

Kelce College of Business
Faculty Meeting
Thursday, May 10, 2012
8:00 a.m., 121 Kelce

Present: Linden Dalecki, Lynn Murray, Kristen Maceli, Dwight Strong, Thomas Box, Jack Fay, James Harris, Don Baack, Kevin Bracker, June Freund, Chuck Fischer, Mike McKinnis, Melvin Roush, Anil Lal, Kailash Chandra, David O’Bryan, Becky Casey, Mike Muoghalu, Sang-Heui Lee, Jay van Wyk, Connie Shum, Maeve Cummings, Mary Wachter, Wei Sha, Choong Lee, Art Fischer, Din Cortes, Mary Polfer, Gail Yarick, Suzanne Hurt, Shipra Paul, Eric Harris, Paul Grimes

Absent: Becky Heath, Ken Smith, Chris Fogliasso (medical leave)

Dr. Grimes opened the meeting and made announcements:

1. There is a problem with mice in the building – faculty were asked to not keep food in their offices over the semester break and when no one is around.
2. Will break at 9:25 for faculty to go start finals and have a reception for honorees.
3. The plan today is to work through discussion on assessing where the Kelce College stands relative to AACSB standards.
 - a. Need to discuss what we do with findings relative to the standards.
 - b. Next year is the year of record for AACSB.

Team 1 Mission (Standards 1, 2, 3)

Team Members: Don Baack, Maeve Cummings, Chuck Fischer, Chris Fogliasso (chair)

Standard 1 Mission Statement (Level 4)

- Periodically review mission statement and strategic plan
 - Management measurable – have reviewed and updated the mission statement
 - Recommendation is to move review the mission statement regularly (put it on the calendar) – no less than once every 5 years

Standard 2 Mission Appropriateness (Level 4)

- Alignment between the mission of Kelce and PSU
 - Management measurable – aligned w/mission of PSU
 - Recommendation is to periodically add this review to the calendar

Standard 3 Student Mission (Level 3)

- Mission policies consistent with the mission statements of PSU
 - Management measurable – need to tap into university resources to make sure we’re serving student needs effectively – data mine institutional research databases

- Summary – in good shape with the Mission statement – but review every 3-5 years
- Discussion
 - May need to revise the mission statement to change its direction
 - Make a decision when the mission statement will be revised (add to the college bylaws)

Team 2 Admissions and Retention (Standards 6 & 7)

Team Members: Kevin Bracker (chair), Suzanne Hurt, Shipra Paul, Mary Polfer

Standard 6 Student Admission (Level 3)

- Recommendations to change admissions policy are underway
- Need to regularly review – every 4 years
- Discussion on current admission procedures/requirements for Kelce
 - Suzanne will provide a copy of the admission letter that goes to the students and will be discussed in KLT
 - Start w/e-mail notification to come sign code of ethics, then receive a hard copy letter
 - Might include the statement of ethics with admission letter
 - Might try to make the letter of admission more outstanding for the students
 - Would like to have more students sign the Student Code of Ethics

Standard 7 Student Retention (Level 3)

- Recommendations
 - New long-term electronic academic plan
 - Increase availability of tutor support in key CBK classes
 - Tutor services have been under-utilized
 - Courses with tutors will be listed each semester in the office of Academic Advising
 - Faculty should include info about tutors on syllabus if there is a tutor for this class
 - Need to have tutors in some statistics courses
 - Need space for tutoring
 - Use data from item 2 to monitor the effectiveness of our efforts
 - Office of Academic Advising is tracking this data
 - Will evaluate retention every 4 years
 - Academic plan is being developed with OIS and will be available on GUS
 - User friendly for students – electronic
 - Will build in classes that are only available in certain semesters

- Will help students map out timelines
 - Will help with class scheduling in the long-term
- Discussion followed on summer school and funding – on-line classes are the suggested format for summer

Team 3 Budget and Personnel (Standards 5, 8, 9)

Team Members: Art Fischer, David O’Bryan (chair), Ken Smith, Gail Yarick

Standard 9 Faculty Sufficiency (Level 3) - participating (full-time) and supporting (adjuncts) faculty

- Level 3 rating – could easily be level 4-5
- 60-75% of overall faculty need to be participating – currently at 80%
- Main recommendation is to keep a close eye on this standard – check each semester and make projections for the future
- Discussion
 - Should be monitored each year
 - Calendar item for KLT to check for compliance
 - Discussed justification for not being at a 4-5 level (The school employs tools that continuously monitor and evaluate faculty sufficiency....)

Standard 8 Staff Sufficiency Student Support (Level 4) - adequacy of student support activities – academic assistance, academic advising and career advising

- Need structure to bind all of these services together (committee to coordinate the three areas)
- Advising surveys for students are conducted each semester in GUS
- Make this a calendar item – share with office of Academic Advising. (advising surveys, assessment surveys)
- Need to close the loop on this standard

Standard 5 Financial Strategies (Level 2)

- Do not have a lot of room to develop financial strategies
 - OOE, Youngman, scholarship \$’s are the bright spots
- Challenge in the future is to re-direct gifts to give the college more independence rather than endowments which are restricted
- Suggestion to do a college-wide newsletter in which we can ask for unrestricted donations
- Other opportunity is to apply for grants, etc.
- This standard will not cost us accreditation – many things outside of our control

- Expand development efforts to secure discretionary funds – focus on endowed professorships and chairs for long-term security

Team 4 Faculty Issues (Standards 10, 11, 12)

Team Members: Thomas Box (chair), Jim Harris, Anil Lal, Dwight Strong

Standard 10 Faculty Qualifications (Level 3)

- Overall AQ rating is 72%
- Recommendation is that a process needs to be developed to define what type of PRJ is being filed in the Dean's office – empirical, conceptual or practitioner. The college needs to revisit the AQ/PQ standards
 - Each faculty member will be in which category their article is.
 - Faculty asked for an explanation of each article.
 - There is a database or depository available that would allow us to enter articles, vitas, etc. which would allow all of the information to be readily available for reports or other uses.
 - The cost is relatively inexpensive.
 - OIS is interested in setting up this type of system for the entire campus.
 - There are web based tools that draw info from the data base that could create faculty profiles.
 - KLT will look at this recommendation.

Standard 11 Faculty Management and Support (Level 3)

- Justification is that there are travel funds available for tenure track faculty and administrative assistants and work study students.
- Recommendation is that we need to develop a college-wide plan for faculty resource including those who are not on the tenure-track. Each department needs to develop a departmental standard for promotion and tenure.
 - Faculty need to be made aware of what funding is available for faculty travel, professional development, etc.
 - Promotion / Tenure documents for each department should be in place and up-to-date by next academic year. Departments will be working on these documents as assigned by the department chair. Must be in accordance with the union contract.
 - Need to update and create standards as appropriate

Standard 12 Aggregate Faculty and Staff Educational Responsibility (Level 2)

- Justification: expectations for students are included in the syllabus and related to the college mission.

- Recommendations: Instructional improvements and innovations should be reported on the annual faculty performance report.
- Long-term issues with classroom adequacy to support innovative teaching pedagogies and innovations – building concerns

Team 5 Responsibility (Standards 13, 14)

Team Members: June Freund, Becky Heath, Wei Sha (chair), Jay van Wyk

Standard 13 Individual Faculty Educational Responsibility (Level 3)

- Justification includes several areas of faculty development, committees, meetings, Youngman Grant, etc.
- Recommendations are that we need to improve current faculty development programs and to evaluate the effectiveness of these processes.
- Discussion
 - Canvas/Angel includes important information for students and could be utilized by more or all faculty to provide feedback to students in a prompt manner.
 - Faculty feedback is currently measured on the SPTE. SPTE use is tied to the union contract, and there is no way for COB to measure its effectiveness.
 - SPTE ratings should be used as a means of discussion between the Chair and the faculty member, and to be included on the faculty performance evaluation.
 - Discussion followed on the unreliability of the SPTE as a measure of teaching effectiveness.

Standard 14 Student Educational Responsibility (Level 3)

- Justification – SPTE's, LiveText, student organizations. Faculty expectations are clearly marked on syllabi.
- Recommendations: need to design formal and informal processes to monitor student learning deficiencies/problem areas. AACSB likes to see more group projects.
- Discussion
 - MFT results will help in providing information to the departments in terms of how the students are doing in different areas.
 - Timing/scheduling is a problem for students to do group projects and student organization meetings.
 - Suggestion to block one class period per week to schedule student meetings or faculty meetings.

Team 6 Curriculum (Standards 4, 15)

Team Members: Jack Fay (chair), Kristen Maceli, Mike McKinnis, Mary Wachter

Standard 4 Continuous Improvement Objectives (Level 3)

- Justification – assessment system is in place but results are not quantified. Student performance is assessed through Live Text. Faculty are not provided feedback
- Recommendations – faculty need access to assessment results and yearly review by the department chair so that improvements can be made
- Discussion:
 - Feedback loop will improve entire process

Standard 15 Management of Curricula (Level 2)

- Justification: Curricula include an appropriate set of learning experience to prepare graduates for careers
- Recommendations: Need timely feedback for courses being assessed in LiveText. Need a formal process for each dept to ensure that their department curriculum supports the mission statement.
- Discussion:
 - Need to determine exactly what our students need and what we can do to help our students get where they need to go.
 - There hasn't been much change to COB curriculum over the years. Need to take a good systematic look at the curriculum. This would be tied to the Mission statement and the strategic plan of the college.

Further discussion led by Dr. Eric Harris:

- Most of the steps in the feedback loop that was distributed came from the assessment conference that he attended in Houston.
- Inner circle pertains specifically to LiveText and learning goals.
- Feedback will be provided to faculty as soon as possible.
- Need to measure everything at least twice and close the loop at least once. Fall 2012, Spring 2013 & Fall 2013 semesters – everyone who is assigned to do LiveText needs to participate.
- Faculty involvement is essential for accreditation. “No swivel heads!”

Team 7 Learning Goals (Standards 16, 17)

Team Members: Kailash Chandra, Sang-Heui Lee, Lynn Murray (chair), Connie Shum

Standard 16 Undergraduate Learning Goals (Level 3)

- Justification: in the defined process stage. Some departmental and program learning goals need to be improved.
- Recommendation: Learning goals should occur and the program level. Better integration between programs.
 - Program goals will be subject to review by the university committee, and then will be used by the college.
 - HLC accreditation requires that we follow scheduled assessment plans.
 - Process is in place, but departmental and college plans are not in place at this time.
 - Assessment plans need to be developed at the program level. Will be due to Dean's from Chairs on 8/1 and will go to University Assessment Committee by 9/15.

Standard 17 Undergraduate Educational Level (Level 5)

- Justification: learning goals are accomplished. Structure appropriately.
- Recommendations: continue what we are doing to maintain level 5. Explore options for providing more opportunities for improvement of student writing required by the university, and strengthen the admission requirements of the COB.

Team 8 MBA Program Issues (Standards 18, 19, 20)

Team Members: Linden Dalecki (chair), Choong Lee, Mike Muoghalu, Melvin Roush

Standard 18 Master's Level General Management Learning Goals (Level 4)

- Justification: Assessment process at the MBA level is designed to generate qualitative and quantitative data.
- Recommendations: continue to refine the assessment process, and the MBA-PAC should continue to convene on a regular basis to discuss emergent issues and curriculum, etc.

Standard 19 Specialized Master's Degree Learning Goals (Level n/a)

- Not applicable – Kelce only offers MBA concentrations, not specialized degrees

Standard 20 Masters Educational Level (Level 4)

- Justification: programs are evaluated against mission and program objectives and results are used to make recommendations on graduate level.
- Recommendations: must continue to increase case-driven, simulation-driven and experiential learning driven courses. Move forward to streamline the core/foundation requirements so that it more closely approximates peer institution requirements.

Wrap-Up and Conclusions

Dr. Grimes stated that the working points from today's discussion will be distributed to faculty and used to create a roadmap for next year.

There will be many important updates included at the opening fall meeting, and will probably be a "working" meeting. In the future the college will probably schedule pre-semester and post-semester meetings.

The meeting concluded with lunch at 11:30.