CEC Work Sessions
Notes (Draft)
June 25-28, 2007

Allocation of SCH to Departments
Kathy Brook distributed copies of the memo that she sent to Jennifer Taylor and Mike Zimmerman asking that the BUSA SCH be distributed as follows: 50% of BUSA 111 to Accounting/IS and 50% to Economics/IB; one third of BUSA 365 to Accounting/IS, one third to Management and one third to Marketing; and 100% of BUSA 421 to Management. She also asked that AECC courses regularly taught by Economics be assigned to that department rather than to Ag Econ. Later in the week she submitted a list of cross-listed courses asking that the SCH be assigned to the department that normally teaches the course. Apparently the BUSA courses have been reassigned but allocation of the remaining courses is a topic of on-going discussion with Jennifer Taylor’s office.

Glen Yoquelet Scholarship
The college has funding in the amount of about $23,000 annually to provide scholarships to graduate students in the college who have financial need. Students will need to file the FAFSA in order to establish need. The funds for 2007-08 will be used to fund 8 scholarships with the award based on merit of the qualifying students. Kathy will draft a summary of the information to be distributed by departments to new and continuing graduate students so that the funds can be awarded as soon as possible.

HLC Questions for Deans
Kathy sought input on some questions posed to the deans in connection with the Higher Learning Commission self study currently under way. With respect to examples of shared governance, input from the Budget and Bylaws Committee on the weighting of current and past performance was offered as an example. With respect to the role of the Budget Committee, the following examples were suggested: input on budgeting of overhead returned to the college, BRR funds, uses of salary savings, allocation of summer money and spending in the deans office.

The deans were asked to identify significant changes in the past 10 years for the college and the university. Changes involving the college were: BUSA curriculum, technology, changes in AACSB standards, growth in graduate programs, development of Arrowhead Center and retirements and hiring of new faculty. For the university, the following items were mentioned: the lottery scholarship, growth of the community colleges, distance education, more customer oriented approaches to students, competition for students, assessment, the broadening definition of scholarship, the faculty position review process, and the new focus on SCH in allocating resources.

Strengths of the college are: faculty dedication to students and student learning, the level of technology and technical support including ITAL, the ability to retain faculty through our culture and atmosphere, and diversity of the student body. Strengths of the university are technical support including ITAL and WebCT, diversity of the student body and the collegial atmosphere.

Challenges we face are: low salaries, retaining students, providing leveling courses for freshmen, establishing a relationship with new freshmen, deteriorating physical plant for teaching and research, inability to fund current technology, low funding (through the formula) for business courses, incentives for funded research, lack of funding for software for research, lack of student preparation for college level work.

The college’s commitment to first year students is reflected in our work with students on probation, the offering of UNIV 150 for business students, efforts to encourage participation in student organizations, moving students into majors as freshmen, department outreach to new freshmen, Business Advisory Council speakers in classes.
Our commitment to assessment is indicated by department activities relating to assessment, our recognition by Quality New Mexico for the MBA program, the input of advisory councils such as those in Accounting, Information Systems, Business Advisory Council, Insurance and the Public Utility Center. We also conduct surveys of graduates in Accounting and the MBA program and we have extensively assessed some of the BBA core courses.

**Expectations of Ethical Behavior**

AACSB requires that colleges provide a statement of ethical expectations for students, faculty and administrators. Larry Tunnell has located the relevant materials in the Policy Manual and in the student handbook. It was agreed that it would be useful to have a short statement of standards similar to those that other business colleges have drafted. In the fall this task will be assigned to a faculty committee with input to be provided by the student Business Council or by the individual student organizations in the college. As part of the discussion, several recent student issues were discussed including the possibility of sharing information about best practices in student group work.

**Employee Management and Training**

The college has been asked to provide a representative to participate in discussions this summer of training to be offered to faculty and staff starting in the fall. Tony Popp agreed to participate with back up from Liz Ellis and/or Jerry Hampton.

**COGNOS Reports**

Kathy distributed copies of several drafts of COGNOS reports relating to retention and time to degree completion and obtained input from department heads on the usefulness of these reports. Rather than writing a lot of reports in response to individual requests, the university is trying to make data more broadly available in formats that can be used across the campus.

**New Faculty Positions**

Requests for new faculty positions (round 2) will be due on July 15. The college will be supporting the request of Ag Econ and Ag Business for a position for the DED program. In addition, the college will request positions in Management (OB, leadership, entrepreneurship), BLAW, and Marketing and will possibly request funding for an executive-in-residence.

**College Strategic Plan**

Much of the focus of the week’s work sessions was on development of a strategic plan, since this must be the cornerstone of the college’s maintenance of accreditation efforts. A draft of the plan, as developed by CEC, will be circulated soon with opportunities for faculty and staff as well as the Business Advisory Council to provide input. The draft contains goals, objectives and action items.

Two items that remain to be addressed are identification of challenges to the college as well as priority action items for the coming year.

In addition to discussion of the action plan, there was discussion of the college’s maintenance of accreditation report which is being drafted by Kathy. It, too, will be available soon.

**Quality Issues**

In recent years there has been discussion of the quality of the MBA program. In reviewing this issue a distinction was drawn between the quality of the students admitted to the program and the quality of the program itself. Some concerns have been expressed by faculty about the pilot project with WSMR involving admission of students without the GMAT and without the usual prerequisite background courses. It was agreed that it would be useful to get feedback from faculty who have taught at WSMR and LANL concerning their experiences there. It would also be useful to look at the distribution of grades in the MBA courses at LANL, WSMR and on-campus. It was also suggested that it might be beneficial to offer an orientation for WSMR students and to
explain to them that they are being asked to do the same work as any other MBA student would on campus.

**Annual Faculty Review Form**
The use of the composite score on the annual faculty review form to allocate merit money necessitates a clear understanding across the college of the meaning of the composite score. It was agreed in the work session that the composite score is the simple average of evaluations over the past five years. As a result the 5 year overall score and the composite score are identical.

**Digital Measures**
The departments are working on entering faculty data into Digital Measures. Since this is a task of significant size, it was agreed that we would focus first on entering data for the period 2002 through 2006. This covers the same period as the most recent five year vitas. After this data is entered, we can consider how best to complete the project. Faculty will have the opportunity to review what has been entered, especially classifications of intellectual contributions.