

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## ANNUAL REPORTS

2003 .....	3
2004 .....	9
2005 .....	15
2006 .....	21
2007 .....	27

## ASSESSMENT

TIMELINE OF ASSESSMENT EFFORTS .....	34
ETS SUMMARY RESULTS .....	39
ASSESSMENT OF TEAMWORK RUBRIC .....	44
UNDERGRADUATE ORAL COMMUNICATIONS RESULTS .....	47
MBA CORE KNOWLEDGE EXAM RESULTS .....	53
RUBRIC .....	54
BBA CONTENT .....	58
BBA LEARNING GOALS .....	72
SACS ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING OUTCOMES .....	76
UNDERGRADUATE EXIT SURVEY RESULTS .....	107
MBA EXIT SURVEY RESULTS .....	122

## FACULTY SUFFICIENCY

TABLE 1 – FACULTY SUFFICIENCY BY DEPARTMENT, SPRING 2008 .....	133
TABLE 1 – FACULTY SUFFICIENCY BY SESSION, SPRING 2008 .....	139
TABLE 1 – FACULTY SUFFICIENCY BY CAMPUS, SPRING 2008 .....	147
TABLE 1 – FACULTY SUFFICIENCY BY DEPARTMENT, FALL 2007 .....	154
TABLE 1 – FACULTY SUFFICIENCY BY SESSION, FALL 2007 .....	160
TABLE 1 – FACULTY SUFFICIENCY BY CAMPUS, FALL 2007 .....	168
TABLE 2 – INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY DEPARTMENT .....	175
TABLE 2A – FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS BY DEPARTMENT .....	183
TABLE 2A – FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS BY CAMPUS .....	189

**ANNUAL REPORTS**

2003 ..... 3  
2004 ..... 9  
2005 ..... 15  
2006 ..... 21  
2007 ..... 27

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS  
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

ACCREDITATION MAINTENANCE ANNUAL REPORT

2003

## INTRODUCTION

During 2003, the Texas Legislature, acting through the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, accelerated implementation of the state's new higher education plan, Closing the Gaps by 2015. This plan is based on achieving the five following goals by 2015: (1) Close The Gaps In Participation [Add 500,000 more students], (2) Close The Gaps In Success [Increase by 50 percent the number of degrees and certificates from high-quality programs], (3) Close The Gaps In Excellence [Substantially increase the number of nationally recognized programs at colleges and universities in Texas], (4) Close The Gaps In Research [Increase federal research and development funding by 50 percent to \$1.3 billion], and (5) Assure Progress Towards These Goals [Develop benchmarks and measures to assess progress toward goals of the plan by each institution and higher education as a whole]. The legislature also deregulated tuition and transferred the responsibility and authority for raising a major portion of the funds to cover the increasing cost of higher education to the Boards of the respective institutions. These actions are producing dramatic changes in funding, accountability, performance measurement, and management of Texas universities.

Under Dean Hazleton's direction, the College of Business Administration was involved in several major university initiatives. The university, and every college and schools, finalized its plans for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) reaccreditation. The college supports and implements the university's SACS assessment of academic programs process through the work of the Undergraduate, Masters, and Doctoral program committees. The university initiated a major effort to review its mission and vision in response to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's announcement of the new Higher Education Accountability System. This system establishes five groups of educational institutions and creates appropriate measures of institutional performance for each group. The University of North Texas and six other schools were designated as members of the Emerging Research University group. Inclusion in this group is fortuitous for the future of the university and the college. A number of college faculty and administrators were heavily engaged in the work of the various task forces undertaking this critically important review. In order to support the university's review efforts and better implement the AACSB's revised accreditation standards and maintenance of accreditation process, the college is endeavoring to determine the best strategies for effectively reexamining its own mission, vision, and strategic planning process.

The college faculty received promotion raises during 2003, but merit salary increases were limited to 2 percent and deferred until January 2004 because of a state revenue shortfall. The university has begun a faculty salary study to determine the additional funding necessary to begin implementing the university's goal of "closing the gaps" with respect to differences in average salaries between UNT and selected Texas higher education institutions.

## Continuing Action Items 2003

Action Item or Activity	Processes Involved	Current Year Resources & Sources	Continuing Resources & Sources	Completion Date & Accountability	Status as of December 31, 2003
Assessment & Enhancement of Student Learning	Functioning of the Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Continuing: Associate Dean, UPC, and COBA Faculty	<p>Changes approved by COBA Faculty</p> <p>New Degree Program = 0            New Professional Field = 0            New Courses = 6            Title/Content = 6            Prerequisites = 9            Degree Requirements = 1            Program/Policy = 9</p>
	Functioning of the Masters Program Committee (MPC)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Continuing: Associate Dean, UPC, and COBA Faculty	<p>Changes approved by COBA Faculty</p> <p>New Degree Program = 0            New Concentration = 4            New Courses = 5            Title/Content = 4            Prerequisites = 1            Degree Requirements = 0            Program/Policy = 4</p>
	Functioning of the Doctoral Program Committee (DPC)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Continuing: Associate Dean, UPC, and COBA Faculty	<p>Changes approved by COBA Faculty</p> <p>New Degree Program = 0            New Professional Field = 0            New Courses = 2            Title/Content = 7            Prerequisites = 0            Degree Requirements = 2            Program/Policy = 4</p>

Status as of December 31, 2003

Completion Date & Accountability

Continuing Resources & Sources

Current Year Resources & Sources

Processes Involved

Action Item or Activity

Assessment & Enhancement of Student Learning	UPC, MPC, and DPC Review Assessment Programs*	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Fall 2007: Associate Dean, UPC, MPC, and DPC	Evaluation in progress: Reviewed SACS and COBA assessment programs
Research and Scholarship	Faculty Research Productivity	Time: COBA Faculty	Time: COBA Faculty	Continuing: Chairs and Faculty	Refereed Articles = 121 Invited Articles = 1 Books = 14 Book Chapters = 12 Editorships = 17 Book Reviews = 1 Papers & Presentations = 109
Research Support	Acquisition of electronic databases and research sources	Funds: \$1,040,367 from UNT: Library allocation for research databases and sources	Funds: \$1,040,367 from UNT: Library allocation	Continuing: COBA's Library committee	Provided 23 research databases utilized by COBA faculty and students
Improve Research, Instructional, and Administrative Technology	Faculty, Classroom, Lab, and Administrative Technology Plan	Funds: \$650 from Department Maintenance & Operations \$90,946 from student fees \$4,755 from Department Higher Education Assistance Fund (HEAF) Total of \$96,351	Funds: The five-year technological plan and HEAF	Continuing: High Technological committee and Assistant Dean	\$252,742 expended for upgrade lab server; for alarm systems; for printers; for software; for renewal of SanDisk Cruzer PC storage devices
Attract, Nurture, and Retain Faculty	Increase faculty salaries based on College and University Salary Procedures	Due to state budget reductions, only promotion funds were available (September 2003) from state appropriations and Vice President Academic Affairs (VPAA) allocation	N/A	Continuing: Department Chairs, Dean, and VPAA	\$24,900 allocated by VPAA on September 1, 2003: Promotions = \$24,900; a 2 percent Merit funds will be available in January 2004

Status as of December 31, 2003

Completion Date & Accountability

Continuing Resources & Sources

Current Year Resources & Sources

Processes Involved

Action Item or Activity

Attract, Nurture, and Retain Faculty	New faculty recruiting based on College & University Recruiting Procedures	Funds: \$279,000 for Tenure Track & \$140,000 for Full Time non tenure track from COBA faculty budget and from funds requested from VPAA N/A	N/A	Continuing: Department Chairs, Dean, and VPAA	ACCT - TT (1) BCJS - FT-NTT (1) MGMT - FT-NTT (1) MKTG - TT (2)
Instructional, Administrative, and Faculty Facilities	College and University Renovation Process	N/A	N/A	Continuing: Assistant Dean	Responsibility for COBA facilities assigned to Assistant Dean, Dr. Cengiz Capan (September 2003)
Increase the level of External Funding	Development activities of the five departments and COBA Dean's Office	Time: Department Chairs, Dean, and COBA Faculty	Time: Department Chairs, Dean, and COBA Faculty	Continuing: Dean and Department Chairs	\$1,531,928 received by the five departments and COBA
Globalization Initiatives	Provide Study Abroad Programs and Courses	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff Funds: UNT Study Abroad grants and student tuition and fees	N/A	Continuing: Faculty, Associate Dean, and Department Chairs	64 students enrolled in 7 courses with instruction and / or visits to Germany, Spain, France, England, Italy, and Malaysia

### Immediate Action Items 2003

Action Item or Activity	Processes Involved	Current Year Resources & Sources	Continuing Resources & Sources	Completion Date & Accountability	Status As Of Dec. 31, 2003
Review COBA Mission, Vision, and Strategic Planning Process	Evaluation by Executive Committee of COBA (September 2003)	Time: Executive committee	N/A	December 2003: Dean and Executive committee	Recommended formation of a COBA Strategic Planning committee
Review Electronic MBA Program	Electronic MBA Review committee (Spring 2002)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	N/A	January 2003: Electronic MBA Review committee	Report presented to COBA faculty on January 24, 2003
Evaluate and update Quality Basic Research outlets list (QBR)	Evaluation conducted by DPC (Fall 2002)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	N/A	Spring 2003: DPC, Dean and Executive committee	Revised QBR list approved by COBA faculty on March 7, 2003
NAFTA Grant Proposal	NAFTA proposal group directed by Dr. Ted Coe (Spring 2002)	Time: COBA Faculty	Time: COBA Faculty	January 2003: NAFTA Group	Received \$300,000 for a two-year grant (April 2003)
New COBA Building	University, System, and Legislative Processes (Fall 2002)	Funds: \$50 Million from Tuition Revenue Bonds Legislative	N/A	Fall 2004: UNT System	Work in progress
Develop SACS's Required Learning Outcomes	All academic and non-academic units in COBA (September 2003)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Fall 2004: Dean, Department Chairs, Center Directors, and Staff	Work in progress
COBA Logo	COBA Logo Project (Spring 2002)	Time: Dean and COBA Staff	N/A	Summer 2003: COBA Dean	Completed Summer 2003
Support UNT's Distributed Learning Initiatives	Work with UNT's Information and Learning Technologies Center (ILTC) (February 2003)	Time: COBA Faculty and ILTC Staff	N/A	Ongoing: Faculty, Department Chairs, and Program Committees	Work in progress: Applied for Telecommunication Infrastructure Fund (TIF) Grant to develop Online courses and degree offerings



UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS  
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

ACCREDITATION MAINTENANCE ANNUAL REPORT

2004

## INTRODUCTION

In February 2004, the college activated a Strategic Planning Committee and launched a major effort to update and improve the current strategic planning process, which had been developed in 1997-1998. Dean Hazelton appointed a Steering Committee, comprised of Dr. Finley Graves (Chair of Accounting Department), Dr. Mary Thibodeaux (Associate Dean), and Mr. Jerry Pinkerton (Advisory Board President), to oversee the process. This committee was made up of faculty, staff, students, alumni, advisory board members, and representatives of other UNT units. The committee developed the COBA Strategic Planning Process that outlined an approach to strategic planning that derived from a desire to (1) effectively manage the college in accordance with university policy, AACSB guidelines, and the COBA Charter and (2) provide a process of assessment and continuous improvement based on SACS and AACSB recommendations and standards. In conjunction with the strategic planning effort, Dean Hazelton appointed ad hoc faculty committees to study and report on ethics and diversity issues in the college.

Throughout the year, the faculty, staff, and administration of the college were involved in several university initiatives. The university, and every colleges and schools, prepared for SACS reaccreditation and evaluated or established learning outcomes. The Provost announced a major new project to develop an Academic Plan for the university. At the urging of the Board and Chancellor, the university community intensified efforts to redefine its Mission/Vision.

During 2004, COBA faculty received excellence and market adjustments in addition to merit raises and promotions. The COBA received \$162,800 in additional funding to begin the university's goal of "closing the gaps" with respect to differences in average salaries between UNT and selected Texas higher education institutions. In order to lessen the salary gaps, this funding was distributed to faculty in the college based on research productivity and market attractiveness. Approximately 35 percent of the faculty received market adjustments. The average adjustment was \$4,500 with the highest amount (\$10,000) awarded to each of the top researchers in each of the departments.

During the College of Business Administration's faculty meeting of April 23, 2004, Provost Howard Johnson announced that Dean Hazelton would step down as Dean and that Dr. Mary Thibodeaux would immediately act as Interim Dean. He stated that a search committee would convene with the intent to fill the position by the fall of 2005.

## Continuing Action Items 2004

Action Item or Activity	Processes Involved	Current Year Resources & Sources	Continuing Resources & Sources	Completion Date & Accountability	Status as of December 31, 2004
Assessment & Enhancement of Student Learning*	Functioning of the Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Continuing: Associate Dean, UPC, and COBA Faculty	Changes approved by COBA Faculty New Degree Program = 0 New Prof Field = 0 New Courses = 2 Title/Content = 5 Prerequisites = 27 Degree Requirements = 2 Program/Policy = 12
	Functioning of the Masters Program Committee (MPC)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Continuing: Associate Dean, UPC, and COBA Faculty	Changes approved by COBA Faculty New Degree Program = 0 New Concentration = 1 New Courses = 1 Title/Content = 1 Prerequisites = 6 Degree Requirements = 2 Program/Policy = 7
	Functioning of the Doctoral Program Committee (DPC)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Continuing: Associate Dean, UPC, and COBA Faculty	Changes approved by COBA Faculty New Degree Program = 0 New Prof Field = 0 New Courses = 0 Title/Content = 8 Prerequisites = 1 Degree Requirements = 0 Program/Policy = 8
	Appoint a COBA Assessment Task Force	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Fall 2007: Associate Dean, Task Force, UPC, MPC, and DPC	Evaluation in progress Assessment Task Force appointed (February 2004)

\* Note: For more information on assessment activities see the Report of the Assessment Task Force

**Action Item or Activity**      **Processes Involved**      **Current Year Resources & Sources**      **Continuing Resources & Sources**      **Completion Date & Accountability**      **Status as of December 31, 2004**

Research and Scholarship	Faculty Research Productivity	Time: COBA Faculty	Time: COBA Faculty	Continuing: Chairs and COBA Faculty	Refereed Articles = 87 Invited Articles = 5 Books = 8 Book Chapters = 2 Editorships = 29 Book Reviews = 11 Papers & Presentations = 121
Research Support	Acquisition of electronic databases and research sources	Funds: \$1,195,824 from UNT; Library allocation for electronic databases and research sources	Funds: \$1,195,824 from UNT; Library allocation	Continuing: COBA's Library committee	Provided 25 research databases and sources utilized by COBA faculty and students
Improve Research, Instructional, and Administrative Technology	Faculty, Classroom, Lab, and Administrative Technology Plan	Funds: \$4,394 from COBA	Funds: \$4,394 from COBA	Continuing: Assistant Dean	Provided 1 additional research database
Attract, Nurture, and Retain Faculty	Increase faculty salaries based on College and University Salary Procedures	Funds: \$111,726 from COBA Higher Education Assistance Fund (HEAF) \$508,097 from student fees	Funds: The five-year technological plan, HEAF, and student fees	Continuing: High Technological committee and Assistant Dean	\$619,823 expended to upgrade lab server; to add a computer kiosks; to upgrade monitors and computers in all labs; and to upgrade monitors in all faculty and staff offices
Instructional, Administrative, and Faculty Facilities	College and University Renovation Process	Funds: \$270,000 from state appropriations and Vice President Academic Affairs (VPAA) allocation	N/A	Continuing: Department Chairs, Dean, and VPAA	\$24,900 allocated by VPAA on September 1, 2004; Market = \$162,800; Excellence = \$69,500; Promotions = \$15,200; Other = \$22,500
Increase the level of External Funding	Development activities of the five departments and COBA Dean's Office	Funds: \$176,985 from UNT HEAF \$62,906 from COBA HEAF \$2,183 from Departments' Maintenance & Operations	N/A	Continuing: Dean	\$242,054 expended on a new roof, for A, P, & C FIREL faculty and administrative areas; for computer labs; for classrooms 331-356; and for new doors for BA 155-167
		Time: Department Chairs, Dean, and COBA Faculty	Time: Department Chairs, Dean, and COBA Faculty	Continuing: Dean and Department Chairs	\$2,674,895 received by the five departments and COBA

Action Item or Activity	Processes Involved	Current Year Resources & Sources	Continuing Resources & Sources	Completion Date & Accountability	Status as of December 31, 2004
Globalization Initiatives	Provide Study Abroad Programs and Courses	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff Funds: UNT Study Abroad Grants and student tuition and fees	N/A	Continuing: Faculty, Associate Dean, and Department Chairs	60 students enrolled in 6 courses with instruction and / or visits to Germany, Spain, France, England, Italy, and Hong Kong

### Immediate Action Items 2004

Action Item or Activity	Processes Involved	Current Year Resources & Sources	Continuing Resources & Sources	Completion Date & Accountability	Status as of December 31, 2004
Update COBA Strategic Plan	Appoint COBA Strategic Plan committee on February 13, 2004	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	N/A	April 2004: Dean, Strategic Plan committee, and COBA Faculty	Mission document approved by COBA faculty on September 15, 2004
Develop a COBA Ethics Statement	Appoint COBA Ethics Task Force on February 13, 2004	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	N/A	Fall 2004: Dean, Ethics TF, and COBA Faculty	Ethics statement approved by COBA faculty on November 19, 2004
Develop a COBA Diversity Statement	Appoint COBA Diversity Task Force on February 13, 2004	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	N/A	Fall 2004: Dean, Diversity TF, and COBA Faculty	Diversity statement approved by COBA faculty on November 19, 2004
Prepare COBA Response to UNT Academic Plan	Respond to Provost's Website and Meetings (September 2004)	Time: Faculty	N/A	December 2004: Associate Dean and COBA Faculty	Work continuing on UNT Academic Plan
Initiate Dean's Search Process	Provost's selection of Search firm and appointment of Selection committee (Fall 2004)	Funds: Search firm's costs covered by the Provost's Office Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Funds: Search firm's costs covered by the Provost's Office Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Fall 2005: Provost and Search committee	Search firm selected and Recommendations for Search Committee sent to Provost on November 19, 2004
New COBA Building	University, System, and Legislative Processes (Fall 2002)	Funds: \$50 million from Tuition Revenue Bonds Legislature	N/A	August 31, 2004: UNT System	Board approved request of \$50 M in Revenue Bonds to Texas Legislature
Develop SACS's Required Learning Outcomes	All academic and non-academic units in COBA (Fall 2003)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Fall 2004: Dean, Department Chairs, Center Directors, and Staff	Completed on November 15, 2004

Action Item or Activity	Processes Involved	Current Year Resources & Sources	Continuing Resources & Sources	Completion Date & Accountability	Status as of December 31, 2004
Achieve better Coordination of Graduate Studies and Research Activities	Create the position of Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Research (March 2004)	Funds: \$73,700 from unfilled administrative line and \$43,120 from unfilled 1/2 time faculty line	N/A	Fall 2004: Dean and VPAA	Funds approved and position filled by Dr. Derrick D'Souza (September 2004)
Develop a Brand Identify for COBA	Appoint a Branding Task Force (June 2004)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Fall 2005: Marketing Specialist & Task Force	Work in progress
Support UNT's Distributed Learning Initiatives	Work with UNT's Information and Learning Technologies Center (ILTC) (January 2004)	Time: COBA Faculty and ILTC Staff	N/A	Ongoing: COBA Faculty, Department Chairs, and Program and Committeees	COBA received \$80,000 Telecommunication Infrastructure Fund (TIF) grant to develop Online courses and degree offerings

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS  
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

ACCREDITATION MAINTENANCE ANNUAL REPORT

2005

## INTRODUCTION

Continuing the work of the COBA Strategic Planning Committee from 2004, departments, standing committees, and support/academic centers within the college developed goals that were incorporated into the 2005 revision of the strategic plan. The strategic initiatives suggested by the Planning Committee were adopted by the college and are the official strategic goals/initiatives used in the COBA Strategic Plan. Several of the academic departments held annual planning and assessment retreats this year. The Academic Advising Office has reinstated its annual fall strategic planning retreat. In addition, each of the academic departments and the College of Business Administration held advisory board meetings that contributed to both planning and assessment.

Throughout the year, the college was involved in three major university initiatives. The university accelerated activities in preparation for SACS reaccreditation. The College of Business Administration faculty and administrators played active roles in these efforts. Interim Dean Mary Thibodeaux led the Undergraduate Curriculum Innovation and Learning Task Force that recommended the Quality Enhancement Plan that has been adopted by the university for SACS accreditation. Dr. Bob Insley served on the UNT Quality Enhancement Plan Steering Committee. His excellent work was instrumental in the College receiving one of the \$10,000 Quality Enhancement Development Awards. The Provost, with extensive faculty and administrative input, continued to develop the first Academic Plan for the university. Dr. Grant Miles served on the Academic Planning Council, and Dr. Lynn Johnson served as Vice-Chair of the Academic Planning Council Implementation Committee. The Board of Regents approved revised Mission and Vision statements reflecting UNT's designation, by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, as an Emerging Research University. The Board instructed the university to start development of a new 10 – 15 year strategic plan designed to achieve the revised UNT Mission and Vision.

During 2005, the faculty received excellence and market adjustments in addition to merit raises and promotions. The college received \$234,606 in additional funding to continue the university's goal of "closing the gaps" with respect to differences in average salaries between UNT and selected Texas higher education institutions. In order to lessen the salary gaps, this funding was distributed to faculty based on research productivity and market attractiveness.

Dr. Mary Thibodeaux continued to serve as Interim Dean of the college until October 2005 when Dr. Kathleen Cooper, previously Undersecretary for Economic Affairs in the Department of Commerce, was selected as Dean of the College of Business Administration.



## Continuing Action Items 2005

Action Item or Activity	Processes Involved	Current Year Resources & Sources	Continuing Resources & Sources	Completion Date & Accountability	Status as of December 31, 2005
Assessment & Enhancement of Student Learning*	Functioning of the Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Continuing: Associate Dean, UPC, and COBA Faculty	Changes approved by COBA Faculty New Degree Program = 0 New Professional Field = 1 New Courses = 0 Title/Content = 7 Prerequisites = 5 Degree Requirements = 0 Program/Policy = 12
	Functioning of the Masters Program Committee (MPC)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Continuing: Associate Dean, UPC, and COBA Faculty	Changes approved by COBA Faculty New Degree Program = 1 New Concentration = 3 New Courses = 1 Title/Content = 0 Prerequisites = 8 Degree Requirements = 1 Program/Policy = 3
	Functioning of the Doctoral Program Committee (DPC)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Continuing: Associate Dean, UPC, and COBA Faculty	Changes approved by COBA Faculty New Degree Program = 0 New Professional Field = 0 New Courses = 0 Title/Content = 0 Prerequisites = 1 Degree Requirements = 0 Program/Policy = 4
	Evaluation conducted by Assessment Task Force	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Fall 2007: Associate Dean, Task Force, UPC, MPC, and DPC	Evaluation in progress Recommended a 1/2 time Position to direct project

\* Note: For more information on assessment activities see the Report of the Assessment Task Force

Status as of December 31, 2005

Completion Date & Accountability

Continuing Resources & Sources

Current Year Resources & Sources

Processes Involved

Action Item or Activity

Research and Scholarship	Faculty Research Productivity	Time: COBA Faculty	Time: COBA Faculty	Continuing: Chairs and COBA Faculty	<p>Referred Articles = 77 Invited Articles = 14 Books = 6 Book Chapters = 4 Editorships = 33 Book Reviews = 9 Papers &amp; Presentations = 149</p> <p>Provided 27 research databases and sources utilized by COBA faculty and students</p> <p>Provided 3 additional research databases</p> <p>\$214,508 expended for computer upgrades and flash drives for all faculty &amp; staff, Lab upgrades, and \$30,000 distribution to academic departments</p> <p>\$251,206 allocated by VPAA on September 1, 2005: Market = \$139,606; Excellence = \$95,000; Promotions = \$7,000; Other = \$10,000</p> <p>FIREL - TT MGMT - TT (2) MGMT - FT-NTT MKTG - TT (3)</p>
Research Support	Acquisition of electronic databases and research sources	<p>Funds: \$1,371,143 from UNT: Library allocation for electronic databases and research sources</p> <p>Funds: \$31,894 from COBA</p>	<p>Funds: \$1,371,143 from UNT: Library allocation</p> <p>Funds: \$31,894 from COBA</p>	<p>Continuing: COBA's Library committee</p> <p>Continuing: Assistant Dean</p>	
Improve Research, Instructional, and Administrative Technology	Faculty, Classroom, Lab, and Administrative Technology Plan	<p>Funds: \$210,404 from COBA Higher Education Assistance Fund (HEAF)</p> <p>\$4,014 from student fees</p>	<p>Funds: The five-year technological plan, HEAF, and student fees</p>	<p>Continuing: Assistant Dean - Tech</p>	
Attract, Nurture, and Retain Faculty	<p>Increase faculty salaries based on College and University Salary Procedures</p> <p>New faculty recruiting based on College and University Recruiting Procedures</p>	<p>Funds: \$251,206 from state appropriations and Vice President Academic Affairs (VPAA) allocation</p> <p>Funds: \$559,835 for Tenure Track &amp; \$85,916 for Full time non tenure track; from COBA faculty budget and funds requested from VPAA</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>Continuing: Department Chairs, Dean, and VPAA</p> <p>Continuing: Department Chairs, Dean, and VPAA</p>	

Action Item or Activity	Processes Involved	Current Year Resources & Sources	Continuing Resources & Sources	Completion Date & Accountability	Status as of December 31, 2005
Instructional, Administrative, and Faculty Facilities	College and University Renovation Process	Funds: \$259,492 from UNT HEAF \$5,865 from COBA HEAF \$31,820 from COBA Maintenance & Operations \$2,000 from Department M & O \$3,326 from students fees	N/A	Continuing: Assistant Dean	\$302,503 expended for A, P, & C MKTG; for MGMT faculty and administrative areas; for new cameras and mikes for all classrooms; and for new seating and tables for BA 116
Increase the level of External Funding	Development activities of the five departments and COBA Dean's Office	Time: Department Chairs, Dean, COBA Faculty	Time: Department Chairs, Dean, and COBA Faculty	Continuing: Dean and Department Chairs	\$894,000 received by the five departments and COBA
Globalization Initiatives	Provide Study Abroad Programs and Courses	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff Funds: UNT Study Abroad Grants and student tuition and fees	N/A	Continuing: COBA Faculty, Associate Dean, and Department Chairs	51 students enrolled in 5 courses with instruction and / or visits to Austria, Germany, France, England, Italy, and Costa Rica.

### Immediate Action Items 2005

Action Item or Activity	Processes Involved & Start Date	Current Year Resources & Sources	Continuing Resources & Sources	Completion Date & Accountability	Status as of December 31, 2005
Update COBA Strategic Plan	Update department strategic plans and align COBA's plan with the new UNT Strategic Plan (February 2004)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	N/A	Spring 2008: Dean, Strategic Plan committee, and COBA Faculty	Work continuing on departmental's and COBA's strategic plans
Prepare COBA Response to New UNT Academic Plan	Respond to Provost's Website and Meetings (September 2004)	Time: COBA Faculty	N/A	March 2005: Associate Dean and COBA Faculty	UNT Academic Plan approved in May 2005

Action Item or Activity	Processes Involved	Current Year Resources & Sources	Continuing Resources & Sources	Completion Date & Accountability	Status as of December 31, 2005
Dean's Search Process	Functioning of search firm, Selection committee, and Provost (Fall 2004)	Funds: Search firm's costs covered by the Provost's Office Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Funds: Search firm's costs covered by the Provost's Office Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Fall 2005: Provost and Search committee	Dr. Kathleen Cooper, selected as Dean, arrived on campus on October 2005
New COBA Building	University, System, and Legislative Processes (Fall 2002)	Funds: \$50 million from the Tuition Revenue Bonds Legislature	N/A	August 31, 2004: UNT System	Texas Legislature did not approve any Tuition Revenue Bonds
Develop the Graduating Senior Exit Survey	UPC and Dr. Gopala Ganesh (January 2005)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Fall 2005: UPC and COBA Faculty	Completed and incorporated into regular graduation packet
Support UNT's QEP (adopted for SACS's accreditation)	Implement quality enhancement tools and procedures (January 2005)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Spring 2006: Dean, Department Chairs and COBA Faculty	Work in progress COBA received a \$10,000 QE Award for MGMT 3330
Develop a Brand Identity For The COBA	Integrate various COBA's websites into one COBA Website  Develop COBA brand in compliance with new UNT Branding approved on April 27, 2005	Consolidate several part-time lines into one Webmaster position	N/A	Ongoing: Dean, Department Chairs, and Marketing specialist  Fall 2007: Marketing Specialist and Task Force	Work in progress One Website under one Webmaster  Work in progress Must comply with UNT Academic word marks and Spirit marks
Support UNT's Distributed Learning Initiatives	Work with UNT's Information and Learning Technologies Center (ILTC) (January 2004)	Time: COBA Faculty and ILTC Staff	N/A	Ongoing: Faculty, Department Chairs, and Program Committees	COBA received \$24,000 Telecommunication Infrastructure Fund (TIF) grant to develop Online courses and degree offerings

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS  
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

ACCREDITATION MAINTENANCE ANNUAL REPORT

2006

## INTRODUCTION

The university continued work on the new 10 – 15 year strategic plan designed to achieve the updated UNT Mission and Vision. The college Strategic Planning Committee hosted a discussion and input session on the Draft Strategic Planning Outline in November of 2006. This meeting was attended by representatives of the college Advisory Board, Dean's Office, department chairs, faculty, and staff. The planning process that was developed reflected an evaluation of the national, state, university, college, and accrediting agency environments and integrated input from employers, advisory board members, faculty, staff, and university/college administrators. Several of the academic departments and the Academic Advising Office also held annual planning and assessment retreats this year. In addition, each of the academic departments and the College of Business Administration held advisory board meetings that contributed to planning and assessment.

The dominant thrust of the university and the college, during 2006, was the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) reaccreditation. At the university level, COBA faculty and administrators continued to play active roles in this effort. Associate Dean Mary Thibodeaux directed the Undergraduate Curriculum Innovation and Learning Task Force in implementing the Quality Enhancement Plan that was adopted by UNT for SACS accreditation. Dr. Bob Insley served on the UNT Quality Enhancement Plan Steering Committee. Most other university initiatives were placed on review status by the new central administration. In September, the Accounting Department hosted a full day workshop for the faculty of the college on Assessment of Student Learning/Academic Improvement. The workshop was conducted by Dr. Kathryn Martell. As a result of this workshop, the college initiated a major effort to revise its traditional SACS-based assessment/academic improvement process by incorporating more direct assessment methods and increasing course imbedded measures. Under Dean Cooper's leadership, the COBA planning effort focused on clarifying and articulating the future direction of the college, refining the strategic planning/management process, and preparing the AACSB Maintenance Review Application and supporting documentation.

During 2006, the faculty received merit and promotion raises. The college received \$240,906 in additional funding to continue the university's goal of "closing the gaps" with respect to differences in average salaries between UNT and selected Texas higher education institutions.

Dr. Kathleen Cooper continued to serve as Dean of the College of Business Administration. On July 7, 2006, the UNT Board of Regents named Dr. Gretchen Bataille to replace Dr. Norval Pohl as President of UNT. Dr. Bataille formerly served as academic chief of the 16-campus University of North Carolina System.

## Continuing Action Items 2006

Action Item or Activity	Processes Involved	Current Year Resources & Sources	Continuing Resources & Sources	Completion Date & Accountability	Status as of December 31, 2006
Assessment and Enhancement of Student Learning*	Functioning of the Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Continuing: Associate Dean, UPC, and COBA Faculty	Changes approved by COBA Faculty New Degree Program = 0 New Professional Field = 0 New Courses = 2 Title/Content = 3 Prerequisites = 6 Degree Requirements = 0 Program/Policy = 8
	Functioning of the Masters Program Committee (MPC)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Continuing: Associate Dean, UPC, and COBA Faculty	Changes approved by COBA Faculty New Degree Program = 0 New Concentration = 0 New Courses = 6 Title/Content = 8 Prerequisites = 10 Degree Requirements = 2 Program/Policy = 3
	Functioning of the Doctoral Program Committee (DPC)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Continuing: Associate Dean, UPC, and COBA Faculty	Changes approved by COBA Faculty New Degree Program = 0 New Professional Field = 0 New Courses = 1 Title/Content = 0 Prerequisites = 1 Degree Requirements = 01 Program/Policy = 5

\* Note: For more information on assessment activities see the Report of the Assessment Task Force

Status as of December 31, 2006

Completion Date & Accountability

Continuing Resources & Sources

Current Year Resources & Sources

Processes Involved

Action Item or Activity

Assessment and Enhancement of Student Learning*	Evaluation conducted by Director, UPC, MPC, and DPC	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Fall 07; Associate Dean, Director, UPC, MPC, and DPC	Work in progress Submitted learning outcomes and assessments
Research and Scholarship	Faculty Research Productivity	Time: COBA Faculty	Time: COBA Faculty	Continuing: Chairs and COBA Faculty	Refereed Articles = 84 Invited Articles = 2 Books = 3 Book Chapters = 4 Editorships = 24 Book Reviews = 4 Papers & Presentations = 116
Research Support	Acquisition of electronic databases and research sources	Funds: \$2,276,248 from UNT: Library allocation for electronic databases and research sources	Funds: \$2,276,248 from UNT: Library allocation	Continuing: COBA's Library committee	Provided 41 research databases and sources utilized by COBA faculty and students
Improve Research, Instructional and Administrative Technology Attract, Nurture, and Retain Faculty	Faculty, Classroom, Lab, and Administrative Technology Plan	Funds: \$34,894 from COBA	Funds: \$31,894 from COBA	Continuing: Assistant Dean	Provided 4 additional research databases
	Increase faculty salaries based on College and University Salary Procedures	Funds: \$43,000 from COBA Higher Education Assistance Fund (HEAF)	Funds: The five-year technological plan, HEAF, and student fees	Continuing: Assistant Dean - Technology	\$43,000 expended on upgrades to COBA file servers
New faculty recruiting based on College and University Recruiting Procedures	University Salary Procedures	Funds: \$240,906 from state appropriations and Vice President Academic Affairs (VPAA) allocation	N/A	Continuing: Department Chairs, Dean, and VPAA	\$240,906 allocated by VPAA on September 1, 2006: Merit = \$229,206; Promotions = \$11,700
	New faculty recruiting based on College and University Recruiting Procedures	Funds: \$417,000 for Tenure Track from COBA faculty budget and funds requested from VPAA	N/A	Continuing: Department Chairs, Dean, and VPAA	ACCT - TT (2) FIRL - TT (1) MGMT - TT (1)



Action Item or Activity	Processes Involved	Current Year Resources & Sources	Continuing Resources & Sources	Completion Date & Accountability	Status as of December 31, 2006
Instructional, Administrative, and Faculty Facilities	College and University Renovation Process	Funds: \$159,526 from UNT HEAF \$9,750 from COBA HEAF \$3,650 from COBA Maintenance & Operations \$84,545 from students fees	N/A	Continuing: Assistant Dean	\$300,771 expended for A, P, & C ITDS & MGMT; for faculty and administrative areas; for A, P, & C 2nd floor classrooms; for new entry doors, and for re-keying of BA building
Increase the level of External Funding	Development activities of the five departments and COBA Dean's Office	Time: Department Chairs, Dean, and COBA Faculty	Time: Department Chairs, Dean, and COBA Faculty	Continuing: Dean and Departments Chairs	\$3,644,883 received by the five departments and COBA
Globalization Initiatives	Provide Study Abroad Programs and Courses	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff Funds: UNT Study Abroad Grants and students' tuitions and fees	N/A	Continuing: COBA Faculty, Associate Dean, and Department Chairs	95 students enrolled in 7 courses with instruction and / or visits to Austria, Germany, Switzerland, Spain, Portugal, France, Hong Kong, China, Panama, and Costa Rica

### Immediate Action Items 2006

Action Item or Activity	Processes Involved	Current Year Resources & Sources	Continuing Resources & Sources	Completion Date & Accountability	Status as of December 31, 2006
Update COBA Strategic Plan	Update department strategic plan and align COBA's plan with the new UNT Strategic Plan (February 2004)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	N/A	Spring 2008: Dean, Strategic Plan committee, and COBA Faculty	Work in progress: COBA's strategic planning process, goals, and initiatives were approved
Evaluate Sedona Database	Determine capabilities of Sedona database (Fall 2005)	Department Chairs, Deans, COBA Faculty, and Computer Center Staff	N/A	Spring 2006: Dean and Assistant Dean	Sedona selected (February 2006); Information is being uploaded from Enterprise Information System (EIS)

Action Item or Activity	Processes Involved	Current Year Resources & Sources	Continuing Resources & Sources	Completion Date & Accountability	Status as of December 31, 2006
Coordination and Control of COBA Reaccreditation Process	Establish position of Director of Assessment and Accreditation	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff Dr. Grant Miles appointed as Director of Assessment and Accreditation	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Fall 2008: Dean, Executive committee, Director, and Faculty	Maintenance review application and support; Documents submitted on June 26, 2006
New COBA Building	University, System, and Legislative Processes (Fall 2002)	Funds: \$50 million from the Tuition Revenue Bonds Legislature	N/A	Ongoing: UNT System	\$50 M in Tuition Revenue Bonds approved by Legislature on May 16, 2006
Support UNT's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) (Adopted for SACS's accreditation)	Implement quality enhancement tools and procedures (January 2005)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Spring 2006: Dean, Department Chairs, and COBA Faculty	COBA complete SACS's QEP requirements
Develop a Brand Identity for COBA	Improve functionality and integration of COBA Website	Time: Marketing specialist and Webmaster	Time: Marketing specialist and Webmaster	Ongoing: Dean, Department Chairs, and Marketing Specialist	Work in progress: Website is now interactive
	Develop COBA brand in compliance with new UNT Branding approved on April 27, 2005	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Fall 2007: Marketing Specialist and Task Force	Work in progress: Compiled with UNT Academic word marks and Spirit marks
	Conduct benchmarking survey to evaluate the brand equity of COBA (April 2006)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Associate Dean and Research Project Director, Dr. Audhesh Paswan	Survey completed and results incorporated into COBA branding program
Support UNT's Distributed Learning Initiatives	Work with UNT's Information and Learning Technologies Center (ILTC) (January 2004)	Time: COBA Faculty and ILTC Staff	N/A	Ongoing: COBA Faculty, Department Chairs, and Program Committees	MBA in Strategic Management & MBA in Marketing offered in Online format

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS  
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

ACCREDITATION MAINTENANCE ANNUAL REPORT

2007

## INTRODUCTION

Upon successful conclusion of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) reaccreditation effort, both the university and the COBA shifted emphasis to (a) searches conducted to fill vacancies in academic and operational leadership positions and to (b) systematic external and internal situational evaluations. During 2007, the university completed the following searches: (1) Dr. Wendy Wilkins, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, (2) Dr. Vish Prasad, Vice President for Research and Technology Transfer, (3) Andrew Harris, Vice President for Finance and Administration, and (4) Dr. Earl Gibbons, Vice Provost for International Programs. The university integrated the unfilled position of Executive Vice President of Administration into the position of Vice President of Finance. Dr. Finley Graves was appointed Interim Dean of the COBA in August 2007, following the resignation of Dean Kathleen Cooper. An outside evaluation team, under the leadership of Dr. Stephen R. Portch, was asked to assist the President and the UNT leadership team by conducting reviews of the key areas of Academic Affairs, Research, Student Development, Advancement, and Information Technology. The fifteen-member team reported its findings and recommendations on May 9, 2007. The report, with a broad consensus among the team members, indicated that UNT (a) is at a crucial time in its development, poised to increase its research and creative activity, and to actively engage a large and increasing diverse student body, (b) is an institution in transition, but with work still to be done in bringing a clear consensus about what it means to be a “student-centered public research university,” (c) has many dedicated and talented faculty and staff members and significant resources that can be directed to its institutional priorities, and (d) has energy, enthusiasm, and excitement about the future. The findings and recommendations of this report are being used to guide the continuing development of the university and college strategic planning processes.

The Strategic Planning Committee completed work on the draft of the new College of Business Administration Strategic Plan. The plan will be reviewed by the faculty and staff of the college and should be ready for the faculty approval process by May 2008. This plan reflects an evaluation of the national, state, university, college, and accrediting agency environments and integrates input from employers, advisory board members, faculty, staff, and university/college administrators. It incorporates sufficient direction and performance expectations to serve as a valuable method for resource allocation and as an effective tool in assessing progress toward achieving the college’s mission and vision. Each of the academic departments and the College of Business Administration held advisory board meetings that contributed to the strategic planning process. Under Dean Graves’s leadership, the college has made excellent progress in strategic planning/management and has developed and implemented a plan for assembling the AACSB maintenance of accreditation materials in preparation for the Peer Review Team’s visit in October of 2008.

During 2007, the college faculty received \$446,548 in merit and promotion raises to continue the university’s goal of “closing the gaps” with respect to differences in average salaries between UNT and selected Texas higher education institutions.

## Continuing Action Items 2007

Action Item or Activity	Processes Involved	Current Year Resources & Sources	Continuing Resources & Sources	Completion Date & Accountability	Status as of December 31, 2007
Assessment and Enhancement of student Learning*	Functioning of the Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Continuing: Associate Dean, UPC, and COBA Faculty	Changes approved by COBA Faculty New Degree Program = 0 New Professional Field = 2 New Courses = 1 Title/Content = 1 Prerequisites = 16 Degree Requirements = 3 Program/Policy = 11
	Functioning of the Masters Program Committee (MPC)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Continuing: Associate Dean, UPC, and COBA Faculty	Changes approved by COBA Faculty New Degree Program = 0 New Concentration = 1 New Courses = 3 Title/Content = 1 Prerequisites = 8 Degree Requirements = 1 Program/Policy = 3
	Functioning of the Doctoral Program Committee (DPC)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Continuing: Associate Dean, UPC, and COBA Faculty	Changes approved by COBA Faculty New Degree Program = 0 New Professional Field = 0 New Courses = 0 Title/Content = 1 Prerequisites = 0 Degree Requirements = 1 Program/Policy = 3

\* Note: For more information on assessment activities see the Report of the Director of Assessment and Accreditation

Status as of December 31, 2007

Completion Date & Accountability

Continuing Resources & Sources

Current Year Resources & Sources

Processes Involved

Action Item or Activity

Assessment and Enhancement of student Learning	Evaluation conducted by the Director of Assessment and Accreditation, UPC, MPC, and DPC	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Continuing: Associate Dean, Director, UPC, MPC, and DPC	Work in progress: BBA assessment program finalized in November 2007
Research and Scholarship	Faculty Research Productivity	Faculty Time COBA Faculty	Faculty Time COBA Faculty	Continuing: Chairs & Faculty	Refereed Articles = 65 Invited Articles = 0 Books = 4 Book Chapters = 2 Editorships = 17 Book Reviews = 2 Papers & Pres = 101
Research Support	Acquisition of electronic databases and research sources	Funds: \$2,379,118 from UNT: Library allocation for electronic databases and research sources	Funds: \$2,379,118 from UNT: Library allocation	Continuing: COBA's Library committee	Provided 43 research databases and sources utilized by COBA faculty and students
Improve Research, Instructional, and Administrative Technology	Faculty, Classroom, Lab, and Administrative Technology Plan	Funds: \$57,894 from COBA	Funds: \$57,894 from COBA	Continuing: Assistant Dean	Provided 5 additional research databases
Attract, Nurture, and Retain Faculty	Increase faculty salaries based on College and University Salary Procedures	Funds: \$65,415 from UNT Higher Education Assistance Fund (HEAF) \$2,722 from Department Maintenance and Operations Fund \$85,405 from students fees \$751 from Department HEAF \$154,293 total	Funds: The five-year technology plan, HEAF, and student fees	Continuing: Assistant Dean - Technology	\$154,293 expended on Memory upgrades to lab computers & lab software upgrades, on software upgrades, and on computer cabling for COBA
		Funds: \$465,248 from state appropriations and Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) allocation	N/A	Continuing: Department Chairs, Dean, and VPAA	\$465,248 allocated by VPAA on September 1, 2007: Merit & Market = \$446,548; Promotions = \$18,700

Action Item or Activity	Processes Involved	Current Year Resources & Sources	Continuing Resources & Sources	Completion Date & Accountability	Status as of December 31, 2007
Attract, Nurture, and Retain Faculty	New faculty recruiting based on College and University Recruiting Procedures	Funds: \$574,732 for Tenure Track & \$663,401 for Full Time non-tenure track; from COBA faculty budget and from funds requested from VPAA	N/A	Continuing: Department Chairs, Dean, and VPAA	ACCT - TT (2) FIRL - TT (1) MGMT - TT (1) MKTG - TT (1) FT - NTT Dallas (8)
Instructional, Administrative, and Faculty Facilities	College and University Renovation Process	Funds: \$65,415 from UNT HEAF	N/A	Continuing: Assistant Dean	\$65,415 expended for new fixed seating, paint, and carpets; for repairs to BA 176 classroom; and for new drainage system for the BA building
Increase the level of External Funding	Development activities of the five departments and COBA Dean's Office	Time: Department Chairs, Dean, and COBA Faculty	Time: Department Chairs, Dean, and COBA Faculty	Continuing: Dean and Department Chairs	\$867,295 received by the five Departments & COBA
Globalization Initiatives	Provide Study Abroad Programs & Courses	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff Funds: UNT Study Abroad Grants, and students' tuitions & fees	N/A	Continuing: COBA Faculty, Associate Dean, and Department Chairs	125 students enrolled in 9 courses with instruction and / or visits to Austria, Germany, Switzerland, England, France, Hong Kong, China, Singapore, and Malaysia

### Immediate Action Items 2007

Action Item or Activity	Processes Involved	Current Year Resources & Sources	Continuing Resources & Sources	Completion Date & Accountability	Status as of December 31, 2007
Update COBA Strategic Plan	Update COBA strategic plan and align COBA's plan with the new UNT Strategic Plan (February 2004) One-day planning workshop	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	N/A	Spring 2008: Dean, Executive Committee, and COBA Faculty	Work in progress: Draft of COBA's strategic plan completed (December 2007) Sent to Faculty (January 2008) Planning retreat (March 2007)

Action Item or Activity	Processes Involved	Current Year Resources & Sources	Continuing Resources & Sources	Completion Date & Accountability	Status as of December 31, 2007
Implement Sedona Database	Transfer faculty data to Sedona Database (March 2006)	Time: Department Chairs, Deans, COBA Faculty, and Computer Center staff	N/A	February 2008: Dean, Executive committee, and COBA Faculty	Data transfer Complete (December 2007); Faculty updates by March 1, 2008
Prepare Materials for Maintenance of Accreditation Review & Visit	Maintenance of accreditation; Reaccreditation procedures	Time: Dean, Executive committee, Director of A & A, and COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: Dean, Executive committee, Faculty, & Staff	Visit Fall 2008: Dean, Executive committee, Director of A & A, and COBA Faculty & Staff	Work in progress: Preparing materials for maintenance of accreditation review & visit
New COBA Building	University, System, and COBA Fall 2002	Funds: \$50 Million in approved Tuition Revenue Bonds	N/A	August 2010 projected building opening	RFIs and RFQs released (August 2007)
Seek External Grant Development Funds	Apply for University development grant funding (February 2007)	Time: COBA Faculty	Time: COBA Faculty	Fall 2007: Dean, Department Chairs, and COBA Faculty	COBA received five \$8,000 awards (October 2007)
Improve Communication & Develop Brand Identity for the COBA	Improve functionality and integration of COBA Website	Time: Marketing specialist and Webmaster	Time: Marketing specialist and Webmaster	Continuing: Dean, Department Chairs, and Marketing Specialist	Work in progress: Website is now interactive
	Develop COBA brand in compliance with new UNT building (approved April 27, 2005)	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Time: COBA Faculty & Staff	Fall 2007: Marketing Specialist and Task Force	All COBA branding are compliant with UNT Academic word marks and Spirit marks (November 2007)
	Consolidate branding and communications into Director of Marketing & Communications	Funds: \$52,000 from COBA staff positions	Funds: \$52,000 from COBA Staff Line	January 2007: Dean	Director hired: January 2007
	Develop COBA's eNewsletter	Time: Marketing Director & Staff	Time: Marketing Director & Staff	Summer 2007: Marketing Director	COBA's eNewsletter published July 2007
Support UNT's Distributed Learning Initiatives	Work with UNT's Information and Learning Technologies Center (ILTC) January 2004	Time: COBA faculty and ILTC Staff	N/A	Continuing: Faculty, Department Chairs, and Program Committees	MKTG -- MBA Offered Online



## **ASSESSMENT**

TIMELINE OF ASSESSMENT EFFORTS .....	34
ETS SUMMARY RESULTS .....	39
ASSESSMENT OF TEAMWORK RUBRIC.....	44
UNDERGRADUATE ORAL COMMUNICATIONS RESULTS.....	47
MBA CORE KNOWLEDGE EXAM RESULTS.....	53
RUBRIC .....	54
BBA CONTENT .....	58
BBA LEARNING GOALS.....	72
SACS ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING OUTCOMES .....	76
UNDERGRADUATE EXIT SURVEY RESULTS.....	107
MBA EXIT SURVEY RESULTS .....	122

# Timeline of Assessment Efforts

## 1997-present

**College of Business Administration – UNT  
Timeline of Assessment Efforts  
1997 - Present**

<b>Assessment Effort</b>	<b>Time Period</b>	<b>Description, Outcomes and Current Status</b>
<p><b>BBA and MBA Core Knowledge Tests (Internal)</b></p>	<p>1997 - Present</p>	<p><b>Description</b> - Beginning in 1997, efforts were made to internally develop an assessment of core business knowledge learned/retained by BBA students. The efforts were driven by professors of the Business Policy course who were at times frustrated by what appeared to be a lack of core business knowledge in the graduating seniors taking the Policy class.</p> <p>Questions were initially solicited from instructors of the primary discipline courses within the business core. A pilot administration was given in the fall of 1997. In 1998, the questions were administered to students at the end of the core courses in order to provide a baseline. The test was administered to the policy students in 1998 and results compared to the baseline.</p> <p><b>Outcomes</b> – Results indicated that there was a significant decrease in scores in most areas between the end of the core course and graduation. On a positive note, students showed a smaller decline in questions within their major, suggesting that material within a major was being reinforced but that material outside the major was not being reinforced or retained as well.</p> <p>Results were shared with the COBA executive committee, the Undergraduate Programs Committee (UPC), and the departments. The exam was repeated several times with similar results. A revision to the test in 2001 incorporated all courses within the business core and updated questions as needed by the core instructors (with accompanying baseline data also updated). Results continued to be shared with the UPC and departments.</p> <p>Discussion within committees and anecdotal evidence suggests that some changes in curriculum were made as a result of the results (e.g. Marketing developed a course to address financial issues in marketing), and business policy professors report some improvement in performance in core areas by the graduating seniors.</p> <p><b>Current Status</b> – The most recent administration of the test was in 2004. The test has not been administered in the past 4 years as efforts have turned to the ETS and other assessment mechanisms.</p> <p>In 2006, the Masters Program Committee MPC began development of a similar test for graduating MBA students. An initial version of the test was administered in 2007, and the test was revised and administered again in Spring 2008.</p>

<p><b>ETS Major Field Exam</b></p>	<p>2001 to Present</p>	<p><b>Description</b> – As a compliment to the internally developed knowledge assessment exam and to provide an external comparison, the college began administering the ETS major field exam in 2001. It has been given a total of 3 times and is now on a schedule to be given once every two years. The exam is given to graduating seniors in the Business Policy course. Students can earn extra credit points in the course for taking the exam, with better performance awarded more extra credit. This is done in an effort to get students to give an honest effort on the exam.</p> <p><b>Outcomes</b> – COBA students as a whole have typically performed slightly better than the historical data provided by ETS. That is, the COBA 50<sup>th</sup> percentile is above the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile for all students taking the exam. This is true for the exam as a whole as well as for each of the various subsections. In the most recent administration, COBA students significantly outperformed the averages.</p> <p>Results are shared with the college as a whole as well as with the UPC and the departments. Results by major within departments are provided where available so that more detailed analysis and comparison can be done.</p> <p><b>Current Status</b> – The ETS exam was most recently given in the Spring of 2007. The results from this administration have been analyzed and shared. While exceeding the ETS average is a reasonable result, ongoing discussions are being held to determine what level of performance ought to be expected from the COBA students.</p>
<p><b>Feedback from Case Competition Judges</b></p>	<p>1998 - Present</p>	<p><b>Description</b> – Beginning in 1998, the Business Policy class began to incorporate a case competition each semester. Student teams are judged within their section based on their presentation and written handouts and the winning teams from the sections compete head-to-head in the competition finals. Initially done using adapted cases, the competition has used a “live” case approach with companies from the DFW area for the past 6 years. In a typical semester, 35-40 teams comprising over 200 students will participate.</p> <p>Faculty members recruited from throughout the college judge the competition within the sections. Each semester, 15-20 faculty members participate (about two thirds of the faculty have participated at least once). Initially, informal feedback was collected each semester from the judges who participated. More recently, efforts have been made to systematically collect information through a questionnaire the judges fill out on each team that rates the team’s ability in a variety of areas.</p> <p>In addition, a member of the company under study and several other local business people judge the competition finals. These judges fill out a questionnaire similar to that completed by the faculty judges.</p> <p><b>Outcomes</b> – The competition continues to provide a good indication of the analytic, integrative, and application skills of the students that is observed and talked about with a substantial portion of the faculty. While the team nature of the</p>

		<p>competition does not allow for individual assessment of students, it does give a good general sense of what the students can and cannot do and provides a venue for faculty discussion of these strengths and weaknesses. Again, both discussion within the UPC and anecdotal evidence suggests that curriculum reform has occurred as a result</p> <p><b>Current Status</b> – The competition continues to occur each long semester. Efforts are being made to more systematically codify the information collected from internal and external judges for distribution and tracking over time.</p>
<b>Exit Surveys</b>	1990 to present (current version 2003 to present)	<p><b>Description</b> – COBA historically administered an external exit exam at irregular intervals. Beginning in 2001, efforts were begun to develop our own exit exam in order to tailor questions more specifically to our students and our programs. Driven initially by the UPC and with the efforts of Gopala Ganesh (professor in Marketing), the first COBA exit survey was administered to undergraduates with the graduating class in 2002. After collecting the data for three long semesters and analyzing the results, additional questions were added to gain more insight on particular items. The current exit exam has now been administered for the past 5 years.</p> <p>Based on the success of the undergraduate exit survey, a similar instrument was developed for the Masters program. The instrument was first given in the XXX of XXX and it is now being analyzed for possible revisions and additions. It will continue to be administered at least once each academic year.</p> <p><b>Outcomes</b> – Summary results of the undergraduate exit survey have been shared several times with the faculty as a whole and the UPC and each department analyzes more detailed reports. Results are broken down so that responses of particular majors can be compared to other majors and the college as a whole. The detailed results are also made available to all faculty members through posting on the college’s computer system.</p> <p>A similar approach is being followed at the Masters level. Summary results have been presented at a faculty meeting and more detailed results provided to both the MPC and the departments. Again, the detailed results are made available to the faculty through posting on the college’s computer system.</p> <p>Changes as a result of the feedback from the exit survey include consideration of class offering times and locations. The feedback also contributed to changes made in several of the business foundation classes, including accounting, statistics, and business communication.</p> <p><b>Current Status</b> – Both the undergraduate and Masters exit surveys continue to be administered. They are continually examined for refinements and for additional issues on which to gather information.</p>
<b>SACS initiatives</b>	2004 – present	<p><b>Description</b> – As part of the University’s work in preparation for reaccreditation by SACS each department was required to develop assessment of student learning outcomes for every major/concentration area in the undergraduate, masters and Ph.D. programs. Each department in COBA developed the assessment program</p>

		<p>for their own majors/concentration areas and COBA personal developed the programs for college level majors (e.g. the general business BBA). The assessment programs were instituted first in 2006 and revised/modified as needed and administered again in 2007.</p> <p>Each area of study has 3-4 learning outcomes measured in a variety of ways. These include direct measures of student learning, observation by faculty, student surveys and surveys of employers and advisory board members.</p> <p><b>Outcomes</b> – The SACS reports for 2006-2007 are included in this section. As can be seen, results of the assessment efforts have led to changes in both courses and programs at all levels of study. Some departments have been more active in their revisions, but all have made at least some changes as a result of these assessment efforts.</p> <p><b>Current Status</b> – As a result of its efforts related to AACSB, COBA has recognized that the assessment programs developed for SACS make too much use of secondary assessment measures and not enough use of direct course embedded measures. This recognition has recently been echoed by the university who is working with all colleges to improve the SACS assessment programs.</p> <p>COBA is currently working to better align the SACS and AACSB efforts. However, as long as SACS requires assessment for each major/concentration area within a degree the assessment programs will remain complimentary rather than directly overlapping.</p>
<p><b>AACSB initiatives</b></p>	<p>2006 - present</p>	<p><b>Description</b> – Specific learning outcomes and direct, course embedded measures have been developed for both the BBA and MBA degree programs. These are shown in the Assessment section in the main body of the 5 year report.</p> <p><b>Outcomes</b> – Results for the outcomes already assessed are included in the pages that follow, as are the rubrics developed and additional detail on the measures. Also included are results of a recent survey of BBA core courses and their coverage of COBA learning outcomes and AACSB International content areas.</p> <p>The results already compiled have shown satisfactory performance by COBA students at both the BBA and MBA levels, so no specific changes have been made to the programs. Additional analysis is being conducted to determine if the measures and standards chosen are appropriate.</p> <p><b>Current Status</b> – The BBA and MBA assessment programs are well underway. Attention will now turn to developing programs for the BS and MS degrees. Effort will also be directed towards better integrating specific course assessments from the core courses into the larger degree assessment programs.</p>

## ETS Summary Results - 2007

### Overall Results and Comparison to 2005

#### Spring 2007

#### Overall Results (scaled score - 120-200)

COBA Scores	ETS average
75 percentile	163
50 percentile	153
25 percentile	144
Mean	159
Stand. Deviation	11.8

#### Scores by Sub Areas (% correct)

COBA Scores	ETS average
Accounting	55
Economics	53
Management	63
Quant. Bus Analysis	52
Finance	64
Marketing	59
Legal & Social Env't	49
International Issues	61
Information Systems	62

#### Spring 2005

#### Overall Results (scaled score - 120-200)

COBA Scores	ETS average
75 percentile	163
50 percentile	153
25 percentile	143
Mean	153.9
Stand. Deviation	11.8

#### Scores by Sub Areas (% correct)

COBA Scores	ETS average
Accounting	46.2
Economics	43.4
Management	59.0
Quant. Bus Analysis	60.6
Finance	38.3
Marketing	46.8
Legal & Social Env't	54.8
International Issues	46.5

COBA results are based on 208 complete tests

ETS results are averages from over 80,000 individuals at 469 schools during 2003 and 2004

COBA results are based on 162 complete tests

ETS results are averages from over 37,000 individuals at 447 schools during fall 2006 and spring 2007

## COBA ETS Results - Spring 2007

As a point of comparison, the following shows the scores associated with various percentile levels for all students who took the exam during Fall 2006 (approximately 9000 students total in over 175 universities)

A percentile level indicates the percent of students scoring below that level - e.g., the 70th percentile means that 70% scored below that level

ETS Averages		UNT Results	
<u>Score</u>	<u>Percentile</u>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Percent</b>
172	90th	24	14.5% Above 90
165	80th	26	15.7% 81-90
161	70th	16	9.6% 71-80
156	60th	23	13.9% 61-70
153	50th	14	8.4% 51-60
150	40th	23	13.9% 41-50
147	30th	9	5.4% 31-40
142	20th	11	6.6% 21-30
138	10th	9	5.4% 11-20
		11	6.6% 0-10
		166	

Note: As a group, UNT COBA students had a mean of about 158, well above the overall mean for all students of 153 - Good Work!!!



## **Assessment of Learning and Retention in the Undergraduate Business Core: Updated Results Through Fall 2001**

**Dr. Derrick D'Souza and Dr. Grant Miles  
September 27, 2001**

Presented below are the updated results (through the fall semester, 2001) of the assessment of core concepts test given in the undergraduate business policy class. A previous report (October 8, 1999) presented a more comprehensive statement of the methods used to create the test, and this material is not repeated here. We do, however, include the section previously presented about the logic behind the test as a means of grounding the work and aiding the reader in interpreting the results.

### **A. Underlying Logic Behind the Assessment Test and Interpretation of Results**

Before presenting the results, a short discussion of the logic underlying the assessment test is in order. We began with the understanding that the COBA core was designed to provide a base level of knowledge across a number of areas. Further, it is our understanding that this knowledge is both beneficial to a business student in its own right as well as a necessary foundation for more advanced courses. Given this starting point, we can then examine the level of performance that one might theoretically desire and/or expect from graduating seniors.

Assuming that the important areas identified for each core course accurately reflect the importance placed on the material in the classroom, and further assuming that the test items associated with each area are reliable measures of the underlying level of understanding by the students, then one might both desire and expect that all of the graduating seniors would make perfect scores on the assessment test. That is, all graduating students should fully understand all of the important material from the core. In reality, however, there may be error in connecting test items to material, and test items do not always do a perfect job of measuring what they are supposed to measure. Further, random error by the students would bring the scores below an absolute perfect level, and the reality of variation among students would suggest that they will never perform equally.

After wrestling with this issue for some time, we concluded that determining a desired absolute level of performance on the assessment test was not likely to be possible. Given that we did want to be able to understand the level at which our students were performing, however, we sought out a next best alternative to an absolute measure. This search led us to testing the performance of students in the core classes on the items that appear on the assessment test in an effort to create baseline performance levels (see discussion above under history). The logic behind this was that we could compare the performance of graduating seniors to the scores taken in the core courses and thereby determine if students were in fact retaining and/or building on the core course material.

While such a comparison still must face issues related to the reliability and validity of the test items, it does make the process of determining relative performance easier. At a minimum, it would seem that we would want the performance of our graduating seniors

to be at or near the level of the students in the core classes. Such a level of performance would indicate that the graduating seniors were at least retaining the material that they had learned in the core classes. More desirable would be to see a performance level by the graduating seniors that surpassed that of the students in the core classes. Such a performance level would indicate that courses within the COBA majors were reinforcing and building on the material of the core courses. Finally, one would expect that students of a given major would build even more on the material from the core course(s) associated with their major than non-majors would, a fact that would be reflected in majors outperforming non-majors on the relevant sections of the assessment test.

Whether this approach and these expectations are appropriate is left for others to determine. Assumptions inherent in this approach can certainly be questioned. Still, there is a logic to it that suggests that it is at least one reasonable way of approaching what is clearly a difficult issue. Other approaches, however, may be equally appropriate.

## B. Results - Fall 1998 through Fall 2001

The current version of the assessment test has been administered in each long semester beginning with fall 1998 (the ETS assessment was given in spring 2001). Tables 1 and 2 below give the results from the 5 semesters for which data is available. Table 1 shows the average performance in each semester for both the overall performance (total) and for the question sets representing each of the core courses. Performance is expressed as a percentage difference compared to the baseline performance gathered from students in the core classes. A cell showing a score of 12%, for example, would indicate that the graduating seniors performed 12% better on that question set than did the students in the core course from which the test items were taken. A percentage is used rather than a raw number to facilitate comparisons across question sets and time periods.

**Table 1 - Overall Comparison  
Percentage Change From Baseline (scores in core courses) For Graduating Seniors**

Question Set*	Fall 1998 (N=200)	Spring 1999 (N = 176)	Fall 1999 (N=221)	Spring 2000 (N=283)	Fall 2000 (N=195)	Fall 2001 (N=164)
Accounting	- 9%	- 12%	- 11%	- 2%	- 4%	-3%
BCIS	3%	- 27%	- 10%	- 8%	- 8%	-10%
Finance	- 37%	- 38%	- 34%	- 16%	- 15%	-21%
Management	- 43%	- 55%	- 35%	- 25%	- 29%	-31%
Marketing	- 41%	- 39%	- 41%	- 27%	- 26%	-26%
BusLaw	1%	- 7%	3%	1%	0 %	-1%
BCOM	- 16%	- 24%	- 11%	-13%	- 13%	-17%
MSCI	- 39%	- 45%	- 27%	- 16%	- 32%	-29%
<b>Total</b>	- 24%	- 31%	- 21%	- 15%	- 16%	-18%

\* Six Questions in each area

In table 2, the overall results are broken down to show, for each semester, the performance of majors versus non-majors within the question sets that represent majors offered within COBA. As in table 1, the percentages listed represent the gain or loss when comparing the results of the graduating seniors to the performance of the baseline scores taken from the core courses. For the question set representing core courses in accounting (column 2), for example, it can be seen that graduating senior accounting majors improved 19%, 3%, 10%, 12% and 19% respectively for fall 98, spring 99, fall 99, spring 00, and fall 00 while graduating seniors with majors in areas outside accounting showed performance decreases of -13%, -14%, -12%, -3%, and -5% for the same four semesters.

**Table 2 - Breakdown Comparisons  
Percentage Change Scores -Majors versus Non-Majors by Question Type**

		<b>ACCT</b>	<b>BCIS</b>	<b>FIRL</b>	<b>MGMT</b>	<b>MKTG</b>
<b>Majors</b>	<b>Fall 98</b>	19%	14%	- 24%	- 41%	- 31%
	<b>Spring 99</b>	3%	- 12%	- 19%	- 54%	- 30%
	<b>Fall 99</b>	10%	18%	- 26%	- 27%	- 29%
	<b>Spring 00</b>	12%	1%	- 7%	- 25%	- 25%
	<b>Fall 00</b>	19%	2%	- 9%	- 26%	- 23%
	<b>Fall 01</b>	10%	NA*	-14%	-32%	-25%
<b>Non-Majors</b>	<b>Fall 98</b>	- 13%	2%	- 40%	- 43%	- 47%
	<b>Spring 99</b>	- 14%	- 29%	- 36%	- 56%	- 42%
	<b>Fall 99</b>	- 12%	- 13%	- 47%	- 38%	- 47%
	<b>Spring 00</b>	- 3%	- 10%	- 20%	- 27%	- 28%
	<b>Fall 00</b>	- 5%	- 8%	- 18%	- 30%	- 28%
	<b>Fall 01</b>	- 4%	-10%	- 23%	- 36%	- 26%

\* There was only 1 BCIS major in Fall 2001

Given the inherent problems of interpreting the meaning of these results (discussed in section 2 above), no attempt will be made here to sway the reader toward any particular viewpoint. Our purpose instead is to present a starting point for further discussion of the issues. We do wish to point out, however, that the results are fairly stable over the six semester period, suggesting that the test instrument has a reasonable degree of reliability in its measurement. What exactly it is measuring and what that means for COBA, however, are questions best left for others to determine.

**Summary Report - Assessment of Teamwork**  
**Spring 2007**

	3.00	2.5-3.0	2.00 - 2.49	Less than 2.0
Initiative	67	99	27	23
Attended Meetings	58	95	41	22
Completed Work	67	100	33	16
Team Spirit	62	96	45	13
Project Completion	73	92	31	20
Overall Average	30	129	34	23

Note: A total of 216 students were rated by their teammates

Scale:

- 1 = Below Expectation
- 2 = Meets Expectation
- 3 = Exceeds Expectation

**BUSI 4940  
ASSESSMENT OF TEAM PARTICIPATION**

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

As part of the College of Business Administration’s ongoing efforts to improve, we are interested in assessing the ability of our students to work in a team setting. Having just been through a lengthy team project, you are in the best position to give us feedback on your teammates. Please note that this assessment **WILL NOT** be used in determining anyone’s grade on the project. It is intended for the broader use of the college in understanding how well our students are doing when working in a team environment. As such, we would appreciate your honest assessment of each of your teammates.

In the table below, please list your team members in the left hand column. For each teammate, there are five characteristics important for teamwork that have been selected for assessment. On each item, please use the scale below to rate the level of each team member’s performance. **For your consideration, typical behaviors that might be associated with the different performance levels on each characteristic are included on the back of this sheet. Please read through these before rating your fellow team members.**

- 1 = Does NOT meet expectations
- 2 = Meets expectations
- 3 = Performs above expectations

**PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT MATRIX**

CRITERIA		ITEM 1	ITEM 2	ITEM 3	ITEM 4	ITEM 5
		Displayed initiative while working on project	Attended scheduled meetings	Adequately completed assigned work	Fostered team spirit	Contributed to project completion
NAME OF TEAM MEMBER						
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						
7.						
8.						

## **Assessment of Team Performance Exemplars**

The following is presented as a general guide to the behaviors that we believe might typify the different levels of performance for each of the items. Please be aware, though, that the “exemplars” listed next to each rating level are only illustrations. Other indicators of effectiveness may also apply.

### **Item 1 – Displayed initiative while working on project**

1 = Does NOT meet expectations – comes to meetings unprepared, does not participate in team discussions, does not volunteer for work assignments

2 = Meets expectations – comes to meetings prepared, contributes to team discussions, accepts work willingly

3 = Performs above expectations – comes to meetings with extra ideas and initiatives, helps shape and advance team discussions, readily volunteers for work assignments

### **Item 2 – Attended scheduled meetings**

1 = Does NOT meet expectations – Attended less than ½ of scheduled meetings

2 = Meets expectations – Attended most team meetings

3 = Performs above expectations – Attends all team meetings

### **Item 3 – Adequately completed assigned work**

1 = Does NOT meet expectations – work not completed on time, work produced is incomplete and/or of poor quality

2 = Meets expectations – work generally completed on time and is of satisfactory quality

3 = Performs above expectations – work always completed on time and is consistently of good quality

### **Item 4 – Fostered team spirit**

1 = Does NOT meet expectations – Complains about having to meet, criticizes team members, questions the value or importance of assignments

2 = Meets expectations – gets along with team members, generally maintains a positive attitude

3 = Performs above expectations – encourages team members, spreads a positive attitude, remains upbeat even when things are stressful

### **Item 5 – Contributed to project completion**

1 = Does NOT meet expectations – did not follow through on final work, did not attend or left crucial meetings early, watched others work rather than contributed

2 = Meets expectations – an active participant, worked with teammates to get things done

3 = Performs above expectations – did all of own work and finished and/or polished the work of others, took on whatever tasks were needed

**Oral Communications – Undergraduate  
Summary of Results – Fall 2007  
(based on 107 students across all BBA majors)**

<b>Evaluative Criteria</b>	<b>Average Score (out of 15 possible)</b>
Introduction and Opening Comments	8
Organization	10
Professionalism	11.5
Voice quality and pace	11
Mannerisms	10
Ability to answer questions	9

**Oral Communication Rubric**

Evaluative Criteria	Below Expectations (0 - 5 points)	Meets Expectations (6 - 10 points)	Exceeds Expectations (11 - 15 points)
Introduction and Opening Comments	<p><b>Fails to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Greet client by name</li> <li>(2) Introduce himself of herself</li> <li>(3) Identify the company s/he represents</li> <li>(4) Fails to state reason for meeting</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Greets client by name</li> <li>(2) Introduces himself or herself</li> <li>(3) Identifies the company s/he represents</li> <li>(4) States reason for meeting</li> <li>(5) Secures client's interest in moving forward</li> </ol>	<p>In addition to (1) - (5), also is effective in building rapport with client. Draws client into the discussion and is very interactive.</p>
Organization	<p>Approach to interaction does not follow a logical organization or flow. Fails to qualify client and/or investigate needs. Presentation does not fit with client's current needs or wants. Avoids, or is unable to handle, objections.</p>	<p>Approach to interaction is logical and flows from discussion with client. Qualifies client and investigates client's needs and wants. Handles most objections in a reasonable fashion. Seeks to gauge client understanding and agreement.</p>	<p>Interaction with client flows naturally and follows a logical course. Carefully qualifies client and then uncovers several important needs and wants. Handles all objectives effectively. Gauges clients understanding and agreement. Clearly attempts to move process forward to next reasonable step.</p>
Professionalism	<p>Does not meet minimum requirements for business dress. Heavy use of vernacular terms (e.g., wow, man, totally). Inappropriately informal, does not stay in role.</p>	<p>Meets minimum standards for business dress. Treats client professionally. Use of vernacular terms at a minimum. Keeps nervousness under control</p>	<p>Dresses as if already working professionally. Treats client professionally. No use of vernacular terms. Appears confident and in command.</p>
Voice quality and pace	<p>Demonstrates one or more of the following: frequent use of inappropriate fillers (e.g., umm, ah), mumbling, hard to understand, too soft, too loud, too fast, too slow.</p>	<p>Can be easily understood. Infrequent use of fillers. Pace and volume appropriate throughout. Delivery is mostly clear and active. Appropriate use of professional language.</p>	<p>Excellent delivery. Conversational and interactive. Appears enthusiastic, interested, and confident. Alternates volume and tone to maintain interest and accentuate important points.</p>
Mannerisms	<p>Demonstrates one or more distracting mannerism, which may include bad posture, shifting feet, swiveling in chair, or nervous use of hands. Avoids eye contact.</p>	<p>No overly distracting mannerisms, Good posture. Appropriate use of hands to animate presentation. Maintains eye contact.</p>	<p>Uses body language effectively to maintain client interest. Appears natural and relaxed. Very professional demeanor overall.</p>
Ability to answer questions	<p>Does not ask client if s/he has questions. If questions are asked, unable to provide appropriate answers.</p>	<p>Specifically asks client about remaining questions. Listens carefully and then offers appropriate answers to most questions.</p>	<p>Specifically asks client about remaining questions. Answers all questions with appropriate answers and then asks for client satisfaction with answers offered.</p>



	/15	/15	/15	/15	/15	/15	/90	/100
#	Rubric #1	Rubric #2	Rubric #3	Rubric #4	Rubric #5	Rubric #6	Total	%
1	12	13	14	12	14	8	72	80
2	6	5	10	8	7	6	42	47
3	11	14	11	13	14	10	73	81
4	11	13	9	12	7	9	61	68
5	11	13	14	12	13	11	74	82
6	9	10	11	8	8	9	53	59
7	8	11	10	10	10	9	58	64
8	6	10	13	10	6	8	53	59
9	10	12	13	12	5	13	65	72
10	10	13	15	14	12	15	79	88
11	12	9	15	11	11	9	67	74
2	7	9	6	9	8	9	48	53
3	12	10	12	9	10	14	67	74
4	7	13	14	14	12	13	73	81
5	4	7	8	7	8	7	41	46
6	10	10	14	13	11	15	73	81
7	14	15	15	13	11	11	79	88
8	8	10	12	12	9	11	62	69
9	11	10	12	13	13	15	74	82
20	7	8	12	9	9	7	52	58
21	12	12	12	11	9	8	64	71
2	8	12	12	12	9	14	67	74
3	8	9	10	10	8	7	52	58
4	10	12	13	11	9	6	61	68

5	7	12	12	7	10	7	55	61
6	6	14	13	12	11	14	70	78
7	10	14	14	13	12	7	70	78
8	7	8	10	11	8	7	51	57
9	7	14	10	11	10	12	64	71
30	9	14	14	13	12	14	76	84
31	9	10	11	10	9	15	64	71
2	14	15	15	14	14	7	79	88
3	11	11	12	12	11	7	64	71
4	5	11	13	11	10	7	57	63
5	6	11	12	10	8	7	54	60
6	6	10	11	11	5	6	49	54
7	10	8	11	10	10	7	56	62
8	11	13	11	11	11	14	71	79
9	8	11	14	10	12	7	62	69
40	6	11	13	12	9	7	58	64
41	8	12	11	12	11	8	62	69
2	8	11	12	10	9	7	58	64
3	9	10	14	14	14	14	75	83
4	7	10	10	9	10	7	53	59
5	6	9	10	9	8	6	48	53
6	9	10	11	11	11	7	59	66
7	8	11	12	11	11	14	67	74
8	6	13	12	12	12	8	63	70
9	8	8	11	11	9	11	58	64
50	7	9	11	9	10	13	59	66
51	9	10	12	11	11	14	67	74
2	7	10	12	12	11	10	62	69

3	11	13	14	13	14	11	76	85
4	6	12	12	11	10	6	57	63
5	1	11	9	11	8	7	53	59
6	10	10	11	11	11	10	63	70
7	8	12	9	11	12	7	59	66
8	9	11	11	12	11	10	64	71
9	7	9	12	11	10	6	55	61
60	7	12	11	11	8	9	58	64
61	10	12	12	10	9	7	60	67
2	9	11	13	13	14	7	67	74
3	8	14	12	11	12	15	72	80
4	7	11	11	11	10	7	57	63
5	7	14	14	12	8	9	64	71
6	8	11	12	11	9	7	57	63
7	10	12	12	11	10	7	62	69
8	6	12	11	11	11	7	58	64
9	10	12	14	14	10	14	74	82
70	7	10	10	10	7	7	57	63
71	7	10	8	10	8	7	50	56
2	7	10	11	10	8	7	53	59
3	9	13	11	11	10	7	61	68
4	7	10	9	9	8	8	51	57
5	6	12	12	12	11	7	60	67
6	9	10	10	10	8	7	54	60
7	7	14	11	11	9	7	59	66
8	6	10	13	12	12	7	60	67
9	8	9	9	9	8	6	49	54
80	8	11	12	11	10	8	60	67

81	1	9	11	9	10	14	54	60
2	7	8	9	8	7	8	47	52
3	7	10	13	12	10	8	60	67
4	7	14	12	12	10	13	69	77
5	9	6	12	10	11	7	55	61
6	7	11	11	8	8	7	52	58
7	7	13	8	11	10	10	59	66
8	7	8	9	8	8	7	47	52
9	6	11	10	9	8	7	51	57
90	7	10	10	9	10	6	52	58
91	8	11	12	12	10	7	60	67
2	2	14	11	8	11	13	59	66
3	5	8	12	8	10	14	57	63
4	10	9	11	9	9	7	55	61
5	10	12	12	13	13	8	68	76
6	10	9	8	9	8	6	50	56
7	7	10	8	9	8	14	56	62
8	7	10	11	10	11	8	57	63
9	10	14	13	12	11	8	68	76
100	5	7	8	8	7	7	42	47
101	8	10	13	12	13	6	62	69
2	10	11	11	10	10	14	66	73
3	10	10	10	10	10	7	57	63
4	7	12	8	12	12	15	66	73
5	7	10	11	8	7	5	48	60
6	8	10	10	10	11	8	57	63
$\bar{x}$	8/15	10/15	11.5/15	11/15	10/15	9/15	60	67

**MBA Core Knowledge Exam  
Summary Results for Fall 2007**

<u>Management</u>		<u>Accounting</u>		<u>Finance*</u>		<u>Marketing</u>		<u>Decision Science</u>	
Question #	% Correct	Question #	% Correct	Question #	% Correct	Question #	% Correct	Question #	% Correct
a001	9	a011	91			a031	96	a041	64
a002	38	a012	71	a022	62	a032	80	a042	51
a003	24	a013	64	a023	44	a033	91	a043	58
a004	47	a014	84	a024	58	a034	13	a044	31
a005	24	a015	76	a025	7	a035	82	a045	44
a006	93	a016	91	a026	47	a036	64	a046	20
a007	67	a017	89	a027	22	a037	29	a047	22
a008	87	a018	47	a028	16	a038	20	a048	9
a009	82	a019	44	a029	36	a039	22	a049	42
a010	44	a020	84	a030	27	a040	47	a050	36
<b>MGMT Avg</b>	<b>51.6</b>	<b>ACCT AVG</b>	<b>74.2</b>	<b>FINA Avg</b>	<b>35.3</b>	<b>MKTG Avg</b>	<b>54.4</b>	<b>DSCI Avg</b>	<b>37.8</b>

**Overall Average for Test: 51%**

**Total Number of Students Taking Exam = 45**

\* Ques 21 in Finance appeared to have had the answer marked incorrectly and results were therefore dropped from analysis

<b>Learning Goal</b> Oral Communication	<b>Objective</b> Demonstrate the ability to effectively plan for and conduct a consultative business meeting.	<b>Desired Traits</b> The ability to develop rapport in a business setting. Guide the client through an organized, logical communication exchange in order to uncover client needs and formulate possible solutions. Present ideas for solutions in a way that meets client needs and holds client interest. Answer questions and address concerns as they arise. Assess client agreement and disposition toward moving forward.	<b>Assessment/Measurement Tool</b> MKTG 3010 Selling Solution DVD video taping
--	--	---	--

**Oral Communication Rubric**

<b>Evaluative Criteria</b>	<b>Below Expectations (0 – 5 points)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (6 - 10 points)</b>	<b>Exceeds Expectations (11 - 15 points)</b>
Introduction and Opening Comments	<p><b>Fails to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Greet client by name</li> <li>(2) Introduce himself of herself</li> <li>(3) Identify the company s/he represents</li> <li>(4) Fails to state reason for meeting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Greets client by name</li> <li>(2) Introduces himself or herself</li> <li>(3) Identifies the company s/he represents</li> <li>(4) States reason for meeting</li> <li>(5) Secures client's interest in moving forward</li> </ul>	<p>In addition to (1) – (5), also is effective in building rapport with client. Draws client into the discussion and is very interactive.</p>
Organization	<p>Approach to interaction does not follow a logical organization or flow. Fails to qualify client and/or investigate needs. Presentation does not fit with client's current needs or wants. Avoids, or is unable to handle, objections.</p>	<p>Approach to interaction is logical and flows from discussion with client. Qualifies client and investigates client's needs and wants. Handles most objections in a reasonable fashion. Seeks to gauge client understanding and agreement.</p>	<p>Interaction with client flows naturally and follows a logical course. Carefully qualifies client and then uncovers several important needs and wants. Handles all objectives effectively. Gauges clients understanding and agreement. Clearly attempts to move process forward to next reasonable step.</p>
Professionalism	<p>Does not meet minimum requirements for business dress. Heavy use of vernacular terms (e.g., wow, man, totally). Inappropriately informal, does not stay in role.</p>	<p>Meets minimum standards for business dress. Treats client professionally. Use of vernacular terms at a minimum. Keeps nervousness under control</p>	<p>Dresses as if already working professionally. Treats client professionally. No use of vernacular terms. Appears confident and in command.</p>
Voice quality and pace	<p>Demonstrates one or more of the following: frequent use of inappropriate fillers (e.g., umm, ah), mumbling, hard to understand, too soft, too loud, too fast, too slow.</p>	<p>Can be easily understood. Infrequent use of fillers. Pace and volume appropriate throughout. Delivery is mostly clear and active. Appropriate use of professional language.</p>	<p>Excellent delivery. Conversational and interactive. Appears enthusiastic, interested, and confident. Alternates volume and tone to maintain interest and accentuate important points.</p>
Mannerisms	<p>Demonstrates one or more distracting mannerism, which may include bad posture, shifting feet, swiveling in chair, or nervous use of hands. Avoids eye contact.</p>	<p>No overly distracting mannerisms, Good posture. Appropriate use of hands to animate presentation. Maintains eye contact.</p>	<p>Uses body language effectively to maintain client interest. Appears natural and relaxed. Very professional demeanor overall.</p>
Ability to answer questions	<p>Does not ask client if s/he has questions. If questions are asked, unable to provide appropriate answers.</p>	<p>Specifically asks client about remaining questions. Listens carefully and then offers appropriate answers to most questions.</p>	<p>Specifically asks client about remaining questions. Answers all questions with appropriate answers and then asks for client satisfaction with answers offered.</p>

## Technology Rubric

Evaluation Criteria	Below Expectations (0 – 5 points)	Meets Expectations (6 – 10 points)	Exceeds Expectations (11 – 15 points)
Proficiency in using word processing software	Unable to use basic word processing functions to create documents professionally acceptable in terms of style, format, spelling and grammar, and overall appearance.	Able to use word processing software to create professional documents with an adequate level of attention to details, style, format, spelling and grammar, and overall appearance.	Able to use advanced word processing functions such as styles, templates, object embedding and linking to create sophisticated professional documents.
Competency in the use of spreadsheet software	Unable to use spreadsheet program for basic functions such as entering data and formulas.	Able to choose and apply appropriate spreadsheet functions to develop worksheets and charts.	Able to choose and apply advanced spreadsheet functions such as what-if analysis and pivot tables.
Ability to use presentation software to develop quality materials for written and oral presentation	Unable to create a basic business presentation or able to create a presentation of sub-par quality in terms of attention to details, consistency, and appearance.	Able to use basic features of presentation software to prepare good business presentation.	Able to use advanced features such as graphics, animation and build effect to create sophisticated high quality business presentation.
Ability to understand the concept of the relational database system and to use database software to create and query a database	Little or no understanding of the concept of the relational database system. No ability to develop and query a simple database.	Understanding of the fundamental characteristics of the relational database system as to how data are organized and related in terms of tables and their relationships. Ability to create a simple database application with basic queries, forms and reports.	Superior understanding of the concept of the relational database system. Ability to develop a complex database application with sophisticated queries, forms and reports.

Direct questions to Chang Koh, [kohce@unte.du](mailto:kohce@unte.du), (940) 368-5530



## Scoring Rubric of Case Analysis to assess Problem Solving

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Below Expectations (0 – 5 points)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (6 – 10 points)</b>	<b>Exceeds Expectations (11 – 15 points)</b>
<b>Factual Knowledge</b>	Shows little knowledge of case facts, makes factual mistakes	Shows solid understanding of case facts	Shows thorough grasp of case facts and offers additional factual knowledge about company or industry
<b>Application of Strategic Analytical Tools</b>	Does not use appropriate analysis models or misconstrues elements within the models	Appropriately applies relevant analytical models	Shows strong understanding and application of strategy analysis tools, concepts and techniques
<b>Application of Financial Analysis</b>	Fails to incorporate financials into case analysis or shows only limited attempt to understand financials	Shows knowledge of ratios and trend analysis; demonstrates understanding of firm's financial situation	Applies ratios and trend analysis to develop sound judgments about company situation and prospects
<b>Identification of Case Problems/Issues</b>	Neglects to identify case issues; recounts facts of case with little analysis	Clearly identifies the key issues in the case and demonstrates understanding of company's decision situation	Develops a well-integrated statement of the complex issues of the case and demonstrates understanding of situation.
<b>Generation of Alternatives</b>	Identifies weak or infeasible alternatives with little attention to case issues	Generates 2-3 feasible alternatives for resolving the key issues of the case	Develops 2-3 insightful alternatives for resolving the issues; offers specificity and originality
<b>Recommendations</b>	Offers weak recommendations or pays little attention to addressing case issues	Provides well-reasoned recommendations that follow from the preceding analysis and clearly address case issues; no surprises	Integrates alternatives into a well-developed action plan; offers specificity, priorities, and sequencing of actions
<b>Business Judgment</b>	Shows little attention to presenting sound arguments or backing up ideas with analysis; offers "I think" statements	Provides good arguments backed up with factual knowledge, analysis, and persuasive rationale	Provides strong rationale and convincing arguments throughout; demonstrates sound business judgment

Adapted from material developed by Monique Forte, Stetson University

AACSB International  
Recommended BBA Content  
and Business  
Foundation Alignment:

Survey of Instructors,  
Spring 2008

**BBA Foundation Coverage of AACSB  
Content Areas - Survey Results**

	This knowledge area or ability is directly addressed in my class	I spend approximately _____% of the class time addressing this knowledge area or ability	Student's ability on this knowledge/ability is directly assessed in my class	If directly assessed, how is this done? (e.g., specific questions on a test, a specific assignment addressing it, a specific component of an assignment, etc.)	This knowledge/ability is NOT directly addressed in my course, but ability in this area is required to successfully complete the course	If required but not directly assessed, where is ability on this knowledge/ability likely to be demonstrated? (e.g., necessary for completing an assignment, necessary for understanding higher level knowledge, etc.)
ACCT 2010						
ACCT 2020						
BLAW 3430	yes	10% yes		case problems, exam quest, quizzes, term papers		
FINA 3770	yes	50% yes		test & oral answer		
BCIS 2610	yes	10% yes		exams & assignments		
BCIS 3610						
DSCI 2710						
DSCI 3710						
MGMT 3720						
MKTG 3650	yes	10% yes		assignments, discussion groups		
BUSI 4940	yes	5% yes		presentations, individual written assignment		
MGMT 3330 (bcom)	yes	90% yes		tests, class activities, writing exercise, team project		
BCIS 3615 (comm)	yes	100% yes		exams & assignments		
LSCM 3960	yes	10% yes		in class activities, short answer question, summary of 2 articles		
<b>Communication abilities</b>						

**BBA Foundation Coverage of AACSB  
Content Areas - Survey Results**

	This knowledge area or ability is directly addressed in my class	I spend approximately % of the class time addressing this knowledge area or ability	Student's ability on this knowledge/ability is directly assessed in my class	If directly assessed, how is this done? (e.g., specific questions on a test, a specific assignment addressing it, a specific component of an assignment, etc.)	This knowledge/ability is NOT directly addressed in my course, but ability in this area is required to successfully complete the course	If required but not directly assessed, where is ability on this knowledge/ability likely to be demonstrated? (e.g., necessary for completing an assignment, necessary for understanding higher level knowledge, etc.)
	yes	5%	yes	essay questions		
	yes	2%	yes	test questions		
	yes	25%	yes	case problems, exam quest, quizzes , term papers		
	yes	5%	yes	discussion		
	yes	5%	yes	exams & assignments		
	yes	5%	yes	exams & assignments		
	yes	5%	yes	exams & assignments		
	yes	5%	yes	exams & assignments		
	yes	5%	yes	test questions		
	yes	20%	yes	exams, assignments, case discussion		
					yes	Case analysis
	yes	5%	yes	test questions		
	yes	5%	yes	exams & assignments		
<b>Ethical understanding and reasoning abilities</b>					yes	embedded in chapters

**BBA Foundation Coverage of AACSB  
Content Areas - Survey Results**

	This knowledge area or ability is directly addressed in my class	I spend approximately % of the class time addressing this knowledge area or ability	Student's ability on this knowledge/ability is directly assessed in my class	If directly assessed, how is this done? (e.g., specific questions on a test, a specific assignment addressing it, a specific component of an assignment, etc.)	This knowledge/ability is NOT directly addressed in my course, but ability in this area is required to successfully complete the course	If required but not directly assessed, where is ability on this knowledge/ability likely to be demonstrated? (e.g., necessary for completing an assignment, necessary for understanding higher level knowledge, etc.)
	yes	70%	yes	test questions		
ACCT 2010	yes	85%	yes	test questions		
ACCT 2020	yes	25%	yes	case problems, exam quest, quizzes, term papers		
BLAW 3430	yes	75%	yes	test & discussion		
FINA 3770	yes	10%	yes	exams & assignments		
BCIS 2610	yes	10%	yes	exams & assignments		
BCIS 3610	yes	100%	yes	exams & assignments		
DSCI 2710	yes	70%	yes	exams & assignments		
DSCI 3710	yes					
MGMT 3720						
MKTG 3650	yes	10%	yes	exams, assignments, case discussion		
BUSI 4940	yes	50%	yes	tests, cases		
MGMT 3330 (bcom)	yes	5%	yes	team project, class activities		
BCIS 3615 (comm)	yes	10%	yes	exams & assignments embedded in chapters, q on t and quizzes		
LSCM 3960	yes	10%	yes			
<b>Analytical skills</b>						

**BBA Foundation Coverage of AACSB  
Content Areas - Survey Results**

	This knowledge area or ability is directly addressed in my class	I spend approximately ___% of the class time addressing this knowledge area or ability	Student's ability on this knowledge/ability is directly assessed in my class	If directly assessed, how is this done? (e.g., specific questions on a test, a specific assignment addressing it, a specific component of an assignment, etc.)	This knowledge/ability is NOT directly addressed in my course, but ability in this area is required to successfully complete the course	If required but not directly assessed, where is ability on this knowledge/ability likely to be demonstrated? (e.g., necessary for completing an assignment, necessary for understanding higher level knowledge, etc.)
	ACCT 2010					
	ACCT 2020	1%	yes	test questions		
	BLAW 3430					
	FINA 3770	5%	no		yes	term papers
	BCIS 2610	100%	yes	exams & assignments		
	BCIS 3610	100%	yes	exams & assignments		
	DSCI 2710	20%	yes	exams & assignments		
	DSCI 3710	20%	yes	exams & assignments		
	MGMT 3720					
	MKTG 3650				yes	needed for assignments and cases
	BUSI 4940				yes	needed for assignments and cases
	MGMT 3330 (bcom)	15%	yes	tests, class activities, writing exercise, team project		
	BCIS 3615 (comm)	75%	yes	exams & assignments in chapters, q on quizzes and assignment		
	LSCM 3960	5%	yes			
<b>Use of information technology</b>						

**BBA Foundation Coverage of AACSB  
Content Areas - Survey Results**

		This knowledge area or ability is directly addressed in my class	I spend approximately % of the class time addressing this knowledge area or ability	Student's ability on this knowledge/ability is directly assessed in my class	If directly assessed, how is this done? (e.g., specific questions on a test, a specific assignment addressing it, a specific component of an assignment, etc.)	This knowledge/ability is NOT directly addressed in my course, but ability in this area is required to successfully complete the course	If required but not directly assessed, where is ability on this knowledge/ability likely to be demonstrated? (e.g., necessary for completing an assignment, necessary for understanding higher level knowledge, etc.)
	ACCT 2010						
	ACCT 2020						
	BLAW 3430	yes	15%	yes	case problems, exam quest, quizzes , term papers		
	FINA 3770						
	BCIS 2610						
	BCIS 3610	yes	5%	yes	exams & assignments		
	DSCI 2710						
	DSCI 3710						
	MGMT 3720	yes	5%	yes	test questions exams, assignments, case discussion		
	MKTG 3650	yes	10%	yes			
	BUSI 4940	yes	5%	yes	test questions tests, class activities, writing exercise, team project		
	MGMT 3330 (bcom)	yes	5%	yes			
	BCIS 3615 (comm)	yes	5%	yes	exams & assignments		
	LSCM 3960	yes	5%	yes	q on t, in chapters		
<b>Multicultural and diversity understanding</b>							

**BBA Foundation Coverage of AACSB  
Content Areas - Survey Results**

	This knowledge area or ability is directly addressed in my class	I spend approximately _____% of the class time addressing this knowledge area or ability	Student's ability on this knowledge/ability is directly assessed in my class	If directly assessed, how is this done? (e.g., specific questions on a test, a specific assignment addressing it, a specific component of an assignment, etc.)	This knowledge/ability is NOT directly addressed in my course, but ability in this area is required to successfully complete the course	If required but not directly assessed, where is ability on this knowledge/ability likely to be demonstrated? (e.g., necessary for completing an assignment, necessary for understanding higher level knowledge, etc.)
ACCT 2010						
ACCT 2020						
BLAW 3430						
FINA 3770	yes	15%	yes	test & discussion		
BCIS 2610						
BCIS 3610						
DSCI 2710						
DSCI 3710						
MGMT 3720						
MKTG 3650	yes	20%	yes	exams, assignments, case discussion		
BUIS 4940	yes	15%	yes	case analysis		
MGMT 3330 (bcom)	yes	5%	yes	class activities, writing exercise		
BCIS 3615 (comm)						
LSCM 3960					yes	on t & quizzes, in class activities
<b>Reflective thinking skills</b>						



**BBA Foundation Coverage of AACSB  
Content Areas - Survey Results**

		This knowledge area or ability is directly addressed in my class	I spend approximately _____% of the class time addressing this knowledge area or ability	Student's ability on this knowledge/ability is directly assessed in my class	If directly assessed, how is this done? (e.g., specific questions on a test, a specific assignment addressing it, a specific component of an assignment, etc.)	This knowledge/ability is NOT directly addressed in my course, but ability in this area is required to successfully complete the course	If required but not directly assessed, where is ability on this knowledge/ability likely to be demonstrated? (e.g., necessary for completing an assignment, necessary for understanding higher level knowledge, etc.)
	ACCT 2010	yes	5%	yes	essay questions		
	ACCT 2020	yes	2%	yes	test questions		
	BLAW 3430	yes	100%	yes	case problems, exam quest, quizzes , term papers		
	FINA 3770	yes	15%	maybe	discussion		
	BCIS 2610	yes	5%	yes	exams & assignments		
	BCIS 3610	yes	5%	yes	exams & assignments		
	DSCI 2710						
	DSCI 3710						
	MGMT 3720	yes	5%	yes	test questions		
	MKTG 3650	yes	10%	yes	exams, assignments, case discussion		
	BUSI 4940	yes	2%	yes	tests, cases		
	MGMT 3330 (bcom)						
	BCIS 3615 (comm)	yes	5%	yes	exams & assignments		
	LSCM 3960	yes	5%	yes	in chapters, q on t & quizzes		
<b>Ethical and legal responsibilities in organizations and society</b>							

**BBA Foundation Coverage of AACSB  
Content Areas - Survey Results**

	This knowledge area or ability is directly addressed in my class	I spend approximately _____% of the class time addressing this knowledge area or ability	Student's ability on this knowledge/ability is directly assessed in my class	If directly assessed, how is this done? (e.g., specific questions on a test, a specific assignment addressing it, a specific component of an assignment, etc.)	This knowledge/ability is NOT directly addressed in my course, but ability in this area is required to successfully complete the course	If required but not directly assessed, where is ability on this knowledge/ability likely to be demonstrated? (e.g., necessary for completing an assignment, necessary for understanding higher level knowledge, etc.)
	yes	10%	Yes	test questions		
	yes			case problems, exam quest, quizzes , term papers		
	yes	5%	Yes	test & discussion		
	yes	90%	yes			
	yes	5%	yes	tests and cases		
	yes	10%	yes	Q on t & quizzes		
<b>Financial theories, analysis, reporting, and markets</b>						

**BBA Foundation Coverage of AACSB  
Content Areas - Survey Results**

		This knowledge area or ability is directly addressed in my class	I spend approximately _____% of the class time addressing this knowledge area or ability	Student's ability on this knowledge/ability is directly assessed in my class	If directly assessed, how is this done? (e.g., specific questions on a test, a specific assignment addressing it, a specific component of an assignment, etc.)	This knowledge/ability is NOT directly addressed in my course, but ability in this area is required to successfully complete the course	If required but not directly assessed, where is ability on this knowledge/ability likely to be demonstrated? (e.g., necessary for completing an assignment, necessary for understanding higher level knowledge, etc.)
	ACCT 2010						
	ACCT 2020	yes	10% yes		test questions		
	BLAW 3430	yes	10% yes		case problems, exam quest, quizzes , term papers		
	FINA 3770						
	BCIS 2610						
	BCIS 3610	yes	10% yes		exams & assignments		
	DSCI 2710						
	DSCI 3710	yes	10% yes		exams & assignments		
	MGMT 3720						
	MKTG 3650	yes	100% yes		exams, assignments, case discussion		
	BUSI 4940	yes	5% yes		cases		
	MGMT 3330 (bcom)						
	BCIS 3615 (comm)	yes	5% yes		exams & assignments		
	LSCM 3960	yes	50% yes		focus of course, tests and assignments		
<b>Creation of value through the integrated production and distribution of goods, services, and information</b>							

**BBA Foundation Coverage of AACSB  
Content Areas - Survey Results**

		This knowledge area or ability is directly addressed in my class	I spend approximately _____% of the class time addressing this knowledge area or ability	Student's ability on this knowledge/ability is directly assessed in my class	If directly assessed, how is this done? (e.g., specific questions on a test, a specific assignment addressing it, a specific component of an assignment, etc.)	This knowledge/ability is NOT directly addressed in my course, but ability in this area is required to successfully complete the course	If required but not directly assessed, where is ability on this knowledge/ability likely to be demonstrated? (e.g., necessary for completing an assignment, necessary for understanding higher level knowledge, etc.)
	ACCT 2010						
	ACCT 2020						
	BLAW 3430						
	FINA 3770						
	BCIS 2610						
	BCIS 3610						
	DSCI 2710						
	DSCI 3710						
	MGMT 3720	yes	70%	yes	test questions		
	IMKTG 3650						
	BUSI 4940	yes	3%	yes	team projects		
	MGMT 3330 (bcom)						
	BCIS 3615 (comm)	yes	20%	yes	tests, class activities, writing exercise, team project		
	LSCM 3960	yes	5%	yes	q on t & quizzes		
<b>Group and individual dynamics in organizations</b>							

**BBA Foundation Coverage of AACSB  
Content Areas - Survey Results**

		This knowledge area or ability is directly addressed in my class	I spend approximately % of the class time addressing this knowledge area or ability	Student's ability on this knowledge/ability is directly assessed in my class	If directly assessed, how is this done? (e.g., specific questions on a test, a specific assignment addressing it, a specific component of an assignment, etc.)	This knowledge/ability is NOT directly addressed in my course, but ability in this area is required to successfully complete the course	if required but not directly assessed, where is ability on this knowledge/ability likely to be demonstrated? (e.g., necessary for completing an assignment, necessary for understanding higher level knowledge, etc.)
	ACCT 2010	yes	10%	yes	test questions		
	ACCT 2020	yes	1%	yes	test questions		
	BLAW 3430						
	FINA 3770	yes	10%	yes	test & discussion		
	BCIS 2610						
	BCIS 3610						
	DSCI 2710						
	DSCI 3710	yes	100%	yes	exams & assignments		
	MGMT 3720						
	MKTG 3650	yes	5%				exposure to stats to appreciate decision making
<b>Statistical data analysis and management science as they support decision-making processes throughout the organization</b>	BUSI 4940					yes	assignments and projects
	MGMT 3330 (bcom)						
	BCIS 3615 (comm)						
	LSCM 3960					yes	q on t & quizzes

**BBA Foundation Coverage of AACSB  
Content Areas - Survey Results**

		This knowledge area or ability is directly addressed in my class	I spend approximately _____% of the class time addressing this knowledge area or ability	Student's ability on this knowledge/ability is directly assessed in my class	If directly assessed, how is this done? (e.g., specific questions on a test, a specific assignment addressing it, a specific component of an assignment, etc.)	This knowledge/ability is NOT directly addressed in my course, but ability in this area is required to successfully complete the course	If required but not directly assessed, where is ability on this knowledge/ability likely to be demonstrated? (e.g., necessary for completing an assignment, necessary for understanding higher level knowledge, etc.)
	ACCT 2010						
	ACCT 2020						
	BLAW 3430	yes	5%	yes	case problems, exam quest, quizzes, term papers		
	FINA 3770						
	BCIS 2610	yes	10%	yes	exams & assignments		
	BCIS 3610	yes	10%	yes	exams & assignments		
	DSCI 2710						
	DSCI 3710						
	MGMT 3720						
	MKTG 3650						
	BUSI 4940					yes	case projects
	MGMT 3330 (bcom)						
Information technologies and their influence on structure and processes of organizations and the economy, and their influence on the roles and techniques of management	BCIS 3615 (comm)	yes	25%	yes	exams & assignments		
	LSCM 3960	yes	5%	yes	q on quizzes, assignments		

**BBA Foundation Coverage of AACSB  
Content Areas - Survey Results**

	This knowledge area or ability is directly addressed in my class	I spend approximately % of the class time addressing this knowledge area or ability	Student's ability on this knowledge/ability is directly assessed in my class	If directly assessed, how is this done? (e.g., specific questions on a test, a specific assignment addressing it, a specific component of an assignment, etc.)	This knowledge/ability is NOT directly addressed in my course, but ability in this area is required to successfully complete the course	If required but not directly assessed, where is ability on this knowledge/ability likely to be demonstrated? (e.g., necessary for completing an assignment, necessary for understanding higher level knowledge, etc.)
	ACCT 2010					
	ACCT 2020					
	BLAW 3430	5%	Yes	case problems, exam quest, quizzes , term papers		
	FINA 3770	3%	yes	discussion		
	BCIS 2610	5%	yes	exams & assignments		
	BCIS 3610	5%	yes	exams & assignments		
	DSCI 2710					
	DSCI 3710					
	MGMT 3720					
	MKTG 3650	20%	yes	exams, assignments, case discussion		
	BUSI 4940	5%	yes	tests and cases		
	MGMT 3330 (bcom)					
	BCIS 3615 (comm)					
<b>Domestic and global economic environments of organizations</b>	LSCM 3960	20%	yes	q on t, assignments		

BBA Learning Goals  
and Business  
Foundation Alignment:

Survey of Instructors,  
Spring 2008



### BBA Learning Goals and Business Foundation Alignment Survey Results

		<b>Knowledge</b>	<b>Communications</b>	<b>Teamwork</b>	<b>Problem Solving</b>	<b>Technology</b>
		Demonstrate mastery of basic business theory, principles and knowledge across the core business disciplines	Demonstrate the ability to effectively prepare and present business material both orally and in writing	Demonstrate the ability to effectively work in a team environment	Demonstrate the ability to apply business knowledge to address complex business situations	Demonstrate the ability to effectively utilize a variety of software programs generally used in business
This Learning Goal is directly addressed in my class	ACCT 2010	Yes			Yes	
	ACCT 2020	Yes			Yes	Yes
	BLAW 3430	Yes	Yes		Yes	
	FINA 3770	Yes	?			
	BCIS 2610		Yes			Yes
	BCIS 3610	Yes			Yes	Yes
	DSCI 2710				Yes	Yes
	DSCI 3710	Yes			Yes	Yes
	MGMT 3720			Yes		
	MKTG 3650	Yes	Yes		Yes	
	BUSI 4940	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
	MKTG 3010	No	Yes	No		Indirect
	MGMT 3330 (bcom)		Yes	Yes		
	BCIS 3615 (comm)	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes
LSCM 3960						
I spend approximately ____% of the class time addressing this Learning Goal	ACCT 2010	70%			30%	
	ACCT 2020	25%			65%	1%
	BLAW 3430	70%	10%		20%	
	FINA 3770	?	?			
	BCIS 2610		10%			50%
	BCIS 3610	10%			10%	50%
	DSCI 2710				10%	50%
	DSCI 3710	10%			15%	50%
	MGMT 3720			10%		
	MKTG 3650	80-90%	5-10%		5-10%	
	BUSI 4940	10%	5%	5%	70%	
	MKTG 3010	0	90	0	15	<5%
	MGMT 3330 (bcom)		90%	90%		
	BCIS 3615 (comm)	10%	100%		10%	50%
LSCM 3960						
Student's ability on this learning goal is directly assessed in my class	ACCT 2010	Yes			Yes	
	ACCT 2020	Yes			Yes	Yes
	BLAW 3430	Yes	Yes		Yes	
	FINA 3770	Yes	Yes			
	BCIS 2610		Yes			Yes
	BCIS 3610	Yes			Yes	Yes
	DSCI 2710				Yes	Yes
	DSCI 3710	Yes			Yes	Yes
	MGMT 3720			Yes		
	MKTG 3650	Yes	Yes		Yes	
	BUSI 4940	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
	MKTG 3010	No	Tests (2) Quizzes (5) Projects (2)			
	MGMT 3330 (bcom)		Yes	Yes		
	BCIS 3615 (comm)	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes
LSCM 3960						

**BBA Learning Goals and Business Foundation Alignment Survey Results**

		<b>Knowledge</b>	<b>Communications</b>	<b>Teamwork</b>	<b>Problem Solving</b>	<b>Technology</b>
		Demonstrate mastery of basic business theory, principles and knowledge across the core business disciplines	Demonstrate the ability to effectively prepare and present business material both orally and in writing	Demonstrate the ability to effectively work in a team environment	Demonstrate the ability to apply business knowledge to address complex business situations	Demonstrate the ability to effectively utilize a variety of software programs generally used in business
If directly assessed, how is this done? (e.g., specific questions on a test, a specific assignment addressing it, a specific component of an assignment, etc.)	ACCT 2010	specific questions on exams			application problems on exams	
	ACCT 2020	specific questions on exams			exams and quizzes, calculate info from scenarios and make recommendations	use of excel on exams
	BLAW 3430	exam questions, term paper, case presentations, quizzes, class questions	Exam questions, case presentations, term papers		exam questions, term paper, case presentations, quizzes, class questions	
	FINA 3770	questions on test	writing on test			
	BCIS 2610		Exams & Assignments			Exams & Assignments
	BCIS 3610	Exams & Assignments			Exams & Assignments	Exams & Assignments
	DSCI 2710				Exams & Assignments	Exams & Assignments
	DSCI 3710	Exams & Assignments			Exams & Assignments	Exams & Assignments
	MGMT 3720			Test Questions		
	MKTG 3650	Exam Questions	essay exam, graded discussions, written and oral project		exam questions, graded discussion, graded case analysis	
	BUSI 4940	assignments, cases, essay exams	essay exam, assignments, oral presentations	peer evaluations	assignments, essay exam, specific test questions, project	
	MKTG 3010		Two taped role plays, one graded role play, five book-based online quizzes, one resume assignment, career goals writeup	N/A	One sell yourself role play, One taped sales presentation	
	MGMT 3330 (bcom)		Test questions, in class & online activities, writing exercise, team project	Team project, test questions, online & inclass activities, writing exercise		
	BCIS 3615 (comm)	Exams & Assignments	Exams & Assignments		Exams & Assignments	Exams & Assignments
LSCM 3960						

**BBA Learning Goals and Business Foundation Alignment Survey Results**

		<b>Knowledge</b>	<b>Communications</b>	<b>Teamwork</b>	<b>Problem Solving</b>	<b>Technology</b>
		Demonstrate mastery of basic business theory, principles and knowledge across the core business disciplines	Demonstrate the ability to effectively prepare and present business material both orally and in writing	Demonstrate the ability to effectively work in a team environment	Demonstrate the ability to apply business knowledge to address complex business situations	Demonstrate the ability to effectively utilize a variety of software programs generally used in business
This Learning Goal is NOT directly addressed in my course, but ability in this area is required to successfully complete the course	ACCT 2010					
	ACCT 2020					
	BLAW 3430					Yes
	FINA 3770		Yes			
	BCIS 2610					
	BCIS 3610					
	DSCI 2710					
	DSCI 3710					
	MGMT 3720					
	MKTG 3650			Maybe		Yes
	BUSI 4940					Yes
	MKTG 3010	Partial		No		Yes. Ability to use MS Word, WebCT Vista
	MGMT 3330 (bcom)					
	BCIS 3615 (comm)					
LSCM 3960						
If required but not directly assessed, where is ability on this learning goal likely to be demonstrated? (e.g., necessary for completing an assignment, necessary for understanding higher level knowledge, etc.)	ACCT 2010					
	ACCT 2020					
	BLAW 3430					Term paper requires use of several software programs
	FINA 3770		writing on exams			
	BCIS 2610					
	BCIS 3610					
	DSCI 2710					
	DSCI 3710					
	MGMT 3720					
	MKTG 3650			Some team work in smaller sections?		Internet, word processing, presentation software and spreadsheets
	BUSI 4940					Research and financial analysis, presentation software
	MKTG 3010	Students have to acquire knowledge of their career field through ability they should possess prior to UNT enrollment		N/A		
	MGMT 3330 (bcom)					
	BCIS 3615 (comm)					
LSCM 3960						

# SACS Assessment of Learning Outcomes

## Samples of Undergraduate, Masters and Ph.D Assessment Efforts

2005-2006

## **SACS Assessment of Learning Outcomes Samples of Efforts 2005-2006**

In Compliance with the requirements of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), the College of Business Administration developed programs for the assessment of student learning in each major/concentration area at the undergraduate, masters and doctoral level. These efforts, initially undertaken in 2004-2005, involved all departments within the college. The initial efforts have continued on an annual basis, with collection of information, analysis of results, and program revisions where necessary. In addition, departments and the college continue to revise and improve on the assessment targets and measures.

Inclusion of all of the assessment efforts for all of the majors is precluded because of space concerns. The pages that follow, however, provide examples of assessment plans and outcomes for an undergraduate, masters, and Ph.D. major/concentration in each of two departments. Examples from other majors/concentration areas and/or other departments will be made available to the AACSB International visitation team upon request.

**ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT PLAN**  
Department: **Management - Entrepreneurship BBA**  
College / School: **College of Business Administration**  
Period: **AY 2005-06**  
Status: **Plan Completed and Approved.**

**Mission**

The Mission for the Bachelors of Business Administration in Entrepreneurship is to provide students with an understanding of the startup and management processes, to prepare students to start a business, and to prepare them to identify opportunities, plan business processes, marshal needed resources, and direct and control work to sustain and grow a business.

**Outcome #: 1**

**Expected Outcome**

Comprehension (C). Entrepreneurship majors will be able to: C1. Describe the functional activities associated with the Entrepreneurship. C2. Illustrate the foundation necessary to effectively start, sustain, and grow a business. C3. Describe their role in and responsibilities in the business society.

**Assessment Tool**

The use of project assignment, current events/case discussions, and team assignments in MGMT 3850 Entrepreneurship, MGMT 3820 Management Concepts, and MGMT 3830 Operations Management provides students with the opportunity to apply quantitative decision-making skills in an applied business setting. Preparation of a business plan is required in MGMT 3850. The project assignments involve submission of written reports and oral presentations that are used to demonstrate students' mastery of content material, integration of that material, as well as their ability to communicate their knowledge in oral and written reports. Professors assess students' performance. Assessment tools include evaluation of projects, individual tests, and assignment submissions, oral presentations, and ability to work in teams (team peer evaluations).

The use of case analysis and written submission in MGMT 3880 Business Ethics and Social Responsibility provide the students with the opportunity to understand the strategic purposes of the firm as both an economic and social entity within society, the ethical conflicts that occur in the workplace and methods for resolving those conflicts. Professors assess students' performance. Assessment tools include evaluation of case analyses, individual tests, and assignment submissions.

Entrepreneurship faculty members meet semi-annually to discuss outcomes or actual results of assessment tools and course content, and discuss how the Entrepreneurship program may be improved.

**Actual Results**

Faculty members met and evaluated both the content and name of the program. It was determined that student performance in terms of comprehension was sufficient, but that the content of the program could build on the resources already in place in the Department of Management through the Murphy Enterprise Center. This would provide a better identity for the program with the entrepreneurship process. Thus, a name change from Entrepreneurship and Strategic Management to Entrepreneurship was recommended. Curriculum changes were also recommended at that time to reflect the program focus on entrepreneurship.

**Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

The name of the degree program change in 2003-04 from Entrepreneurship and Strategic Management to better reflect the strengths of the program. The current program is more focused on the needs of students who wish to apply their B.B.A. degree to the process of starting and operating their own businesses. Curriculum changes noted below are being implemented in the 2006-07 catalog.

Individual course requirements and projects are continually being adapted to better develop understanding of material content and application to the real world.

## **Outcome #: 2**

### **Expected Outcome**

Analysis and Application (AA). Entrepreneurship majors will be able to: AA1. Demonstrate effective decision-making abilities needed in the start-up and entrepreneurial process. AA2. Perform a variety of business tasks such as market analysis, preparing a business plan, or re-designing processes and managing resources. AA3. Demonstrate effective skills in oral and written communications. AA4. Develop confidence in their ability to start and manage an entrepreneurial business.

### **Assessment Tool**

Assignment of one-on-one student-employer experience in the entrepreneurship capstone course, MGMT4220 Field Study in Entrepreneurship, requires students to work with an entrepreneur and perform different business activities and make business decisions in the real world. The students are required to conduct a comprehensive business project (team project) for an existing business, submit a written report and an oral presentation. In addition, the course requirements include individual assignments to be submitted. Professors and entrepreneurs assess students' performance. Assessment tools include evaluation of projects, individual tests, and assignment submissions, oral presentations, and ability to work in teams (team peer evaluations). Employers (entrepreneurs) of those students are surveyed to identify strengths and weaknesses of the students in terms of their abilities to perform business tasks.

The Entrepreneurial self-efficacy survey is administered to students each semester. This is a research tool used to measure belief in the ability to perform a variety of activities required to successfully start and run a business. The instrument is used by professors to assess students' confidence in their ability to start up and run a business, and thus is an indicator of students' perceived ability to be successful as an entrepreneur.

Entrepreneurship faculty members meet semi-annually to discuss outcomes or actual results of assessment tools and course content, and discuss how the Entrepreneurship program may be improved.

### **Actual Results**

Responses of entrepreneur employers from MGMT 4220 have been shared with entrepreneurship faculty as needed and analyzed to identify strengths and weaknesses of the program. Faculty members in the professional field met and discussed curriculum changes that address application and analysis. Course content and the structure of the curriculum, as well as the introduction of new technology into the curriculum are the issues considered most recently for change. Feedback regarding strengths and weaknesses indicated that students in entrepreneurship will need a background in marketing, finance, insurance, and accounting in order to set up and run a new business. Thus, it was determined that the curriculum needed to be expanded to include these topics. In addition, WebCT was discussed as an important tool in facilitating the exchange of information between faculty and students.

### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

Changes in course content and curriculum will be made on the basis of both faculty and employer feedback. Program changes in effect as of the 2006-07 catalog include a revision of the supporting field courses. Students may take 6 hours each from two course groups. Courses in group 1 include 5 management courses, one marketing research, and one course in property and liability insurance. Courses in group 2 include 4 accounting courses, three finance courses, and one course in e-management. This revision addresses the need for entrepreneurs to possess knowledge and skills in finance, accounting, and marketing in order to successfully start up and operate a business.

Many faculty members now integrate WebCT technology into course requirements. The introduction of this technology permits better information flow between faculty and students, as well as between students who collaborate on course projects.

Enrollment in MGMT 4800, Internship, has been steadily increasing. In 2005, 48 students participated in paid internships in business organizations for course credit.

The Entrepreneurship program received national ranking as a "Top Tier Regional Program" by Entrepreneurship Magazine in 2004 and 2005.

### **Outcome #: 3**

#### **Expected Outcome**

Synthesis (S). Entrepreneurship majors will be able to: S1. Integrate and apply knowledge of Entrepreneurship in a variety of environmental settings. S2. Synthesize knowledge from several functional areas and apply new techniques and practices in Operations and Supply Chain Management.

#### **Assessment Tool**

The capstone course, BUSI 4940 Business Policy, requires students (in teams) to integrate and apply knowledge from both entrepreneurship courses and BBA breadth courses. Case analysis submission and presentation of analysis is the pedagogical process in capstone course. Several cases involving different businesses in different environmental settings are used throughout each term. The final case analysis is a competition across the various teams and sections of BUSI 4940. Faculty members from throughout the college of business participate in judging the final case analysis and presentation. Faculty members involved in the case competition provide feedback on the quality and depth of information analyzed and presented. In the final round of the last case analysis, the case analysis and presentation are judged by industry representatives. The industry representatives, also provide feedback on the quality and depth of information analyzed and presented. Assessment tools include evaluation of case analysis submissions (written and oral presentations), individual tests, and ability to work in teams (team peer evaluations).

An overall exam (BBA Knowledge Assessment) has been administered with students enrolled in BUSI 4940; this provides specific feedback on the mastery of BBA breadth courses.

Management faculty members meet annually to discuss outcomes or actual results of assessment tools, course content and faculty feedback, and discuss how Management programs may be improved. In addition, Entrepreneurship faculty members meet annually to discuss actual results of assessment tools and how the Entrepreneurship program may be improved.

#### **Actual Results**

Results of BBA Knowledge Assessment are reviewed by the COBA Undergraduate Programs committee. Results show that management students perform better in their own subject area and that they perform lowest in the quantitative areas. The performance of entrepreneurship students in the capstone course suggests that they are able to synthesize and apply knowledge from their discipline to a variety of organizational settings. A committee of Department of Management faculty was appointed to review the teaching methodology employed in BUSI 4940 as it had been several years since the course had been evaluated. The results of the evaluation indicated the need for a new textbook and cases to be adopted in the fall of 2006.

#### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

Content of MGMT 3820 had been modified to address quantitative skills. Course content of BUSI 4940 was modified to reflect the use of more in-depth cases in 2006-2007. New cases are utilized each long semester that comprehensively address key content areas. Since new cases are continually being introduced into the curriculum, faculty members adapt capstone course content to address critical knowledge areas of the B.B.A. degree. Industry sponsors provide funding each year to support competitive case competition in the fall and spring semesters.



## **Outcome #: 4**

### **Expected Outcome**

Application (A). Entrepreneurship majors will be able to: A1. Demonstrate effective decision-making abilities needed in the start-up and entrepreneurial process. A2. Demonstrate effective skills in oral and written communications.

### **Assessment Tool**

The Department of Management Advisory Board (MAB) meets annually to discuss departmental initiatives, as well as to seek feedback regarding skills and capabilities of graduates overall and by individual program. Feedback from the MAB is used for curriculum revisions and course content.

Management faculty members meet annually to discuss feedback from the MAB and how programs and individual courses may be improved.

Entrepreneurship faculty members meet semi-annually to discuss feedback from the MAB and internships and how programs and individual courses may be improved.

### **Actual Results**

Feedback from the annual MAB meeting is provided to faculty program coordinators to be considered in curriculum or program revisions. Past feedback from the board has addressed such general skills as oral and written communication and the ability to apply classroom knowledge to the "real world." In response to results of exit surveys of graduating undergraduate students, the May 2006 Advisory Board meeting focused on careers. After hearing from a panel of students currently in the job search process, board members gave helpful input on career strategies for students, including such techniques as networking with management alumni, setting realistic goals, and using multiple methods for locating their first jobs. This information will be helpful in coaching students in the classroom, and in assisting individual students with their job searches.

Feedback from internships provides entrepreneurship faculty members with information about the students' ability to apply new techniques and practices in the entrepreneurship area.

In addition, entrepreneurship faculty members meet annually to discuss feedback from the various assessments to evaluate whether or not students are mastering the application of new techniques and practices in the real-world.

### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

New technology that develops student skills, the application of those skills, and develops oral and written communication skills is integrated into the curriculum. There has been an increased use of web-based tools in all classes. These tools permit constant feedback to students concerning their progress and performance in each course.

Focus groups, consisting of MAB members who have a background in Entrepreneurship, will be formed in the fall of 2006 to evaluate the curriculum of the Entrepreneurship professional field in order to obtain program-specific feedback to be used in future curriculum revisions.

Internships and professional positions are announced and promoted in each of the professional field courses.

In an effort to provide students with more assistance in the job search process, the Murphy Enterprise Center located in the Department of Management conducts a "Mean Green Job Fair" at the end of the spring semester. This job fair is open to all students on campus, but focuses on COBA students. May 2006 was the third year for the job fair.

## ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT PLAN

Department: **Management - Operations & Supply Chain Management - MBA**

College / School: **College of Business Administration**

Period: **AY 2005-06**

Status: **Plan Completed and Approved.**

### **Mission**

The Mission of the Masters in Business Administration with a concentration in Operations and Supply Chain Management is to provide students with an understanding of the scope of Operations and Supply Chain Management, introduce students to new techniques and practices, and develop the decision-making skills necessary to prepare them for careers as managers in the field of Operations and Supply Chain Management.

### **Outcome #: 1**

#### **Expected Outcome**

Comprehension (C). OSCM majors will be able to: C1. Describe the planning and decision making activities associated with the field of Operations and Supply Chain Management, and apply scientific management principles and a systems approach to management. C2. Interpret information, compare and contrast different scenarios across the production processes employed by businesses.

#### **Assessment Tool**

The use of problem sets as assignments and case analysis submissions in MGMT 5280 Analysis & Design of Operations Systems provides students with the opportunity to apply conceptual and quantitative decision-making skills in an applied business setting. The assignments may involve learning and applying EXCEL in the assignment solutions. Professors assess students' performance. Assessment tools include individual tests, assignment submissions and case analysis submissions.

The use of projects and case analysis submissions in MGMT 5850 Materials Management provides students with the opportunity to apply decision-making in a real-world team environment. Cases provide the opportunity to interpret information and develop a proposal for improvement. Projects involve a real-world situation with analysis. The project submission also involves competitive presentation of project material. Professors assess students' performance. Assessment tools include project submissions, case-analysis, individual tests, and oral presentations.

Integration of new technology, such as Microsoft Word, Excel, and Power Point in class assignments, allows students to apply their knowledge, while developing new skills and techniques in Operations and Supply Chain Management.

OSCM faculty members meet semi-annually to discuss outcomes or actual results of assessment tools and course content, and discuss how the OSCM program may be improved.

#### **Actual Results**

OSCM faculty members met and evaluated the students' performance on the problem sets and case analysis submissions. It was determined that student performance in terms of overall comprehension and their ability to work in teams was sufficient, but that the students' quantitative decision-making abilities needed further development. In addition, it was determined, based on feedback from problem sets submissions and presentations, that more emphasis should be placed on mastering new technology skills and application of that technology.

#### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

OSCM faculty members recommended that the topical areas of coursework in two professional field courses (MGMT 5280 & MGMT 5850) be changed 2005-2006 to better develop the course-specific quantitative areas in OSCM. Individual course requirements and problem sets have been adapted to better develop the students' understanding of quantitative decision-making and their application of technology skills. In addition, the number of individual technology related assignments have been increased throughout the professional field courses.

## **Outcome #: 2**

### **Expected Outcome**

Analysis and Application (AA). OSCM majors will be able to: AA1. Demonstrate the design, operation, and control of a variety of production systems employed by businesses. AA2. Apply effective decision-making abilities in both the conceptual and/or quantitative areas associated with Operations and Supply Chain Management. AA3. Develop skills in new techniques and practices that will allow students to effectively apply these skills in the Operations and Supply Chain Management area.

### **Assessment Tool**

The use of projects (teams) in MGMT 5240 Project Management provides students with the opportunity to apply decision-making (qualitative and quantitative) in a real-world team environment. Projects involve a systems approach to developing a real-world company while learning and applying Microsoft Project Management. These projects provide students an opportunity to integrate the theory, principles, and knowledge of Operations and Supply Chain Management. The project submission also involves competitive presentation of project material. Professors assess students' performance. Other faculty members are involved in judging the project presentations. Assessment tools include project submissions, individual assignments, individual tests, oral presentations, and ability to work in teams (team peer evaluations).

Integration of new technology, such as Microsoft Project, Microsoft Word, and Power Point in class assignments and projects, allows students to apply their knowledge, while developing new skills and techniques in Operations and Supply Chain Management.

OSCM faculty members meet semi-annually to discuss outcomes or actual results of assessment tools and course content, and discuss how the OSCM program may be improved.

### **Actual Results**

OSCM faculty met and evaluated the feedback from the project assignments. It was determined, based on the students' application of new technology skills, that some content changes were needed. The faculty determined that the student's ability to work in teams was sufficient, but the application of Microsoft Project Management by individual students needed emphasis and the students' application of decision-making skills (qualitative and quantitative) in the real world needed further development. Based on feedback from students, the faculty also determined that additional flexibility in course scheduling was needed.

### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

Project assignments have been revised to incorporate both conceptual and quantitative applications in a real world environment. Individual assignments have been adapted to better develop the student's understanding of conceptual and quantitative decision-making and application of new OSCM techniques and practices.

In response to increased demand for on-line courses, MGMT 5070 Management Concepts now has an on-line section each term. In addition, many faculty members now integrate WebCT technology into course requirements. The introduction of this technology also permits a more flexible schedule for student, and better information flow between faculty and students.

## **Outcome #: 3**

### **Expected Outcome**

Synthesis (S). OSCM majors will be able to: S1. Synthesize knowledge from several functional areas and apply knowledge of Operations and Supply Chain Management. S2. Demonstrate effective skills in oral and written communications.

### **Assessment Tool**

Case analysis submissions, research, projects, and presentations in MGMT 5240, MGMT 5280, and MGMT 5850 are used to evaluate students' mastery of content material, the integration of that material, as well as their ability to communicate their knowledge in oral and written reports.

Integration of new technology, such as Microsoft Project, Microsoft Word, Excel and Power Point in class assignments and projects, allows students to apply their knowledge, while developing new skills and techniques in Operations and Supply Chain Management.

Professors assess students' performance. Assessment tools include project submissions, case analysis submissions, individual assignments, individual tests, oral presentations, and ability to work in teams (team peer evaluations).

#### **Actual Results**

OSCM faculty members met and evaluated the students' performance on the case analysis submissions. It was determined that student performance in terms of content of material and the integration of that material and their ability to work in teams was sufficient, but that the students' quantitative decision-making abilities needed further development. In addition, it was determined, based on feedback from case analysis submissions, and oral and written presentations, that more emphasis should be placed on mastering new technology skills, new techniques in OSCM and applying decision-making skills in the real world.

#### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

Case assignments are selected to better allow for development of the student's quantitative decision-making and application of their technology skills. The case assignments allow for the students' synthesis of the material and application of OSCM knowledge in real world situations while applying the new technology. Individual assignments incorporate both conceptual and quantitative applications.

#### **Outcome #: 4**

##### **Expected Outcome**

Application (A). OSCM majors will be able to: A1. Apply new techniques and practices in Operations and Supply Chain Management. A2. Demonstrate effective skills in oral and written communication.

##### **Assessment Tool**

The capstone course for the MBA program, BUSI 5190 Business Policy, requires students to integrate and apply knowledge from both Operations and Supply Chain Management courses and MBA breadth (organizational behavior, accounting, marketing, finance, and statistics) courses through case analysis and simulation. Several cases involving different businesses in different environmental settings are used throughout each term. Assessment tools include evaluation of case analysis submissions (written and oral presentations), individual tests, and ability to work in teams (team peer evaluations).

The MBA Knowledge Assessment test is administered to all MBA students provides specific feedback on the mastery of management principles. This assessment tool is given to students enrolled in BUSI 5190, the capstone course for the MBA program. The results of this assessment are evaluated by the College of Business Administration Graduate Programs Committee and feedback is provided to the faculty in the Department of Management through their representative on this committee to be used in making changes to the program.

Management faculty members meet annually to discuss outcomes or actual results of assessment tools, course content and faculty feedback, and discuss how Management programs may be improved. In addition, the OSCM faculty members meet annually to discuss actual results of the case analysis and presentations and how the OSCM program relates to student performance.

#### **Actual Results**

The performance of the OSCM in the capstone course suggests that they are able to synthesize and apply knowledge from the discipline to a variety of settings. Student performance on the Knowledge Assessment test is reviewed by the College of Business Administration Graduate Programs Committee. Any deficiencies identified in that review initiate action planning directed toward the delivery, methodology, and/or content of the core MBA curriculum. This tool is still in the development stage and substantive results have not been used as the basis for program or curriculum changes. Management faculty members met to discuss program content and curriculum issues as described above in Outcomes #2 & #3 above.

#### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

The Knowledge Assessment test has been pilot tested with students. Revisions to the tool are being made. Student performance on this exam will be used to make changes in the core curriculum based on identified areas of weakness. BUSI 5190 is now offered both face-to-face and online to meet the needs of a growing segment of working students who take many of their classes in an online format. In response to faculty concerns regarding students' ability to analyze financial statements, FINA 5040 has been added as a COBA leveling class for students who enter the MBA program without an undergraduate degree in

business.

## **Outcome #: 5**

### **Expected Outcome**

Application (A). OSCM majors will be able to: A1. Apply new techniques and practices in Operations and Supply Chain Management. A2. Demonstrate effective skills in oral and written communications. A3. Serve as a specialist or manager in Operations and Supply Chain Management area in a complex and global business environment.

### **Assessment Tool**

The Department of Management Advisory Board (MAB) meets annually to discuss departmental initiatives, as well as to seek feedback regarding skills and capabilities of graduates overall and by individual program. Feedback from the MAB is used for curriculum revisions and course content.

The Board of Directors (ISM – BOD), sponsors of the UNT Institute for Supply Management (ISM) Student organization, provide feedback on curriculum each year.

Management faculty members meet annually to discuss feedback from the MAB, ISM-BOD, and internships and how programs and individual courses may be improved.

### **Actual Results**

Faculty members identified the need to improve student communication skills, provide additional opportunities for written and oral assignments, and incorporate use of the latest technology in the curriculum.

Feedback from the annual MAB meeting is provided to faculty program coordinators to be considered in curriculum or program revisions. Past feedback from the board has addressed such general skills as oral and written communication and the ability to apply classroom knowledge to the “real world.” In response to results of exit surveys of graduating undergraduate students, the May 2006 Advisory Board meeting focused on careers. This topic, however, is also relevant to graduate students. After hearing from a panel of students currently in the job search process, board members gave helpful input on career strategies for students, including such techniques as networking with management alumni, setting realistic goals, and using multiple methods for locating their first jobs. This information is helpful in coaching students in the classroom, and in assisting individual students with their job searches.

Feedback from the ISM - BOD is provided to the OSCM faculty members to be considered in curriculum or program revisions. Past feedback has addressed such curriculum revisions as quality, MRP/ERP, and project management initiatives.

In addition, the OSCM faculty members meet annually to discuss feedback from the various assessments to evaluate whether or not students are mastering the application of new techniques and practices in the real-world.

### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

New technology that develops student skills, the application of those skills, and develops oral and written communication skills is integrated into the curriculum. There has been an increased use of web-based tools in all classes. These tools permit constant feedback to students concerning their progress and performance in each course.

Focus groups, consisting of MAB members who have a background in Operations and Supply Chain Management, will be formed in the fall of 2006 to evaluate the curriculum of the OSCM professional field in order to obtain program-specific feedback to be used in future curriculum revisions.

In an effort to provide students with more assistance in the job search process, the Murphy Enterprise Center located in the Department of Management conducts a “Mean Green Job Fair” at the end of the spring semester. This job fair is open to all students on campus, but focuses on COBA students. May 2006 was the third year for the job fair. In addition, internships and professional positions are announced and promoted in each of the professional field courses.

**ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT PLAN**  
Department: **Management - Management - PHD**  
College / School: **College of Business Administration**  
Period: **AY 2005-06**  
Status: **Plan Completed and Approved.**

**Mission**

The mission of the doctoral program is to provide the student with theoretical and methodological research tools needed to become creative scholars and teachers. The students will have a highly developed knowledge of their chosen discipline and be provided the opportunity to develop the research and teaching skills necessary to function as competent members of the academic community.

**Outcome #: 1**

**Expected Outcome**

Comprehension (C). Graduates with a Management Ph.D. will be able to: C1. Describe theory and principles associated with performing research in management. C2. Interpret information, compare and contrast different theories and principles in the management field. C3. Demonstrate effective skills in oral and written communications. C4. Describe their role in and responsibilities to learned societies in their professional field.

**Assessment Tool**

Five Ph.D. management seminars (MGMT 6880 Seminar in Production and Operations Management, MGMT 6820 Seminar in Organizational Theory, MGMT 6030 Seminar in Strategic Management, 6100 Seminar in Organizational Behavior, and Seminar in Human Resources) are conducted over a two year cycle. These courses provide management content material needed to understand management principles and their relationship to and value in performing research. Assignments typically involve routine written assignments, research projects, oral presentations and final comprehensive-like exams which are administered in each of the courses. Research projects require submission of a final manuscript and class presentation to class and invited faculty members. Professors assess students' performance. Assessment tools include assignment submission, project submissions, oral presentations, and tests.

A Graduate Faculty Committee (GPC), composed of six elected Management category three faculty, meet routinely (biweekly or monthly) to discuss outcomes and progress of the Ph.D. students, and discuss activities associated with the Ph.D. program and how Management Ph.D. program may be improved.

Routine "brown bag" seminars, sponsored and directed by the Management faculty, allow for an open discussion between the Management faculty and their Ph.D. students. Different topics are discussed throughout each term, but the focus tends to center around the research, service and teaching responsibilities in an academic career. Frequently, research presentations allow for critique and discussion associated with research responsibilities.

Management Ph.D. students will serve as a TA/RA (10hrs. per week) in addition to teaching an organized class (survey course - 10 hrs. per week) each long term during the first two years in the program. The TA/RA assignment allows the students to work with an individual faculty member on teaching assistantship or on research. The mentoring faculty assesses' the student's performance and provide feedback to the GPC.

**Actual Results**

Management faculty members met and evaluated the students' performance on feedback from the department level courses. The faculty determined that the Ph.D. students' oral and written communication skills are sufficient, but a better understanding or management principles and their relationship to and value in performing research is needed. In addition, the faculty determined that student's understanding of teaching and research responsibilities in an academic career needed to be further developed.

**Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

The GPC reviewed course content for duplication and sequence of courses for program improvement, then discussed and recommended revisions to reflect desired topics. Selection of instructors (some new instructors) occurred 2005-2006. "Brown Bag" seminars were added that allows for professional dialogue between students and management faculty members and provides the students with a practical understanding of the professional field. Attendance at "Brown Bag" seminars is required.

Based on the results, the GPC and Department Ph.D. Coordinator developed a new assignment scheme for the Ph.D. students for the 2005-2006 year. Each term, new students are assigned to a lab (10 hrs per week) and a TA/RA (assigned to as faculty for 10 hrs per week) to provide easier acclimation to the rigors of a Ph.D. program. The opportunity (TA/RA) to work with a faculty member provides students with a better understanding of applying research and/or teaching techniques in an academic setting. The dialogue between faculty and student allows for specific questions to be addressed in a non-threatening environment. Second year students are assigned to teaching one organized class (10 hrs per week) and one TA/RA (10hrs per week). After comprehensive exams, students are assigned to teaching two organized classes each term.

## **Outcome #: 2**

### **Expected Outcome**

Analysis and Application (AA). Graduates with a Management Ph.D. will be able to: AA1. Conduct and publish research. AA2. Analyze empirical data and explain trends, results, and findings. AA3. Effectively teach at the college level. AA3. Demonstrate effective skills in oral and written communications.

### **Assessment Tool**

Five college level research courses are required of all Ph.D. students. The specific courses are BUSI 6220 Applied Regression Analysis, BUSI 6240 Applied Multivariate Statistics, BUSI 6280 Applications in Causal and Covariance Structure Modeling, and BUSI 6480 Advanced Issues in Research Design. These courses provide specific research tools needed to develop skills for conducting research. In addition, the sequential and cumulative build up of research tool knowledge provides the foundation for continuous personal development in this area. These courses provide the basis for collecting and analyzing data associated with performing research. Assignments typically involve routine written assignments, research projects, oral presentations and final comprehensive-like exams which are administered in each of the courses. Research projects often require submission of a final manuscript and class presentation to class and other invited faculty members. Professors assess students' performance. Assessment tools include assignment submission, project submissions, oral presentations, and tests.

Three foundation college level courses are required of all Ph.D. students. Two of these courses, BUSI 6450 Business Research Methods and BUSI 6460 Foundations of Scientific Inquiry, provide an overview of research design and the scientific process. The third required foundation course, BUSI 6100 University Teaching for Business Administration, provides a practical and theoretical framework for teaching at the college level. Assignments typically involve routine written assignments, research projects, oral presentations and final comprehensive-like exams which are administered in each of the courses. Research projects often require submission of a final manuscript and class presentation to class and invited faculty members. Professors assess students' performance. Assessment tools include assignment submission, project submissions, oral presentations, and tests.

A college level committee, Doctoral Policy Committee (DPC) composed of five elected category three faculty (an elected representative from each department) members, meet routinely (biweekly or monthly) to discuss outcomes and progress of the Ph.D. students, and discuss activities associated with the Ph.D. program and how the college Ph.D. programs may be improved.

Management Ph.D. students teach and an organized class (survey course - 10hrs. per week) each term during the first two years in the program. Starting their third year in the program, Ph.D. students teach two organized classes each long term. Assessment of Ph.D. students teaching includes departmental PAC evaluations (instructor evaluations and written comments) and feedback to the student and GPC. In addition, the students receive annual reviews of their teaching performance.

### **Actual Results**

College level faculty members (DPC) met and evaluated the students' performance on feedback from the college level courses. The faculty determined that the Ph.D. students' oral and written communication skills are sufficient, but the skills for conducting research and the foundation for personal development needed to be further emphasis. In addition, it was determined that students

should be provided with a better understanding of teaching and research methodologies.

### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

The DPC met and evaluated the results. Subsequently, the DPC recommended modifications in the college level teaching course and selected new instructors for the college level courses for the 2005-2006 year. Management Ph.D. coordinator assigned Ph.D. students new course preparations to develop their teaching knowledge of the management field. The GPC provides a progress report to each Ph.D. student each semester. Student evaluations of the Ph.D. students, as instructors, are collected and assessed by the departmental Personnel Affairs Committee (PAC) every semester. Feedback is provided to each Ph.D. student. Ph.D. students were provided mentors and/or coordinators for guiding class room teaching in 2006-2007.

### **Outcome #: 3**

#### **Expected Outcome**

Synthesis (S). Graduates with a Management Ph.D. will be able to: S1. Integrate and apply knowledge of research in the field of Management. S2. Generalize from previous research and develop a theoretical framework to support their research stream. S3. Conduct and publish research.

#### **Assessment Tool**

Comprehensive exams given at the end of course work are in Management, Research Methods, and the student's minor areas. Faculty members throughout the Department of Management participate in writing and grading the exams. The results of the individual exams allow for feedback to individual students and the GPC for consideration of improvement of Management's Ph.D. program.

Completion of a dissertation is a requirement of every Ph.D. student. The dissertation requires original research that involves all research methodologies (literature review, theoretical framework, research design, data collection, analysis, etc.) presented throughout the Ph.D. program. The dissertation committee, comprised of at least three category three faculty members, guides, monitors and approves the dissertation progress. All the department faculty members formally assess content and quality of the dissertation during the proposal and final defense. Final approval comes from dissertation committee, Department Chair, College Doctoral Program Coordinator and the University Graduate College.

A Graduate Faculty Committee (GPC), composed of six elected Management category three faculty, meet routinely (biweekly or monthly) to discuss outcomes and progress of the Ph.D. students, and discuss activities associated with the Ph.D. program and how Management Ph.D. program may be improved.

#### **Actual Results**

Management faculty members met and evaluated the results. They determined that the comprehensive exams provide mixed results. The students are not adequately prepared to successfully address both the material content and research understandings needed for their comprehensive exams. Some students needed remediation to progress forward. This resulted in extended time period in working through the comprehensive-like exams.

### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

The GPC reviewed course content for duplication (discussed above in Outcome #1), then discussed and recommended revisions to reflect desired topics. In addition, the recommended increased rigor associated with comprehensive-like exam at the end of each course. In addition, selection of instructors (some new instructors) occurred 2005-2006. "Brown bag" lunches were added. The students were asked to present their research in the "brown bag" lunches in which management faculty members attend and provide constructive feedback. Based on the results and feedback, the GPC and Department Ph.D. Coordinator developed a new assignment scheme for the Ph.D. students for the 2005-2006 year. Each term, new students are assigned to a lab (10 hrs per week) and a TA/RA (10 hrs per week) to provide easier acclimation to the rigors of a Ph.D. program. Second year students are assigned to teaching one organized class (10 hrs per week) and one TA/RA (10hrs per week). This assignment scheme allows for more focus on the research side of the program.

In addition, students were provided mentors for guidance in courses taken and research in 2005-2006.



#### **Outcome #: 4**

#### **Expected Outcome**

Application (A). Graduates with a Management Ph.D. will be able to: A1. Compete favorably in the Ph.D. market for jobs and being successful in the profession. A2. Conduct and publish research.

#### **Assessment Tool**

Records are maintained on each Ph.D. graduate on their admission information, progress through the program, placement and career success after graduation. The records are routinely reviewed and evaluated by the GPC. This information is utilized for future admission decisions and for consideration of improvement Management's Ph.D. program.

#### **Actual Results**

The faculty met and evaluated the results. They determined that the students are successful in obtaining career positions in tier levels 4 and 5 (MBA level - teaching oriented) institutions are typically successful in progressing through (teaching and performing research) those institutions to the higher level ranks. In addition, some graduates move into administrative positions in those institutions. The results indicate that the Ph.D. students progress well in a teaching oriented environment, but less success has been achieved in the research oriented environment.

#### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

The admission process has focused on controlled admission. The number of Ph.D. students admitted is tied to resources available (faculty). The admission is based on the number of faculty available for support in a professional field (Strategy, Organizational Behavior/Human Resources, Operations Management). Management faculty have identified peer and aspirant programs to benchmark characteristics of programs (faculty support, monies, etc.) to compare and evaluate, then provide direction for improving the research aspect of program. "Brown bag" lunches were added. The students were asked to present their research in the "brown bag" lunches in which management faculty members attend and provide constructive feedback.

Based on the results and feedback (discussed in Outcome #3 above), the GPC and Department Ph.D. Coordinator developed a new assignment scheme for the Ph.D. students for the 2005-2006 year. Each term, new students are assigned to a lab (10 hrs per week) and a TA/RA (10 hrs per week) to provide easier acclimation to the rigors of a Ph.D. program. Second year students are assigned to teaching one organized class (10 hrs per week) and one TA/RA (10hrs per week). This assignment scheme allows for more focus on the research side of the program.

## Plan

### ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT PLAN

Department: **Information Technology & Decision Sciences - BS BCIS**

College / School: **College of Business Administration**

Period: **AY 2005-06**

Status:

## Mission

The mission of the BCIS BS in the Business Computer Information Systems program at UNT is to prepare students who have the analytical and technical business computer skills to succeed at the operational levels of organizations. These skills provide students with the ability to apply Information Systems to the functional areas of organizations (Business, Government, and Academia). The students will be able to successfully acquire analytical concepts, analysis techniques, business modeling, system development, program development, and applied methodologies across levels and functions of a firm in the continually changing global organizational environment by: • providing a strong and comprehensive base of knowledge in the functional areas of business, • equipping students with Information Technology (IT) and Information Systems (IS) skills, • strengthening communication skills through data analyses and presentation, • enhancing students' understanding the IT relation to business functions, • developing involvement in professional societies and intellectual attainment, • demonstrating to students the link between the functional areas of organizations and IT methodologies.

## Expected Outcome #1

### Expected Outcome

Technical Objectives: Students will become technically competent by: developing Information Technology (IT) problem definition, problem solving and implementation skills; developing IT analysis and design skills; developing information and database analysis and design skills; developing IS programming and integration skills; developing system process design, measurement, and implementation skills; developing of information management skills; understanding the application tools, techniques and methodologies critical to IT; utilizing IT to enhance the productivity of organizations.

### Assessment Tool

Project Assignments. -- developed by faculty in the area of study. Project assignments are used throughout the degree program in order to assess this technical knowledge attainment throughout the degree program. Projects serve as a basis for not only a demonstration of the fundamental technical concepts in a give course; but also provide the base on which to build a demonstration of research and the application of technical concepts, methodologies and procedures from other courses as well. For example, in the BCIS 4720 course, students are expected to not only demonstrate knowledge from this course, but to demonstrate knowledge of prior courses taken as prerequisites (e.g., 4610). Specific rubrics used to assess projects in courses include the extent of technical knowledge expected from prior coursework incorporated and demonstrated in the current course project.

The ITDS Advisory Board. Organized by ITDS department which meets 2 or 3 times per year is also used to assess the attainment of this outcome in the degree program. IT executives from industry give feedback to ITDS on the MBA with a concentration in Decision Sciences curriculum and courses. Specific data collected and analyzed includes the extent to which the Board members believe that our program is addressing business foundation knowledge that they need the graduates they hire to.

Written assessment of all exiting seniors given in BCIS 4690 (capstone course) to assess overall learning from the degree program. Specific rubrics include technical knowledge and the ability to apply this knowledge to organizational problems. Faculty adjust the content of prior courses based on the outcomes observed in this capstone course.

## Actual Results

The assessment of the technical outcome is framed in a network of tightly integrated course sequences that culminate in the

capstone course, BCIS 4690. Thus, assessments of the program are made for sets of integrated courses throughout the program. For example, BCIS 3620 is a pre-requisite for BCIS 3690 (a two sequence COBOL programming set of courses). Faculty teaching BCIS 3690 evaluate each programming project not only for how well students have understood and applied the technical concepts in that course, but for how well they have integrated what they learned in the prior BCIS 3620 course. Faculty teaching BCIS 3620 work closely with the faculty teaching 3690 to assess the requirements of each project in 3620 in order to ensure that it meets the technical background requirements for students to successfully proceed through 3690. This is done each semester.

The technical course sequences in order of prerequisites for this evaluation process include: BCIS 3620 & BCIS 3690; BCIS 3630 & BCIS 3680 (Java programming); BCIS 4610 (Systems analysis), BCIS 4620 (Database development), & BCIS 4640 (Systems design and development). Additionally, BCIS 4610 is a prerequisite for BCIS 4720 (e-commerce systems development), and is also assessed in conjunction with BCIS 4720. The capstone BCIS 4690 is taken in the final semester, and projects in that course are assessed for how well students have integrated skills and knowledge acquired throughout the program.

Another assessment is through our semi-annual discussions with our advisory board members. Beginning in 2001 and 2002, the face of the IS job market began to change drastically; partly in response to the 'dot com' debacle, partly in response to the economy, and partly in response to the prolific trends in industry to outsource and offshore many of the jobs for which IS majors are prepared. Thus, we began detailed discussions with our advisory board members about what the new entry level job descriptions were, how they had changed, and where we were in terms of preparing our students for this new world. We met for these discussions once each in the Spring and Fall of 2002 and 2003. Based on feedback received in 2002, we drafted changes in the curriculum, and brought those back to the board in the 2003 meetings. After each meeting, the faculty met to discuss how best to alter the curriculum based on what the board had told us, and presented our revisions at the next board meeting. By Spring of 2004, we felt and the board agreed that we had made substantive and appropriate changes to proceed with implementation. The essence of what we learned from the board was that while we had traditionally held a strong position with employers by preparing highly technically competent graduates, the entry level positions required even more of a mix of technical and business skills than ever before; particularly with emphasis on how to manage IS development projects. We asked for and received specific guidance from them on the programming languages and the depth of programming language knowledge they believed was appropriate for entry level positions as well as specific project management skills they wanted in new hires. Based on this 2 year iterative and intensive process, we developed a revised curriculum beginning the roll-out in Fall 2005 with a plan to complete it in Fall 2007. This is described below.

### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

Two major changes have been made in the past 3 years based on assessments of the course sequences. One major change was in the COBOL course sequence. Assessment of student performance on initial projects in BCIS 3690 indicated that they were no longer retaining the technical knowledge that we expected of them from BCIS 3620. Faculty discussion and further assessment of the technical knowledge revealed in the 3690 initial project, along with assessment of performance on BCIS 3620 projects indicated that students were not as technically proficient in 3620 as they had been. Further discussion resulted in the conclusion that they were missing introductory programming concept knowledge because we had stopped requiring a Computer Science department prerequisite to BCIS 3620 which we had relied on to teach these introductory programming concepts. We stopped requiring it because the course changed in the Computer Science department, and we have no control over that department's courses. So, we redesigned both BCIS 3620 and BCIS 3690 so that BCIS 3620 spent the first 3 to 4 weeks of the course in introductory programming concepts. This required condensing some of the other 3620 material on a more accelerated basis, and moving some of it to 3690. By doing so, we ensured that students were exposed to the foundational concepts required to progress through the COBOL programming sequence.

Another major change was in the systems analysis sequence (BCIS 4610, BCIS 4620, and BCIS 4640). Assessment of student performance on projects in BCIS 4640 revealed that students were not retaining the prerequisite technical knowledge from BCIS 4610 that we expected. Their BCIS 4620 knowledge (database development) was sufficient. Thus, in the Fall of 2003, the faculty did a detailed assessment of what exactly was covered in both BCIS 4610 and BCIS 4640. We compared syllabi, homework, and projects from the two. The two courses were originally designed so that 4610 fed directly into 4640, and used the same textbook. Roughly the first half was covered in 4610 and the next half in 4640. Our assessment revealed that the 4640 course was covering roughly 2 ½ chapters that were covered in 4610 because of the knowledge gap. This is 2 ½ chapters represented approximately 20-25% of the each course. After extensive discussion of performance in 4610 and 4640, we determined that there was generally at least 1 long semester and 1 summer, and sometimes 2 long semester and summer between the time students took 4610 and 4640 because of the 4620 prerequisite in between. It was decided to combine 4610 and 4640 and to make 4620 a prerequisite to 4610 so

that the students would have the database knowledge required to complete all the projects requirements in the revised 4610. Some material on project management was removed from 4610 and moved to 3610, and the remaining material was revised and integrated so that it could be taught in 1 semester. We have just completed the end of the first year of implementing that revision and assessment of 4610 projects indicate that students are largely able to learn the material and apply it to meet our expectations. There has not been sufficient time to assess the impact of this change on 4690 performance since the students who have completed the revised 4610 have not yet taken 4690.

Based on the iterative and intensive process of feedback and curriculum revisions with the advisory board described in the section above, we made the following planned changes, with the first of the roll-out occurring in Fall 2005, to be completely rolled out in Fall 2007. The board indicated that we were requiring too many programming language classes, and that while these technical skills were vital, the volume took away from time students could spend developing other types of knowledge. Based on this input from the representatives of these employers of our majors, and with an eye toward maintaining our technical niche, we decided that rather than requiring both the 2 course COBOL and 2 course Java sequence and a Visual Basic programming class, we would reduce the requirement to only two course sequence of a given language. Students can still take the second sequence as an elective if they choose. Based on feedback from the board and our discussions with other employers in the area as well as labor statistics, and published job skills assessments, Java will be the programming language in the required 2 course sequence by 2007, with the other programming languages as electives. We are also integrating a course in computer security (BCIS 4630) into the required curriculum to meet an ever growing and increasingly important technical skill base.

Furthermore, based on this process, we have altered the BCIS 3610 requirements (beginning summer 2005) to include two projects on MicroSoft Project so that when students reach 4610, they will have the technical foundation for more conceptual project management concepts. We have also decided to revise the 4640 that was subsumed by the revised 4610 with objected oriented systems analysis and design concepts to meet the growing demand for skills in that arena.

These are the major changes we have made based on assessments of technical skills. However, we annually or bi-annually update and upgrade all versions of software that we teach in order to stay current, based on both our knowledge of that marketplace, and on advisory board input.

## **Expected Outcome #2**

### **Expected Outcome**

Communication Objectives: Students will develop the ability to communicate effectively with analytical and non-analytical people both within and outside the organization by enhancing: presentation skills both oral and graphical; writing skills; interpersonal and collaborative skills; ability to listen and develop problem definition and solutions.

### **Assessment Tool**

Project and Research Presentations developed by faculty in area of study. Project and Research Projects are required in all courses throughout the program, thus students are evaluated on their communication skills throughout the program. Rubrics used to assess the communication objective of the project presentations include the extent to which a student speaks clearly, provides cogent and easy to follow slides and/or handouts, clearly and readily answers questions, as well as the extent to which the student understands the material he/she is presenting. The latter taps whether the student is able to present what he/she knows or is simply presenting a parroted version of something they have written down. Rubrics to measure the written portion of the projects include clarity of writing, proper use of grammar, as well as the how well the student has cogently, concisely, and clearly conveyed his/her message and how well they understood the project problem and how well they have developed a solution. This helps to ensure that this outcome is assessed throughout the degree program, and provides a more complete view of how well the communication objectives are met in the program. Individual and team presentations assess the ability of the student to structure, create visual materials, and communicate verbally their project outcomes or research findings. In addition if group projects are required, these undertakings assess the students ability to work in teams and their ability to communicate within the team structure; while assuming various roles required for team success.

### **Actual Results**

The assessment of the communications outcome is performed in each course that requires project or other presentations and written

reports. Faculty assess each project every semester to determine how well students are exhibiting the communication skills expected. In addition, they indirectly assess ability to work in teams based on student ratings of team members at the end of semester projects. Faculty determined through the assessment that most students work well in teams, are able to create adequate visual materials, and present their written findings in a clear and concise manner. Many students, however, do not present well in oral presentations.

### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

Because of the extensive changes we have been making in the overall curriculum sequence and courses required, the course matriculation is in such flux that we have decided to wait until these changes settle in before conducting more in-depth analysis of where and how to address this issue.

### **Expected Outcome #3**

#### **Expected Outcome**

**Business Foundation:** Students will develop a well-rounded knowledge of organizational functions thus preparing them to effectively and efficiently define, analyze, and provide solutions to organizations by enhancing the students understanding of: the functional areas of an organization; the role of different management levels in an organization; the role of an organization's external environment in its operations; the role of an organization's internal environment in its operations; the analysis and information needs of different functional areas and levels of an organization.

#### **Assessment Tool**

Project Assignments. -- developed by faculty in the area of study. Project assignments are used throughout the degree program in order to assess this objective throughout the degree program. Projects serve as a basis for not only a demonstration of the fundamental concepts of the course structure; but also provide the base on which to build a demonstration of research and the applied concepts, methodologies and procedures. These projects provide the material for the building of the written and verbal skills we are building in communication of data and information based on the knowledge of organizational functions. In addition, knowledge of the business foundation is assessed through an examination administered in the capstone course that is designed to assess knowledge of business functional areas that is taught throughout the degree program.

A written comprehensive exam is given at the end of each business foundation course in the program at the end of the semester. This exam consists of questions to measure the student's business foundation knowledge in the field that the course addresses, and as they progress throughout the program, their performance on these exams can be assessed to determine their level of overall attainment of this outcome in the degree program. Thus, it is used in business foundation coursework each semester to continually assess this outcome throughout the degree program. The faculty members recommend course and curriculum changes to the departmental curriculum committee. After committee deliberations, program changes are recommended to the entire faculty in the department for approval.

The ITDS Advisory Board. Organized by ITDS department which meets 2 or 3 times per year is also used to assess the attainment of this outcome in the degree program. IT executives from industry give feedback to ITDS on the degree program curriculum and courses. Specific data collected and analyzed includes the extent to which the Board members believe that our program is addressing business foundation knowledge that they need the graduates they hire to have, as well as any gaps they perceive in what we offer and what they need.

### **Actual Results**

The assessment of the business foundation outcome is framed in a network of tightly integrated course sequences that culminate in the capstone course, BCIS 4690. Thus, assessments of the program are made throughout the program. Courses in which the faculty are best able to assess students ability to apply business foundation knowledge are BCIS 4610 (Systems analysis), BCIS 4620 (Database development), BCIS 4640 (Systems design and development), & BCIS 4720 (e-commerce systems development), as well as the capstone BCIS 4690. Faculty in each course assess all projects each semester to determine whether most students demonstrate the business foundation knowledge we expect.

Another assessment is through our semi-annual discussions with our advisory board members. Beginning in 2001 and 2002, the face of the IS job market began to change drastically; partly in response to the 'dot com' debacle, partly in response to the economy, and partly in response to the prolific trends in industry to outsource and offshore many of the jobs for which IS majors are prepared. Thus, we began detailed discussions with our advisory board members about what the new entry level job descriptions were, how they had changed, and where we were in terms of preparing our students for this new world. We met for these discussions once each in the Spring and Fall of 2002 and 2003. Based on feedback received in 2002, we drafted changes in the curriculum, and brought those back to the board in the 2003 meetings. After each meeting, the faculty met to discuss how best to alter the curriculum based on what the board had told us, and presented our revisions at the next board meeting. By Spring of 2004, we felt and the board agreed that we had made the substantive and appropriate changes necessary to proceed with implementation. The essence of what we learned from the board was that while we had traditionally held a strong position with employers by preparing highly technically competent graduates, the entry level positions required even more of a mix of technical and business skills than ever before; particularly with emphasis on how to manage IS development projects. We asked for and received specific guidance from them on the level and extensiveness of business foundation skills they expected.

#### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

Based on our advisory board input and our own assessments, we determined that one area that was lacking was the opportunity for our majors to interact with people from different business disciplines on a team based business application project. Although we require a variety of projects throughout the program, and our assessments indicate that the majority of students are meeting our expectations with regard to the business foundation, we believe that this outcome would be enhanced by a more comprehensive business experience. Therefore, beginning in the fall of 2005 all entering majors will be required to take the business college capstone (BUSI 4690) course. In this course, they will be required to work with people from other business major areas on an industry based project chosen by a non-IS faculty member who teaches that course. We believe that assessing how well they perform in this environment will provide us another valuable and possibly even more insightful view of how well they are meeting the business foundation objective.

#### **Expected Outcome #4**

##### **Expected Outcome**

Integration of IT in Organizations: Students will develop the ability to analyze an organizational/environmental situation and design solutions that integrate the capabilities and limitations of the solution elements with the needs and goals of the organization by: understanding the relationships among functional areas and needs of the organization; assessing general organizational needs and areas for applications for solution methodologies; assessing specific organizational systems needs; incorporating the human element in solution definition, analysis development, and implementation; enhancing problem solving skills; understanding the role and function of decision technologies in organizations; enhancing skills in managing the providing of analytical solutions.

##### **Assessment Tool**

A comprehensive examination given in BCIS 4690 (capstone course) is given to assess the students' overall attainment of business foundational knowledge, which is a key component of this outcome.

All majors are required to take BCIS 4690 within 9 hours of graduation. This course provides an assessment of the integration of information technology in organizations outcome through a semester project in which students apply information technology knowledge acquired throughout the program to a specific organizational problem. Specific rubrics used to assess this project include the extent to which students have applied specific information technology tools (e.g., data mapping, workflow mapping, etc...) to the solution of the problem posed in the project, as well as the extent to which they have drawn on business foundational knowledge. For example, if the project addresses an accounting problem, the student's work is assessed on the basis of how well the student demonstrated an understanding of the accounting issues involved in addition to how well they applied the information technology tools to the problem. Faculty adjust the content of prior courses based on the outcomes observed in this capstone course.

A written comprehensive exam is also given at the end of each Information Technology and business foundation course in the program at the end of the semester. This exam consists of questions to measure the student's knowledge in the field that the course addresses, and as they progress throughout the program, their performance on these exams can be assessed to determine their level

of overall attainment of this outcome in the degree program. Specifically, it is used to assess the extent to which students are gaining both business foundational knowledge and information technology knowledge; both of which are key to attaining this outcome of integration of information technology in organizations. Thus, it is used in coursework each semester to continually assess this outcome throughout the degree program. The faculty members recommend course and curriculum changes to the departmental curriculum committee. After committee deliberations, program changes are recommended to the entire faculty in the department for approval.

The ITDS Advisory Board organized by ITDS department which meets 2 or 3 times per year is also used to assess the attainment of this outcome in the degree program. IT executives from industry give feedback to ITDS on the MBA with a concentration in IT curriculum and courses. Tool 4. Internships and employer feedback provide semi-structured assessment feedback on the attainment of this outcome in the degree program. It is continuously used to assess progress of students in the workplace, and the relevance of their knowledge and skills to the employer.

Specific data collected and analyzed includes the extent to which the Board members believe that our program is addressing integration of IT knowledge and skills into business situation that they need the graduates they hire to have, as well as any gaps they perceive in what we offer and what they need.

### **Actual Results**

The assessment of the business foundation outcome is framed in a network of tightly integrated course sequences that culminate in the capstone course, BCIS 4690. Thus, assessments of the program are made throughout the program. Courses in which the faculty are best able to assess students ability to apply business foundation knowledge are BCIS 4610 (Systems analysis), BCIS 4620 (Database development), BCIS 4640 (Systems design and development), & BCIS 4720 (e-commerce systems development), as well as the capstone BCIS 4690. Faculty in each course assess all projects each semester to determine whether most students demonstrate the business foundation knowledge we expect.

Another assessment is through our semi-annual discussions with our advisory board members. Beginning in 2001 and 2002, the face of the IS job market began to change drastically; partly in response to the 'dot com' debacle, partly in response to the economy, and partly in response to the prolific trends in industry to outsource and offshore many of the jobs for which IS majors are prepared. Thus, we began detailed discussions with our advisory board members about what the new entry level job descriptions were, how they had changed, and where we were in terms of preparing our students for this new world. We met for these discussions once each in the Spring and Fall of 2002 and 2003. Based on feedback received in 2002, we drafted changes in the curriculum, and brought those back to the board in the 2003 meetings. After each meeting, the faculty met to discuss how best to alter the curriculum based on what the board had told us, and presented our revisions at the next board meeting. By Spring of 2004, we felt and the board agreed that we had made substantive and appropriate changes to proceed with implementation. The essence of what we learned from the board was that while we had traditionally held a strong position with employers by preparing highly technically competent graduates, the entry level positions required even more of a mix of technical and business skills that ever before; particularly with emphasis on how to manage IS development projects. We asked for and received specific guidance from them on the level and extensiveness of business foundation skills they expected.

### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

Based on our advisory board input and our own assessments, we determined that one area that was lacking was the opportunity for our majors to interact with people from different business disciplines on a team based business application project. Although we require a variety of projects throughout the program, and our assessments indicate that the majority of students are meeting our expectations with regard to the business foundation, we believe that this outcome would be enhanced by a more comprehensive business experience. Therefore, beginning in the fall of 2005 all entering majors will be required to take the business policy (BUSI 4690) course. In this course, they will be required to work with people from other business major areas on an industry based project chosen by a non-IS faculty member who teaches that course. We believe that assessing how well they perform in this environment will provide us another valuable and possibly even more insightful view of how well they are meeting the business foundation objective.

## Plan

### ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT PLAN

Department: **Information Technology & Decision Sciences - MS BCIS**

College / School: **College of Business Administration**

Period: **AY 2005-06**

Status: **Plan Completed**

## Mission

The mission of the IT MS in the IT program at UNT is to prepare students to become Information Technology professionals with the ability to apply the technical skills and the managerial training to succeed at both the operational and managerial levels within an organization. The students will be able to successfully develop, acquire, and integrate analytical concepts, analysis techniques, system modeling, system development, business modeling, and applied methodologies across levels and functions of a firm in the continually changing global organizational environment by: • providing a strong and comprehensive base of knowledge in the functional areas of business, • equipping students with Information Technology (IT) and Information Systems (IS) skills, • strengthening communication skills through data analyses and presentation, • enhancing students' understanding the IT relation to business functions, • developing involvement in professional societies and intellectual attainment, • demonstrating to students the link between the functional areas of organizations and IT methodologies, • instilling understanding of how IT is used to productively manage the business organization.

This differs from the mission of the undergraduate degree in that the graduate degree program provides more in-depth exploration of business applications of the concepts than undergraduate program, with particular emphasis on managerial aspects throughout various levels of an organization. This is accomplished through vehicles such as individual student presentations of current topics in the field and intensive instructor led and/or student led discussions, and additional supplemental readings that provide theoretical bases for the concepts. The undergraduate program focuses more on the 'hands-on' or technical aspects of the concepts and the applications, with emphasis on preparing the undergraduates to assume entry level responsibilities in organizations.

## Outcome #1

### Expected Outcome

Technical Objectives: Students will become technically competent by: developing Information Technology (IT) and Information Systems (IS) problem definition, problem solving and implementation skills; developing IT analysis and design skills; developing information and database analysis and design skills; developing IS programming and integration skills; developing system process design, measurement, and implementation skills; developing of information management skills; understanding the application tools, techniques and methodologies critical to IT; utilizing IT to enhance the productivity of organizations; assessing the emerging IT tools, techniques, methodologies, and software.

### Assessment Tool

The course work utilized in the major of an IT Master's Degree is as follows: 5110. Structure of Programming Languages 5120. Information Systems Development 5130. Foundations of Business Presentations 5420. Foundations of Database Management 5610. Executive and Decision Support Technology 5620. Networking and Telecommunications 5630. N-Tier Systems 5640. Object-Oriented Systems 5650. Emerging Information Technologies 5660. Data Administration Project Management 5670. International Issues in IT 5700. Strategic Use of IT (capstone) The faculty members recommend course and curriculum changes to the departmental curriculum committee. After committee deliberations, program changes are recommended to the entire faculty in the department for approval.



Project assignments are used throughout the degree program in order to assess this technical knowledge attainment throughout the degree program. Projects serve as a basis for not only a demonstration of the fundamental technical concepts in a give course; but also provide the base on which to build a demonstration of research and the application of technical concepts, methodologies and procedures from other courses as well. For example, in the BCIS 5420 course, students are expected to not only demonstrate knowledge from this course, but to demonstrate knowledge of prior courses taken as prerequisites (e.g., 5120). Specific rubrics used to assess projects in courses include the extent of technical knowledge expected from prior coursework incorporated and demonstrated in the current course project. The faculty members recommend course and curriculum changes to the departmental curriculum committee. After committee deliberations, program changes are recommended to the entire faculty in the department for approval.

Independent learning assessment. This is done specifically through a team based project required in BCIS 5700(capstone course). Performance and contribution to team based projects are part of independent learning because of the team based nature of the work that is expected of our graduates by their employers. Students must receive a "B" or above in the project to be considered to have satisfied this requirement of the degree program. The project requires not only that students integrate and apply what they have learned throughout the degree program, but also to bring new insight to the problem posed in the project. Specific rubrics used include the extent to which business foundations of accounting, finance, management, decision analysis and marketing are addressed and integrated in the project as well as the extent to which the student exhibits that they have brought new insight (e.g., solved a problem in the project in a unique way) to the project problem.

A written comprehensive exam is given at the end of each Information Systems course in the program at the end of the semester. This exam consists of questions to measure the student's technical knowledge in the field that the course addresses, and as they progress throughout the program, their performance on these exams can be assessed to determine their level of overall attainment of technical knowledge in the degree program. Specifically, each exam consists of questions to measure the student's technical knowledge in the field and their ability to apply technical concepts, methods and tools relevant to the subject matter in each course. It is used in coursework each semester to assess technical learning objectives throughout the degree program. Faculty adjust the content of prior courses based on the outcomes observed in the capstone course.

The ITDS Advisory Board. Organized by ITDS department which meets 2 or 3 times per year is also used to assess the attainment of this outcome in the degree program. IT executives from industry give feedback to ITDS on the degree program curriculum and courses. Specific data collected and analyzed includes the extent to which the Board members believe that our program is addressing business foundation knowledge that they need the graduates they hire to have, as well as any gaps they perceive in what we offer and what they need.

### **Actual Results**

Faculty teaching each of our courses evaluate projects and comprehensive exams in the courses every semester to determine how well the students are able to demonstrate and apply the expected technical skills. In 2001 and 2002, this assessment indicated that skills and knowledge about computer security was lacking in the program. At the same time, our knowledge of the field and our discussions with advisory board members indicated that this was a critical area of knowledge expected of graduates from information systems masters programs. The change we made is described below.

In addition, faculty teaching 5700 (capstone) evaluate the performance of every student each semester in that course for the quality and attainment of independent learning abilities. Specific rubrics used include the extent to which business foundations of accounting, finance, management, decision analysis and marketing are addressed and integrated in the project as well as the extent to which the student exhibits that they have brought new insight (e.g., solved a problem in the project in a unique way) to the project problem. Assessment of this indicated that while students are able to apply technical knowledge and skills in an independent environment, their ability to include and apply the business foundations was weak. The change we made is described below.

Another assessment is through our semi-annual discussions with our advisory board members. Beginning in 2001 and 2002, the face of the IS job market began to change drastically; partly in response to the 'dot com' debacle, partly in response to the economy, and partly in response to the prolific trends in industry to outsource and offshore many of the jobs for which IS majors are prepared. Thus, we began detailed discussions with our advisory board members about what the job descriptions for graduates of our program were, and where we were in terms of preparing our students for this new world. We met for these discussions once each in the Fall

of 2001, Spring and Fall of 2002 and 2003. Based on feedback received in 2001, we drafted changes in the curriculum, and brought those back to the board in the 2003 meetings. After each meeting, the faculty met to discuss how best to alter the curriculum based on what the board had told us, and presented our revisions at the next board meeting. By Spring of 2004, we felt and the board agreed that we had made substantive and appropriate changes to proceed with implementation. The essence of what we learned from the board was that we were adequately preparing students in the MS program for the technical positions employers expected them to hold. However, there was also strong demand for masters graduates with a much stronger mix of business and technical skills than ever before, and we were not providing that in our MS. We also conducted a survey of the businesses that hire our majors to gather information about the mix of technical and business skills they wanted, and the extent to which they preferred more technical MS graduates or more business focused MBAs. Approximately one-half indicated their needs were primarily for technical MS graduates, and the other half indicated their needs were for MBAs who had an information systems concentration. Changes made are discussed below.

### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

During the 2002-2003 academic year, we revised our N-tier systems class (5640) to include a much stronger focus on computer security in order to address this identified weakness. Assessments of the projects in that course indicate that most students are adequately gaining this knowledge, thereby strengthening their technical knowledge. Thus, the technical knowledge outcome is strengthened in the program.

During the 2003-2004 academic year, we decided to require students to take the college of business capstone course in addition to our 5700. Although we require a variety of projects throughout the program, and our assessments indicate that the majority of students are meeting our expectations with regard to the technical foundations, we believe that this outcome would be enhanced by a more comprehensive business experience. In this course, they are required to work with people from other business major areas on an industry based project chosen by a non-IS faculty member who teaches that course.

In response to advisory board input and our own assessment of the skills the MS provides and those required by many in industry, we decided to retain our MS and to offer an MBA with a concentration in information systems. This degree's mission and expectations are described in a different document.

## **Outcome #2**

### **Expected Outcome**

Communication Objectives: Students will develop the ability to communicate effectively with analytical and non-analytical people both within and outside the organization by enhancing: presentation skills both oral and graphical; writing skills; interpersonal and collaborative skills; ability to listen and develop problem definition and solutions

### **Assessment Tool**

Project and Research Presentations.- developed by faculty in area of study. Project and Research Projects are required in all courses throughout the program, thus students are evaluated on their communication skills throughout the program. Rubrics used to assess the communication objective of the project presentations include the extent to which a student speaks clearly, provides cogent and easy to follow slides and/or handouts, clearly and readily answers questions, as well as the extent to which the student understands the material he/she is presenting. The latter taps whether the student is able to present what he/she knows or is simply presenting a parroted version of something they have written down. Rubrics to measure the written portion of the projects include clarity of writing, proper use of grammar, as well as the how well the student has cogently, concisely, and clearly conveyed his/her message and how well they understood the project problem and how well they have developed a solution. This helps to ensure that this outcome is assessed throughout the degree program, and provides a more complete view of how well the communication objectives are met in the program. Individual and team presentations assess the ability of the student to structure, create visual materials, and communicate verbally their project outcomes or research findings. In addition if group projects are required, these undertakings assess the students ability to work in teams and their ability to communicate within the team structure; while assuming various roles required for team success. The faculty members recommend course and curriculum changes to the departmental curriculum

committee. After committee deliberations, program changes are recommended to the entire faculty in the department for approval.

### **Actual Results**

The assessment of the communications outcome is performed in each course that requires project or other presentations and written reports. Faculty assess each project every semester to determine how well students are exhibiting the communication skills expected. In addition, they indirectly assess ability to work in teams based on student ratings of team members at the end of semester projects. Faculty determined though the assessment that most students work well in teams, are able to create adequate visual materials, and present their written findings in a clear and concise manner. Many students, however, do not present well in oral presentations.

### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

Because of the extensive changes we have been making in the overall curriculum sequence and courses required, the course matriculation is in such flux that we have decided to wait until these changes settle in before conducting more in-depth analysis of where and how to address this issue.

### **Outcome #3**

#### **Expected Outcome**

Business Foundation: Students will develop a well-rounded knowledge of organizational functions thus preparing them effectively and efficiently define, analyze, and provide solutions to organizations by enhancing the students understanding of: the functional areas of an organization; the role of different management levels in an organization; the role of an organization's external environment in its operations; the role of an organization's internal environment in its operations; the analysis and information needs of different functional areas and levels of an organization.

#### **Assessment Tool**

Project Assignments. - – developed by faculty in the area of study. Project assignments are used throughout the degree program in order to assess this objective throughout the degree program. Projects serve as a basis for not only a demonstration of the fundamental concepts of the course structure; but also provide the base on which to build a demonstration of research and the applied concepts, methodologies and procedures. These projects provide the material for the building of the written and verbal skills we are building in communication of data and information based on the knowledge of organizational functions. In addition, knowledge of the business foundation is assessed through an examination administered in the capstone course that is designed to assess knowledge of business functional areas that is taught throughout the degree program. The faculty members recommend course and curriculum changes to the departmental curriculum committee. After committee deliberations, program changes are recommended to the entire faculty in the department for approval.

Independent learning assessment. This is done specifically through a team based project required in BCIS 5700 (capstone course). Performance and contribution to team based projects are part of independent learning because of the team based nature of the work that is expected of our graduates by their employers. Students must receive a "B" or above in the project to be considered to have satisfied this requirement of the degree program. The project requires not only that students integrate and apply what they have learned throughout the degree program, but also to bring new insight to the problem posed in the project. Specific rubrics used include the extent to which business foundations of accounting, finance, management, decision analysis and marketing are addressed and integrated in the project as well as the extent to which the student exhibits that they have brought new insight (e.g., solved a problem in the project in a unique way) to the project problem. Faculty adjust the content of prior courses based on the outcomes observed in the capstone course.

A written comprehensive exam is given at the end of each business foundation course in the program at the end of the semester. This exam consists of questions to measure the student's business foundation knowledge in the field that the course addresses, and as they progress throughout the program, their performance on these exams can be assessed to determine their level of overall

attainment of this outcome in the degree program. Thus, it is used in business foundation coursework each semester to continually assess this outcome throughout the degree program. The faculty members recommend course and curriculum changes to the departmental curriculum committee. After committee deliberations, program changes are recommended to the entire faculty in the department for approval.

The ITDS Advisory Board. Organized by ITDS department which meets 2 or 3 times per year is also used to assess the attainment of this outcome in the degree program. IT executives from industry give feedback to ITDS on the MBA with a concentration in Decision Sciences curriculum and courses. Specific data collected and analyzed includes the extent to which the Board members believe that our program is addressing business foundation knowledge that they need the graduates they hire to have, as well as any gaps they perceive in what we offer and what they need.

### **Actual Results**

Faculty teaching each of our courses evaluate projects and comprehensive exams in the courses every semester to determine how well the students are able to demonstrate and apply the expected business foundation knowledge and skills. In addition, faculty teaching 5700 (capstone) evaluate the performance of every student each semester in that course for the quality and attainment of independent learning abilities. Specific rubrics used include the extent to which business foundations of accounting, finance, management, decision analysis and marketing are addressed and integrated in the project as well as the extent to which the student exhibits that they have brought new insight (e.g., solved a problem in the project in a unique way) to the project problem. These assessments indicated that while students are able to apply technical knowledge and skills, their ability to include and apply the business foundations in the capstone (BCIS 5700) class was weak. The change we made is described below.

Another assessment is through our semi-annual discussions with our advisory board members. Beginning in 2001 and 2002, the face of the IS job market began to change drastically; partly in response to the 'dot com' debacle, partly in response to the economy, and partly in response to the prolific trends in industry to outsource and offshore many of the jobs for which IS majors are prepared. Thus, we began detailed discussions with our advisory board members about what the job descriptions for graduates of our program were, and where we were in terms of preparing our students for this new world. We met for these discussions once each in the Fall of 2001, Spring and Fall of 2002 and 2003. Based on feedback received in 2001, we drafted changes in the curriculum, and brought those back to the board in the 2003 meetings. After each meeting, the faculty met to discuss how best to alter the curriculum based on what the board had told us, and presented our revisions at the next board meeting. By Spring of 2004, we felt and the board agreed that we had made substantive and appropriate changes to proceed with implementation. The essence of what we learned from the board was that we were adequately preparing students in the MS program for the technical positions employers expected them to hold. However, there was also strong demand for masters graduates with a much stronger mix of business and technical skills than ever before, and we were not providing that in our MS. We also conducted a survey of the businesses that hire our majors to gather information about the mix of technical and business skills they wanted, and the extent to which they preferred more technical MS graduates or more business focused MBAs. Approximately one-half indicated their needs were primarily for technical MS graduates, and the other half indicated their needs were for MBAs who had an information systems concentration. Changes made are discussed below.

### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

During the 2003-2004 academic year, we decided to require students to take the college of business capstone course in addition to our 5700. Although we require a variety of projects throughout the program, and our assessments indicate that the majority of students are meeting our expectations with regard to the technical foundations, we believe that this outcome would be enhanced by a more comprehensive business experience. In this course, they are required to work with people from other business major areas on an industry based project chosen by a non-IS faculty member who teaches that course.

In response to advisory board input and our own assessment of the skills the MS provides and those required by many in industry, we decided to retain our MS and to offer an MBA with a concentration in information systems. This degree's mission and expectations are described in a different document.

## **Outcome #4**

### **Expected Outcome**

**Integration of Information Technologies in Organizations:** Students will develop the ability to analyze a organizational/environmental situation and design solutions that integrate the capabilities and limitations of the solution elements with the needs and goals of the organization by: understanding the relationships among functional areas and needs of the organization; assessing general organizational needs and areas for applications for solution methodologies; assessing specific organizational systems needs; incorporating the human element in solution definition, analysis development, and implementation; understanding the changing global organizational environment and the impact of change on solution needs in this environment; enhancing problem solving skills; understanding the role and function of IT in organizations; enhancing skills in managing the providing of analytical solutions.

### **Assessment Tool**

A comprehensive examination given in BCIS 5700(capstone course) is given to assess the students' overall attainment of business foundational knowledge, which is a key component of this outcome.

All majors are required to take BCIS 5700 within 9 hours of graduation. This course provides an assessment of the integration of information technology in organizations outcome through a semester project in which students apply information technology knowledge acquired throughout the program to a specific organizational problem. Specific rubrics used to assess this project include the extent to which students have applied specific information technology tools (e.g., data mapping, workflow mapping, etc...) to the solution of the problem posed in the project, as well as the extent to which they have drawn on business foundational knowledge. For example, if the project addresses an accounting problem, the student's work is assessed on the basis of how well the student demonstrated an understanding of the accounting issues involved in addition to how well they applied the information technology tools to the problem.

A written comprehensive exam is given at the end of each Information Technology and business foundation course in the program at the end of the semester. This exam consists of questions to measure the student's knowledge in the field that the course addresses, and as they progress throughout the program, their performance on these exams can be assessed to determine their level of overall attainment of this outcome in the degree program. Specifically, it is used to assess the extent to which students are gaining both business foundational knowledge and information technology knowledge; both of which are key to attaining this outcome of integration of information technology in organizations. Thus, it is used in coursework each semester to continually assess this outcome throughout the degree program.

The ITDS Advisory Board organized by ITDS department which meets 2 or 3 times per year is also used to assess the attainment of this outcome in the degree program. IT executives from industry give feedback to ITDS on the MBA with a concentration in IT curriculum and courses. Specific data collected and analyzed includes the extent to which the Board members believe that our program is addressing business foundation knowledge that they need the graduates they hire to have, as well as any gaps they perceive in what we offer and what they need.

### **Actual Results**

Faculty teaching each of our courses evaluate projects and comprehensive exams in the courses every semester to determine how well the students are able to demonstrate and apply the expected technical skills. In 2001 and 2002, this assessment indicated that skills and knowledge about computer security was lacking in the program. At the same time, our knowledge of the field and our discussions with advisory board members indicated that this was a critical area of knowledge expected of graduates from information systems masters programs. The change we made is described below.

In addition, faculty teaching 5700 (capstone) evaluate the performance of every student each semester in that course for the quality and attainment of independent learning abilities. Specific rubrics used include the extent to which business foundations of accounting, finance, management, decision analysis and marketing are addressed and integrated in the project as well as the extent to which the student exhibits that they have brought new insight (e.g., solved a problem in the project in a unique way) to the project problem. Assessment of this indicated that while students are able to apply technical knowledge and skills in an independent

environment, their ability to include and apply the business foundations was weak, particularly in the capstone BCIS 5700 class. The change we made is described below.

Another assessment is through our semi-annual discussions with our advisory board members. Beginning in 2001 and 2002, the face of the IS job market began to change drastically; partly in response to the 'dot com' debacle, partly in response to the economy, and partly in response to the prolific trends in industry to outsource and offshore many of the jobs for which IS majors are prepared. Thus, we began detailed discussions with our advisory board members about what the job descriptions for graduates of our program were, and where we were in terms of preparing our students for this new world. We met for these discussions once each in the Fall of 2001, Spring and Fall of 2002 and 2003. Based on feedback received in 2001, we drafted changes in the curriculum, and brought those back to the board in the 2003 meetings. After each meeting, the faculty met to discuss how best to alter the curriculum based on what the board had told us, and presented our revisions at the next board meeting. By Spring of 2004, we felt and the board agreed that we had made substantive and appropriate changes to proceed with implementation. The essence of what we learned from the board was that we were adequately preparing students in the MS program for the technical positions employers expected them to hold. However, there was also strong demand for masters graduates with a much stronger mix of business and technical skills than ever before, and we were not providing that in our MS. We also conducted a survey of the businesses that hire our majors to gather information about the mix of technical and business skills they wanted, and the extent to which they preferred more technical MS graduates or more business focused MBAs. Approximately one-half indicated their needs were primarily for technical MS graduates, and the other half indicated their needs were for MBAs who had an information systems concentration. Changes made are discussed below.

#### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

During the 2003-2004 academic year, we decided to require students to take the college of business capstone course in addition to our 5700. Although we require a variety of projects throughout the program, and our assessments indicate that the majority of students are meeting our expectations with regard to the technical foundations, we believe that this outcome would be enhanced by a more comprehensive business experience. In this course, they are required to work with people from other business major areas on an industry based project chosen by a non-IS faculty member who teaches that course.

In response to advisory board input and our own assessment of the skills the MS provides and those required by many in industry, we decided to retain our MS and to offer an MBA with a concentration in information systems. This degree's mission and expectations are described in a different document.

## Plan

### ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT PLAN

Department: **Information Technology & Decision Sciences - Ph.D. BCIS**

College / School: **College of Business Administration**

Period: **AY 2005-06**

Status:

## Mission

The Ph.D. program in business computer information systems is designed to prepare its graduates for a career in university education, research, or professional practice. It is open to individuals who have demonstrated superior academic and/or practical proficiency. It relates to the University mission through its commitment to excellence in teaching and the discovery and application of knowledge through research and creative activities as it prepares its graduates for their own careers.

## Expected Outcome #1

### Expected Outcome

Students are expected to demonstrate relevant foundational knowledge of the information systems field.

### Assessment Tool

First year written competency exam given at the end of a student's first year of coursework. It is written by and graded by faculty who teach the undergraduate and masters foundations courses in the field. This is not a course based exam, but rather a program level exam whose purpose is to assess student's foundational knowledge of the information systems field. It assesses the fundamental knowledge expected of people who have either undergraduate degrees in the field or at least 18 hours of master's level coursework in field. Specific knowledge assessed includes use of systems analysis and design tools and techniques, application of database tools, understanding of components and workings of computer networks, ability to write computer code, and an understanding of general information systems knowledge.

While this provides specific assessment of the outcome, faculty also use student performance on this exam to assess the quality of the way in which 1<sup>st</sup> year students are guided and mentored toward this goal. Specifically, faculty discuss whether the results over time indicate a weakness in one or more given areas of knowledge to determine whether the program is providing adequate support for students to attain this outcome. The faculty members recommend course and curriculum changes to the departmental curriculum committee. After committee deliberations, program changes are recommended to the entire faculty in the department for approval.

## Actual Results

First year exams are given annually in the spring or summer semesters for all first year doctoral students. After these are evaluated for each student, faculty then discuss performance to determine the extent to which students have a foundational knowledge of information systems and how well we are able to identify and adjust their degree programs when they demonstrate less knowledge than we desire. Assessments reveal that most students who enter the program with a masters or undergraduate in information systems or a related field demonstrate adequate knowledge, while those who enter from a different discipline demonstrate less knowledge.

## Changes Made Based on Assessment Results

One of the reasons for the first year exam is to determine the extent of knowledge and where deficiencies exist early enough to recommend additional coursework where required. Our assessments reveal that this tool is serving this purpose. Therefore, we did not make changes.

## **Expected Outcome #2**

### **Expected Outcome**

Students are expected to demonstrate relevant specialized knowledge of the information systems field that enables a person to conduct research, teach others in the field, and pursue professional practice in the field.

### **Assessment Tool**

Comprehensive Exam written by faculty in the department. Again, this is a program level exam, not a course based exam. It has both written and oral components and is given the first long semester after a student has completed all coursework. The written part consists of questions to measure the student's specialized knowledge in the field. It is written by faculty who teach the Ph.D. level courses in the program. It is graded by these faculty and a departmentally elected Ph.D. exam pool committee. Within one month of passing the written part of the exam, the student is given an oral exam that addresses weaknesses identified in answers to the written exam and/or other relevant areas of the field. The oral exam is also conducted by the people who wrote the written exam.

Again, not only is this used to assess specific student's progress in the program, but also to assess the adequacy of the way in which the program provides support to attain this outcome. The faculty involved discuss at the end of each oral examination period the strengths and weaknesses of not only each student, but also of whether there appears to be a consistent weakness in the attainment of this outcome. This provides guidance on assessing the quality of the program, in addition to assessing individual students. The faculty members recommend course and curriculum changes to the departmental curriculum committee. After committee deliberations, program changes are recommended to the entire faculty in the department for approval.

### **Actual Results**

These exams are given each long semester for doctoral students who have completed all their required coursework. After these are evaluated for each student, faculty then discuss performance to determine the extent to which students have demonstrated relevant specialized knowledge and whether our program is sufficiently providing opportunities for them to acquire this knowledge. Assessments reveal that most students demonstrate adequate specialized knowledge at this stage.

### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

Our assessments indicate that this goal is being met, therefore no changes were made.

## **Expected Outcome #3**

### **Expected Outcome**

Students are expected to demonstrate relevant knowledge about how to apply research methods and statistics to the information systems field.

### **Assessment Tool**

Same as for Expected Outcome #2. Again, this is a program level exam, not a course based exam. It has both written and oral components and is given the first long semester after a student has completed all coursework. The written part consists of questions to measure the student's ability to apply research methods and statistical tools to research in the IS field. It is written by faculty who teach the Ph.D. level courses in the program. It is graded by these faculty and a departmentally elected Ph.D. exam pool committee. Within one month of passing the written part of the exam, the student is given an oral exam that addresses weaknesses identified in answers to the written exam and/or other relevant areas of the field. The oral exam is also conducted by the people who wrote the written exam.

Again, not only is this used to assess specific student's progress in the program, but also to assess the adequacy of the way in which the program provides support to attain this outcome. The faculty involved discuss at the end of each oral examination period the strengths and weaknesses of not only each student, but also of whether there appears to be a consistent weakness in the attainment of this outcome. This provides guidance on assessing the quality of the program, in addition to assessing individual students. The faculty members recommend course and curriculum changes to the departmental curriculum committee. After committee



deliberations, program changes are recommended to the entire faculty in the department for approval.

#### **Actual Results**

These exams are given each long semester for doctoral students who have completed all their required coursework. After these are evaluated for each student, faculty then discuss performance to determine the extent to which students have demonstrated relevant specialized knowledge and whether our program is sufficiently providing opportunities for them to acquire this knowledge. Assessments in 1999 and 2000 revealed that while students demonstrated understanding of research and statistical tools, they were having trouble adequately applying them in the information systems research context.

#### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

In response to this, the BCIS 6660 seminar which is focused on introduction to information systems at the doctoral level was revised to more closely focus on exposing students to a variety of research and research methods in the field. Another seminar, BCIS 6010 was revised to provide students more in-depth exposure to research on a given topic in the field. Since that time, assessments of this tool indicate that student understanding of application of research methods and statistical tools to information systems research has improved. Thus, no further changes have been made.

#### **Expected Outcome #4**

##### **Expected Outcome**

Students are expected to demonstrate relevant knowledge about a specialized area of interest outside of, but related to, information systems.

##### **Assessment Tool**

Comprehensive Exam – minor field written by faculty in the student's area of specialization or minor field. This is a written and oral exam given the first long semester after a student has completed coursework. This is a program level exam not a course based exam. The written part consists of questions to measure the student's knowledge in this area. It is written and graded by at least two faculty in the minor area. It is given during the same week as the exam in Tool 2, above. Then an oral exam is given by those faculty at the same time as the oral exam in Tool 2 above.

This used to assess specific student's progress in the program, and to assess the adequacy of the way in which the program provides support to attain this outcome. The faculty involved discuss at the end of each oral examination period the strengths and weaknesses of not only each student, but also of whether there appears to be a consistent weakness in the attainment of this outcome with regard to the quality of the 'minors' in the program. This provides guidance on assessing the quality of this aspect of the program, in addition to assessing individual students. The faculty members recommend course and curriculum changes to the departmental curriculum committee. After committee deliberations, program changes are recommended to the entire faculty in the department for approval.

#### **Actual Results**

These exams are given each long semester for doctoral students who have completed all their required coursework. After these are evaluated for each student, faculty then discuss performance to determine the extent to which students have demonstrated relevant specialized knowledge and whether our program is sufficiently providing opportunities for them to acquire this knowledge.

#### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

Faculty determined that the majority of students demonstrate sufficient specialized knowledge in these areas. Thus, no changes have been made.

#### **Expected Outcome #5**

##### **Expected Outcome**

Students are expected to demonstrate ability to engage in independent thought in conducting a research project in the information systems field.

#### **Assessment Tool**

Dissertation Proposal Students begin writing a dissertation proposal after they successfully complete the comprehensive exam. They are guided by a dissertation committee consisting of at least 3 doctoral mentor faculty, two of which must be in the information systems field.

Dissertation Students begin writing a dissertation after they successfully complete the dissertation proposal. They are guided by a dissertation committee consisting of at least 3 doctoral mentor faculty, two of which must be in the information systems field.

#### **Actual Results**

Dissertation proposals and dissertations are evaluated by committee members, the departmental doctoral coordinator, and the associate dean for graduate programs during the development process and immediately prior to proposal defense for each student. Committee members, the doctoral coordinator, and the associate dean discuss the student performance both for issues specific to that proposal and to identify any weaknesses in the program indicated by this assessment.

#### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

In the fall of 2005, it was noted that while most committees were made up of at least one faculty member outside the field, as required by the college, many relied on one field in particular for the third member. After much discussion, it was decided that this would be monitored by the doctoral program coordinator to ensure that the committee representatives brought sufficient specialized knowledge and alternate viewpoints to the dissertation process.

#### **Expected Outcome #6**

##### **Expected Outcome**

Students are expected to demonstrate the ability to teach information systems courses.

##### **Assessment Tool**

Teaching evaluations by students that the Ph.D. students teach. Standard form used by the university Student evaluations of teaching for all Ph.D. student instructors are conducted every semester, and reviewed by the department head. The department chair reviews the evaluations each semester, and counsels the Ph.D. student instructors if the evaluations indicate weaknesses in teaching. Faculty members in the department also work closely with Ph.D. students to monitor and help set up syllabi, exams, and grading procedures. There is also a designated faculty coordinator for the courses that Ph.D. students teach, and that person is directly responsible for monitoring and identifying areas for improvement in the Ph.D. students' teaching performance.

##### **Actual Results**

Each semester the department chair and relevant course coordinator examine all teaching evaluations for all doctoral students who are teaching. They examine not only the averages, but comments that the students taking these courses make. In addition, the chair and coordinator monitor and encourage student feedback directly to them during the semester in which the doctoral student teaches.

##### **Changes Made Based on Assessment Results**

The purpose of this tool is to allow us to determine where weaknesses in teaching are and to work with doctoral students to help them enhance their teaching. Assessments indicate that most doctoral students improve their teaching from semester to semester, therefore, this tool is working as a means for evaluating this outcome. Thus, no changes were made.

# Undergraduate Exit Survey Results

Correspondence of V1, V2, Combined Reporting

SCALED ITEMS: EGFP					
	Question #			Scale	Description
	Combined	V1	V2		
1	Q04a	Q01a		EGFP	Your CoBA Major Area?
2	Q04b	Q01b		EGFP	Your CoBA non-Major Areas?
3	Q05a	Q02a		EGFP	proficiency: accounting
4	Q05b	Q02b		EGFP	proficiency: business communications
5	Q05c	Q02c		EGFP	proficiency: business law
6	Q05d	Q02d		EGFP	proficiency: business policy
7	Q05e	Q02e		EGFP	proficiency: computer information systems
8	Q05f	Q02f		EGFP	proficiency: finance
9	Q05g	Q02g		EGFP	proficiency: marketing
10	Q05h	Q02h		EGFP	proficiency: statistics
11	Q07a		Q04a	EGFP	proficiency: business ethics
12	Q07b		Q04b	EGFP	proficiency: computer proficiency
13	Q07c		Q04c	EGFP	proficiency: critical thinking
14	Q07d		Q04d	EGFP	proficiency: diversity management
15	Q07e		Q04e	EGFP	proficiency: entrepreneurship
16	Q07f		Q04f	EGFP	proficiency: international aspects
17	Q07g		Q04g	EGFP	proficiency: interpersonal skills
18	Q07h		Q04h	EGFP	proficiency: leadership development
19	Q07i		Q04i	EGFP	proficiency: management of change
20	Q07j		Q04j	EGFP	proficiency: management of technology
21	Q07k		Q04k	EGFP	proficiency: mathematical analysis
22	Q07l		Q04l	EGFP	proficiency: oral communication
23	Q07m		Q04m	EGFP	proficiency: problem solving
24	Q07n		Q04n	EGFP	proficiency: teamwork
25	Q07o		Q04o	EGFP	proficiency: written communication
26	Q07p		Q04p	EGFP	proficiency: start, manage a business
27	Q07q		Q04q	EGFP	proficiency: global aspects of business
28	Q08a	Q04a		EGFP	access to faculty out of class
29	Q08b	Q04b		EGFP	faculty interest in teaching
30	Q08c	Q04c		EGFP	faculty willingness to answer questions
31	Q08d	Q04d		EGFP	instructor-generated interest in subject
32	Q08e	Q04e		EGFP	knowledge and expertise of instructor
33	Q08f	Q04f		EGFP	level of challenge of classes
34	Q08g	Q04g		EGFP	overall quality and relevance of instruction
35	Q09a		Q05a	EGFP	availability of courses
36	Q09b		Q05b	EGFP	number of sections
37	Q09c		Q05c	EGFP	time of sections
38	Q12a		Q08a	EGFP	learning value of the online course
39	Q12b		Q08b	EGFP	other aspects of online courses (convenience etc)
40	Q15a	Q08a		EGFP	computer classroom ba 331
41	Q15b	Q08b		EGFP	computer labs ba 333
42	Q15c	Q08c		EGFP	campus libraries in general
43	Q15d	Q08d		EGFP	general meeting areas
44	Q15e	Q08e		EGFP	library electronic resources
45	Q15f	Q08f		EGFP	regular classrooms
46	Q15g	Q08g		EGFP	team meeting areas cury
47	Q24	Q13		EGFP	UNT as place to get a business degree
48	Q25	Q14		EGFP	Preparation at UNT for a business career
47	Q17a		Q10a	EGFP	coba.ug advising ba 123
48	Q17b		Q10b	EGFP	departmental degree plan advising
49	Q17c		Q10c	EGFP	faculty advising
50	Q17d		Q10d	EGFP	unt student employment and career services
51	Q22a	Q11a		EGFP	alumni
52	Q22b	Q11b		EGFP	career opportunity services
53	Q22c	Q11c		EGFP	faculty
54	Q22d	Q11d		EGFP	internship
55	Q22e	Q11e		EGFP	job fairs
56	Q22f	Q11f		EGFP	student organizations
57	Q22g	Q11g		EGFP	other resources: first job
58	Q23a	Q12a		EGFP	alumni
59	Q23b	Q12b		EGFP	career opportunity services
60	Q23c	Q12c		EGFP	faculty
61	Q23d	Q12d		EGFP	internship
62	Q23e	Q12e		EGFP	job fairs
63	Q23f	Q12f		EGFP	student organizations
64	Q23g	Q12g		EGFP	other resources: career strategy
65	Q24	Q13		EGFP	untcoba as place to earn business degree
66	Q25	Q14		EGFP	untcoba prep for a business career

SCALED ITEMS: VQHN					
	Question #			Scale	Description
	Combined	V1	V2		
67	Q14a	Q05a		VQHN	computer classroom ba 331
68	Q14b	Q05b		VQHN	computer labs ba 333
69	Q14c	Q05c		VQHN	campus libraries in general
70	Q14d	Q05d		VQHN	general meeting areas
71	Q14e	Q05e		VQHN	library electronic resources
72	Q14f	Q05f		VQHN	regular classrooms
73	Q14g	Q05g		VQHN	team meeting areas cury
74	Q16a		Q09a	VQHN	coba ug advising ba 123
75	Q16b		Q09b	VQHN	departmental degree plan advising
76	Q16c		Q09c	VQHN	faculty advising
77	Q16d		Q09d	VQHN	unt student employment and career services
78	Q35		Q20	VQHN	importance WebCT to COBA future
79	Q10		Q06	YN	taken an online COBAUNT class
<b>SCHEDULING QUESTIONS</b>					
	Question #			Scale	Description
	Combined	V1	V2		
80	Q18	Q07			Search for job at UNT COBA
81	Q19	Q08			Was this first job search
82	Q20	Q09			# Offers received
83	Q21	Q10			Starting salary
<b>SCHEDULING QUESTIONS</b>					
	Question #			Scale	Description
	Combined	V1	V2		
r Questions					
84	Q26		Q11		Preferred class format
85	Q27		Q12		Preferred class days
86	Q28		Q13		Saturday class attendance
87	Q29		Q14		Time of day for classes
88	Q30		Q15		Start time for evening class
89	Q31		Q16		Summer session format
90	Q32		Q17		Keep minimester
91	Q33		Q18		Preferred class location
92	Q34		Q19		Preferred off-campus location
<b>DEMOGRAPHICS/BACKGROUND</b>					
	Question #			Scale	Description
	Combined	V1	V2		
93		Q15a	Q21a		CoBA Major
94		Q16	Q22		Work hrs/week while at COBA
95		Q17	Q23		Year first enrolled at UNT
96		Q18	Q24		UG hours completed at UNT
97		Q19	Q25		UG houts at UNT at 3000-4000
98		Q20	Q26		UNT CGPA
99		Q21	Q27		Year Born
100		Q22	Q28		Citizenship
101		Q23	Q29		Ethnicity
102		Q24	Q30		gender
103		Q25	Q31		Homezip
104		Q26	Q32		Workzip

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	<b>DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES BY YEAR BY COBA AREA</b>												
2			Combined 5 years		Y34		Y45		Y56		Y67		Y78
3			Count		Count		Count		Count		Count		Count
4													
5													
6	ACCT		321		70		59		49		72		71
7	MKTGLSCM		694		173		123		122		126		150
8	FIREL		682		131		129		113		175		134
9	ITDS		247		100		59		32		33		23
10	MGMT		498		129		97		90		90		92
11	Total		2442		603		467		406		496		470
12													
13													
14			Combined 5 years		Y34		Y45		Y56		Y67		Y78
15			Col %		Col %		Col %		Col %		Col %		Col %
16													
17	ACCT		13		12		13		12		15		15
18	MKTGLSCM		28		29		28		30		25		32
19	FIREL		28		22		28		28		35		29
20	ITDS		10		17		13		8		7		5
21	MGMT		20		21		21		22		18		20
22	Total		100		100		100		100		100		100
23													
24													
25			Combined 5 years		Y34		Y45		Y56		Y67		Y78
26			Row %		Row %		Row %		Row %		Row %		Row %
27													
28	ACCT		100		22		18		15		22		22
29	MKTGLSCM		100		25		18		18		18		22
30	FIREL		100		19		19		17		26		20
31	ITDS		100		40		24		13		13		9
32	MGMT		100		26		19		18		18		18
33	Total		100		25		19		17		20		19

	A	B	Background Characteristics										H	
			C		D		E		F		G			
			Total	1 y34	2 w45	3 y66	4 y67	5 y78	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %	Col %
558														
559														
560														
561														
562														
563		1 acct	n=321	13.1%	11.6%	12.6%	12.1%	14.5%	15.1%					
564		2 dm1	n=694	26.4%	26.7%	26.3%	30.0%	25.4%	31.9%					
565		3 flnl	n=882	27.9%	21.7%	27.8%	27.8%	35.3%	28.5%					
566		4 hrs	n=247	10.1%	16.6%	12.6%	7.9%	6.7%	4.9%					
567		5 mgmt	n=498	20.4%	21.4%	20.8%	22.2%	18.1%	19.6%					
568		Total	n=2442	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%					
569		0 did not work		9.5%	8.4%	11.6%	8.9%	9.1%	9.3%					
570		1 le 20 hr/wk		30.1%	32.6%	28.7%	30.3%	28.0%	30.7%					
571		2 21+ hours/wk		53.6%	54.7%	54.7%	55.6%	57.3%	53.0%					
572		3 off and on		5.5%	5.1%	5.0%	5.2%	5.5%	6.9%					
573		Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%					
574		age category		15.2%	15.4%	11.4%	15.2%	18.4%	23.0%					
575		1 le 22		20.2%	8.3%	24.4%	22.9%	22.2%	24.3%					
576		2 23		18.9%	22.3%	22.3%	13.9%	20.1%	18.1%					
577		3 24		12.4%	18.5%	12.5%	9.5%	11.0%	8.4%					
578		4 25		13.1%	11.6%	10.5%	11.1%	11.6%	10.0%					
579		5 26-27		8.4%	11.0%	8.2%	8.7%	7.8%	6.0%					
580		6 28-30		10.9%	14.3%	10.7%	10.3%	8.9%	10.2%					
581		7 31+		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%					
582		Total		0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.2%					
583		years at uni		1.9%	0.6%	0.9%	2.4%	3.6%	2.9%					
584		1		13.5%	9.4%	18.7%	18.7%	17.0%	22.2%					
585		2		19.9%	8.8%	27.3%	23.9%	19.5%	21.3%					
586		3		26.9%	21.1%	26.6%	26.1%	31.1%	29.5%					
587		4		17.2%	12.6%	19.5%	12.6%	15.9%	13.4%					
588		5		9.3%	22.3%	8.0%	6.1%	6.0%	2.9%					
589		6		11.2%	23.6%	8.2%	8.9%	6.4%	7.7%					
590		7 7 or more		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%					
591		Total		10.0%	13.9%	8.9%	11.1%	9.2%	6.6%					
592		1 2.00 to 2.59		31.3%	33.8%	33.9%	29.7%	30.5%	28.1%					
593		2 2.60 to 2.99		38.7%	36.4%	36.4%	40.8%	39.0%	44.5%					
594		3 3.00 to 3.49		20.0%	18.5%	20.8%	18.3%	21.4%	20.8%					
595		4 3.50 to 4.00		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%					
596		Total		41.3%	47.7%	42.8%	40.8%	38.7%	34.7%					
597		1 lt 3.00		58.7%	52.3%	57.2%	59.2%	60.3%	65.3%					
598		2 ge 3.00		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%					
599		Total		90.6%	88.4%	90.8%	91.6%	89.9%	92.4%					
600		1 us citizen		3.1%	3.0%	3.5%	3.7%	2.5%	3.1%					
601		2 green card		6.3%	8.7%	5.7%	4.7%	7.6%	4.6%					
602		3 nr alien		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%					
603		Total		9.7%	8.5%	12.6%	9.8%	10.1%	7.5%					
604		1 african-american		0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.8%	1.4%	0.7%					
605		2 native american		10.6%	12.8%	11.7%	10.3%	9.7%	8.6%					
606		3 asian		8.3%	7.4%	9.9%	4.8%	9.7%	9.0%					
607		4 hispanic		66.3%	67.0%	60.5%	71.0%	64.2%	69.7%					
608		5 white		4.2%	4.2%	4.4%	3.5%	4.9%	4.6%					
609		8 other		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%					
610		Total		52.2%	52.0%	47.3%	46.8%	58.3%	55.4%					
611		1 female		47.8%	48.0%	50.3%	50.2%	41.7%	44.6%					
612		2 male		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%					
613		Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%					
613		Undergraduate Exit Survey: F2003 thru Spring 2003												

UNDERGRADUATE EXIT SURVEY: EVALUATION OF COBA ASPECTS DURING 2003-2008													
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L		
SCALE: Excellent-Good-Fair-Poor													
1													
2													
3													
4	☺☺☺			means E%+G% is >75% and E% is >30%									
5	☺			means (E%+G% is >75% and E% is 25%-30%) OR (E%+G% is 50%-75% and E% is >30%)									
6	☺			means (E%+G% is 50%-75% and E% is <25%) OR (E%+G% is <50% and E% is 25-30%)									
7	☺☺☺			means E%+G% is < 50% and E% is <25%									
8	?			means one of E%+G% or E% rated high, while the other rated low									
9	M			means both E%+G% and E% fell in the mid range									
10													
11													
12		Q#	Scale	All 5 Years Combined				By Year					
				E+G%	E%	Conclusion	Y0304	Y0405	Y0506	Y0607	Y0708		
13													
14	<b>OVERALL PROFICIENCY:</b>												
15													
16	1	Q04a	EGFP	Your CoBA Major Area?	90.7	34.3	☺☺☺	☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺
17	2	Q04b	EGFP	Your CoBA non-Major Areas?	80.5	17.7	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
18													
19	<b>PROFICIENCY BY AREA:</b>												
20													
21	3	Q05a	EGFP	proficiency: accounting	66.4	17.4	☺	☺	?	☺		M	
22	4	Q05b	EGFP	proficiency: business communications	82.5	24.7	?	?	☺	☺	?		
23	5	Q05c	EGFP	proficiency: business law	77.5	24.7	?	☺	☺	☺☺☺	☺		
24	6	Q05d	EGFP	proficiency: business policy	82.2	29.6	☺	☺	☺	☺☺☺	☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺
25	7	Q05e	EGFP	proficiency: computer information systems	73.2	20.9	☺	?	?	☺	☺	☺	☺
26	8	Q05f	EGFP	proficiency: finance	75.1	23.0	?	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺
27	9	Q05g	EGFP	proficiency: marketing	81.3	31.7	☺☺☺	☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺
28	10	Q05h	EGFP	proficiency: statistics	71.0	21.2	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺



A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	
<b>UNDERGRADUATE EXIT SURVEY: EVALUATION OF COBA ASPECTS DURING 2003-2008</b>												
SCALE: Excellent-Good-Fair-Poor												
1												
2												
3												
4	☺☺☺											
5	☺											
6	☺											
7	☺☺☺											
8	?											
9	M											
10												
11	Q#	Scale		<b>All 5 Years Combined</b>				<b>By Year</b>				
12				E+G%	E%	Conclusion	Y0304	Y0405	Y0506	Y0607	Y0708	
13												
<b>PROFICIENCY BY SKILL:</b>												
31												
32	11	Q07a	EGFP	89.3	35.7	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	
33	12	Q07b	EGFP	84.3	31.4	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺	☺☺☺	☺	
34	13	Q07c	EGFP	87.1	27.4	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺☺☺	
35	14	Q07d	EGFP	77.1	23.0	?	?	?	?	?	?	
36	15	Q07e	EGFP	55.2	14.5	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	
37	16	Q07f	EGFP	67.9	18.7	☺	☺	☺	☺	M	☺	
38	17	Q07g	EGFP	81.9	23.3	?	?	?	?	?	?	
39	18	Q07h	EGFP	77.7	24.5	?	?	?	?	?	?	
40	19	Q07i	EGFP	77.7	19.4	?	?	?	?	?	?	
41	20	Q07j	EGFP	74.6	18.4	☺	☺	?	?	?	?	
42	21	Q07k	EGFP	73.3	19.0	☺	☺	☺	?	?	☺	
43	22	Q07l	EGFP	80.9	23.9	☺	?	☺	☺	?	☺☺☺	
44	23	Q07m	EGFP	57.9	29.0	☺	☺	☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	
45	24	Q07n	EGFP	89.7	47.9	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	
46	25	Q07o	EGFP	77.9	20.7	?	?	?	?	?	?	
47	26	Q07p	EGFP	59.8	15.8	☺	n/a	n/a	☺	☺	☺	
48	27	Q07q	EGFP	72.8	25.1	M	n/a	n/a	☺	☺	☺	

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
<b>UNDERGRADUATE EXIT SURVEY: EVALUATION OF COBA ASPECTS DURING 2003-2008</b>											
SCALE: Excellent-Good-Fair-Poor											
1											
2											
3											
4	☺☺☺										
5	☺										
6	☺										
7	☹☹☹										
8	?										
9	M										
10											
11		Scale									
12		Q#									
13											
<b>STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF COBA FACULTY:</b>											
50											
51											
52	28	Q08a	EGFP	access to faculty out of class	87.0	32.5	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺
53	29	Q08b	EGFP	faculty interest in teaching	87.6	35.1	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺
54	30	Q08c	EGFP	faculty willingness to answers questions	88.9	36.9	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺
55	31	Q08d	EGFP	instructor-generated interest in subject	88.2	34.3	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺
56	32	Q08e	EGFP	knowledge and expertise of instructor	93.0	46.6	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺
57	33	Q08f	EGFP	level of challenge of classes	90.4	33.2	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺
58	34	Q08g	EGFP	overall quality and relevance of instruction	90.1	31.3	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺
59											
<b>BRIEF SCHEDULING ASPECTS:</b>											
60											
61											
62	35	Q09a	EGFP	availability of courses	59.4	12.8	☹	☹	☹	☹	☹
63	36	Q09b	EGFP	number of sections	45.0	8.8	☹☹☹	☹☹☹	☹☹☹	☹☹☹	☹☹☹
64	37	Q09c	EGFP	time of sections	46.0	9.5	☹☹☹	☹☹☹	☹☹☹	☹☹☹	☹☹☹

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
<b>UNDERGRADUATE EXIT SURVEY: EVALUATION OF COBA ASPECTS DURING 2003-2008</b>											
SCALE: Excellent-Good-Fair-Poor											
1											
2											
3											
4	☺☺☺			means E%+G% is >75% and E% is >30%							
5	☺			means (E%+G% is >75% and E% is 25%-30%) OR (E%+G% is 50%-75% and E% is >30%)							
6	☺			means (E%+G% is 50%-75% and E% is <25%) OR (E%+G% is <50% and E% is 25-30%)							
7	☺☺☺			means E%+G% is < 50% and E% is <25%							
8	?			means one of E%+G% or E% rated high, while the other rated low							
9	M			means both E%+G% and E% fell in the mid range							
10											
11											
12											
13											
66											
67											
68											
69	34	EGFP		78.0	27.8						
70	39	EGFP		85.9	45.8						
71											
72											
73											
74	40	EGFP	computer classroom ba 331	91.0	40.1						
75	41	EGFP	computer labs ba 333	94.3	51.6						
76	42	EGFP	campus libraries in general	87.1	35.5						
77	43	EGFP	general meeting areas	79.7	24.7						
78	44	EGFP	library electronic resources	87.1	33.6						
79	45	EGFP	regular classrooms	81.6	24.6						
80	46	EGFP	team meeting areas cury	87.5	43.9						







A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
UNDERGRADUATE EXIT SURVEY: EVALUATION OF COBA ASPECTS DURING 2003-2008											
SCALE: Excellent-Good-Fair-Poor											
1											
2											
3											
4	😊😊😊			means E%+G% is >75% and E% is >30%							
5	😊😊			means (E%+G% is >75% and E% is 25%-30%) OR (E%+G% is 50%-75% and E% is >30%)							
6	😊			means (E%+G% is 50%-75% and E% is <25%) OR (E%+G% is <50% and E% is 25%-30%)							
7	😊😊😊			means E%+G% is < 50% and E% is <25%							
8	?			means one of E%+G% or E% rated high, while the other rated low							
9	M			means both E%+G% and E% fell in the mid range							
10											
11		Q#	Scale	All 5 Years Combined			By Year				
12				E+G%	E%	Conclusion	Y0304	Y0405	Y0506	Y0607	Y0708
13											
82	<b>ADVISING ISSUES:</b>										
83											
84	47	Q17e	EGFP	career advising ba 123	75.3	28.8	😊	M	😊😊😊	M	M
85	48	Q17b	EGFP	departmental degree plan advising	73.6	25.3	M	😊	M	M	😊
86	49	Q17c	EGFP	faculty advising	74.9	24.2	😊	😊	😊	😊	M
87	50	Q17d	EGFP	uni student employment and career services	72.3	24.3	😊	😊	?	M	😊😊😊
88											
89	<b>HELP WITH FINDING FIRST JOB:</b>										
90											
91	51	Q22a	EGFP	alumni	38.6	9.3	😊😊😊	😊😊😊	😊😊😊	😊😊😊	😊😊😊
92	52	Q22b	EGFP	career opportunity services	66.2	24.7	😊	😊	😊	😊	😊
93	53	Q22c	EGFP	faculty	64.3	26.7	M	😊	😊	M	😊
94	54	Q22d	EGFP	industry	65.5	34.0	😊	M	😊	😊	😊
95	55	Q22e	EGFP	job fairs	63.2	19.9	😊	😊😊😊	😊	😊	?
96	56	Q22f	EGFP	student organizations	57.1	19.4	😊	😊	😊	😊	😊
97	57	Q22g	EGFP	other resources: first job	49.8	14.5	😊😊😊	😊😊😊	😊😊😊	😊😊😊	😊😊😊

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
<b>UNDERGRADUATE EXIT SURVEY: EVALUATION OF COBA ASPECTS DURING 2003-2008</b>											
SCALE: Excellent-Good-Fair-Poor											
1											
2											
3											
4	☺☺☺		means E%+G% is >75% and E% is >30%								
5	☺		means (E%+G% is >75% and E% is 25%-30%) OR (E%+G% is 50%-75% and E% is >30%)								
6	☺		means (E%+G% is 50%-75% and E% is <25%) OR (E%+G% is <50% and E% is 25-30%)								
7	☹☹☹		means E%+G% is < 50% and E% is <25%								
8	?		means one of E%+G% or E% rated high, while the other rated low								
9	M		means both E%+G% and E% fell in the mid range								
10											
11		Scale		<b>All 5 Years Combined</b>							
12		Q#		E+G%	E%	Conclusion	Y0304	Y0405	Y0506	Y0607	Y0708
13											
99	<b>HELP WITH CAREER STRATEGY:</b>										
100											
101	58	Q23a	EGFP alumni	44.1	8.8	☹☹☹	☹☹☹	☹☹☹	☹☹☹	☹☹☹	☹☹☹
102	59	Q23b	EGFP career opportunity services	65.8	18.9	☺	☺	☺	?	M	☺
103	60	Q23c	EGFP faculty	75.8	28.0	☺	☺	M	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺
104	61	Q23d	EGFP internship	63.9	24.5	☺	☺	M	M	☺	☺
105	62	Q23e	EGFP job fairs	60.8	16.4	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺
106	63	Q23f	EGFP student organizations	61.9	19.5	☺	☺	☺	M	☺	☺
107	64	Q23g	EGFP other resources: career strategy	56.6	12.9	☺	☺	☺	M	☺	☺
108											
109	<b>OVERALL EVALUATION OF COBA:</b>										
110											
111	65	Q24	EGFP untcoba as place to earn business degree	85.8	37.7	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺
112	66	Q25	EGFP untcoba prep for a business career	83.3	30.3	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺☺☺	☺



507	A	B	C	Q26 thru Q34: Scheduling Preferences in Detail					G	
				D		E		F		
				2 y45 Col %	3 y56 Col %	4 y67 Col %	5 y78 Col %			
508			Total							
509			Col %							
510										
511										
512		1 3 @ 1 hr	11.3%	10.7%	14.5%	12.6%	8.7%			
513		2 2 @ 1.5 hr	63.5%	63.5%	58.1%	65.9%	64.8%			
514		3 1 @ 3 hr	25.2%	25.8%	27.3%	21.5%	26.5%			
515		Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
516		"preferred class days"	39.1%	36.9%	34.9%	36.9%	49.3%			
517		1 mw	8.5%	9.4%	11.0%	7.9%	5.4%			
518		2 mwf	52.4%	53.6%	54.1%	55.2%	45.2%			
519		3 tr	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
520		"attend Sat class?"	23.7%	23.2%	22.7%	23.7%	25.7%			
521		1 yes	76.3%	76.8%	77.3%	76.3%	74.3%			
522		2 no	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
523		"preferred time of day"	17.2%	20.9%	14.0%	14.2%	15.3%			
524		1 8-10	44.1%	40.2%	46.5%	50.4%	43.2%			
525		2 10-12	13.8%	11.8%	15.7%	13.4%	16.7%			
526		3 12-2	9.0%	9.0%	12.2%	6.5%	9.0%			
527		4 2-4	16.0%	18.1%	11.6%	15.4%	15.8%			
528		5 6:30-9:30	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
529		"preferred evening class start"	44.6%	45.0%	43.0%	43.3%	46.6%			
530		1 change to 7 pm	55.4%	55.0%	57.0%	56.7%	53.4%			
531		2 keep at 6:30	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
532		"preferred summer format"	86.3%	87.9%	84.4%	82.1%	89.0%			
533		1 keep 5 wk	8.3%	7.8%	8.7%	9.3%	8.2%			
534		2 switch to 14 wk	5.4%	4.3%	6.9%	8.5%	2.7%			
535		3 no comment	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
536		"keep/drop minimester"	71.9%	76.3%	69.4%	67.5%	69.7%			
537		1 keep minimester	4.1%	4.3%	4.0%	4.1%	3.6%			
538		2 Drop minimester	24.0%	19.4%	26.6%	28.5%	26.7%			
539		3 no comment	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
540		"preferred class location"	83.2%	82.8%	86.1%	81.3%	83.8%			
541		1 f2f Denton	5.2%	6.2%	3.5%	4.5%	5.4%			
542		2 f2f off campus	11.6%	10.9%	10.4%	14.2%	10.8%			
543		3 WebCT	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
544		"preferred off campus location"	5.4%	5.2%	9.7%	2.2%	6.3%			
545		1 alliance	9.8%	13.4%	6.5%	7.7%	8.8%			
546		2 lbj@75	3.3%	2.2%	1.6%	4.4%	5.0%			
547		3 fw unt hsc	6.5%	6.7%	4.8%	6.6%	7.5%			
548		4 frisco 121 @ preston	19.6%	20.1%	17.7%	19.3%	16.0%			
549		5 lewisville	8.4%	9.0%	6.5%	9.9%	7.5%			
550		6 plano legacy	3.0%	3.7%	3.2%	3.3%	2.5%			
551		7 unt dallas	1.1%	1.5%	1.6%	1.6%	1.3%			
552		8 uc dwntwn dallas	39.8%	32.1%	45.2%	46.2%	41.3%			
553		9 other	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
554		10 no pref								
555		Total								
Undergraduate Exit Survey: F2003 thru Spring 2008										

# Student Perceptions: Evaluation

3	?		
2		<b>M</b>	
1			?

% Excellent, 1 means <25%, 2 means 25%-30%, 3 means >30%

% Excellent+Good, 1 means <50%, 2 means 50%-75%, 3 means >75%



# Student Perceptions: Importance

% Very, 1 means <25%, 2 means 25%-30%, 3 means >30%

3	?	😊	😊😊😊
2	☹️	<b>M</b>	😊
1	☹️☹️☹️	☹️	?

% Very+Quite, 1 means <50%, 2 means 50%-75%, 3 means >75%

# MBA Exit Survey Results

# MBA GRADUATION SURVEY RESULTS

SPRING 2008 ONLY

84 responses (67% completed, 33% abandoned)

**(1) Which semester do you plan to graduate?**

Spring 08 48

**(2.1) Meet my expectations**

Strongly Agree 10.4%  
 Agree 52.1%  
 Somewhat Agree 20.8%  
 Neither 2.1%  
 Somewhat Disagree 10.4%  
 Disagree 2.1%  
 Strongly Disagree 2.1%

**(2.2) Satisfied with UNT master's program**

Strongly Agree 12.5%  
 Agree 62.5%  
 Somewhat Agree 10.4%  
 Neither 6.3%  
 Somewhat Disagree 4.2%  
 Disagree 2.1%  
 Strongly Disagree 2.1%

**(2.3) Worth the time spent commuting**

Strongly Agree 14.6%  
 Agree 41.7%  
 Somewhat Agree 18.8%  
 Neither 8.4%  
 Somewhat Disagree 8.3%  
 Disagree 2.1%  
 Strongly Disagree 4.2%

**(2.4) Courses were integrated with other courses**

Strongly Agree 22.9%  
 Agree 31.3%  
 Somewhat Agree 25.0%  
 Neither 13.6%  
 Somewhat Disagree 6.3%  
 Disagree 0%  
 Strongly Disagree 0%

**(2.5) Course were scheduled at a convenient location.**

Strongly Agree 22.9%  
 Agree 41.7%  
 Somewhat Agree 18.8%  
 Neither 8.3%  
 Somewhat Disagree 8.3%  
 Disagree 0%  
 Strongly Disagree 0%

**(2.6) Classes were schedule when needed**

Strongly Agree 18.8%  
 Agree 29.2%  
 Somewhat Agree 18.8%  
 Neither 8.3%  
 Somewhat Disagree 18.8%  
 Disagree 0%  
 Strongly Disagree 6.3%

**(2.7) Schedule met my needs**

Strongly Agree 16.7%  
 Agree 35.4%  
 Somewhat Agree 25.0%  
 Neither 12.5%  
 Somewhat Disagree 4.2%  
 Disagree 6.3%  
 Strongly Disagree 0%

**(2.8) The instructors were knowledgeable about their subjects.**

Strongly Agree 16.7%  
 Agree 35.4%  
 Somewhat Agree 25%  
 Neither 12.5%  
 Somewhat Disagree 4.2%  
 Disagree 6.3%  
 Strongly Disagree 0%

**(2.9) Overall the quality of instruction in master's program was high**

Strongly Agree	21.3%
Agree	53.2%
Somewhat Agree	14.9
Neither	4.3%
Somewhat Disagree	4.3%
Disagree	0%
Strongly Disagree	2.1%

**(2.10) Good integration of materials**

Strongly Agree	20.8%
Agree	54.2%
Somewhat Agree	14.6%
Neither	4.2%
Somewhat Disagree	4.2%
Disagree	2.1%
Strongly Disagree	0%

**(2.11) I obtained a great deal of relevant information**

Strongly Agree	41.7%
Agree	41.7%
Somewhat Agree	18.8%
Neither	8.3%
Somewhat Disagree	4.2%
Disagree	2.1%
Strongly Disagree	2.1%

**(2.12) Program enhanced my understanding of business practices**

Strongly Agree	37.5%
Agree	33.3%
Somewhat Agree	14.6%
Neither	8.3%
Somewhat Disagree	2.1%
Disagree	2.1%
Strongly Disagree	2.1%

**(2.13) Knowledge received will help future career**

Strongly Agree	37.5%
Agree	39.6%
Somewhat Agree	18.8%
Neither	2.1%
Somewhat Disagree	2.1%
Disagree	0%
Strongly Disagree	0%

**(2.14) Department advisor was helpful**

Strongly Agree	25.5%
Agree	40.4%
Somewhat Agree	12.8%
Neither	8.5%
Somewhat Disagree	2.1%
Disagree	0%
Strongly Disagree	10.6%

**(2.15) Dept advisor was available**

Strongly Agree	31.9%
Agree	34.0%
Somewhat Agree	8.5%
Neither (no opinion)	12.8%
Somewhat Disagree	2.1%
Disagree	8.5%
Strongly Disagree	0%

**(2.16) Advisors in GPO helpful**

Strongly Agree	12.5
Agree	37.5%
Somewhat Agree	16.7%
Neither	14.6%
Somewhat Disagree	2.1%
Disagree	6.3%
Strongly Disagree	10.4%

**(2.18) Received enough advising to make decisions**

Strongly Agree	6.3%
Agree	39.6%
Somewhat Agree	20.8%
Neither	10.4%
Somewhat Disagree	10.4%
Disagree	10.4%
Strongly Disagree	2.1%

**(2.19) Master Degree got me the job I wanted**

Strongly Agree	15.2%
Agree	15.2%
Somewhat Agree	10.9
Neither	47.8%
Somewhat Disagree	2.2
Disagree	4.3
Strongly Disagree	4.3

**(2.20) I expect my earning power to increase because of my Master's Degree**

Strongly Agree	29.2%
Agree	39.6%
Somewhat Agree	18.8%
Neither	10.5%
Somewhat Disagree	0%
Disagree	0%
Strongly Disagree	2.1%

**(2.21) The UNT Master's program helped me achieve my career goals**

Strongly Agree	12.5%
Agree	37.5%
Somewhat Agree	16.7%
Neither	27.1%
Somewhat Disagree	2.1%
Disagree	2.1%
Strongly Disagree	2.1%

**(2.22) A master's degree from UNT is a good value.**

Strongly Agree	36.2%
Agree	36.2%
Somewhat Agree	14.9%
Neither	10.7%
Somewhat Disagree	2.1%
Disagree	0%
Strongly Disagree	0%

**(2.23) I would recommend program to a friend**

Strongly Agree	29.2%
Agree	37.5
Somewhat Agree	12.5%
Neither	9.4%
Somewhat Disagree	6.3%
Disagree	2.1%
Strongly Disagree	2.1%

**(3.1) Location of campus**

Very important	20.8%
Important	41.7%
Slightly important	22.9%
Neither	4.2%
Slightly important	0%
Unimportant	6.3%
Very unimportant	4.2%

**(3.2) Cost of completing a master's degree**

Very important	37.5%
Important	37.5%
Slightly important	12.5%
Neither	6.3%
Slightly important	2.1%
Unimportant	2.1%
Very unimportant	2.1%

**(3.3) Convenience of class offerings**

Very important	33.3%
Important	33.3%
Slightly important	10.4%
Neither	10.4%
Slightly important	4.2%
Unimportant	4.2%
Very unimportant	4.2%

**(3.4) Availability of online classes**

Very Important	22.9%
Important	16.7%
Slightly Important	18.8%
Neither	12.5%
Slightly important	2.1%
Unimportant	10.4%
Very Unimportant	16.7%

**(3.5) Flexibility of the program**

Very important	27.1%
Important	33.3%
Slightly important	20.8%
Neither	8.3%
Slightly important	0%
Unimportant	4.2%
Very unimportant	6.3%

**(3.6) Reputation of UNT**

Very important	12.5%
Important	37.5%
Slightly important	33.3%
Neither	8.3%
Slightly important	4.2%
Unimportant	2.1%
Very unimportant	2.1%

**(3.7) Reputation of UNT COBA**

Very important	17.0%
Important	31.9%
Slightly important	34.0%
Neither	10.6%
Slightly important	2.1%
Unimportant	2.1%
Very unimportant	2.1%

**(3.8) Reputation of UNT**

Very important	16.7%
Important	35.4%
Slightly important	35.4%
Neither	6.3%
Slightly important	2.1%
Unimportant	2.1%
Very unimportant	2.1%

**(3.9) AACSB accreditation of COBA**

Very important	29.2%
Important	33.3%
Slightly important	22.9%
Neither	2.1%
Slightly important	4.2%
Unimportant	0%
Very unimportant	8.3%

**(4.1) How important is an internship**

Very Important	31.3
Important	4.2
Slightly important	8.3
Neither	35.4%
Slightly important	0
Unimportant	14.6%
Very Unimportant	6.3%

**(4.2) UNT Career Services Center**

Very important	14.6%
Important	22.9%
Slightly important	16.7%
Neither	29.2%
Slightly important	2.1%
Unimportant	8.3%
Very unimportant	6.3%

**(4.3) Local or regional newspapers**

Very important	2.1%
Important	2.1%
Slightly important	16.7%
Neither	37.5%
Slightly important	6.3%
Unimportant	20.8%
Very unimportant	14.6%

**(4.4) Current or prior employers**

Very important	17.0%
Important	23.4%
Slightly important	21.3%
Neither	23.4%
Slightly important	0%
Unimportant	10.6%
Very unimportant	4.3%

**(4.5) Networking with other students**

Very important	18.8%
Important	20.8%
Slightly important	27.1%
Neither	18.8%
Slightly important	0%
Unimportant	10.4%
Very unimportant	4.2%

**(4.6) UNT faculty**

Very important	20.8%
Important	22.9%
Slightly important	14.6%
Neither	25.0%
Slightly important	0%
Unimportant	12.5%
Very unimportant	4.2%

**(4.7) Websites**

Very important	10.4%
Important	27.1%
Slightly important	8.3%
Neither	31.3%
Slightly important	2.1%
Unimportant	14.6%
Very unimportant	6.3%

**(5) MBA or MS**

MBA	68.8%
MS	31.3%

**(6) In which concentration are you getting your MS degree?**

Accounting Information Systems	0.0%
Audit and Financial Accounting	0.0%
Accounting Information Systems	0.0%
Accounting Internal Auditing	0.0%
Accounting - Entrepreneurial	0.0%
Accounting - Managerial	0.0%
Accounting- Taxation	0.0%
Decision Technologies	0.0%
Finance	4.5%
Information Technologies	0.0%
NA	95.5%

**(7) In which concentration are you getting your MBA degree?**

Accounting	6.1%
Decision Sciences	0.0%
Decision Technology	0.0%
E Business	0.0%
Finance	27.3%
Information Technology	0.0%
Health Sciences Management	3.0%
Logistics & Supply Chain MGMT	9.1%
Marketing	6.1%
Organizational Behavior	18.2%
Oper & Supply Chain MGMT	3.0%
Strategic Management	27.3%
MBA/ MS Engineering Tech	0.0%
MBA / MS in Hospitality MGMT	0.0%
MBA/ MS in Merchandising	0.0%
NA	0.0%

**(8) How USEFUL were each of the core courses in your MBA program.**

**ACCT 5130**

Very Useful	15.2%
Useful	36.4%
Somewhat useful	24.2%
Neither	12.1%
Somewhat useless	3.0%
Useless	3.0%
Very useless	6.1%

**MGMT 5140**

Very Useful	15.2%
Useful	30.3%
Somewhat useful	33.3%
Neither	6.1%
Somewhat useless	6.1%
Useless	0%
Very useless	9.1%

**MKTG 5150**

Very Useful	21.2%
Useful	45.5%
Somewhat useful	24.2%
Neither	6.1%
Somewhat useless	3.0%
Useless	0%
Very useless	0%

**FINA 5170**

Very Useful	28.1%
Useful	40.6%
Somewhat useful	21.9%
Neither	0%
Somewhat useless	3.1%
Useless	0%
Very useless	6.3%

**DCSI 5180**

Very Useful	15.2%
Useful	9.1%
Somewhat useful	39.4%
Neither	18.2%
Somewhat useless	15.2%
Useless	0%
Very useless	3.0%

**BUSI 5190**

Very Useful	40.6%
Useful	43.8%
Somewhat useful	12.5%
Neither	3.1%
Somewhat useless	0%
Useless	0%
Very useless	0%

**(9) What two course were the most valuable to you?**

5190 & 5150 - learned by doing  
Accounting Research and Tax Research  
Acct 5110 and Blaw 5400. Learnt alot.  
ACCT 5130 & FINA5170  
ACCT 5130 & FINA 5170, I am in finance  
ACCT 5360 & 5370 – Relevant  
ACCT 5370 & 5310  
Advanced accounting - for the CPA  
BCIS 5420, and 5700, tech & bus skills  
BUSI 5190 &  
BUSI 5190 and MGMT 5140  
C-Corp's; S-Corp & p/s; Fam Tax  
Corporate Social Responsibility – Altman  
Econ/Finance  
Emp Placement - current topics; Acct  
Ethics and Adv acct - CPA exam  
Family Planning and Corporations  
Family Tax Planning and Tax Research.  
FINA 5170 and MSCI 5180.  
FINA 5170, FINA 5400  
Fina 5220, Fina 5500,  
Fina 5310 and 5210 they were wholesome  
FINA 5400 FINA 5310  
FINA5190 BUSI5190  
FINA5400, ECON5040 learn something  
new  
Financial Management and Account  
HR Management & Compensation-  
Relevant  
Institutions-Cole and Adv Fina – Sidiqui  
International Mgmt  
Internship and Partnership – relevant  
Ledgerwood's PHR class and Davis' Labor  
LSCM 5560 and MGMT 5240  
LSCM 5860 - LSCM 5560. Great  
experience  
Marketing Management and  
Administrative  
Marketing, it is my concentration area  
MGMT 5140 because it applies to  
managing  
Mgmt 5210 and 5260 applied to my  
postion  
mgmt 5710 mgmt 5870  
Mgmt and Busi - they are real world  
organizational behavior and strategy  
p'ship tax & corp tax

tax research & family tax planning  
Tax Research and Partnerships

**(10) What two courses were the least valuable?**

5180 & 5140 - same as undergrad  
Accounting & Statistics- Not relevant  
ACCT 5130 and FINA 5170 (Siddiqi was  
bad  
Acct 5270 & ECON 5140  
ACCT 5270 & ECON 5140 - not relevant  
Acct Info Sys; Acct Research  
acct research - it was pointless  
acct research & acct information systems  
ACCT2010, FINA5040 too basic  
Advanced Accting and Accting Research  
All have some value  
all leveling courses - too basic  
BCIS and Acct I wont use  
BLAW at the masters lvl - nothing new  
DSCI 5180 & BUSI 5190, not relevant  
DSCI 5180 and MKTG 5150  
Ethics and AIS  
FINA 5170 - ACCT 5130. Nothing new  
FINA 5170-repeat of undergrad, MSCI  
5180  
Hutchinsons' 5020 & Kuo's MGMT 5070  
I really dont have  
IS in Accounting and ACCT 5760  
Capstone  
marketing - so much of it in undergrad  
Mgmt 5140 and Strategic Accounting  
MGMT 5140, ACCT 5130  
MGMT 5140, because I did not learn  
anyth  
mktg 5150  
MKTG 5150 and MGMT 5140  
MKTG 5150 MGMT 5140  
mktg and fina  
MSCI 5180  
MSCI 5180  
MSCI 5180 and ACCT5130  
MSCI 5180 and RMIN 5770 boring  
MSCI 5180-probably won't use it; comp.  
MSCI5180 MGMT5140  
Strategic Management-too much stats  
tax research & IS in accounting



**(11) What did you like most about the program?**

Professors.  
challenging classes.  
Flexibility.  
Location.  
Instructors with significant experience.  
It was less expensive than SMU.  
the Logistics department experience.  
good faculty and networking opportunity.  
Ledgerwood's PHR class & Welch's BLAW.  
Flexible.  
absolutely nothing.  
Location.  
Faculty.  
Interaction with other students.  
online classes.  
The convenience and flexibility of class.  
Class time flexibility. schedule and proffs.  
The small classes.  
The material taught and the professors.  
on line courses.  
Online Classes where available.  
Expanding my knowledge of business.  
Location.  
Credibility  
convenient class times.  
small classes.  
professors w/ much real world experience.  
Low Cost,  
Flexibility in courses.  
Professors.  
the cost efficiency.  
As a pathway to my PhD.  
Insight on business and finance.  
Flexibility.  
Flexibility.  
Knowledge of professors.  
The ease to finish it under 2 years.  
Professors.  
The online option.  
the degree.  
On-line classes

**(12) What did you like least?**

Class Times.  
one professor taught poorly.  
Somewhat unorganized.  
Scheduling of required courses.  
I wish there were more tax classes.  
The no professional classes over summer.  
the core courses.  
tricky scheduling sometimes.  
Lack of on-campus courses.  
Some material was dated.  
horrible classrooms compared to my tenur.  
Graduate Business Advising Office.  
class schedules.  
Group work.  
trying to meet in groups for projects.  
Nothing particularly.  
The numerous group projects;  
scheduling.  
the 5yr acct masters is not well orginized.  
Nothing.  
Some online classes.  
The distance to campus.  
Commuting to Denton.  
Inability to register for courses at HSC.  
lacking communication between department.  
Guidance of Administrative Procedures.  
redundancy of some classes to undergrad.  
not a big choice of classes.  
unhelpful main graduate office advisors.  
driving to dallas campus.  
Advisors.  
Class offerings in the middle of the day.  
the overload of unimportant information. too basic.  
Irrelevant courses. lack of communication with students.  
Lack of companies recruiting UNT MBA's.  
professors that tricked students Siddiqi.  
Classrooms.  
online wasn't offered sooner.  
the graduate advising office.  
the lack of on-line classes.

**(13) How may we improve COBA Masters?**

Add a financial statement analysis class. classes offered every semester.  
Get better Guidance Counselors to let pe.  
Integrate w/ the business community more.  
Have Professors Care more about students. hire more acct teachers.  
hire new graduate advisors.  
improve the advising program.  
improve the way staff treat students.  
increase class availability.  
Integrate the classes a little better.  
Introduction of more program.  
make class less lecture and more discuss.  
Offer subsidy for CFA taker.  
More business emphasis.  
More course offerings or more seat avail.  
Better Advising.  
New business building.  
Not sure.  
Offer a choice btw on-line & on-campus.  
Offer more classes off campus.  
Offer more courses online.  
Offer networking opportunities & require.  
Offer night and weekend classes.  
offer some classes during the day.  
Some exposure to ESB Software. improve availability of required courses. better communication.  
student level of knowledge!!!  
The finance and accounting core courses. more class times.  
The program is awesome.  
Use the most current business data avail.  
get better advisors, teachers, & facility.  
Better communication between departments.  
Variety of classes.  
Watch Siddiqi give exams.  
Work on the scheduling needs of working.

**(14) Gender**

Male	44.7%
Female	55.3%

**(15) Age**

21-30	76.1%
31-40	21.7%
41-50	2.2%
51-60	0%
Over 60	0%

**(16) Currently Employed**

Yes	74.5%
No	25.5%

**(17) While taking classes, how many hours worked?**

None	8.5
1-10	4.3%
11-20	23.4%
21-30	14.9%
31-40	21.3%
Over 40	27.7%

**(18) After graduating, you expect to**

New career	40.4%
Change company	4.3%
Seek better position	23.4%
Continue position	21.3
Other	10.6%

**(19) If you have obtained a job after graduation, identify the firm.**

Alvarez & Marsal  
Banking - Human Resources  
Ernst & Young  
Ernst & Young  
Grant Thornton  
KPMG, LLP  
none of your business  
NT  
Tax Staff Accountant, KPMG, LLP

**(20) Annual salary before master's degree**

\$30-40,999	56.1%
\$40-49,999	17.1%
\$50-59,999	9.8%
\$60-69,999	2.4%
\$70-79,999	7.3%
\$80-89,999	4.9%
\$90-99,999	0%
\$100-109,999	0%
\$110-119,999	0%
Over \$120,000	0%

**(21) Annual salary expected after graduation**

\$30-40,999	2.4%
\$40-49,999	2.4%
\$50-59,999	40.5%
\$60-69,999	26.2%
\$70-79,999	9.5%
\$80-89,999	9.5%
\$90-99,999	2.4%
\$100-109,999	2.4%
\$110-119,999	0%
Over \$120,000	4.6%

**FACULTY SUFFICIENCY**

TABLE 1 – FACULTY SUFFICIENCY BY DEPARTMENT, SPRING 2008 ..... 133  
TABLE 1 – FACULTY SUFFICIENCY BY SESSION, SPRING 2008..... 139  
TABLE 1 – FACULTY SUFFICIENCY BY CAMPUS, SPRING 2008 ..... 147  
TABLE 1 – FACULTY SUFFICIENCY BY DEPARTMENT, FALL 2007 ..... 154  
TABLE 1 – FACULTY SUFFICIENCY BY SESSION, FALL 2007 ..... 160  
TABLE 1 – FACULTY SUFFICIENCY BY CAMPUS, FALL 2007..... 168  
TABLE 2 – INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY DEPARTMENT ..... 175  
TABLE 2A – FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS BY DEPARTMENT ..... 183  
TABLE 2A – FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS BY CAMPUS ..... 189

# Table 1

## Faculty Sufficiency by Department

Spring 2008

## 2008-Spring

### Accounting

Faculty Name	Part	Supp	
Atwood, Tammy	84		
Ball, Jon		276	
Bibb, Kyle		60	
Cain, April		117	
Chui , Chun-Tat (Lawrence)		144	
Clay, Jr., Raymond	157.5		
Conover, Teresa	114		
Curtis, Mary	120		
Cutler, Ross	810		
Elam, Dennis	147		
Frost, Carol	336		
Hale, Rusty		72	
Hodges, Joe		36	
Hutchison, Paul	225		
Hynak, Christopher		198	
Kromer, Jeffrey		24	
Liu, Xiang (Samantha)		396	
Menge, Jennifer		378	
Merino, Barbara	252		
Merki, Mark		228	
Olvera, Renee		201	
Pike, Byron		240	
Racca, Joshua		219	
Radnik, Lydia		87	
Raman, K. K.	366		
Reyna, Miquel		114	
Robinson, Shani	339		
Smith, Alan		36	
Vineyard, Ramona (Mona)		75	
Young, Randall		585	
Zimmermann, Harvey	234		
<b>Accounting</b>	<b>3,185</b>	<b>3,486</b>	<b>6,671</b>

% of total SCH taught by participating faculty:

**47.74%**

(Department % required to be taught by participating faculty: > 60 %)

**2008-Spring**

<b>Finance, Insurance, Real Estate and Law</b>			
<b>Faculty Name</b>	<b>Part</b>	<b>Supp</b>	
Baen, John	888		
Braswell, Michael	450		
Brown, Steven		39	
Chandrasekaran, Perinkolam	1,035.00		
Cole, C. Steven	156		
Conover, James	61.5		
Durham, James		78	
Engler, Dennis		270	
Forgey, Fred	201		
Foster, Charles	897		
Furst, Jack		63	
Guttery, Randall	15		
He, Min (Enya)	384		
Impson, Michael	102		
Jones, Kevin		111	
Karafiath, Imre	180		
Kensinger, John	75		
Kim, Jaehoon		267	
Lapointe, Fred		72	
MacDonald, Don	426		
McCormick, Gary	393		
McDonald, James	258		
Olson, Robin		120	
Poe, Stephen	156		
Roden, Peyton	648		
Siddiqi, Mazhar	276		
Staff, Marcia	177		
Stucky, Alan		165	
Terrell, Thomas		240	
Tripathy, Niranjan	135		
Welch, Russell		195	
Winson-Geideman, Kimberly	243		
<b>Finance, Insurance, Real Estate and Law</b>	<b>7,157</b>	<b>1,620</b>	<b>8,777</b>

% of total SCH taught by participating faculty:

**81.54%**

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)

**2008-Spring**

<b>Information Technology &amp; Decision Sciences</b>			
<b>Faculty Name</b>	<b>Part</b>	<b>Supp</b>	
Becker, Jack	36		
Capan, Cengiz	114		
Dake, Jerry	456		
Evangelopoulos, Nicholas	375		
Friesen, Daniel	309		
Guynes, Carl	84		
Hossain, Muhammad		657	
Jayakumar, Maliyakal	912		
Jensen, Bradley	957		
Jones, Mary	18		
Kappelman, Leon	390		
Koh, Chang	87		
Kulkarni, Shailesh	141		
Kvanli, Alan	1,089.00		
Pan, Youqin		240	
Pavur, Robert	48		
Peak, Daniel	366		
Qin, Hong		651	
Richards, Thomas		96	
Ryan, Sherry	72		
Schuessler, Joseph		210	
Sidorova, Anna	672		
Spence, Jimmy	81		
Vedder, Richard	1,044.00		
Windsor, John	93		
Wu, Yu	117		
<b>Information Technology &amp; Decision Sciences</b>	<b>7,461</b>	<b>1,854</b>	<b>9,315</b>

**% of total SCH taught by participating faculty: 80.10%**

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)



**2008-Spring**

**Management**

<b>Faculty Name</b>	<b>Part</b>	<b>Supp</b>	
Altman, Barbara	90		
Annamalai, Danielle	102		
Calhoun, Glo		111	
Cernas-Ortiz, Daniel		234	
Davis, Mark	243		
D'Souza, Derrick	252		
Goktan, Ayse	246		
Goodwin, Vicki	135		
Hite, Dwight		135	
Hubbard, Joan	621		
Huzdovich, James		48	
Insley, Robert	810		
Johnson, J.	855		
Kuykendall, April		225	
Lau, Wai		141	
Ledgerwood, Donna	417		
Li, Zhen		132	
Lillie, Nancy	141		
Madapusi, Arunkumar		246	
Miles, Grant	12		
Muniz, Elizabeth		150	
Niu, Kuei-Hsien (Jeff)		249	
Pitre, Evelyn		138	
Ponthieu, Louis	801		
Powell, James	633		
Rogers, Pamela		351	
Russell, Lisa		249	
Salimath, Manjula	192		
Sexton, Sidney	654		
Stodnick, T. Michael	348		
Taylor, III, Lewis	282		
Watson, Warren	303		
White, LeRoy		132	
White, Richard	258		
<b>Management</b>	<b>7,395</b>	<b>2,541</b>	<b>9,936</b>

**% of total SCH taught by participating faculty:**

**74.43%**

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)

### 2008-Spring

### Marketing & Logistics

Faculty Name	Part	Supp	
Ames, Scott	90		
Blankson, Charles	603		
Chowdhury, Jhinuk	465		
Gade, Michael		411	
Ganesh, Gopala	369		
Grabner, John		42	
Guzman, Francisco	528		
Hasty, Ronald	528		
Holmes, Gary		342	
Knipper, Mike		51	
Lewin, Jeffrey	303		
Manuj, Ila	282		
Morris, Richard		1,515.00	
Paswan, Audhesh Kumar	153		
Pelton, Lou	417		
Pentina, Iryna		648	
Pohlen, Terrance	18		
Sager, Jeffrey	755		
Savitz, Jeffrey		69	
Selcuk, Ertekin		507	
Sivakumar, Soumya	30		
Spears, Nancy	84		
Strutton, H. David	795		
Sun, Qin		147	
Swartz, Stephen	123		
Thompson, Kenneth	1,284.00		
Treger, Mark		213	
<b>Marketing &amp; Logistics</b>	<b>6,827</b>	<b>3,945</b>	<b>10,772</b>

% of total SCH taught by participating faculty:

**63.38%**

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)

**Table 9-1: Summary of Faculty Sufficiency  
in Discipline and School  
Student Credit Hours by Involvement by session**

**2008-Spring**

	<b>Part</b>	<b>Supp</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>% Part</b>
<b>Day</b>	<b>18,809</b>	<b>7,152</b>	<b>25,961</b>	<b>72.5%</b>
<b>Evening</b>	<b>8,372</b>	<b>4,341</b>	<b>12,713</b>	<b>65.9%</b>
<b>INET</b>	<b>4,844</b>	<b>1,953</b>	<b>6,797</b>	<b>71.3%</b>
<b>% of total SCH taught by participating faculty:</b>	<b>32,025</b>	<b>13,446</b>	<b>45,471</b>	<b>70.4%</b>

(Department % required to be taught by participating faculty: > 60 %)

(College % required to be taught by participating faculty: > 75 %)

## Student Credit Hours by Involvement by session

### 2008-Spring

<b>Day</b>		
Faculty Name	Part	Supp
Altman, Barbara	90	
Ames, Scott	45	
Annamalai, Danielle	63	
Atwood, Tammy	84	
Baen, John	696	
Becker, Jack	36	
Blankson, Charles	471	
Braswell, Michael	294	
Cain, April		117
Calhoun, Glo		111
Capan, Cengiz	114	
Cernas-Ortiz, Daniel		234
Chandrasekaran, Perinkolam	1,035	
Chowdhury, Jhinuk	327	
Chui, Chun-Tat (Lawrence)		144
Clay, Jr., Raymond	83	
Conover, Teresa	114	
Curtis, Mary	15	
Cutler, Ross	570	
D'Souza, Derrick	114	
Dake, Jerry	339	
Elam, Dennis	147	
Engler, Dennis		270
Evangelopoulos, Nicholas	126	
Forgey, Fred	66	
Foster, Charles	780	
Friesen, Daniel	63	
Frost, Carol	126	
Gade, Michael		285
Ganesh, Gopala	369	
Goktan, Ayse	246	
Goodwin, Vicki	45	
Guzman, Francisco	423	
He, Min (Enya)	210	
Hite, Dwight		135
Holmes, Gary		342
Hossain, Muhammad		657
Hubbard, Joan	516	
Hutchison, Paul	84	
Huzdovich, James		48
Hynak, Christopher		198
Impson, Michael	39	

## Student Credit Hours by Involvement by session

### 2008-Spring

<b>Day</b>		
Faculty Name	Part	Supp
Insley, Robert	51	
Jayakumar, Maliyakal	339	
Jensen, Bradley	660	
Jones, Kevin		111
Kappelman, Leon	330	
Kim, Jaehoon		156
Knipper, Mike		51
Koh, Chang	48	
Kulkarni, Shailesh	75	
Kvanli, Alan	447	
Ledgerwood, Donna	399	
Lewin, Jeffrey	303	
Lillie, Nancy	141	
Liu, Xiang (Samantha)		171
MacDonald, Don	426	
Manuj, Ila	63	
McCormick, Gary	273	
McDonald, James	177	
Menge, Jennifer		378
Merino, Barbara	24	
Miles, Grant	12	
Morris, Richard		864
Niu, Kuei-Hsien (Jeff)		126
Olvera, Renee		201
Pan, Youqin		240
Paswan, Audhesh Kumar	117	
Pavur, Robert	48	
Pelton, Lou	339	
Pentina, Iryna		480
Pike, Byron		240
Poe, Stephen	99	
Powell, James	633	
Robinson, Shani	339	
Roden, Peyton	333	
Russell, Lisa		249
Ryan, Sherry	42	
Sager, Jeffrey	660	
Salimath, Manjula	192	
Schuessler, Joseph		210
Selcuk, Ertekin		204
Siddiqi, Mazhar	180	
Sidorova, Anna	657	

## Student Credit Hours by Involvement by session

**2008-Spring**

<b>Day</b>		
Faculty Name	Part	Supp
Sivakumar, Soumya	27	
Smith, Alan		36
Spears, Nancy	15	
Spence, Jimmy	33	
Staff, Marcia	177	
Stodnick, T. Michael	330	
Strutton, H. David	453	
Stucky, Alan		165
Swartz, Stephen	90	
Taylor, III, Lewis	114	
Thompson, Kenneth	1,140	
Treger, Mark		213
Vedder, Richard	636	
Welch, Russell		18
White, Richard	258	
Windsor, John	57	
Winson-Geideman, Kimberly	243	
Young, Randall		498
Zimmermann, Harvey	99	
<b>Day</b>	<b>18,809</b>	<b>7,152</b>
		<b>25,961</b>

**% of total SCH taught by participating faculty:**

**72.45%**

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)

## Student Credit Hours by Involvement by session

### 2008-Spring

<b>Evening</b>		
Faculty Name	Part	Supp
Ames, Scott	45	
Annamalai, Danielle	39	
Baen, John	192	
Ball, Jon		276
Bibb, Kyle		60
Blankson, Charles	132	
Braswell, Michael	156	
Brown, Steven		39
Chowdhury, Jhinuk	138	
Clay, Jr., Raymond	75	
Cole, C. Steven	156	
Conover, James	15	
Curtis, Mary	105	
Cutler, Ross	240	
D'Souza, Derrick	36	
Dake, Jerry	117	
Davis, Mark	93	
Durham, James		78
Evangelopoulos, Nicholas	249	
Forgey, Fred	135	
Foster, Charles	117	
Friesen, Daniel	246	
Frost, Carol	210	
Furst, Jack		63
Gade, Michael		126
Goodwin, Vicki	90	
Guttery, Randall	15	
Guynes, Carl	84	
Guzman, Francisco	105	
Hale, Rusty		72
He, Min (Enya)	174	
Hodges, Joe		36
Hubbard, Joan	45	
Impson, Michael	63	
Jayakumar, Maliyakal	342	
Jensen, Bradley	297	
Johnson, J.	87	
Jones, Mary	18	
Kappelman, Leon	60	
Karafiath, Imre	180	
Kensinger, John	75	
Kim, Jaehoon		111

## Student Credit Hours by Involvement by session

### 2008-Spring

<b>Evening</b>		
Faculty Name	Part	Supp
Koh, Chang	39	
Kromer, Jeffrey		24
Kulkarni, Shailesh	66	
Kuykendall, April		225
Kvanli, Alan	642	
Lapointe, Fred		72
Lau, Wai		141
Ledgerwood, Donna	18	
Li, Zhen		132
Liu, Xiang (Samantha)		225
Madapusi, Arunkumar		96
Manuj, Ila	219	
McCormick, Gary	120	
McDonald, James	81	
Merino, Barbara	228	
Merki, Mark		228
Niu, Kuei-Hsien (Jeff)		123
Olson, Robin		120
Paswan, Audhesh Kumar	36	
Peak, Daniel	366	
Pitre, Evelyn		138
Poe, Stephen	57	
Pohlen, Terrance	18	
Ponthieu, Louis	90	
Qin, Hong		651
Racca, Joshua		219
Radnik, Lydia		87
Raman, K. K.	366	
Reyna, Miquel		114
Roden, Peyton	315	
Rogers, Pamela		105
Ryan, Sherry	30	
Sager, Jeffrey	95	
Savitz, Jeffrey		69
Siddiqi, Mazhar	96	
Sidorova, Anna	15	
Sivakumar, Soumya	3	
Spears, Nancy	69	
Spence, Jimmy	48	
Stodnick, T. Michael	18	
Strutton, H. David	342	
Swartz, Stephen	33	



**Student Credit Hours by Involvement by session**  
**2008-Spring**

<b>Evening</b>		
<b>Faculty Name</b>	<b>Part</b>	<b>Supp</b>
Terrell, Thomas		240
Tripathy, Nirranjan	135	
Vedder, Richard	408	
Vineyard, Ramona (Mona)		75
Welch, Russell		177
White, LeRoy		132
Windsor, John	36	
Wu, Yu	117	
Young, Randall		87
Zimmermann, Harvey	135	
<b>Evening</b>	<b>8,372</b>	<b>4,341</b>
		<b>12,713</b>

**% of total SCH taught by participating faculty:**

**65.85%**

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)

## Student Credit Hours by Involvement by session

**2008-Spring**

<b>Inet</b>		
Faculty Name	Part	Supp
Conover, James	47	
D'Souza, Derrick	102	
Davis, Mark	150	
Grabner, John		42
Hasty, Ronald	528	
Hubbard, Joan	60	
Hutchison, Paul	141	
Insley, Robert	759	
Jayakumar, Maliyakal	231	
Johnson, J.	768	
Madapusi, Arunkumar		150
Morris, Richard		651
Muniz, Elizabeth		150
Pelton, Lou	78	
Pentina, Iryna		168
Ponthieu, Louis	711	
Richards, Thomas		96
Rogers, Pamela		246
Selcuk, Ertekin		303
Sexton, Sidney	654	
Sun, Qin		147
Taylor, III, Lewis	168	
Thompson, Kenneth	144	
Watson, Warren	303	
<b>Inet</b>	<b>4,844</b>	<b>1,953</b>

**6,797**

**% of total SCH taught by participating faculty:**

**71.26%**

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)

**Table 9-1: Summary of Faculty Sufficiency  
in Discipline and School  
Student Credit Hours by Involvement by campus**

**2008-Spring**

	<b>Part</b>	<b>Supp</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>% Part</b>
<b>Dallas</b>	<b>1,452</b>	<b>543</b>	<b>1,995</b>	<b>72.8%</b>
<b>Denton</b>	<b>30,443</b>	<b>12,903</b>	<b>43,346</b>	<b>70.2%</b>
<b>Frisco</b>	<b>129</b>		<b>129</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>% of total SCH taught by participating faculty:</b>	<b>32,024</b>	<b>13,446</b>	<b>45,470</b>	<b>70.4%</b>

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)

(College % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 75 %)

**Student Credit Hours by Involvement by campus  
2008-Spring**

<b>Dallas</b>		
<b>Faculty Name</b>	<b>Part</b>	<b>Supp</b>
Altman, Barbara	90	
Ames, Scott	90	
Brown, Steven		39
Calhoun, Glo		111
Capan, Cengiz	48	
D'Souza, Derrick	36	
Elam, Dennis	147	
Forgey, Fred	201	
Foster, Charles	117	
Friesen, Daniel	309	
Goktan, Ayse	246	
Insley, Robert	51	
Johnson, J.	87	
Kromer, Jeffrey		24
Olson, Robin		120
Sivakumar, Soumya	30	
Smith, Alan		36
Treger, Mark		213
<b>Dallas</b>	<b>1,452</b>	<b>543</b>
		<b>1,995</b>

**% of total SCH taught by participating faculty:**

**72.78%**

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)

## Student Credit Hours by Involvement by campus

**2008-Spring**

<b>Denton</b>		
Faculty Name	Part	Supp
Annamalai, Danielle	102	
Atwood, Tammy	84	
Baen, John	888	
Ball, Jon		276
Becker, Jack	36	
Bibb, Kyle		60
Blankson, Charles	603	
Braswell, Michael	450	
Cain, April		117
Capan, Cengiz	66	
Cernas-Ortiz, Daniel		234
Chandrasekaran, Perinkolam	1,035	
Chowdhury, Jhinuk	465	
Chui, Chun-Tat (Lawrence)		144
Clay, Jr., Raymond	158	
Cole, C. Steven	90	
Conover, James	62	
Conover, Teresa	114	
Curtis, Mary	120	
Cutler, Ross	810	
D'Souza, Derrick	216	
Dake, Jerry	456	
Davis, Mark	243	
Durham, James		78
Engler, Dennis		270
Evangelopoulos, Nicholas	312	
Foster, Charles	780	
Frost, Carol	336	
Furst, Jack		63
Gade, Michael		411
Ganesh, Gopala	369	
Goodwin, Vicki	135	
Grabner, John		42
Guttery, Randall	15	
Guynes, Carl	84	
Guzman, Francisco	528	
Hale, Rusty		72
Hasty, Ronald	528	
He, Min (Enya)	384	
Hite, Dwight		135
Hodges, Joe		36
Holmes, Gary		342

**Table 9-1: Summary of Faculty Sufficiency  
in Discipline and School  
Student Credit Hours by Involvement by campus**

**2008-Spring**

	<b>Part</b>	<b>Supp</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>% Part</b>
<b>Dallas</b>	<b>1,452</b>	<b>543</b>	<b>1,995</b>	<b>72.8%</b>
<b>Denton</b>	<b>30,443</b>	<b>12,903</b>	<b>43,346</b>	<b>70.2%</b>
<b>Frisco</b>	<b>129</b>		<b>129</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>% of total SCH taught by participating faculty:</b>	<b>32,024</b>	<b>13,446</b>	<b>45,470</b>	<b>70.4%</b>

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)

(College % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 75 %)

## Student Credit Hours by Involvement by campus

**2008-Spring**

<b>Denton</b>		
Faculty Name	Part	Supp
Paswan, Audhesh Kumar	153	
Pavur, Robert	48	
Peak, Daniel	366	
Pelton, Lou	417	
Pentina, Iryna		648
Pike, Byron		240
Pitre, Evelyn		138
Poe, Stephen	156	
Pohlen, Terrance	18	
Ponthieu, Louis	801	
Powell, James	633	
Qin, Hong		651
Racca, Joshua		219
Radnik, Lydia		87
Raman, K. K.	366	
Reyna, Miquel		114
Richards, Thomas		96
Robinson, Shani	339	
Roden, Peyton	648	
Rogers, Pamela		351
Russell, Lisa		249
Ryan, Sherry	72	
Sager, Jeffrey	755	
Salimath, Manjula	192	
Savitz, Jeffrey		69
Schuessler, Joseph		210
Selcuk, Ertekin		507
Sexton, Sidney	654	
Siddiqi, Mazhar	276	
Sidorova, Anna	672	
Spears, Nancy	84	
Spence, Jimmy	81	
Staff, Marcia	177	
Stodnick, T. Michael	348	
Strutton, H. David	795	
Stucky, Alan		165
Sun, Qin		147
Swartz, Stephen	123	
Taylor, III, Lewis	282	
Terrell, Thomas		240
Thompson, Kenneth	1,284	
Tripathy, Niranjan	135	

## Student Credit Hours by Involvement by campus

**2008-Spring**

<b>Denton</b>			
Faculty Name	Part	Supp	
Vedder, Richard	1,044		
Vineyard, Ramona (Mona)		75	
Watson, Warren	303		
Weich, Russell		195	
White, LeRoy		132	
White, Richard	258		
Windsor, John	93		
Winson-Geideman, Kimberly	243		
Wu, Yu	117		
Young, Randall		585	
Zimmermann, Harvey	234		
<b>Denton</b>	<b>30,443</b>	<b>12,903</b>	<b>43,346</b>

**% of total SCH taught by participating faculty:**

**70.23%**

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)



**Student Credit Hours by Involvement by campus  
2008-Spring**

<b>Frisco</b>		
<b>Faculty Name</b>	<b>Part</b>	<b>Supp</b>
Cole, C. Steven	66	
Evangelopoulos, Nicholas	63	
<b>Frisco</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>129</b>

**% of total SCH taught by participating faculty: 100.00%**

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)

# Table 1

## Faculty Sufficiency by Department

Fall 2007

**2007-Fall**

<b>Accounting</b>		
<b>Faculty Name</b>	<b>Part</b>	<b>Supp</b>
Atwood, Tammy	273	
Ball, Jon		237
Chui , Chun-Tat (Lawrence)		240
Clay, Jr., Raymond	138	
Conover, Teresa	501	
Curtis, Mary	171	
Cutler, Ross	489	
Elam, Dennis	120	
Elrod, Gene		18
Frost, Carol	174	
Hale, Rusty		21
Hutchison, Paul	138	
Klammer, Thomas	396	
Koss, Ray		96
Kromer, Jeffrey		39
Kurdi, Ammr		336
Liu, Xiang (Samantha)		321
Mayper, Alan	147	
McDonald, Sharmila	795	
Merino, Barbara	15	
Olvera, Renee		339
Pike, Byron		339
Racca, Joshua		135
Raman, K. K.	471	
Robinson, Shani	237	
Vineyard, Ramona (Mona)		123
Widmer, Robert		87
Wilner, Neil	261	
Young, Randall		639
Zimmermann, Harvey	120	
<b>Accounting</b>	<b>4,446</b>	<b>2,970</b>
		<b>7,416</b>

**% of total SCH taught by participating faculty:**

**59.95%**

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)

**2007-Fall**

<b>Finance, Insurance, Real Estate and Law</b>			
<b>Faculty Name</b>	<b>Part</b>	<b>Supp</b>	
Baen, John	1,029.00		
Braswell, Michael	288		
Carter, Michael	141		
Chandrasekaran, Perinkolam	996		
Cole, C. Steven	219		
Conover, James	9		
Durham, James		132	
Engler, Dennis		210	
Forgey, Fred	219		
Foster, Charles	639		
Furst, Jack		72	
Guttery, Randall	171		
He, Min (Enya)	357		
Impson, Michael	60		
Karafiath, Imre	336		
Kensinger, John	66		
Kim, Jaehoon		180	
MacDonald, Don	330		
McCormick, Gary	111		
McDonald, James	792		
Olson, Robin		102	
Poe, Stephen	195		
Roden, Peyton	238.5		
Siddiqi, Mazhar	285		
Staff, Marcia	465		
Stucky, Alan		138	
Tripathy, Niranjan	78		
Welch, Russell		183	
Wells, Brenda	360		
Winslow, Barry		45	
Winson-Geideman, Kimberly	261		
<b>Finance, Insurance, Real Estate and Law</b>	<b>7,646</b>	<b>1,062</b>	<b>8,708</b>
<b>w</b>			

% of total SCH taught by participating faculty:

**87.80%**

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)

**2007-Fall**

<b>Information Technology &amp; Decision Sciences</b>			
<b>Faculty Name</b>	<b>Part</b>	<b>Supp</b>	
Becker, Jack	462		
Capan, Cengiz	66		
Dake, Jerry	987		
Evangelopoulos, Nicholas	234		
Friesen, Daniel	432		
Guynes, Carl	105		
Hossain, Muhammad		648	
Jayakumar, Maliyakal	294		
Jensen, Bradley	966		
Jones, Mary	15		
Kappelman, Leon	69		
Koh, Chang	69		
Kvanli, Alan	1,080.00		
Magro, Michael		324	
Pan, Youqin		243	
Pavur, Robert	654		
Prybutok, Victor	162		
Richards, Thomas		102	
Ryan, Sherry	357		
Schuessler, Joseph		327	
Sidorova, Anna	141		
Spence, Jimmy	747		
Vedder, Richard	75		
Windsor, John	216		
Wu, Yu	705		
<b>Information Technology &amp; Decision Sciences</b>	<b>7,836</b>	<b>1,644</b>	<b>9,480</b>

**% of total SCH taught by participating faculty: 82.66%**

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)

**2007-Fall**

<b>Management</b>		
<b>Faculty Name</b>	<b>Part</b>	<b>Supp</b>
Altman, Barbara	192	
Annamalai, Danielle	219	
BarNir, Anat	156	
Calhoun, Glo		120
Cernas-Ortiz, Daniel		102
Davis, Mark	153	
D'Souza, Derrick	207	
Goktan, Ayse	261	
Goodwin, Vicki	141	
Hite, Dwight		201
Hubbard, Joan	498	
Huzdovich, James		180
Insley, Robert	843	
Johnson, J.	567	
Kuykendall, April		453
Lau, Wai		141
Ledgerwood, Donna	357	
Li, Zhen		138
Lillie, Nancy	144	
Madapusi, Arunkumar		81
Miles, Grant	123	
Muniz, Elizabeth		126
Niu, Kuei-Hsien (Jeff)		114
Pennington, Myles		144
Pitre, Evelyn		144
Ponthieu, Louis	588	
Powell, James	1,062.00	
Rogers, Pamela		387
Russell, Lisa		159
Salimath, Manjula	225	
Sexton, Sidney	966	
Stodnick, T. Michael	177	
Taylor, III, Lewis	444	
Watson, Warren	270	
White, LeRoy		114
White, Richard	153	
<b>Management</b>	<b>7,746</b>	<b>2,604</b>
		<b>10,350</b>

**% of total SCH taught by participating faculty: 74.84%**

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)

**2007-Fall**

<b>Marketing &amp; Logistics</b>		
<b>Faculty Name</b>	<b>Part</b>	<b>Supp</b>
Ames, Scott	78	
Blankson, Charles	198	
Chowdhury, Jhinuk	573	
Crawford, John	234	
Farris II, M. Theodore	72	
Gade, Michael		348
Ganesh, Gopala	216	
Guzman, Francisco	312	
Hasty, Ronald	723	
Holmes, Gary		342
Lewin, Jeffrey	363	
Manuj, Ila	114	
Morris, Richard		759
Paswan, Audhesh Kumar	111	
Pelton, Lou	111	
Pentina, Iryna		723
Pohlen, Terrance	69	
Sager, Jeffrey	654	
Savitz, Jeffrey		90
Selcuk, Ertekin		297
Sivakumar, Soumya	162	
Spears, Nancy	429	
Strutton, H. David	90	
Sun, Qin		339
Swartz, Stephen	339	
Thompson, Kenneth	1,468.50	
Treger, Mark		129
Ye, Lei (Lilly)		306
<b>Marketing &amp; Logistics</b>	<b>6,317</b>	<b>3,333</b>
		<b>9,650</b>

**% of total SCH taught by participating faculty: 65.46%**

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)

**Table 9-1: Summary of Faculty Sufficiency  
in Discipline and School  
Student Credit Hours by Involvement by session**

2007-Fall

	<b>Part</b>	<b>Supp</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>% Part</b>
<b>Day</b>	<b>20,007</b>	<b>6,537</b>	<b>26,544</b>	<b>75.4%</b>
<b>Evening</b>	<b>8,966</b>	<b>3,411</b>	<b>12,377</b>	<b>72.4%</b>
<b>INET</b>	<b>5,018</b>	<b>1,665</b>	<b>6,683</b>	<b>75.1%</b>
<b>% of total SCH taught by participating faculty:</b>	<b>33,991</b>	<b>11,613</b>	<b>45,604</b>	<b>74.5%</b>

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)

(College % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 75 %)



**Student Credit Hours by Involvement by session  
2007-Fall**

<b>Day</b>		
Faculty Name	Part	Supp
Altman, Barbara	192	
Ames, Scott	60	
Annamalai, Danielle	102	
Atwood, Tammy	273	
Baen, John	1,014	
Ball, Jon		237
BarNir, Anat	15	
Becker, Jack	168	
Blankson, Charles	162	
Braswell, Michael	216	
Carter, Michael	75	
Chandrasekaran, Perinkolam	996	
Chowdhury, Jhinuk	573	
Clay, Jr., Raymond	54	
Cole, C. Steven	168	
Conover, James	9	
Conover, Teresa	198	
Crawford, John	90	
Curtis, Mary	84	
Cutler, Ross	249	
D'Souza, Derrick	111	
Dake, Jerry	660	
Elam, Dennis	120	
Elrod, Gene		18
Engler, Dennis		210
Evangelopoulos, Nicholas	171	
Forgey, Fred	33	
Foster, Charles	582	
Friesen, Daniel	75	
Furst, Jack		72
Gade, Michael		270
Ganesh, Gopala	168	
Goktan, Ayse	123	
Goodwin, Vicki	141	
Guttery, Randall	171	
Guynes, Carl	81	
Guzman, Francisco	135	
He, Min (Enya)	273	
Hite, Dwight		201
Holmes, Gary		342
Hossain, Muhammad		648
Hubbard, Joan	381	

**Student Credit Hours by Involvement by session  
2007-Fall**

<b>Day</b>		
Faculty Name	Part	Supp
Hutchison, Paul	15	
Insley, Robert	843	
Jensen, Bradley	324	
Jones, Mary	15	
Kappelman, Leon	48	
Karafiath, Imre	159	
Kensinger, John	9	
Kim, Jaehoon		180
Klammer, Thomas	75	
Koh, Chang	36	
Kvanli, Alan	519	
Lau, Wai		141
Ledgerwood, Donna	318	
Lewin, Jeffrey	363	
Li, Zhen		138
Lillie, Nancy	144	
Liu, Xiang (Samantha)		321
MacDonald, Don	330	
Madapusi, Arunkumar		81
Magro, Michael		324
Manuj, Ila	114	
Mayper, Alan	81	
McDonald, James	417	
McDonald, Sharmila	444	
Merino, Barbara	15	
Morris, Richard		249
Niu, Kuei-Hsien (Jeff)		114
Olvera, Renee		339
Pan, Youqin		243
Paswan, Audhesh Kumar	111	
Pentina, Iryna		432
Pike, Byron		339
Poe, Stephen	93	
Pohlen, Terrance	69	
Powell, James	594	
Prybutok, Victor	147	
Raman, K. K.	135	
Robinson, Shani	237	
Rogers, Pamela		108
Russell, Lisa		159
Ryan, Sherry	357	
Sager, Jeffrey	654	

**Student Credit Hours by Involvement by session  
2007-Fall**

<b>Day</b>		
<b>Faculty Name</b>	<b>Part</b>	<b>Supp</b>
Salimath, Manjula	225	
Schuessler, Joseph		327
Siddiqi, Mazhar	168	
Sidorova, Anna	129	
Sivakumar, Soumya	162	
Spears, Nancy	333	
Spence, Jimmy	747	
Staff, Marcia	447	
Stodnick, T. Michael	63	
Strutton, H. David	18	
Stucky, Alan		138
Swartz, Stephen	279	
Thompson, Kenneth	1,389	
Treger, Mark		63
Vedder, Richard	33	
Vineyard, Ramona (Mona)		66
Welch, Russell		24
Wells, Brenda	360	
White, LeRoy		114
White, Richard	135	
Wilner, Neil	69	
Winson-Geideman, Kimberly	144	
Wu, Yu	651	
Ye, Lei (Lilly)		306
Young, Randall		333
Zimmermann, Harvey	66	
<b>Day</b>	<b>20,007</b>	<b>6,537</b>
		<b>26,544</b>

**% of total SCH taught by participating faculty:**

**75.37%**

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)

## Student Credit Hours by Involvement by session

2007-Fall

<b>Evening</b>		
Faculty Name	Part	Supp
Ames, Scott	18	
Baen, John	15	
Becker, Jack	294	
Blankson, Charles	36	
Braswell, Michael	72	
Calhoun, Glo		120
Capan, Cengiz	66	
Carter, Michael	66	
Cernas-Ortiz, Daniel		102
Chui, Chun-Tat (Lawrence)		240
Clay, Jr., Raymond	84	
Cole, C. Steven	51	
Conover, Teresa	303	
Crawford, John	144	
Curtis, Mary	87	
Cutler, Ross	240	
D'Souza, Derrick	96	
Dake, Jerry	327	
Davis, Mark	120	
Durham, James		132
Evangelopoulos, Nicholas	63	
Farris II, M. Theodore	72	
Forgey, Fred	186	
Foster, Charles	57	
Friesen, Daniel	357	
Frost, Carol	174	
Gade, Michael		78
Goktan, Ayse	138	
Guynes, Carl	24	
Guzman, Francisco	177	
Hale, Rusty		21
He, Min (Enya)	84	
Hutchison, Paul	123	
Huzdovich, James		180
Impson, Michael	60	
Jayakumar, Maliyakal	105	
Jensen, Bradley	642	
Johnson, J.	57	
Kappelman, Leon	21	
Karafiath, Imre	177	
Kensinger, John	57	
Koh, Chang	33	

## Student Credit Hours by Involvement by session

**2007-Fall**

<b>Evening</b>		
Faculty Name	Part	Supp
Koss, Ray		96
Kromer, Jeffrey		39
Kurdi, Ammr		336
Kuykendall, April		453
Kvanli, Alan	561	
Ledgerwood, Donna	39	
Mayper, Alan	66	
McCormick, Gary	111	
McDonald, James	375	
McDonald, Sharmila	231	
Miles, Grant	123	
Olson, Robin		102
Pavur, Robert	654	
Pelton, Lou	72	
Pennington, Myles		144
Pitre, Evelyn		144
Poe, Stephen	102	
Ponthieu, Louis	45	
Powell, James	468	
Prybutok, Victor	15	
Racca, Joshua		135
Raman, K. K.	336	
Roden, Peyton	68	
Rogers, Pamela		279
Savitz, Jeffrey		90
Siddiqi, Mazhar	117	
Sidorova, Anna	12	
Stodnick, T. Michael	114	
Swartz, Stephen	60	
Treger, Mark		66
Tripathy, Niranjana	78	
Vedder, Richard	42	
Vineyard, Ramona (Mona)		57
Welch, Russell		159
White, Richard	18	
Widmer, Robert		87
Wilner, Neil	192	
Windsor, John	216	
Winslow, Barry		45
Winson-Geideman, Kimberly	117	
Wu, Yu	54	
Young, Randall		306

## Student Credit Hours by Involvement by session

2007-Fall

<b>Evening</b>		
<b>Faculty Name</b>	<b>Part</b>	<b>Supp</b>
Zimmermann, Harvey	54	
<b>Evening</b>	<b>8,966</b>	<b>3,411</b>
		<b>12,377</b>

**% of total SCH taught by participating faculty:**

**72.44%**

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)

## Student Credit Hours by Involvement by session

**2007-Fall**

<b>Inet</b>		
Faculty Name	Part	Supp
Annamalai, Danielle	117	
BarNir, Anat	141	
Davis, Mark	33	
Ganesh, Gopala	48	
Hasty, Ronald	723	
Hubbard, Joan	117	
Jayakumar, Maliyakal	189	
Johnson, J.	510	
Klammer, Thomas	321	
McDonald, Sharmila	120	
Morris, Richard		510
Muniz, Elizabeth		126
Pelton, Lou	39	
Pentina, Iryna		291
Ponthieu, Louis	543	
Richards, Thomas		102
Roden, Peyton	171	
Selcuk, Ertekin		297
Sexton, Sidney	966	
Spears, Nancy	96	
Staff, Marcia	18	
Strutton, H. David	72	
Sun, Qin		339
Taylor, III, Lewis	444	
Thompson, Kenneth	80	
Watson, Warren	270	
<b>Inet</b>	<b>5,018</b>	<b>1,665</b>

**6,683**

**% of total SCH taught by participating faculty:**

**75.08%**

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > **60 %**)

**Table 9-1: Summary of Faculty Sufficiency  
in Discipline and School  
Student Credit Hours by Involvement by campus**

**2007-Fall**

	<b>Part</b>	<b>Supp</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>% Part</b>
<b>Dallas</b>	<b>1,830</b>	<b>510</b>	<b>2,340</b>	<b>78.2%</b>
<b>Denton</b>	<b>32,067</b>	<b>11,103</b>	<b>43,170</b>	<b>74.3%</b>
<b>Frisco</b>	<b>93</b>		<b>93</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>% of total SCH taught by participating faculty:</b>	<b>33,990</b>	<b>11,613</b>	<b>45,603</b>	<b>74.5%</b>

(Department % required to be taught by participating faculty: > 60 %)

(College % required to be taught by participating faculty: > 75 %)



**Student Credit Hours by Involvement by campus  
2007-Fall**

<b>Dallas</b>		
<b>Faculty Name</b>	<b>Part</b>	<b>Supp</b>
Altman, Barbara	192	
Ames, Scott	78	
Calhoun, Glo		120
Carter, Michael	141	
D'Souza, Derrick	51	
Elam, Dennis	120	
Elrod, Gene		18
Forgey, Fred	219	
Foster, Charles	57	
Friesen, Daniel	432	
Goktan, Ayse	261	
Hale, Rusty		21
Insley, Robert	60	
Johnson, J.	57	
Kromer, Jeffrey		39
Madapusi, Arunkumar		81
Olson, Robin		102
Sivakumar, Soumya	162	
Treger, Mark		129
<b>Dallas</b>	<b>1,830</b>	<b>510</b>
		<b>2,340</b>

**% of total SCH taught by participating faculty:**

**78.21%**

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)

## Student Credit Hours by Involvement by campus

2007-Fall

<b>Denton</b>		
Faculty Name	Part	Supp
Annamalai, Danielle	219	
Atwood, Tammy	273	
Baen, John	1,029	
Ball, Jon		237
BarNir, Anat	156	
Becker, Jack	462	
Blankson, Charles	198	
Braswell, Michael	288	
Capan, Cengiz	66	
Cernas-Ortiz, Daniel		102
Chandrasekaran, Perinkolam	996	
Chowdhury, Jhinuk	573	
Chui, Chun-Tat (Lawrence)		240
Clay, Jr., Raymond	138	
Cole, C. Steven	219	
Conover, James	9	
Conover, Teresa	501	
Crawford, John	234	
Curtis, Mary	171	
Cutler, Ross	489	
D'Souza, Derrick	156	
Dake, Jerry	987	
Davis, Mark	153	
Durham, James		132
Engler, Dennis		210
Evangelopoulos, Nicholas	234	
Farris II, M. Theodore	72	
Foster, Charles	582	
Frost, Carol	174	
Furst, Jack		72
Gade, Michael		348
Ganesh, Gopala	216	
Goodwin, Vicki	141	
Guttery, Randall	171	
Guynes, Carl	105	
Guzman, Francisco	312	
Hasty, Ronald	723	
He, Min (Enya)	357	
Hite, Dwight		201
Holmes, Gary		342
Hossain, Muhammad		648
Hubbard, Joan	498	

## Student Credit Hours by Involvement by campus

**2007-Fall**

<b>Denton</b>		
Faculty Name	Part	Supp
Hutchison, Paul	138	
Huzdovich, James		180
Impson, Michael	60	
Insley, Robert	783	
Jayakumar, Maliyakal	294	
Jensen, Bradley	966	
Johnson, J.	510	
Jones, Mary	15	
Kappelman, Leon	69	
Karafiath, Imre	336	
Kensinger, John	66	
Kim, Jaehoon		180
Klammer, Thomas	396	
Koh, Chang	69	
Koss, Ray		96
Kurdi, Ammr		336
Kuykendall, April		453
Kvanli, Alan	1,080	
Lau, Wai		141
Ledgerwood, Donna	357	
Lewin, Jeffrey	363	
Li, Zhen		138
Lillie, Nancy	144	
Liu, Xiang (Samantha)		321
MacDonald, Don	330	
Magro, Michael		324
Manuj, Ila	114	
Mayper, Alan	147	
McCormick, Gary	111	
McDonald, James	792	
McDonald, Sharmila	795	
Merino, Barbara	15	
Miles, Grant	123	
Morris, Richard		759
Muniz, Elizabeth		126
Niu, Kuei-Hsien (Jeff)		114
Olvera, Renee		339
Pan, Youqin		243
Paswan, Audhesh Kumar	111	
Pavur, Robert	654	
Pelton, Lou	75	
Pennington, Myles		144

**Student Credit Hours by Involvement by campus**  
**2007-Fall**

<b>Denton</b>		
<b>Faculty Name</b>	<b>Part</b>	<b>Supp</b>
Pentina, Iryna		723
Pike, Byron		339
Pitre, Evelyn		144
Poe, Stephen	195	
Pohlen, Terrance	69	
Ponthieu, Louis	588	
Powell, James	1,062	
Prybutok, Victor	162	
Racca, Joshua		135
Raman, K. K.	471	
Richards, Thomas		102
Robinson, Shani	237	
Roden, Peyton	239	
Rogers, Pamela		387
Russell, Lisa		159
Ryan, Sherry	357	
Sager, Jeffrey	654	
Salimath, Manjula	225	
Savitz, Jeffrey		90
Schuessler, Joseph		327
Selcuk, Ertekin		297
Sexton, Sidney	966	
Siddiqi, Mazhar	285	
Sidorova, Anna	141	
Spears, Nancy	429	
Spence, Jimmy	747	
Staff, Marcia	465	
Stodnick, T. Michael	177	
Strutton, H. David	90	
Stucky, Alan		138
Sun, Qin		339
Swartz, Stephen	339	
Taylor, III, Lewis	444	
Thompson, Kenneth	1,469	
Tripathy, Niranjana	78	
Vedder, Richard	75	
Vineyard, Ramona (Mona)		123
Watson, Warren	270	
Welch, Russell		183
Wells, Brenda	360	
White, LeRoy		114
White, Richard	153	

## Student Credit Hours by Involvement by campus

**2007-Fall**

<b>Denton</b>		
Faculty Name	Part	Supp
Widmer, Robert		87
Wilner, Neil	204	
Windsor, John	216	
Winslow, Barry		45
Winson-Geideman, Kimberly	261	
Wu, Yu	705	
Ye, Lei (Lilly)		306
Young, Randall		639
Zimmermann, Harvey	120	
<b>Denton</b>	<b>32,067</b>	<b>11,103</b>
		<b>43,170</b>

**% of total SCH taught by participating faculty:**

**74.28%**

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)

## Student Credit Hours by Involvement by campus

2007-Fall

<b>Frisco</b>		
<b>Faculty Name</b>	<b>Part</b>	<b>Supp</b>
Pelton, Lou	36	
Wilner, Neil	57	
<b>Frisco</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>93</b>

**% of total SCH taught by participating faculty: 100.00%**

(Department % required to be taught by **participating** faculty: > 60 %)

## Table 2

# Intellectual Contributions Summary By Department

**Accounting:**

Faculty Name	Highest Earned Degree & Year	Date of First Appointment to School	Percent of Time Dedicated to the School's Mission	Qualifications			Number of Contributions during the period (2003-2008)						
				Acad	Prof	Oth	Pedagogical Scholarship		Discipline-Based Scholarship		Contributions to Practice		
							PRJ	OIC	PRJ	OIC	PRJ	OIC	
Atwood, Tammy Jean	Ph.D., 1995	2006	100.0%	Yes					2	5			
Conover, Teresa	Ph.D., 1988	1989	100.0%	Yes					3	5			1
Curtis, Mary B.	Ph.D., 1995	1998	100.0%	Yes				1	8	13			9
Elam, Dennis	Ph.D., 2003	2006	100.0%	Yes			2	12		2			
Frost, Carol	Ph.D., 1989	2007	100.0%	Yes					2	26			
Hutchison, Paul D.	Ph.D., 1997	1998	100.0%	Yes					15	8		4	1
Mayper, Alan	Ph.D., 1981	1987	100.0%	Yes					1	12			
Merino, Barbara D.	Ph.D., 1975	1983	100.0%	Yes					4	12			
Raman, K. K.	Ph.D., 1979	1981	100.0%	Yes					9	15			1
Wilner, Neil	Ph.D., 1980	1987	100.0%	Yes					2	2			
Young, Randall	M.Acc., 2001	2007	100.0%	Yes									
Clay, Jr., Raymond J.	D.B.A., 1974	1983	100.0%		Yes								12
Cutler, Ross	M.Acc., 1975	2004	100.0%		Yes								
McDonald, Sharmila	M.S., 2000	2006	100.0%		Yes								
Zimmermann, Harvey	M.B.A., 1972	2002	100.0%		Yes								
Ball, Jon	M.B.A., 1997	2007	50.0%		Yes								
Menge, Jennifer	M.S., 2005	2008	50.0%		Yes								
Smith, Alan	M.B.A.,	2008	50.0%		Yes								
Bibb, Kyle	M.S., 1983	2006	25.0%		Yes								
Cain, April M.	M.S., 2002	2008	25.0%		Yes								
Hale, Rusty	M.S., 2001	2007	25.0%		Yes								
Hodges, Joe	M.B.A., 1975	2008	25.0%		Yes								
Kromer, Jeffrey	M.B.A., 1988	2007	25.0%		Yes								
Merki, Mark	M.S., 1991	2008	25.0%		Yes								
Reyna, Miguel	B.B.A., 1973	2008	25.0%		Yes								
Vineyard, Ramona (Mona)	M.S., 1999	2007	25.0%		Yes								
Radnik, Lydia	M.S., 1997	2008	12.5%		Yes								
Walker, Anthony	B.B.A., 1999	2008	12.5%		Yes								
<b>Accounting: (FTE):</b>				<b>11</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>24</b>	
				<b>11.00</b>	<b>7.75</b>	<b>0</b>							



***Finance, Insurance, Real Estate and Law:***

Faculty Name	Highest Earned Degree & Year	Date of First Appointment to School	Percent of Time Dedicated to the School's Mission	Qualifications			Number of Contributions during the period (2003-2008)																	
				Acad	Prof	Oth	Pedagogical Scholarship		Discipline-Based Scholarship		Contributions to Practice													
							PRJ	OIC	PRJ	OIC	PRJ	OIC												
Baen, John S.	Ph.D.,	1985	100.0%	Yes															2	37				
Braswell, Michael K.	J.D.,	1990	100.0%	Yes					1											1				
Carter, Michael	Ph.D.,	2006	100.0%	Yes																				
Chandrasekaran, Perinkolam	Ph.D.,	1981	100.0%	Yes							2									1				
Cole, C. Steven	Ph.D., 1989	1988	100.0%	Yes				2		6									3	1				
Conover, James Allen	Ph.D., 1989	1989	100.0%	Yes									2						10	1				
Forgey, Fred A.	Ph.D., 1992	2007	100.0%	Yes									3											
Guttery, Randall S.	Ph.D., 1994	1994	100.0%	Yes									3							1	2			
He, Min (Enya)	Ph.D., 2006	2006	100.0%	Yes									1						22					
Karafiath, Imre	Ph.D., 1983	1984	100.0%	Yes									3						39					
Kensinger, John W.	Ph.D., 1983	1991	100.0%	Yes									3						9					
McCormick, Gary P.	Ph.D.,	2007	100.0%	Yes																				
Poe, Stephen L.	J.D., 1982	1989	100.0%	Yes															3		1	2		
Roden, Peyton Foster	Ph.D.,	1974	100.0%	Yes												3			2		2	5		
Siddiqi, Mazhar	Ph.D., 1991	1991	100.0%	Yes															3					
Staff, Marcia J.	J.D., 1975	1979	100.0%	Yes															1		2	8	1	
Tripathy, Niranjan	Ph.D., 1987	1987	100.0%	Yes																4		5		
Winson-Geideman, Kimberly	Ph.D.,	2007	100.0%	Yes																6		4		
Brown, Steven F.	Ph.D.,	2008	25.0%	Yes																				
Foster, Charles M.	J.D.,	1971	100.0%																					
Impson, Michael	Ph.D.,	1987	100.0%																					
MacDonald, Don N.	Ph.D., 1984	1989	100.0%	Yes																				
MacDonald, James L.	Ph.D., 1979	1976	100.0%	Yes																				
Wells, Brenda P.	Ph.D., 1992	1992	100.0%	Yes																1			1	
Engler, Dennis	J.D.,	1991	50.0%	Yes																				
Welch, Russell	J.D.,	1997	50.0%	Yes																				
Durham, James	B.S.,	2004	25.0%	Yes																				
Furst, Jack	M.B.A.,	2006	25.0%	Yes																				

**Finance, Insurance, Real Estate and Law:**

Faculty Name	Highest Earned Degree & Year	Date of First Appointment to School	Percent of Time Dedicated to the School's Mission	Qualifications			Number of Contributions during the period (2003-2008)									
				Acad	Prof	Oth	Learning & Pedagogical Scholarship		Discipline-Based Scholarship		Contributions to Practice					
							PRJ	OIC	PRJ	OIC	PRJ	OIC				
Lapointe, Fred P.	B.A.,	2008	25.0%		Yes											
Olson, Robin	B.A.,	2003	25.0%		Yes											
Stucky, Alan	J.D.,	2004	25.0%		Yes											
Terrell, Thomas	B.A.,	2007	25.0%		Yes											
Winslow, Barry	M.B.A.,	2007	25.0%		Yes											
<b>Finance, Insurance, Real Estate and Law:</b>				<b>19</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>6</b>					
<b>(FTE):</b>				<b>18.25</b>	<b>5.75</b>	<b>2.00</b>										

**Information Technology & Decision Sciences:**

Faculty Name	Highest Earned Degree & Year	Date of First Appointment to School	Percent of Time Dedicated to the School's Mission	Qualifications			Learning & Pedagogical Scholarship				Discipline-Based Scholarship				Contributions to Practice	
				Acad	Prof	Oth	PRJ	OIC	PRJ	OIC	PRJ	OIC	PRJ	OIC	PRJ	OIC
<u>Becker, Jack D.</u>	Ph.D., 1977	1986	100.0%	Yes			1			1	4					1
<u>Evangelopoulos, Nicholas</u>	Ph.D., 1999	2002	100.0%	Yes						7	8					
<u>Friesen, Daniel</u>	Ph.D., 1997	2006	100.0%	Yes			1	4							3	9
<u>Guynes, Carl Stephen</u>	Ph.D., 1969	1969	100.0%	Yes			1			6	1					
<u>Jensen, Bradley K.</u>	Ph.D.,	2002	100.0%	Yes						4	3					
<u>Jones, Mary Callie</u>	Ph.D., 1990	2001	100.0%	Yes						10	8					
<u>Kappelman, Leon Allan</u>	Ph.D., 1990	1990	100.0%	Yes						2				1	13	
<u>Koh, Chang</u>	Ph.D., 1992	1999	100.0%	Yes						10	11					
<u>Kulkarni, Shailesh</u>	Ph.D., 1999	2001	100.0%	Yes				2		8	12				1	
<u>Kvanli, Alan H.</u>	Ph.D., 1973	1981	100.0%	Yes							3			1	10	
<u>Pavur, Robert J.</u>	Ph.D., 1981	1981	100.0%	Yes						2	3			8	19	
<u>Peak, Daniel</u>	Ph.D., 1994	2001	100.0%	Yes						7					2	
<u>Prybutok, Victor R.</u>	Ph.D., 1984	1991	100.0%	Yes						30	21				1	
<u>Ryan, Sherry D.</u>	Ph.D., 1997	1998	100.0%	Yes						8	8					
<u>Sidorova, Anna</u>	Ph.D., 2002	2006	100.0%	Yes			1			3	10					
<u>Vedder, Richard G.</u>	Ph.D., 1978	1984	100.0%	Yes	Yes						1			1	1	
<u>Windsor, John C.</u>	Ph.D., 1981	1983	100.0%	Yes						2	1			2	1	
<u>Wu, Yu</u>	Ph.D., 2007	2007	100.0%	Yes						1	7					
<u>Richards, Thomas</u>	Ph.D., 1971	1983	50.0%	Yes						3						
<u>Dake, Jerry</u>	Ph.D., 1968	2001	100.0%		Yes											
<u>Jayakumar, Maliyakal D.</u>	Ph.D., 1989	1990	100.0%			Yes										
<u>Spence, Jimmy W.</u>	Ph.D., 1978	1980	100.0%			Yes									1	1
<u>Capan, Cengiz</u>	M.S., 1980	1980	50.0%		Yes											
<b>Information Technology &amp; Decision Sciences:</b>				<b>19</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>59</b>				
<b>(FTE):</b>				<b>18.50</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>2.00</b>										

Management:															
Faculty Name	Highest Degree & Year	Date of First Appointment to School	Percent of Time Dedicated to the School's Mission	Qualifications			Number of Contributions during the period (2003-2008)								
				Acad	Prof	Oth	Pedagogical Scholarship		Discipline-Based Scholarship		Contributions to Practice				
							PRJ	OIC	PRJ	OIC	PRJ	OIC			
<u>Annamalai, Danielle Cooper</u>	Ph.D., 2007	2006	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	2	6	-	-	-	-
<u>BarNir, Anat</u>	Ph.D., 1998	1998	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	4	7	-	-	-	1
<u>Davis, Mark A.</u>	Ph.D., 1984	1998	100.0%	Yes	-	-	1	-	-	5	2	-	-	-	-
<u>D'Souza, Derrick E.</u>	Ph.D., 1990	1989	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	4	3	-	-	-	-
<u>Goktan, Ayse Banu</u>	Ph.D.,	2007	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Goodwin, Vicki L.</u>	Ph.D., 1991	1991	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	5	7	-	-	-	-
<u>Kuo, Ching-Chung</u>	Ph.D., 1989	2000	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	5
<u>Ledgerwood, Donna E.</u>	Ph.D., 1980	1978	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	-	-	-	-
<u>Lillie, Nancy G. Boyd</u>	Ph.D., 1991	1991	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	1	4	2	-	-	-	-
<u>Miles, Grant E.</u>	Ph.D., 1994	1995	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	7	12	1	-	-	-
<u>Salimath, Manjula S.</u>	Ph.D., 2006	2005	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	3	35	-	-	-	-
<u>Stodnick, T. Michael</u>	Ph.D., 2005	2004	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	22	-	-	-	-
<u>Taylor, III, Lewis A.</u>	Ph.D., 1984	1992	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
<u>Watson, Warren E.</u>	Ph.D., 1980	1983	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-
<u>White, Richard E.</u>	Ph.D., 1990	1990	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	2	7	-	-	-	2
<u>Muniz, Elizabeth</u>	Ph.D.,	2007	25.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Altman, Barbara</u>	D.B.A.,	1999	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Hubbard, Joan</u>	Ed.D.,	2004	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Insley, Robert</u>	Ph.D.,	1987	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
<u>Johnson, J. Lynn</u>	Ph.D., 1977	1978	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
<u>Ponthieu, Louis D.</u>	Ph.D., 1968	1986	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Powell, James D.</u>	Ph.D., 1977	1977	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Huzdovich, James</u>	Ph.D.,	2007	50.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Sexton, Sidney Michael</u>	M.B.A.,	1999	50.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Calhoun, Gio</u>	M.A.,	2003	25.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Kuykendall, April</u>	M.B.A.,	2003	25.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Pitre, Evelyn</u>	A.B.D.,	1997	25.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-
<u>White, LeRoy</u>	M.B.A.,	2003	25.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-
<b>Management:</b>				<b>16</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	

**Management:**

Faculty Name	Highest Earned Degree & Year	Date of First Appointment to School	Percent of Time Dedicated to the School's Mission (FTE):	Qualifications			Number of Contributions during the period (2003-2008)										
				Acad	Prof	Oth	Pedagogical Scholarship		Discipline-Based Scholarship		Contributions to Practice						
							PRJ	OIC	PRJ	OIC	PRJ	OIC					
				15.25	7.75	0.25											

**Marketing & Logistics:**

Faculty Name	Highest Degree & Year	Date of First Appointment to School	Percent of Time Dedicated to the School's Mission	Qualifications			Number of Contributions during the period (2003-2008)					
				Acad	Prof	Oth	Pedagogical Scholarship		Discipline-Based Scholarship		Contributions to Practice	
							PRJ	OIC	PRJ	OIC		
<u>Blankson, Charles</u>	Ph.D., 1990	2005	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	17	17	-	-
<u>Chowdhury, Jinuk</u>	Ph.D., 1981	1989	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
<u>Crawford, John C.</u>	Ph.D., 1981	1981	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-
<u>Farris II, M. Theodore</u>	Ph.D., 1994	1997	100.0%	Yes	-	-	1	-	8	7	4	8
<u>Ganesh, Gopala</u>	Ph.D., 1985	1983	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	10	7	5	-	-
<u>Guzman, Francisco</u>	Ph.D., 1969	2006	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	7	20	-	-
<u>Hasty, Ronald W.</u>	Ph.D., 1997	1992	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	2	3	5	-	-
<u>Lewin, Jeffrey E.</u>	Ph.D., 1997	2005	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	7	2	-	-
<u>Manuj, Ila</u>	Ph.D., 1992	2007	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	1	3	-	-
<u>Paswan, Audhesh Kumar</u>	Ph.D., 1993	1999	100.0%	Yes	-	-	1	-	20	15	-	10
<u>Pelton, Lou E.</u>	Ph.D., 1986	1994	100.0%	Yes	-	-	2	-	4	24	-	-
<u>Pohlen, Terrance L.</u>	Ph.D., 1986	2003	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	7	9	1	13
<u>Sager, Jeffrey Kenneth</u>	Ph.D., 1990	1985	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	7	4	-	-
<u>Sivakumar, Soumya</u>	Ph.D., 1999	2007	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
<u>Spears, Nancy</u>	Ph.D., 1999	2000	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	11	2	-	-
<u>Strutton, H. David</u>	Ph.D., 1988	2001	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	14	17	1	2
<u>Swartz, Stephen M.</u>	Ph.D., 1988	2004	100.0%	Yes	-	-	1	-	6	4	-	-
<u>Thompson, Kenneth Niel</u>	D.B.A., 2008	1987	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Grabner, John</u>	Ph.D., 1990	2002	50.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Hubbard, Charles</u>	M.B.A., 2007	2008	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Ames, Scott A.</u>	M.B.A., 2006	2003	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Gade, Michael</u>	M.S., 2006	2006	100.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Morris, Richard</u>	M.B.A., 2003	2006	50.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Savit, Jeffrey</u>	M.B.A., 2003	2003	50.0%	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Treger, Mark</u>												
<b>Marketing &amp; Logistics:</b>				<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>(FTE):</b>				<b>19</b>	<b>4.00</b>							

# Table 2A

## Faculty Qualifications By Department

**Accounting:**

Faculty Name	Qualifications	% of Time Dedicated to the School's Mission			
		Acad	Acad - Ph.D	Prof	Other
Atwood, Tammy Jean	AQ	100			
Ball, Jon	PQ			50	
Bibb, Kyle	PQ			25	
Cain, April	PQ			25	
Clay, Jr., Raymond J.	PQ			100	
Conover, Teresa	AQ	100			
Curtis, Mary B.	AQ	100			
Cutler, Ross	PQ			100	
Elam, Dennis	AQ	100			
Frost, Carol	AQ	100			
Hale, Rusty	PQ			25	
Hodges, Joe	PQ			25	
Hutchison, Paul D.	AQ	100			
Kromer, Jeffrey	PQ			25	
Mayper, Alan	AQ	100			
Menge, Jennifer	PQ			50	
Merino, Barbara D.	AQ	100			
Merki, Mark	PQ			25	
Radnik, Lydia	PQ			12.5	
Raman, K. K.	AQ	100			
Reyna, Miquel	PQ			25	
Smith, Alan	PQ			50	
Vineyard, Ramona (Mona)	PQ			25	
Walker, Anthony	PQ			12.5	
Wilner, Neil	AQ	100			
Young, Randall	AQ - Ph.D	100			
Zimmermann, Harvey	PQ			100	
Chui, Chun-Tat (Lawrence)	AQ - Ph.D		50		
Hynak, Christopher	AQ - Ph.D		25		
Liu, Xiang (Samantha)	AQ - Ph.D		50		
Olvera, Renee	AQ - Ph.D		25		
Pike, Byron	AQ - Ph.D		25		
Racca, Joshua	AQ - Ph.D		25		
Robinson, Shani	AQ - Ph.D		25		
<b>Accounting:</b>		<b>1100</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>675</b>	<b>0</b>

2000

$$AQ/(AQ+PQ+O) \geq 50\%$$

66.25%

$$(AQ+PQ)/(AQ+PQ+O)$$

(n=20/21)

100.00%

$$AQ-Ph.D/(AQ-AQ-$$

$$Ph.D+PQ+O) \leq 10\%$$

11.25%



**Finance, Real Estate and Law :**

Faculty Name	Qualifications	% of Time Dedicated to the School's Mission			
		Acad	Acad - Ph.D	Prof	Other
Baen, John S.	AQ	100			
Braswell, Michael K.	AQ	100			
Brown, Steven F.	AQ	25			
Carter, Michael	AQ	100			
Chandrasekaran, Perinkolam	AQ	100			
Cole, C. Steven	AQ	100			
Conover, James Allen	AQ	100			
Durham, James	PQ			25	
Engler, Dennis	PQ			50	
Forgey, Fred A.	AQ	100			
Foster, Charles M.	Neither AQ/PQ				100
Furst, Jack	PQ			25	
Guttery, Randall S.	AQ	100			
He, Min (Enya)	AQ	100			
Impson, Michael	Neither AQ/PQ				100
Karafiath, Imre	AQ	100			
Kensinger, John W.	AQ	100			
Lapointe, Fred P.	PQ			25	
MacDonald, Don N.	PQ			100	
McCormick, Gary P.	AQ	100			
McDonald, James L.	PQ			100	
Olson, Robin	PQ			25	
Poe, Stephen L.	AQ	100			
Roden, Peyton Foster	AQ	100			
Siddiqi, Mazhar	AQ	100			
Staff, Marcia J.	AQ	100			
Stucky, Alan	PQ			25	
Terrell, Thomas	PQ			25	
Tripathy, Niranjan	AQ	100			
Welch, Russell	PQ			75	
Wells, Brenda P.	PQ			100	
Winslow, Barry	PQ				
Winson-Geideman, Kimberly	AQ	100			
Jones, Kevin	AQ - Ph.D		25		
Kim, Jaehoon	AQ - Ph.D	50			
<b>Finance, Real Estate and Law:</b>		<b>1875</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>575</b>	<b>200</b>

2675

$AQ/(AQ+PQ+O) \geq 50\%$  : 71.03%  
 $(AQ+PQ)/(AQ+PQ+O) \geq 90\%$  : 92.52%  
 $AQ-Ph.D/(AQ+AQ-Ph.D+PQ+O) \leq 10\%$  : 0.93%

### Information Technology & Decision Sciences :

Faculty Name	Qualifications	% of Time Dedicated to the School's Mission			
		Acad	Acad - Ph.D	Prof	Other
<u>Becker, Jack D.</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Capan, Cengiz</u>	PQ			50	
<u>Dake, Jerry</u>	PQ			100	
<u>Evangelopoulos, Nicholas</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Friesen, Daniel</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Guynes, Carl Stephen</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Jayakumar, Maliyakal D.</u>	Neither AQ/PQ				100
<u>Jensen, Bradley K.</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Jones, Mary Callie</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Kappelman, Leon Allan</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Koh, Chang</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Kulkarni, Shailesh</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Kvanli, Alan H.</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Pavur, Robert J.</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Peak, Daniel</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Prybutok, Victor R.</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Richards, Thomas</u>	AQ	50			
<u>Ryan, Sherry D.</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Sidorova, Anna</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Spence, Jimmy W.</u>	Neither AQ/PQ				100
<u>Vedder, Richard G.</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Windsor, John C.</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Wu, Yu</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Hossain, Muhammad</u>	AQ - Ph.D				
<u>Magro, Michael</u>	AQ - Ph.D				
<u>Pan, Youqin</u>	AQ - Ph.D	50			
<u>Qin, Hong</u>	AQ - Ph.D	50			
<u>Schuessler, Joseph</u>	AQ - Ph.D	25			
<b>Information Technology &amp; Decision Sciences:</b>		<b>1975</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>200</b>

**AQ/(AQ+PQ+O) <sup>[>=50%]</sup> ; 84.95%**

**(AQ+PQ)/(AQ+PQ+O) <sup>[>=90%]</sup> ; 91.40%**

**AQ-Ph.D/(AQ+AQ-Ph.D+PQ+O) [ $\leq 10\%$ ] 0.00%**

2325

**Management:**

Faculty Name	Qualifications	% of Time Dedicated to the School's Mission			
		Acad	Acad - Ph.D	Prof	Other
<u>Altman, Barbara</u>	PQ			100	
<u>Annamalai, Danielle Cooper</u>	AQ	100			
<u>BarNir, Anat</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Calhoun, Glo</u>	PQ			25	
<u>Davis, Mark A.</u>	AQ	100			
<u>D'Souza, Derrick E.</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Goktan, Ayse Banu</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Goodwin, Vicki L.</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Hubbard, Joan</u>	PQ			100	
<u>Huzdovich, James</u>	PQ			25	
<u>Insley, Robert</u>	PQ			100	
<u>Johnson, Joe L.</u>	PQ			100	
<u>Kuo, Ching-Chung</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Kuykendall, April</u>	PQ			25	
<u>Ledgerwood, Donna E.</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Lillie, Nancy G. Boyd</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Miles, Grant E.</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Muniz, Elizabeth</u>	AQ	25			
<u>Pitre, Evelyn</u>	Neither AQ/PQ				25
<u>Ponthieu, Louis D.</u>	PQ			100	
<u>Powell, James D.</u>	PQ			100	
<u>Salimath, Manjula S.</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Sexton, Sidney Michael</u>	PQ			50	
<u>Stodnick, T. Michael</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Taylor, III, Lewis A.</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Watson, Warren E.</u>	AQ	100			
<u>White, LeRoy</u>	PQ			25	
<u>White, Richard E.</u>	AQ	100			
<u>Cernas-Ortiz, Daniel</u>	AQ - Ph.D		25		
<u>Hite, Dwight</u>	AQ - Ph.D	25			
<u>Lau, Wai</u>	AQ - Ph.D		25		
<u>Lawani, Uyi</u>	AQ - Ph.D				
<u>Li, Zhen</u>	AQ - Ph.D	25			
<u>Madapusi, Arunkumar</u>	AQ - Ph.D	50			
<u>Niu, Kuei-Hsien (Jeff)</u>	AQ - Ph.D	50			
<u>Rogers, Pamela</u>	AQ - Ph.D	75			
<u>Russell, Lisa</u>	AQ - Ph.D		25		
<b>Management:</b>		<b>1750</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>25</b>

2600

$AQ/(AQ+PQ+O) \geq 50\%$  : 70.19%

$(AQ+PQ)/(AQ+PQ+O) \geq 90\%$  : 99.04%

$AQ-Ph.D/(AQ+AQ-Ph.D+PQ+O) \leq 10\%$  : 2.88%

**Marketing & Logistics :**

Faculty Name	Qualifications	% of Time Dedicated to the School's Mission			
		Acad	Acad - Ph.D	Prof	Other
Ames, Scott A.	PQ			100	
Blankson, Charles	AQ	100			
Chowdhury, Jhinuk	AQ	100			
Crawford, John C.	AQ	100			
Farris II, M. Theodore	AQ	100			
Gade, Michael	PQ			100	
Ganesh, Gopala	AQ	100			
Grabner, John	AQ	50			
Guzman, Francisco	AQ	100			
Hasty, Ronald W.	AQ	100			
Holmes, Gary	AQ	50			
Lewin, Jeffrey E.	AQ	100			
Manuj, Ila	AQ	100			
Morris, Richard	PQ			100	
Paswan, Audhesh Kumar	AQ	100			
Pelton, Lou E.	AQ	100			
Pohlen, Terrance L.	AQ	100			
Sager, Jeffrey Kenneth	AQ	100			
Savitz, Jeffrey	PQ			25	
Sivakumar, Soumya	AQ	100			
Spears, Nancy	AQ	100			
Strutton, H. David	AQ	100			
Swartz, Stephen M.	AQ	100			
Thompson, Kenneth Niel	AQ	100			
Treger, Mark	PQ			100	
Knipper, Michael	AQ - Ph.D		25		
Pentina, Iryna	AQ - Ph.D	50.0			
Selcuk, Ertekin	AQ - Ph.D		50		
Sun, Qin	AQ - Ph.D		25		
Ye, Lei (Lilly)	AQ - Ph.D	25			
<b>Marketing &amp; Logistics:</b>		<b>1975</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>0</b>

2500

**AQ/(AQ+PQ+O) [ $\geq 50\%$ ] :**

**83.00%**

**(AQ+PQ)/(AQ+PQ+O)**  
**[ $\geq 90\%$ ] :**

**100.00%**

**AQ-Ph.D/(AQ+AQ-Ph.D+PQ+O) [ $\leq 10\%$ ] :**

**4.00%**

## Table 2A

# Faculty Qualifications By Campus

**Table 10-2: Calculations Relative to Deployment  
of Qualified Faculty  
Spring 2008**

<b>Denton</b>				
Faculty Name (Click on faculty member to enter/view explanatory remarks - highlighted cells indicate saved remarks)	Qualifications	% of Time Dedicated to the School's Mission		
		Acad	Prof	Other
<a href="#">Annamalai, Danielle Cooper</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Atwood, Tammy Jean</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Baen, John S.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Ball, Jon</a>	PQ		50.0	
<a href="#">BarNir, Anat</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Becker, Jack D.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Bibb, Kyle</a>	PQ		25.0	
<a href="#">Blankson, Charles</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Braswell, Michael K.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Cain, April M.</a>	PQ		25.0	
<a href="#">Calhoun, Glo</a>	PQ		25.0	
<a href="#">Capan, Cengiz</a>	PQ		50.0	
<a href="#">Chandrasekaran, Perinkolam</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Chowdhury, Jhinuk</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Clay, Jr., Raymond J.</a>	PQ		100.0	
<a href="#">Cole, C. Steven</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Conover, James Allen</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Conover, Teresa</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Crawford, John C.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Curtis, Mary B.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Cutler, Ross</a>	PQ		100.0	
<a href="#">Dake, Jerry</a>	PQ		100.0	
<a href="#">Davis, Mark A.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">D'Souza, Derrick E.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Durham, James</a>	PQ		25.0	
<a href="#">Engler, Dennis</a>	PQ		50.0	
<a href="#">Evangelopoulos, Nicholas</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Farris II, M. Theodore</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Foster, Charles M.</a>	Neither AQ/PQ			100.0
<a href="#">Frost, Carol</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Furst, Jack</a>	PQ		25.0	
<a href="#">Gade, Michael</a>	PQ		100.0	
<a href="#">Ganesh, Gopala</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Goodwin, Vicki L.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Grabner, John</a>	AQ	50.0		
<a href="#">Graves, Oliver Finley</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Guttery, Randall S.</a>	AQ	100.0		

**Table 10-2: Calculations Relative to Deployment  
of Qualified Faculty  
Spring 2008**

<i>Denton</i>				
Faculty Name (Click on faculty member to enter/view explanatory remarks - highlighted cells indicate saved remarks)	Qualifications	% of Time Dedicated to the School's Mission		
		Acad	Prof	Other
<a href="#">Guynes, Carl Stephen</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Guzman, Francisco</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Hale, Rusty</a>	PQ		25.0	
<a href="#">Hasty, Ronald W.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">He, Min (Enya)</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Hodges, Joe</a>	PQ		25.0	
<a href="#">Holmes, Gary</a>	AQ	50.0		
<a href="#">Hubbard, Joan</a>	PQ		100.0	
<a href="#">Hutchison, Paul D.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Huzdovich, James</a>	PQ		50.0	
<a href="#">Impson, Michael</a>	Neither AQ/PQ			100.0
<a href="#">Insley, Robert</a>	PQ		100.0	
<a href="#">Jayakumar, Maliyakal D.</a>	Neither AQ/PQ			100.0
<a href="#">Jensen, Bradley K.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Johnson, J. Lynn</a>	PQ		100.0	
<a href="#">Jones, Mary Callie</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Kappelman, Leon Allan</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Karafiath, Imre</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Kensinger, John W.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Knipper, Mike</a>	AQ	25.0		
<a href="#">Koh, Chang</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Kulkarni, Shailesh</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Kuo, Ching-Chung</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Kuykendall, April</a>	PQ		25.0	
<a href="#">Kvanli, Alan H.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Lapointe, Fred P.</a>	PQ		25.0	
<a href="#">Ledgerwood, Donna E.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Lewin, Jeffrey E.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Lillie, Nancy G. Boyd</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">MacDonald, Don N.</a>	PQ		100.0	
<a href="#">Manuj, Ila</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Mayper, Alan</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">McCormick, Gary P.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">McDonald, James L.</a>	PQ		100.0	
<a href="#">McDonald, Sharmila</a>	PQ		100.0	
<a href="#">Menge, Jennifer</a>	PQ		50.0	
<a href="#">Merino, Barbara D.</a>	AQ	100.0		

**Table 10-2: Calculations Relative to Deployment  
of Qualified Faculty  
Spring 2008**

<b>Denton</b>				
Faculty Name (Click on faculty member to enter/view explanatory remarks - highlighted cells indicate saved remarks)	Qualifications	% of Time Dedicated to the School's Mission		
		Acad	Prof	Other
<a href="#">Merki, Mark</a>	PQ		25.0	
<a href="#">Miles, Grant E.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Morris, Richard</a>	PQ		100.0	
<a href="#">Muniz, Elizabeth</a>	AQ	25.0		
<a href="#">Paswan, Audhesh Kumar</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Pavur, Robert J.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Peak, Daniel</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Pelton, Lou E.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Pitre, Evelyn</a>	Neither AQ/PQ			25.0
<a href="#">Poe, Stephen L.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Pohlen, Terrance L.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Ponthieu, Louis D.</a>	PQ		100.0	
<a href="#">Powell, James D.</a>	PQ		100.0	
<a href="#">Prybutok, Victor R.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Radnik, Lydia</a>	PQ		12.5	
<a href="#">Raman, K. K.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Reyna, Miquel</a>	PQ		25.0	
<a href="#">Richards, Thomas</a>	AQ	50.0		
<a href="#">Roden, Peyton Foster</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Ryan, Sherry D.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Sager, Jeffrey Kenneth</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Salimath, Manjula S.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Savitz, Jeffrey</a>	PQ		50.0	
<a href="#">Sexton, Sidney Michael</a>	PQ		50.0	
<a href="#">Siddiqi, Mazhar</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Sidorova, Anna</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Spears, Nancy</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Spence, Jimmy W.</a>	Neither AQ/PQ			100.0
<a href="#">Staff, Marcia J.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Stodnick, T. Michael</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Strutton, H. David</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Stucky, Alan</a>	PQ		25.0	
<a href="#">Swartz, Stephen M.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Taylor, III, Lewis A.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Terrell, Thomas</a>	PQ		25.0	
<a href="#">Thompson, Kenneth Niel</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Tripathy, Niranjan</a>	AQ	100.0		



**Table 10-2: Calculations Relative to Deployment  
of Qualified Faculty  
Spring 2008**

<i>Denton</i>				
Faculty Name (Click on faculty member to enter/view explanatory remarks - highlighted cells indicate saved remarks)	Qualifications	% of Time Dedicated to the School's Mission		
		Acad	Prof	Other
<a href="#">Vedder, Richard G.</a>	Both AQ/PQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Vineyard, Ramona (Mona)</a>	PQ		25.0	
<a href="#">Watson, Warren E.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Welch, Russell</a>	PQ		50.0	
<a href="#">Wells, Brenda P.</a>	PQ		100.0	
<a href="#">White, LeRoy</a>	PQ		25.0	
<a href="#">White, Richard E.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Wilner, Neil</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Windsor, John C.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Winslow, Barry</a>	PQ		25.0	
<a href="#">Winson-Geideman, Kimberly</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Wu, Yu</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Zimmermann, Harvey</a>	PQ		100.0	
		7600	2312.5	425

$AQ/(AQ+PQ+O)^{[>=50\%]}$  : **73.52%**  
 $(AQ+PQ)/(AQ+PQ+O)^{[>=90\%]}$  : **95.89%**

**Table 10-2: Calculations Relative to Deployment  
of Qualified Faculty  
Spring 2008**

<i>Dallas</i>				
Faculty Name (Click on faculty member to enter/view explanatory remarks - highlighted cells indicate saved remarks)	Qualifications	% of Time Dedicated to the School's Mission		
		Acad	Prof	Other
<a href="#">Altman, Barbara</a>	PQ		100.0	
<a href="#">Ames, Scott A.</a>	PQ		100.0	
<a href="#">Brown, Steven F.</a>	AQ	25.0		
<a href="#">Calhoun, Glo</a>	PQ		25.0	
<a href="#">Capan, Cengiz</a>	PQ		50.0	
<a href="#">Carter, Michael</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">D'Souza, Derrick E.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Elam, Dennis</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Forgey, Fred A.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Foster, Charles M.</a>	Neither AQ/PQ			100.0
<a href="#">Friesen, Daniel</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Goktan, Ayse Banu</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Guzman, Francisco</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Hale, Rusty</a>	PQ		25.0	
<a href="#">Impson, Michael</a>	Neither AQ/PQ			100.0
<a href="#">Insley, Robert</a>	PQ		100.0	
<a href="#">Johnson, J. Lynn</a>	PQ		100.0	
<a href="#">Kromer, Jeffrey</a>	PQ		25.0	
<a href="#">Kvanli, Alan H.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Ledgerwood, Donna E.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Olson, Robin</a>	PQ		25.0	
<a href="#">Roden, Peyton Foster</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Sivakumar, Soumya</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Smith, Alan</a>	PQ		50.0	
<a href="#">Staff, Marcia J.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Treger, Mark</a>	PQ		50.0	
<a href="#">Watson, Warren E.</a>	AQ	100.0		
		1,325.0	650.0	200.0

**AQ/(AQ+PQ+O) [ $\geq 50\%$ ] :** **60.92%**

**(AQ+PQ)/(AQ+PQ+O) [ $\geq 90\%$ ] :** **90.81%**

**Table 10-2: Calculations Relative to Deployment  
of Qualified Faculty  
Spring 2008**

<i>Frisco</i>				
Faculty Name (Click on faculty member to enter/view explanatory remarks - highlighted cells indicate saved remarks)	Qualifications	% of Time Dedicated to the School's Mission		
		Acad	Prof	Other
<a href="#">Cole, C. Steven</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Evangelopoulos, Nicholas</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Pelton, Lou E.</a>	AQ	100.0		
<a href="#">Wilner, Neil</a>	AQ	100.0		
		400.0		

$AQ/(AQ+PQ+O)^{[>=50\%]}$  : 100.00%  
 $(AQ+PQ)/(AQ+PQ+O)^{[>=90\%]}$  : 100.00%