, 39, 71, 37, 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>Negotiations</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38, 71, 70, 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>Hunt.</td>
<td>8, 6, 78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>International Mgt.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>Hunt.</td>
<td>26, 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>Green Mgt.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>Hunt.</td>
<td>26, 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total: During the review period **13,073** students completed Management classes.

Indicate all program and service courses. Please include all special topics courses offered as well as independent studies. When listing Independent studies, please list the **number of independent study students enrolled**, but **DO NOT** include individual names or the titles of the independent studies. Please use the following codes:

**Required/Elective:** Required = R; Elective = E; Service = S (Please indicate all that apply; e.g. E + S, if the course is both an elective and a service course.

**Delivery Method:** Traditional = Td, Online = O, Hybrid = H

**Location:** Huntington, South Charleston, Point Pleasant, etc.
Appendix VI
Program Enrollment: BBA in Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Year 1 2007-2008</th>
<th>Year 2 2008-2009</th>
<th>Year 3 2009-2010</th>
<th>Year 4 2010-2011</th>
<th>Year 5 2011-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Majors Enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Area of Emphasis</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Majors Enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Majors Enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culinary Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Majors Enrolled*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Majors Enrolled:**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total of Students Enrolled in the Program</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates of the program</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If known. This information is not completely accurate at this time, as students often do not declare a second major until the junior evaluation or the student has her/his primary major in another college.

**On occasion you may have a student enrolled in your program who is declaring your program as a 3rd major.

***If known. This information is not completely accurate at this time, as students often do not declare minors until the junior evaluation or senior application for graduation.
Figure 1. Trend Line for Total Enrollment and Program Graduates: BBA in Management
## Appendix VII

### Job and Graduate School Placement Rates: BBA in Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of graduates employed in major field</th>
<th># of graduates employed in related fields</th>
<th># of graduates employed outside field</th>
<th># of graduates accepted to Graduate Programs</th>
<th># of graduates not accounted for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 – 2008</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 – 2009</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 – 2010</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 – 2011</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 - 2012</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five –Year Total</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VIII
Assessment Letters

Office of Assessment & Program Review

June 20, 2012

Dr. Margie McInerney, Chair
Management and Marketing
College of Business

Dear Margie:

The University Assessment Committee and I have completed our evaluation of the BBA in Management’s assessment of student learning. This letter will provide general comments and suggestions for improvement. I have included the scoring rubric we used to evaluate your assessment report in a separate document.

Unless I’m missing something, the only documents submitted were the cycles in the BBA in Management Program and curricular changes made since the last assessment. Learning goals are not written as outcomes. Measures are identified, but no assessment data are given.

During the coming academic year, it will be important that you follow the plan you developed as part of the first two activities of the Open Pathways Demonstration Project. The project’s steering committee will provide more feedback regarding next steps in that project at summer’s end. If you have questions or concerns, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds

Mary E. Reynolds
Director of Academic Assessment

C: Dr. Chong Kim, Dean, COB
Dr. Charles K. Braun, Division Head
Management, Marketing, and MIS
LCOB

Dear Charles,

This letter will document that the Office of Assessment did not receive an annual assessment report for the BBA in Management for the academic year 2009-2010 (report was due to your Dean on December 1, 2010 and to the Office of Assessment on December 15, 2010).

During the academic year 2011-2012, I plan to meet with all programs to assist with further development of assessment plans and look forward to meeting with you. I will be in touch at the end of the summer about scheduling. If you have questions or concerns, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds

Mary E. Reynolds
Director of Academic Assessment

C: Dr. Chong Kim, Dean, LCOB
Dr. Harlan Smith, AOL Coordinator, LCOB
Dear Charles,

The University Assessment Committee and I have completed our evaluation of the BBA in Management's assessment of student learning. This letter will provide my general comments and suggestions for improvement. Although the scoring rubric we used to evaluate assessment reports is attached, I will not include numerical ratings in this letter. The reason for this is that we used the attached rubric is still relatively new and, as you will see, it raises the bar for what is considered excellent assessment. However, I ask that you use it for formative purposes to help improve your assessment plan. We also would appreciate your comments concerning this rubric.

Learning outcomes for knowledge domains are not written in measurable terms, i.e., “Student will acquire knowledge.” It would be helpful to say what students will do to show they have acquired knowledge. Better yet, it would be preferable to have students do something with that knowledge that demonstrates higher orders of thinking. Can they use their knowledge to evaluate, design, develop, compare and contrast, etc.? Doing this is likely to result in assessment of application of knowledge, rather than of knowledge itself. I would recommend assessing application of core knowledge at one point earlier than the capstone. It appears that writing and oral communication will be assessed at more than one place in the curriculum.

The critical thinking test you are using in the capstone is a good idea. I think you could easily incorporate critical thinking exercises into assessment of your discipline specific knowledge objective. (The in-basket exercises may be designed to do this). So, rather than writing that objective as “Students will acquire knowledge,” how about “Students will use knowledge of management principles to create a management plan, to solve management problems, etc.” These types of objectives will help to more clearly define appropriate assessment measures.

Please see the attached rubric. If you have questions or concerns, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds

Mary E. Reynolds
Director of Academic Assessment
C: Dr. Chong Kim, Dean, LCOB
Dr. Harlan Smith, AOL Director, LCOB
Dr. Katherine Karl, Division Head
Management and Marketing
LCOB

Dear Katherine:

The University Assessment Committee and I have completed our evaluation of the BBA in Management’s assessment of student learning. This letter will provide my general comments and suggestions for improvement. Although the scoring rubric we used to evaluate assessment reports is attached, I will not include numerical ratings in this letter. The reason for this is that we used the attached rubric for the first time this year and, as you will see, it has changed considerably from the ones used in previous years. It raises the bar for what is considered excellent assessment considerably and, since it was not shared with programs before this assessment cycle, I’m not comfortable using it to give programs a formal rating this year. However, I ask that you use it for formative purposes to help improve your assessment plan. We also would appreciate your comments concerning this new rubric.

You have developed and implemented a thoughtful assessment plan, which is already resulting in continuous improvement of your program. This was especially demonstrated by your use of data from the in-basket exercises (discipline specific knowledge) and capstone case analysis (problem solving and critical thinking). Your report would have been enhanced, however, by the inclusion of the rubrics used for these assessments, along with an in-depth analysis and reporting of student performance in each area of the rubric.

I also would encourage you to develop a curriculum map to determine where (and how often) each outcome is being assessed throughout the Management curriculum. For example, you plan to assess core knowledge in the capstone final exam, but I’m sure this knowledge also is assessed in various courses throughout the curriculum. Capturing these complementary assessments at different points throughout the curriculum, would help you to gauge student learning over time. Also, you will be assessing written and oral communication using various types of class projects and presentations. I assume that students will write and speak about one of the topics listed in the core knowledge domain. Perhaps your assessment rubrics could include a category for assessment of the student’s depth and breadth of understanding of that specific topic area. The same is true of critical thinking; students will be thinking critically and solving problems using some content. Using more than one assessment for each outcome will add a useful measure of reliability to your results.

However, I commend you for an excellent start to your assessment program, which is already resulting in program improvement! Please see the attached rubric and letter to Deans, Chairs, and Faculty detailing general suggestions for an effective assessment program. If you have questions or concerns, please let me know.
Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds

Mary E. Reynolds
Director of Academic Assessment

C: Dr. Chong Kim, Interim Dean, LCOB
Appendix IX
AACSB Accreditation Documents

January 24, 2012

Chong W. Kim
Dean
Marshall University
Lewis College of Business
One John Marshall Drive, 107 Corbly Hall
Huntington, WV 25755-2300
UNITED STATES

Via email: kim@marshall.edu

Dear Dean Kim,

It is my pleasure to inform you that the peer review team recommendation to extend maintenance of accreditation for the undergraduate and master’s degree programs in business offered by Marshall University is concurred with by the Maintenance of Accreditation Committee and ratified by the Board of Directors. Congratulations to you, the faculty, the students, the staff, and all supporters of the school.

One purpose of peer review is to stimulate further continuous improvement of quality programs. As noted in the team report, the school is to be commended on the following strengths and effective practices:

1. The College’s Business Advisory Board plays a critically significant role in advancing the quality of the College and its outreach into the business community as well as Marshall University as a whole.

2. The College is commended for its effective recruitment and retention of students. University administration has made this a top strategic initiative and the College has added a new position of Director of Recruitment and Retention.

3. The College provides vital business, community and economic development outreach to the service region through a wide variety of course/degree based opportunities. Examples include: the College’s effective economic development outreach such as the Toyota/International Business program Problem-Solving partnership; live cases in marketing and entrepreneurship program with the medical center; and, the MS in Health Care Administration Internships with Cabell-Huntington Hospital.
3. The College’s Hall of Fame Dinner Fundraiser each spring is a significant source of external funds and increases community prestige for the College as well as the University as a whole.

5. In discussions with business faculty and the College Business Advisory Board the PRT learned that the College Dean has been effective in increasing the linkage between the College and the business community.

6. The College’s students laud the small class size, close association with faculty in learning and service as well as the faculty’s dedication to student success.

Additionally, in the interest of continuous improvement, Marshall University should closely monitor the following item and incorporate it into ongoing strategic planning initiatives:

a. The PRT was concerned that the Fifth Year Report did not adequately tell the story of the overall quality. The entire report was not well organized and lacked management and key faculty supervision and leadership. Even though an Executive Summary is no longer required by AACSB, the addition of a clear summary would have added an effective beginning to the entire maintenance report. All five parts of the Situational Analysis were entirely too brief and required PRT members to spend much time obtaining additional information. The report did not contain a table showing financial support for the College strategic action items for the next three years (report did contain discussion points).

2. The College should continue to use and mature its AoL program and more effectively demonstrate widespread faculty involvement and ownership in all aspects of the program and its implementation and assessment. It should ensure that results from the analysis of goals/objectives for each assessment cycle are more exact and have clear links to continuous improvements. Additionally, the College should be more consistent in developing AoL methodologies and processes used for all degree programs. (Standards 16-19: Assurance of Learning)

3. In the spirit of continuous improvement, the College should review and strengthen its process used to classify faculty intellectual contributions as basic, applied and pedagogical research. The Digital Measures system should be carefully implemented to ensure faculty intellectual data are correctly entered in Table 2-1. (Standard 2: Intellectual Contributions)

4. In the spirit of continuous improvement, the College should review and strengthen its maintenance of qualification definitions for AQ faculty, particularly related to the overall quality of peer-reviewed journals. The College should have sufficient AQ faculty resources prior to starting any new
Marshall University has achieved accreditation for five additional years. The next on-site maintenance review occurs in the fifth year, 2016-2017. A timeline specific to your visit year is attached. Please note that your Maintenance Review Application will be due on July 1st, 2014. You will be expected to provide an update on progress in addressing the concerns stated above in addition to other relevant information for initiation of the next maintenance review.

Please refer to the Maintenance of Accreditation Handbook for more information regarding the processes for maintenance of accreditation. The handbook is updated periodically to provide the most current process improvements. Please monitor the website to make certain that you have the most current version.

Again, congratulations from the Accreditation Council and AACSB International - The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business. Thank you for participating in the maintenance of accreditation process and for providing valuable feedback that is essential to a meaningful and beneficial review.

Sincerely,

Jan Williams, Chair
Board of Directors

cc: Peer Review Team
Berkwood M. Farmer,
Business Team Chair George W. Krull Jr., Accounting Team Chair Henry Lowenstein,
Business Team Member Gary D. Burkette, Accounting Team Member