
SMAC’s Review of the Strategic Management section of 5th year maintenance report using AACSB template as a guide for review 9-12-2011  http://business.nmsu.edu/administration/accreditation/fifth-year-report

SMAC was asked to review particular sections of the 5th year maintenance report that apply to issues of budget and strategy. First we will list the sections reviewed, and then get into comments, feedback, and suggestions.

MAIN REPORT SECTIONS REVIEWED
These items are available online at http://business.nmsu.edu/administration/accreditation/fifth-year-report

Section 1. Situational Analysis
- 5th Year Rept Section 1: Situational Analysis (Aug 30, 2011)
Section 2. Progress Update on Concerns from Previous Review
- 5th Year Rept Section 2: Progress Update (Aug 30, 2011)
Section 3. Strategic Management
- 5th Year Rept Section 3: Strategic Management (Aug 30, 2011)
- 5th Year Rept Section 3: Strategic Mgt Financial Strategies (Aug 30, 2011)

Our priority is to collect and collate comments of all SMAC members:

1. SECTION 1 items discussed at meeting: page 3 – The turnover of administration could be reframed, as we now have a President and Provost. However there are several new issues involving upper-administration that can be referenced. For example, the discretionary funds of the College of Business have been centralized, the authority of college deans is less that it was (e.g. deans submit travel requests, and meetings with Santa Fe legislators to central-administration approval, etc. together with the changes in the economy, the new policy changes have created more pressure on departments to compete for scarcer resources. This is a significant change, since for past five years departments were encouraged to cooperate for greater success of the College, and university. Competitiveness for dwindling budget (especially discretionary funds), faculty, and TA lines. Whereas, these were once decided more at the Dean’s level, that is no longer the case with the current administration.

2. Section 1 - The report states the number of administrators that we have, and then has a section on "Advantages and Disadvantages in Reputation, Resources, Sponsors, and Supporters". It would seem negligent to not clearly state the proportion of time that Dean Carruthers serves as Dean of the college, as he has responsibilities as VP for Economic Development.

   Section 1 - The report has a section on "Low faculty compensation" that discusses the attempt to bring salaries to the median of peers, and then indicates that due to a downturn in the economy only the first of the four salary increases was provided, thus continuing to leave faculty salaries significantly below the market median. It would seem apropos to indicate that, until recent years, raises for cost of living increase were common place for faculty performing at an acceptable level, but that this has not been given for several <insert actual number> years.

3. SECTION 2 – Progress update – Seems like this could benefit from a summary of the key points that have changed since 2008.

4. SECTION 3 – The mission lists “maintaining high academic standards resulting in a quality education.” At the last convocation, Dean Carruthers introduced a strategy of raising admission standards. SMAC discussed extending this to ‘requiring a C or better in calculus (currently not the norm), “departments can required certain grade performance in courses necessary to quality delivery of their core courses.’ Etc. It was also discussed, that given the apparent positive reception of increasing standards, trimming back the number of students enrolled, that this was something that could be addressed in the report. It could affect Goal 1 in particular, in that an added
fee would be charged for College of Business students. P. 2 – has the Dean’s role changed since LTV s no longer the upper-administration’s direction, given the successor to that approach that they have implemented. P. 3-4 – with regard to graduate student enrollment, at convocation the Dean indicated that a priority was to increase the enrollment in all graduate programs of the College. And in today’s email from the Dean, “Our inability to properly fund our graduate programs seems to be showing up in the numbers!”

5. Feedback for future goal changes: Sustainability strategies that are continuing at NMSU, and the College of Business role. I was going to put it in the last minutes, but was waiting on the report results. Now those are in, and I propose it makes sense to interpret some of the goals and action items of the College plan in ways that bring out some sort of sustainability effort. This is in keeping with the President’s strategy. Letter from President Couture [https://stars.aashe.org/media/secure/209/submission-272/NMSU%20AASHE%20STARS%20President%27s%20letter%209.7.2011.pdf](https://stars.aashe.org/media/secure/209/submission-272/NMSU%20AASHE%20STARS%20President%27s%20letter%209.7.2011.pdf) The new STARS report done by the Sustainability Council, extends from work done by faculty senate on the sustainability memorial. [http://www.nmsu.edu/atnmsu/cur/sustainabilitymemorial.html](http://www.nmsu.edu/atnmsu/cur/sustainabilitymemorial.html) You can see that NMSU succeeded in receiving a Bronze rating. [https://stars.aashe.org/institutions/new-mexico-state-university-nm/report/2011-09-07/](https://stars.aashe.org/institutions/new-mexico-state-university-nm/report/2011-09-07/) There is a role the College of Business can play in sustainability, in particular in Education and Research. We did well in identifying courses at NMSU that have some sustainability relevance. [http://sustainability.nmsu.edu/documents/sustainability-course-inventory-20091027.pdf](http://sustainability.nmsu.edu/documents/sustainability-course-inventory-20091027.pdf) (there are additional College of Business courses that can be listed). We have a ways to go in developing sustainability research, and other areas. These are the scores received: Education & Research

5.00 / 18.00
Points Claimed + Co-Curricular Education

```
+-----------------+---------------+---
| Credit | Status | Points |
|-----------------+---------------+---|
| ER-1: Student Sustainability Educators Program | -- | 0.00 / 5.00 |
| ER-2: Student Sustainability Outreach Campaign | -- | 0.00 / 5.00 |
| ER-3: Sustainability in New Student Orientation | -- | 0.00 / 2.00 |
| ER-4: Sustainability Outreach and Publications | ✓ | 4.00 / 4.00 |
| Tier2-1: Student Group | ✓ | 0.25 / 0.25 |
| Tier2-2: Organic Garden | -- | 0.00 / 0.25 |
| Tier2-3: Model Room in a Residence Hall | -- | 0.00 / 0.25 |
| Tier2-4: Themed Housing | -- | 0.00 / 0.25 |
| Tier2-5: Sustainable Enterprise | -- | 0.00 / 0.25 |
| Tier2-6: Sustainability Events | ✓ | 0.25 / 0.25 |
| Tier2-7: Outdoors Program | ✓ | 0.25 / 0.25 |
| Tier2-8: Themed Semester or Year | ✓ | 0.25 / 0.25 |
```

20.75 / 55.00
Points Claimed + Curriculum

```
+-----------------+---------------+---
| Credit | Status | Points |
|-----------------+---------------+---|
| ER-5: Sustainability Course Identification | ✓ | 3.00 / 3.00 |
| ER-6: Sustainability-Focused Courses | ✓ | 3.24 / 10.00 |
| ER-7: Sustainability-Related Courses | ✓ | 0.41 / 10.00 |
```

2
ER-8: Sustainability Courses by Department  
4.10 / 7.00

ER-9: Sustainability Learning Outcomes  
-- 0.00 / 10.00

ER-10: Undergraduate Program in Sustainability  
✓ 4.00 / 4.00

ER-11: Graduate Program in Sustainability  
✓ 4.00 / 4.00

ER-12: Sustainability Immersive Experience  
✓ 2.00 / 2.00

ER-13: Sustainability Literacy Assessment  
-- 0.00 / 2.00

ER-14: Incentives for Developing Sustainability Courses  
-- 0.00 / 3.00

0.00 / 27.00

Points Claimed + Research

6. P. 6 – What is the meaning of diversity in the university and College? It is our understanding that AACSB defines diversity more broadly, including the diversity of types of institutions from which faculty are educated. Does diversity also apply to faculty, staff, as well as to student composition?

7. Section 3 - Page 4, paragraph 2, states: "As all of NMSU’s community colleges participate in the articulation agreement this helps to assure consistent quality among “swirled” classes. The articulation group is also developing a common assessment process that will eventually provide an objective means of determining the quality of transferred courses. "Comment: I don’t think "objective" really describes the situation because there appear to be many more institutions that have instructors with lower education-levels, hence, the less educated instructors seem to have a greater voice in making decisions about what should be in the articulated courses. Frankly, this greatly concerns me. In my limited experience as the articulation liaison for the statistics course, I have been surprised at lack of statistical background the instructors have and by the methods of teaching that they believe are appropriate. I think we need to include this imbalance in representation as a concern. People with a Masters degree in statistics or, worse, a Masters degree in some other field, should not be making decisions about what should be in an articulated statistics class or even how it is taught, and yet they have the greater voice.

8. Section 3 – p. 5 - My main issue comes with two statements I think are much too strongly worded given the respective situations. The first was addressed by [comments] below and relates to the statement that the articulation is objective. The second one involves the statement that access has not come at the cost of quality on Section 3 page 5. I believe that is way too strong of a statement. I believe it definitely has. Also the examples do not support the concept of student learning, or outcomes in other words.

9. Section 3: Following up are additional comments, in Finance we just received some numerical results indicating that the average grade in FIN341 for students taking some (or all) prerequisites at the community colleges is quite a bit lower (not sure of statistical significance) than students taking prereqs on the main campus. I can share those results in our meeting today.

10. Section 3 - The "Resource Stewardship" Section discusses the evidence of success of hiring an assistant dean for development and public relations. In particular, it states as evidence the four endowed chairs that have been given since the last accreditation. The benefit of this position is largely questioned by faculty - maybe they just don't see what goes on, but the fact is that many faculty question the benefit. This "evidence" of the four chairs seems very questionable, and if it is going to be used and we don't want faculty balking at it when they are the visiting accreditation team speaks with them, we should probably state how the assistant dean for development and public relations had a role in obtaining *each* of these endowed chairs. I don't think faculty believe the assistant dean had much to do with obtaining them. This section also presents as "evidence" of success, the usage of gifts to the COB. This does not appear to be evidence of the how we are obtaining the gifts, only how they are used. Again, directly stating how the assistant dean helped in obtaining these gifts would be evidence.