College of Business
COLLEGE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
December 19, 2012
MINUTES

Members:
Garrey Carruthers, Chair, Dean and Vice President for Economic Development
Kathy Brook, Assec Dean for Academics; Kevin Boberg, Assec Dean for Research; Andrea Tawney, Asst Dean for Development and Public Relations; Kevin Melendrez, Dept Head, ACCT/IS; Rick Adkisson, Dept Head, ECON/IB/ESTAT; Liz Ellis, Dept Head, FIN; Steve Elias, Dept Head, MGT; Pookie Sautter, Dept Head, MKTG; Chris Erickson, Faculty Council Representative; Janet Green, School of HRTM; Gena Bermudez, assistant to the dean.

Absent: G., Bermudez, K. Boberg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Description and Follow Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Review of minutes of Nov 28 and tracking tool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Updates and Announcements – G. Carruthers</td>
<td>The deans will meet with Provost Jordan tomorrow for lunch and will discuss a number of issues including the status of the Graduate School and the College of Extended Learning, possible redistribution of overhead and distance ed funds, the implementation of entrepreneurial models for distance ed and summer teaching, enrollment management and the role of the colleges, and STEM programs in the funding formula. In addition, the dean is meeting with the provost on Friday and will be discussing some college-related issues. Dean Carruthers noted that Provost Jordan is modifying the process for the dean’s evaluation to include no more than the survey form that was previously distributed in the college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Meetings with the Provost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Disturbing Behavior by Students in Classes</td>
<td>A recent student issue involving an angry and excessive response to a grade was discussed along with more generally inappropriate communications from students to faculty members. Two recent cases have been turned over to the Dean of Students. Both cases involved courses with significant online instruction and it was observed that the anonymity associated with online instruction may allow students to respond excessively. One question was whether we as faculty members have the authority to penalize this kind of behavior when it occurs as part of a class. (The behavior was referred to the Dean of Students who is responsible for dealing with non-academic misconduct.) <strong>Excessive/disturbing/threatening student behavior will be placed on the convocation agenda.</strong> Pookie Sautter will talk with the Dean of Students about the general topic and the dean will contact Dario Silva for advice on dealing with such situations. Janet Green noted that there had been a situation in ACES where a student was suspended from campus for a while because of disturbing behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Development and Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hall of Fame</td>
<td>Andrea welcomed input on selections of people/businesses to be honored at the upcoming Hall of Fame event. While it seems appropriate for a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Research- K. Boberg</td>
<td>Dean Carruthers reported on behalf of Kevin that we may be getting a small NSF I-Corps grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Academic and other issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convocation topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy distributed a list of items for possible discussion at the January college convocation. One item is a reminder to faculty concerning the need to complete consulting forms as well as conflict of interest forms. This topic raised a number of questions including whether weekend consulting counts against the consulting allowance of one day per week. Kathy indicated that she would like department heads who are approving conflict of interest forms to be prepared to say whether the faculty member’s consulting has been approved. Another question was whether the consulting form is required. <strong>Kathy will look at the Policy Manual on this subject.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another topic for brief discussion is the feedback we received from the AACSB peer review team. The team report may have already been distributed to faculty but we have not yet identified who should follow up on the items that need to be addressed by the time of the next visit. <strong>Kathy (for Business) and Kevin (for Accounting) should prepare a couple of slides for convocation concerning our successes and our challenges based on the team report.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy plans to distribute at convocation some data on MBA students. She would welcome suggestions concerning the type of data to be presented. Chris Erickson noted that since the enrollments have declined he has observed better performance in his class. It might also be useful to remind the faculty that funding was requested last spring so that an MBA director could be hired; unfortunately we did not receive funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pilot Program to Streamline MBA Prerequisites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There was a brief discussion of the Graduate Committee’s approval of a pilot project to streamline the prerequisites for the MBA program. It was noted that material could be covered in less time since it would not be necessary to spoon feed students and less repetition would be required for graduate students. In addition, this proposal is not unlike our old approach to teaching MBA prerequisites using two credit courses numbered at the 500-level. It is up to the departments to determine what needs to be covered with the goal being to prepare students for the MBA program. We have always offered multiple pathways for students to satisfy the prerequisites (such as taking an undergraduate course at NMSU or elsewhere or a challenge exam). This would be one more method. Chris reminded the group that he has taught such a course for WSMR and that he was quite satisfied with the outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Program Task Force Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean Carruthers (who had left the meeting at this point) has asked Kathy whether the task force report (at the bottom of these minutes) should be discussed at convocation. This led to a discussion of what we want to do</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with the report along with references to the recent Graduate Education External Review. The consensus was to ask each of the graduate programs to meet before the end of January after reading the task force report and the report from the external review. The goal of these meetings is for each program to provide a vision and a five year plan for increasing the quality and stature of the program. Included should be a timeline and identification of the top three actionable items to implement the plan. We should consider what can be done with existing resources and what could be done with more resources (amount of resources and the timeline).

- MBA orals

Issues relating to the MBA orals have come up a number of times in the past two years starting with a decision by the Graduate Committee in December 2010 to discuss some of the issues with the faculty as a whole. There was some discussion in January 2011 but, from the convocation minutes, no action was taken and the intent was for the Graduate Committee to come back with a proposal. Issues include: composition of the orals committee, availability of the written report prior to the oral exam, differences in the operation of the MBA orals committees compared with other orals committees (e.g. no committee member serves the functions performed by the dean’s representative in terms of handling paperwork and no discussion among the committee members at the conclusion of the oral exam). It was agreed that we should establish a task force of interested faculty to bring forth recommendations on the issues. Kathy will draft a statement of the issues and a specific charge for the task force for review at the next meeting.

- Assessment

Kevin Melendrez reported that Sherry Mills does not want to continue in the assessment coordinator position. On behalf of CEC he will ask Sherry to write up a statement concerning where the college is with assessment and what she thinks needs to happen in the future. After that CEC can meet with her as needed and make a determination of how to proceed.

Liz Ellis asked whether Renee Brown might be brought into the discussion since she has been very helpful in organizing assessment materials on the web page. Kathy will follow up on this.

6. Other

Action/follow-up items are in bold.
Report of Graduate Program Task Force (submitted to Dean Carruthers 9/27/2012)

During the spring 2012 semester Rick Adkisson was charged with assembling a taskforce including the directors of all of the graduate programs in the NMSU College of Business. The group met at 12:00 noon, on Wednesday, February 29, 2012 in BC 246. The charge was discussed and the election of a chair was attempted. Because several of the participants were already involved in university level discussions of the same topic and accreditation activities it was impossible to find a real chair. Therefore the bottom of the barrel was scraped and Rick Adkisson agreed to chair the process.

On March 13, 2012, the e-mail below was sent by Rick Adkisson to Carl Enomoto, Robert Steiner, Michael Hyman, Bonnie Daily, Tom McGuckin, Carlo Mora, and Cindy Seipel. It was copied to Kathy Brook, Garrey Carruthers and the Department Heads.

Colleagues,

As I said I would I followed up with Kathy and Garrey to see what the actual charge for our group is. Please see below.

You will recall that Garrey is interested in expanding our graduate programs. He has publicly suggested specific levels of growth (see attached). Garrey is trying to come up with a plan to accomplish this in the next few years (by 2016) and needs faculty input. He realizes it will take resources. At this point we don’t know where the resources will come from, perhaps from differential tuition, but I don’t think it is our task to worry about that right now. That’s his job.

What we need to do, for each of our programs, is to identify what will be required to meet the numerical goals suggested in the attached file by 2016. It seems like a multidimensional question. I suggest that we begin by answering the following for each of our graduate programs.

1. How much (if any) can we expand our graduate enrollments with current resources (IE if we have capacity but not enough qualified applicants)
2. What additional resources would be required to achieve the objectives (faculty lines?, Assistantships?, teaching loads?, etc)?

I also propose that we impose three constraints on our deliberations.

1. That quality be at least maintained, perhaps increased.
2. That we consider the ethics of program expansion (IE, are we doing this for us or for the students?, will the students we produce have genuine prospects for employment?, does expanding our programs serve NMSU’s and the College’s broad mission?, etc).
3. That we aim to finish by the end of the spring 2012 semester.

Perhaps others have suggestions too. I think it is important that we avoid scope creep so let’s decide early what we need and produce it without drifting to things outside of our influence.

Think about it. Provide feedback if you want. Eventually we will meet again.

Rick
4. Increase graduate degree offerings by one and increase current graduate program enrollments as follows:

- Ph. D. in Management from 14 to 20
- Ph. D. in Marketing from 8 to 16
- Doctorate in Economic Development from 24 to 30
- MBA from 220 to 320
- Master of Arts in Economics from 24 to 40
- Master of Accountancy from 47 to 60
- Master of Science in Applied Statistics from 10 to 20
- Add a Master of Health Administration jointly with the College of Health and Social Services.

The following are the responses I received. They are listed by Program.

---

Response from Marketing Ph.D. provided by Mike Hyman and Pookie Sautter.

1. How much (if any) can we expand our graduate enrollments with current resources (IE if we have capacity but not enough qualified applicants)

I believe the target of 16 Ph.D. students in Marketing is obtainable eventually. Although it’s always advisable to argue for more resources assuming you’ll receive less resources than requested, the quality of the program would be compromised meaningfully unless the Marketing Department could retain all current lines plus receive Kelly Tian’s old line. In essence, the department would need to return to its 2011 strength at a minimum.

I think 12 may be a better target that gives us growth without jeopardizing best placement for our students. If a target of 12 is taken rather than 16, I think one additional faculty line would suffice beyond our current hire. Obviously it would also reduce the number of assistantships needed.

1. What additional resources would be required to achieve the objectives (faculty lines?, Assistantships?, teaching loads?, etc)?

The only major financial roadblock is assistantships. The roughly $21k we now offer isn’t competitive—which means we often must recruit local/captive students—and we’ve only enough...
assistantships to cover eight students. To maintain current quality—which we believe requires full-time students who are not employed in any capacity other than as a GA or TA—we’d need eight more assistantships. To be truly competitive, we’d need those assistantships funded at more than $21k.

MKTG plans to admit 6 in Fall 2013 rather than 8 with the guarantee that we get the 2 unfilled back in the Fall 2015 plus an additional 4 to then admit another class of 6 (bringing total enrollment to 50% increase with 12 students). To meet the target of 16 we would need 6 more assistantships Fall 2015 with finally 2 more in Fall of 2016 (total of 16 enrollments requiring 8 new assistantships).

If the total enrollment is 12, then we would ultimately need 1 more faculty line (total of 10 tenure track lines excluding Kevin’s line). This would allow for 1 dedicated to dept head, 2-3 for untenured faculty (none of which would be chairing dissertations). With a target of 16, we would need two more tenure track lines.

- Maintenance of 2/2 teaching load though we can balance that with an expectation for publishing productivity and/or dissertation chairing roles (e.g., keep 2/2 assuming they produce 1-2 PRJ in previous year and/or are AQ and chairing a dissertation for one year)

I also propose that we impose three constraints on our deliberations.

1. That quality be at least maintained, perhaps increased.

As faculty-student contact time is a major factor in our program’s quality, doubling the student-teacher ratio will make maintenance of quality difficult. However, I believe it can be accomplished (although my department colleagues may be otherwise; thus, I may be in the minority).

2. That we consider the ethics of program expansion (IE, are we doing this for us or for the students?, will the students we produce have genuine prospects for employment?, does expanding our programs serve NMSU’s and the College’s broad mission?, etc).

We wouldn’t consider expanding the program unless we were certain that such expansion wasn’t ethically problematic.

3. That we aim to finish by the end of the spring 2012 semester.

OK.

Response from Economics, M.A. provided by Carl Enomoto.

Here are my comments:

1. It is difficult to expand the program with current resources. Most students who inquire about our masters program want to know if there are assistantships available. We have only 7 (10-hour assistantships) for 24-27 masters students. I now tell students that they must have their own funds to complete the program.

2. To achieve the objectives we need more faculty lines, more assistantships, and reduced course loads.

I also agree that quality should be maintained. We should not lower our admission standards.
I also think that the reason behind this push for increased enrollments is not for the benefit of the students. They benefit by having smaller class sizes and more one-on-one attention from faculty.

---

**Response from Applied Statistics, M.S. provided by Robert Steiner**

Here is my info regarding graduate task force:

1. Our big bottle-neck is having faculty who will serve as major advisor. We usually have 5 to 7 students in the first year and 5 - 7 in second year. We also have 1 to 3 stragglers from previous cohorts who have finished coursework but not finished the project. So in the 2nd year, if we have 6 students needing project advisors then I usually have 2 students and the others are spread throughout the other faculty. Many of my colleagues have really helped with the project advising!

   As you know the MS project takes a lot of time in editing, directing the reading for the new topic, writing SAS or R simulations, weekly meetings, and more.

   We cannot increase the enrollment much now and still have a reasonable student to advisor ratio.

2. Also the assistantships are vital to attracting students. It does occur that a strong applicant will not choose our program because our 10 hour level of funding cannot compete with other offers.

On the positive side, more 10 hour assistantships would allow us to increase our MS enrollment. We usually have 2 or 3 students (out of 12 - 14) who do not require funding.

---

**Response from Accounting, MAcc provided by Cindy Seipel**

What we need to do, for each of our programs, is to identify what will be required to meet the numerical goals suggested in the attached file by 2016. It seems like a multidimensional question. I suggest that we begin by answering the following for each of our graduate programs.

0. How much (if any) can we expand our graduate enrollments with current resources (IE if we have capacity but not enough qualified applicants) – I can go to about upper 40s with the current resources. When we were in the mid 50s, We needed another class. Bill Foster taught a class for us on a one time basis to pick up some of the students.

1. What additional resources would be required to achieve the objectives (faculty lines?, Assistantships?, teaching loads?, etc)?

   ✓ In order to go to 60 like the dean wants, I would need to find quality students. We are doing a couple of things to bring in more students currently: (1) Kevin Melendrez and I have gone to the Acct 301 classes to inform the students of the benefits of the MAcc program and to catch the students before they are too far in the process of double or triple majoring in order to pick up the required 150 hours for the CPA certification and (2) we are going to decide in the fall whether to extend our GMAT waiver to those high GPA undergraduates in Acct from other AACSB institutions. We probably could place all of good students, especially minority students, who are willing to locate outside of Las Cruces

   ✓ Like I said, if we get to 50 some students again, we need another MAcc class.

   ✓ There probably should be some money for the MAcc Director for summer support if the program grows to and stays at 60ish. The rewards in the system currently do not support putting that much time into the program for the Director.
1. How much (if any) can we expand our graduate enrollments with current resources (IE if we have capacity but not enough qualified applicants)

The DED is already near the size specified in the PowerPoint attachment. It is this large primarily because Arrowhead center and others have been able to hire many of the students as graduate assistantships. The program has been running on a shoestring, supported in large part by temporary funds granted too late to allow the funds to be used for recruiting or to allow planning of any sort. It will be necessary to have permanent funds for assistantships and other programming if the program is to be maintained, let alone expand.

The College of Business provided substantial help when it reallocated approximately four assistantships to the DED. The use of temporary money and the cooperation of folks with grant money has helped keep the program alive but it is a bit of a house of cards. If the temporary/grant funding disappears, the program is likely to collapse. Permanent assistantship finding in an amount appropriate to the size of the program would allow more purposeful in recruiting students which would help the programs long-term prospects.

2. What additional resources would be required to achieve the objectives (faculty lines?, Assistantships?, teaching loads?, etc)?

As mentioned above, permanent assistantship funds (perhaps at least 10-12 total) would help stabilize the program and allow the funds to be used for recruiting. Past experience suggests that these funds could continue to be supplemented by grant funding and other sources.

Adding the DED program increased the number of courses that the Department must staff. This has decreased teaching capacity in other areas. Meanwhile it is difficult for faculty members to find the time to work closely with the DED students on their research. In order to maintain/increase quality, even at the current size of the program two more faculty members should be added. They would not have to directly participate in the DED (although it would be useful). The new faculty members could fill in some of the areas from which people were diverted to support the DED.

At a minimum the faculty actively involved in the DED should have their teaching loads reduced to 3-2 and the most active probably deserve a 2-2 load.

Response from Master of Business Administration provided by Kathy Brook

1. How much (if any) can we expand our graduate enrollments with current resources (IE if we have capacity but not enough qualified applicants)

Since we have been handling far more MBA students than the current 158, I would guess that we have some capacity for expansion currently. One of our constraints in offering remote site programs has been the change in funding associated with vacant lines. Now that we are able to retain some of the funding we might well be able to fund at least one new cohort on our own.

As to the deans numbers, we would need to get back to 220 MBA students before we go for 320. My guess is that 220 is a better target.
Probably our ability to expand the MBA program is dependent on our willingness to consider alternative delivery systems. I think we are the ones who opted to go from fully face to face to other forms of delivery on the remote site programs. I am in favor of exploring, in particular, synchronous delivery using technology.

Developing a main campus cohort also seems to me to be a reasonable idea to explore.

2. What additional resources would be required to achieve the objectives (faculty lines?, Assistantships?, teaching loads?, etc)?

The question of faculty lines is difficult to answer in isolation from the other graduate programs. I am guessing that since we served 185 students a year ago we could serve that many without more faculty lines. We might, however, need some overload funds. These are questions that are better addressed with input from your fellow department heads, especially Steve.

I also propose that we impose three constraints on our deliberations.

4. That quality be at least maintained, perhaps increased.
5. That we consider the ethics of program expansion (IE, are we doing this for us or for the students?, will the students we produce have genuine prospects for employment?, does expanding our programs serve NMSU’s and the College’s broad mission?, etc).
6. That we aim to finish by the end of the spring 2012 semester.

It seems to me that expansion of master’s programs in the College of Business serves the university’s and college’s missions and that we do not have an ethical issue in expanding these programs.

No Response from Management Ph.D.