

AACSB Tables

AACSB TABLE 2-1: Strategic Initiatives and Expected Source of Funds for the Next Accreditation Cycle

TABLE 2-1

Table 2-1
Strategic Initiatives and Expected Source of Funds
for the Next Accreditation Cycle

| Strategic Initiatives | Total Estimated Investment | Expected Source of Funds | Notes |
|---|----------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Learner Success | \$385,000.00 | | |
| Drop-In Tutoring | \$60,000.00 | University Funds | |
| 1st Year Mentor Program | \$300,000.00 | Gifts and Endowment | |
| Virtual Walk-In Advising | \$25,000.00 | University Funds | |
| Develop Distinctive Curriculum | \$935,000.00 | | |
| Multiple Modalities | \$290,000.00 | University Funds/Gifts/Endowments | Bluescape |
| Multiple Modalities | \$210,000.00 | Gifts and Endowments | Mashme |
| Multiple Modalities | \$100,000.00 | University Funds | Modality Students |
| Multiple Modalities | \$50,000.00 | University Funds | Lightboard Support |
| Professional Development | \$285,000.00 | University Funds/ Gifts/Endowments | Pondera |
| Societal Impact | \$165,000.00 | | |
| Create Structure | \$90,000.00 | Endowment | Project Management |
| Community Impact | \$75,000.00 | Gifts | Seidman Breakfast |
| Distinctive & Relevant Curriculum & Learner Success* - overlapping costs with Learner Success; Develop Distinctive Curriculum; and Societal Impact | | | |

AACSB Tables

AACSB TABLE 3-1: FACULTY SUFFICIENCY AND QUALIFICATIONS SUMMARY FOR THE MOST RECENTLY COMPLETED NORMAL ACADEMIC YEAR USING STUDENT CREDIT HOURS (RE: Standard 3)¹

TABLE 3-1

| AACSB TABLE 3-1: FACULTY SUFFICIENCY AND QUALIFICATIONS SUMMARY FOR THE MOST RECENTLY COMPLETED NORMAL ACADEMIC YEAR USING STUDENT CREDIT HOURS (RE: Standard 3) ¹ | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|--------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|-----------------------------|--|
| Date Range: Fall 2020 - Winter 2021 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Faculty Portfolio | | | Faculty Sufficiency Related to (e.g., SCH, ECTS, contact hours) | | Normal Professional Responsibilities ³ | Faculty Qualifications With Respect to Percent of Time Devoted to Mission ⁵ | | | | | Brief Description of Basis for Qualification |
| Faculty Member's Name | Specialty Field | Highest Degree, Year Earned | Participating Faculty Teaching Productivity (P) ² | Supporting Faculty Teaching Productivity (S) ² | | Scholarly Academic (SA) ⁴ | Practice Academic (PA) ⁴ | Scholarly Practitioner (SP) ⁴ | Instructional Practitioner (IP) ⁴ | Additional (A) ⁴ | |
| Accounting | | | 10179.5 sch | 1332 sch | | 1000 (51.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 200 (10.2%) | 760 (38.8%) | 0 (0.0%) | |
| | | | P ≥ 60% guideline for AACSB met (88.4%) | | | SA ≥ 40% guideline for AACSB met (51.0%) SA + PA + SP + IP ≥ 90% guideline for AACSB met (100.0%) | | | | | |
| Economics | | | 10134 sch | 3267 sch | | 1500 (75.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 410 (20.5%) | 90 (4.5%) | |
| | | | P ≥ 60% guideline for AACSB met (75.6%) | | | SA ≥ 40% guideline for AACSB met (75.0%) SA + PA + SP + IP ≥ 90% guideline for AACSB met (95.5%) | | | | | |
| Finance | | | 7449 sch | 1512 sch | | 600 (48.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 350 (28.0%) | 300 (24.0%) | |
| | | | P ≥ 60% guideline for AACSB met (83.1%) | | | SA ≥ 40% guideline for AACSB met (48.0%) SA + PA + SP + IP ≥ 90% guideline for AACSB not met (76.0%) | | | | | |
| Management | | | 23918.5 sch | 7111.5 sch | | 2110.5 (53.9%) | 100 (2.6%) | 320 (8.2%) | 1210 (30.9%) | 173.5 (4.4%) | |
| | | | P ≥ 60% guideline for AACSB met (77.1%) | | | SA ≥ 40% guideline for AACSB met (53.9%) SA + PA + SP + IP ≥ 90% guideline for AACSB met (95.6%) | | | | | |
| Marketing | | | 9802.5 sch | 2538 sch | | 1300 (70.9%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 433.5 (23.6%) | 100 (5.5%) | |
| | | | P ≥ 60% guideline for AACSB met (79.4%) | | | SA ≥ 40% guideline for AACSB met (70.9%) SA + PA + SP + IP ≥ 90% guideline for AACSB met (94.5%) | | | | | |
| Grand Total | | | 61483.5 sch | 15760.5 sch | | 6510.5 (59.4%) | 100 (0.9%) | 520 (4.7%) | 3163.5 (28.9%) | 663.5 (6.1%) | |
| | | | P ≥ 75% guideline for AACSB met (79.6%) | | | SA ≥ 40% guideline for AACSB met (59.4%) SA + PA + SP + IP ≥ 90% guideline for AACSB met (93.9%) | | | | | |
| Faculty Sufficiency Indicators ¹ : | | | | | | Faculty Qualifications Indicators ¹ : | | | | | |
| Overall guideline: P/(P+S) ≥ 75% | | | | | | SA guideline: SA/(SA + PA + SP + IP + O) ≥ 40% | | | | | |
| By discipline, location, delivery mode, or program: P/(P+S) ≥ 60% | | | | | | SA + PA + SP + IP guideline: (SA + PA + SP + IP)/(SA + PA + SP + IP + O) ≥ 90% | | | | | |

TABLE 3-1

- 1 This summary information is useful in assisting the peer review team in its initial assessment of alignment with Standard 3. The summary information allows the team to effectively focus its in-depth review of individual faculty vitae or other documents supporting the conclusions presented in the table. List all faculty contributing to the mission of the school including participating and supporting faculty, graduate students who have formal teaching responsibilities, and administrators holding faculty rank. For faculty not engaged in teaching, leave columns 4 and 5 (Faculty Sufficiency) blank. Faculty who left during the time frame represented in the table should not be included. Faculty members who joined the school for any part of the time frame are to be included. The school must explain the "normal academic year" format/schedule. Peer review teams may request documentation for additional years; for individual terms; or by programs, location, delivery mode, and/or discipline.
- 2 The measure of "teaching productivity" must reflect the operations of the business school, e.g. student credit hours (SCHs), European Credit Transfer Units (ECTUs), contact hours, individual courses, modules, or other designations that are appropriately indicative of the teaching contributions of each faculty member. Concurrence of the metric must be reached with the peer review team early in the review process. If a faculty member has no teaching responsibilities, he or she must be listed and reflected in the qualifications section of the table. Online courses should use the same teaching metric being used for in-person courses and the manner in which this is calculated should be described.
- 3 Indicate the normal professional responsibilities of each faculty member using the following guide: UT for undergraduate teaching; MT for master's level teaching; DT for doctoral level teaching/mentoring; ADM for administration; RES for research; ED for executive education; SER for other service and outreach responsibilities. A faculty member may have more than one category assigned. Individuals who teach only in non-credit executive education programs should not be listed in this table.
- 4 For faculty qualifications based on engagement activities, faculty members may be Scholarly Academic (SA), Practice Academic (PA), Scholarly Practitioner (SP), Instructional Practitioner (IP), or Additional (A). Faculty members should be assigned one of these designations based on the school's criteria for initial qualifications and continuing engagement activities that support currency and relevance in the teaching field and to support other mission components. Faculty may meet the school's criteria for more than one category (e.g. SA and PA), but must be listed in only one category. Doctoral students who have obtained ABD status are normally considered SA or PA (depending on the nature of the doctoral degree) for 3 years. Faculty who have earned a doctoral degree will normally be considered SA or PA (depending on the nature of the doctoral degree) for 5 years from the date the degree is awarded. The "Additional" category should be used for those individuals holding a faculty title but whose qualifications do not meet the criteria established by the school for SA, PA, SP, or IP status.
- 5 The "percent of time devoted to mission" reflects each faculty member's contributions to the school's overall mission during the period of evaluation. Reasons for less than 100 percent might include part-time employment, shared appointment with another academic unit, or other assignments that make the faculty member partially unavailable to the school. A full-time faculty member's percent of time devoted to mission is 100 percent. For doctoral students who have formal teaching duties, the percent of time devoted to mission should reflect their teaching duties only and not any other activities associated with their roles as a student, e.g. work on a dissertation. For example, a doctoral student who teaches one class over the normal academic year and a part-time faculty member whose responsibilities are limited to the same level of activity should be assigned the same "percent of time devoted to mission." A faculty member teaching in more than one discipline may be listed multiple times, but the percent of time devoted to mission should be reflected proportionally in each discipline and not be more than 100 percent. For part-time faculty the expected percentage is less than 100 percent and should reflect the amount of time devoted to the mission. If a school used a full-time equivalent (FTE) human resources system then the FTE may be a reasonable approximation for "percent of time devoted to mission." In the absence of an FTE system, the school should have a rational manner of assigning the percentage to part-time faculty that is agreed to by the Peer Review Team well in advance of the submission of the report.

AACSB Tables

AACSB TABLE 3-2: DEPLOYMENT OF PARTICIPATING AND SUPPORTING STAFF

TABLE 3-2 and TABLE 3-2B

| AACSB TABLE 3-2: DEPLOYMENT OF PARTICIPATING AND SUPPORTING STAFF | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| Date Range: Fall 2020 - Winter 2021 | | | | | |
| Faculty percent of teaching by program and degree level (measured by student credit hours) | | | | | |
| Degree Program | Scholarly Academic (SA) % | Practice Academic (PA) % | Scholarly Practitioner (SP) % | Instructional Practitioner (IP) % | Additional (A) % |
| ACC - Undergraduate | 40.40% | 0% | 11.22% | 48% | 0% |
| BBA | 47.38% | 1% | 8.75% | 36% | 7.29% |
| MBA | 77.42% | 0% | 1.78% | 21% | 0% |
| MSA/MST | 59.30% | 0% | 24.13% | 17% | 0% |
| EMBA | 75% | 0% | 25% | 0% | 0% |

| AACSB TABLE 3-2 B: DEPLOYMENT OF PARTICIPATING AND SUPPORTING STAFF | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| Date Range: Fall 2020 - Winter 2021 | | | | | |
| Faculty percent of teaching by program and degree level (measured by student credit hours) | | | | | |
| Major | Scholarly Academic (SA) % | Practice Academic (PA) % | Scholarly Practitioner (SP) % | Instructional Practitioner (IP) % | Additional (A) % |
| Accounting | 69% | 0% | 14% | 16% | 0% |
| Business Economics | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Entrepreneurship | 20% | 0% | 0% | 80% | 0% |
| Finance | 64% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 33% |
| Human Resources | 23% | 0% | 0% | 77% | 0% |
| International Business | 75% | 0% | 0% | 6% | 19% |
| Marketing | 58% | 0% | 0% | 37% | 5% |
| Management Information Systems | 9% | 0% | 67% | 24% | 0% |
| Operations Management | 65% | 0% | 0% | 19% | 17% |
| Supply Chain Management | 47% | 0% | 0% | 21% | 32% |
| Core Classes | 43% | 0% | 11% | 42% | 3% |

Accounting: ACC 240; ACC 310; ACC 311; ACC 317; ACC 318; ACC 321; ACC 340; ACC 413; ACC 414

Business Economics: ECO 300; ECO 312; ECO 313; ECO 495

Entrepreneurship: BUS 490; ENT 350; ENT 351; MGT 330; MKT 369; MKT 370

Finance: FIN 321; FIN 322; FIN 422

Human Resources: MGT 333; MGT 334; MGT 336; MGT 355; MGT 429; MGT 430; MGT 431; MGT 432; MGT 433

International Business: ACC 330; ECO 349; ECO 365; ECO 369; FIN 429; MGT 433; MGT 466; MKT 355; MKT 359

Marketing: MKT 351; MKT 352; MKT 451

Management Information Systems: MGT 351; MGT 371; MGT 471; MGT 475; MGT 477; MGT 478

Operations Management: MGT 337; MGT 361; MGT 362; MGT 363; MGT 364; MGT 365; MT 367; MGT 457; MGT 466; MGT 467

Supply Chain Management: MGT 337; MGT 367; MGT 467; MKT 354; MKT 355; MKT 363; MKT 457

Core: ACC 213; FIN 320; MGT 331; MGT 366; MGT 495; MKT 350

AACSB Tables

AACSB TABLE 5-1: ASSESSMENT PLAN AND RESULTS FOR MOST RECENT COMPLETED ACCREDITATION CYCLE

TABLE 5-1: BBA

| AACSB TABLE 5-1: ASSESSMENT PLAN AND RESULTS FOR MOST RECENT COMPLETED ACCREDITATION CYCLE | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---------------|--|--|
| BACHELOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (BBA) | | | | | | |
| Competency | Performance Target | How Assessed | Where Assessed | When Assessed | Results | Improvements Identify whether process (P) or curriculum (C) (Date changes were made) |
| Direct Measures | | | | | | |
| Communication Skills-Written | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Student Reports | MGT 331 | Years 2, 5 | Year 2: met Year 5: met | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Communication Skills-Oral | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Video recordings of student presentations | MGT 331 | Years 2, 5 | Year 2: met for 4/6 criteria Year 5: met | Year 2 assessment revealed weakness in the areas of communication aids and nonverbals. A GAT was formed, which recommended (1) revising the rubric to lay clear expectations and (2) pre and post video presentations. (P) |
| Communication Skills-Information Literacy | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Assignment | ECO 210/211 | Years 3,5 | Year 3: not met Year 5: met | Year 3 assessment revealed weaknesses in all four-criterion measured by the rubric. A GAT was formed, which recommended revising the assignment and increasing the point allocation. (P) |
| Informed Decision Making | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Exam | MGT 495 | Years 2, 5 | Year 2: met for 2/5 criteria Year 5: pending | Year 2 assessment revealed weakness in the areas of internal environment, identification of firm's global strategy and cultural factors. A GAT was formed, which recommended (1) placing more emphasis on global strategy and analyzing the internal environment components of the course accomplished by ensuring that 50% of the cases have a global content (2) devoting more class time to analyzing the internal environment. (C) |
| Ethics | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | | Year 2 Ethics courses across discipline, delivery mode and instructors Year 4 1.5 credit Large Lecture Ethics course | Years 2, 4 | Year 2: met overall for 4/5 criteria Year 4: met for 3/5 criteria | Based on previous performance a common case was employed for assessment in year 2. Student performance was weak in sections taught online and by part-time instructors. Student performance was also weak overall on application of ethical theory/models. To address these weaknesses, in year 4, ethics assessment was piloted in a 1.5 credit large lecture section focused on ethical theory/models with the remaining 1.5 credits section focused on discipline specific applications. (C) In the second round of assessment, student performance was weak in the areas of stakeholder identification and personal voice and action. A GAT was formed, which recommended (1) Revising the questions for assessment (2) Ensuring that the syllabus of record for the large-lecture and breakout sessions appropriately addresses the assessment need (3) employing role play methods. (P) |

TABLE 5-1: BBA

| Indirect Measures | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|---------|------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Functional Business Knowledge | Scores at or above the national average overall and on each subsection of the test | ETS® Major Field Test. | MGT 495 | Years 3, 5 | Year 3: not met Year 5: not met | In year 3 student average was slightly below the national average overall and on the information systems and international issues subsection of the test. In year 5, student performance fell short of the established target <u>only</u> on the international issues section of the test. A GAT was formed, which has recommended integrating global issues throughout the business core. (C) |

TABLE 5-1: BBA - ACCT

| AACSB TABLE 5-1: ASSESSMENT PLAN AND RESULTS FOR MOST RECENT COMPLETED ACCREDITATION CYCLE | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------|--|---------------|---|--|
| BACHELOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION IN ACCOUNTING (BBA ACC) | | | | | | |
| Competency | Performance Target | How Assessed | Where Assessed | When Assessed | Results | Improvements Identify whether process (P) or curriculum (C) (Date changes were made) |
| Direct Measures | | | | | | |
| Communication Skills-Written | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Student Reports | Year 1 ACC 311 Year 5 MGT 331 | Years 1, 5 | Year 1: met Year 5: met | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Communication Skills-Oral | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Oral Presentations to CPA firms | ACC 311 | Years 1, 4 | Year 1: met Year 4: met | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Communication Skills-Information Literacy | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Assignment | ECO 210/211 | Years 3,5 | Year 3: not met on 2/4 criteria Year 5: met | Year 3 assessment revealed weakness in the areas of seeks and uses information. A GAT was formed, which recommended revising the assignment and increasing the point allocation. (P) |
| Informed Decision Making | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Exam | MGT 495 | Years 2, 5 | Year 2: met for 3/5 criteria Year 5: pending | Year 2 assessment revealed weakness in the areas of identification of firm's global strategy and cultural factors. A GAT was formed, which recommended (1) placing more emphasis on global strategy and analyzing the internal environment components of the course accomplished by ensuring that 50% of the cases have a global content (2) devoting more class time to analyzing the internal environment. (C) |
| Ethics | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Exam | ACC 333 | Years 1, 3 | Year 2: met Year 3: met | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Technical Accounting Knowledge-Accounting Elements within Financial Statements | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Exam | ACC 310 | Years 3,5 | Year 3: met Year 5: met | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |

TABLE 5-1: BBA - ACCT

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|------------------------|-------------|------------|---|---|
| Technical Accounting Knowledge-Internal Control | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Business Memo | ACC 413/414 | Years 3,5 | Year 3: met for 5/7 criteria Year 5: met | Year 3 assessment revealed weakness in the areas of internal control assessment and communication of results. Instructors of ACC 413/414 determined that their courses did not emphasize the necessary concepts evenly. A plan was made to be more consistent in the teaching of elements of a control evaluation (P) |
| Technical Accounting Knowledge-Strategic | At least 70% of the students will score 70% and above | Quiz | ACC 321 | Years 3,5 | Year 3: met Year 5: met | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Data Management and Analytics | At least 70% of the students will score 70% and above | Exam | ACC 340 | Years 3,5 | Year 3: met Year 5: pending | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Indirect Measures | | | | | | |
| Functional Business Knowledge | Scores at or above the national average overall and in each subsection of the test | ETS® Major Field Test. | MGT 495 | Years 3, 5 | Year 3: not met Year 5: met | In year 3 student average was slightly below the national average overall and fell short on 6/9 subsections of the test. The instructors recommended placing more emphasis on the weak areas. (P) Year 5 results show a considerable improvement in all areas. |

5-1 (MSA)

AACSB TABLE 5-1: ASSESSMENT PLAN AND RESULTS FOR MOST RECENT COMPLETED ACCREDITATION CYCLE

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN ACCOUNTING (MSA)

| Competency | Performance Target | How Assessed | Where Assessed | When Assessed | Results | Improvements Identify whether process (P) or curriculum (C) (Date changes were made) |
|---|---|--------------------|----------------|---------------|---|--|
| Direct Measures | | | | | | |
| Communication Skills—Written | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Research Project | ACC 620 | Years 2, 4 | Year 2: met Year 4: met for 6/7 criteria | Year 4 assessment revealed weakness in the area of style. The SOA faculty decided to (1) allocate more time in class to stress upon writing style and (2) share and discuss the rubric with students at the beginning of the semester. (P) |
| Communication Skills—Oral | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Oral Presentations | ACC 620 | Years 2,4 | Year 2: met Year 4: met | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Business Acumen and Strategic Decision Making | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Course Project | ACC 613 | Years 2,4 | Year 2: met Year 4: met | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Global Perspective | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Exam | ACC 617 | Years 2, 5 | Year 2: met Year 5: pending | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Ethics | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Exam | ACC 607 | Years 3, 5 | Year 2: met for 3/5 criteria Year 4: met | Year 2 assessment revealed weakness in the areas of application of ethical theory/models and governance recommendation. The SOA increased coverage of descriptive literature on how ethical decisions are actually made as opposed to the more traditional coverage of normative ethics of how ethical decisions should be made. In addition, the SOA incorporated behavioral influences on decision-making in the future offerings of ACC 607. (C) |
| Indirect Measures - none | | | | | | |

5-1 (MST)

AACSB TABLE 5-1: ASSESSMENT PLAN AND RESULTS FOR MOST RECENT COMPLETED ACCREDITATION CYCLE
 MASTER OF SCIENCE IN TAXATION (MST)

| Competency | Performance Target | How Assessed | Where Assessed | When Assessed | Results | Improvements Identify whether process (P) or curriculum (C) (Date changes were made) |
|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|----------------|---------------|--|--|
| Direct Measures | | | | | | |
| Ethical Awareness and Competence | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Tax Memo Research paper | ACC 636 | Years 3 and 5 | Year 3: met Year 5: program paused for revision | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Tax Communication | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Tax protest letter | ACC 636 | Years 3 and 5 | Year 3: met Year 5: program paused for revision | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Substantive Tax Law | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Tax Memo | ACC 636 | Years 3 and 5 | Year 3: met Year 5: program paused for revision | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Strategic Tax Analysis and Planning | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Paper | ACC 636 | Years 3 and 5 | Year 3: met Year 5: program paused for revision | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Indirect Measures - none | | | | | | |

5-1 (PROFESSIONAL MBA)

AACSB TABLE 5-1: ASSESSMENT PLAN AND RESULTS FOR MOST RECENT COMPLETED ACCREDITATION CYCLE

PROFESSIONAL MBA (MBA)

| Competency | Performance Target | How Assessed | Where Assessed | When Assessed | Results | Improvements Identify whether process (P) or curriculum (C) (Date changes were made) |
|--|---|----------------------------|----------------|---------------|---|--|
| Direct Measures | | | | | | |
| Communication Skills-Written | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Case | MBA 683 | Years 4, 5 | Year 4: met Year 5: pending | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Communication Skills-Oral | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Oral presentations | MBA 683 | Years 4, 5 | Year 4: met Year 5: pending | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Business Acumen and Strategic Decision Making | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Case | MBA 683 | Years 4, 5 | Year 4: met for 4/5 criteria Year 5: pending | Year 4 assessment revealed weakness in the area of assessing competitive position. The instructor decided to incorporate more cases to illustrate how to assess a firm's competitive position. (P) |
| Global and Inter-Cultural Competence | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Discussion Board | MBA 683 | Years 4, 5 | Year 4: met Year 5: pending | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Values Driven Leadership-Ethics | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Paper Quiz Exam | MBA 677 | Years 4, 5 | Year 4: met Year 5: met | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Values Driven Leadership-Team Work | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Teamwork Competency Survey | MBA 631 | Years 4, 5 | Year 4: met Year 5: met | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Values Driven Leadership-Leadership Philosophy | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Paper Project Quiz | MBA 677 | Years 4, 5 | Year 4: met Year 5: met | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Indirect Measures - none | | | | | | |

5-1 (EMBA)

AACSB TABLE 5-1: ASSESSMENT PLAN AND RESULTS FOR MOST RECENT COMPLETED ACCREDITATION CYCLE
EXECUTIVE MBA (EMBA)

| Competency | Performance Target | How Assessed | Where Assessed | When Assessed | Results | Improvements Identify whether process (P) or curriculum (C) (Date changes were made) |
|--|---|--|----------------|---------------|--|---|
| Direct Measures | | | | | | |
| Communication Skills-Written | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Case | EMBA 683 | Years 2, 5 | Year 2: met Year 5: pending | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Communication Skills-Oral | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Oral Presentations | Prof. Dev. | Years 2, 5 | Year 2: met Year 5: met | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Global and Inter-Cultural Competence | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Professional Development | Study Abroad | Years 2, 5 | Year 2: met for 3/4 criteria Year 5: met | Criterion 4 was assessed using the Major Field Test. Because of Covid-19, the two-weeks study abroad program was cancelled. Consequently, this goal was assessed using the Major Field Test. |
| Values Driven Leadership-Ethics | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Papers Presentations Participation Quiz | EMBA 678 | Years 2, 5 | Year 2: met Year 5: met | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Values Driven Leadership-Team Work | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Peer Assessment | Prof. Dev. | Years 2, 5 | Year 2: met Year 5: met | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Values Driven Leadership-Leadership Philosophy | Average score of at least 3 and/or at least 70% of the students sampled perform at level 3 or above on the four-point scale rubric employed | Paper Project Quiz | EMBA 678 | Years 2, 5 | Year 2: met Year 5: met | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Indirect Measures | | | | | | |
| Functional Business Knowledge | Scores at or above the national average overall and in each subsection of the test | ETS® Major Field Test | EMBA 683 | Years 2, 5 | Year 2: met Year 5: met | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |
| Global and Inter-Cultural Competence | Scores at or above the national average overall and in each subsection of the test | ETS® Major Field Test | EMBA 683 | Years 2, 5 | Year 2: met for criterion 4 Year 5: met overall | Given the strong student performance no further action was required. |

AACSB Tables

AACSB TABLE 8-1: INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

TABLE 8-1

| AACSB TABLE 8-1 INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|-------------|--|---|
| Date Range: Winter 2016 - Fall 2020 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Part A: Five-Year Summary of Intellectual Contributions | | | | | | | | | | |
| Aggregate and summarize data by discipline. | Portfolio of Intellectual Contributions | | | | Types of Intellectual Contributions | | | | Percentages of Faculty Producing ICs | |
| | Basic or Discovery Scholarship | Applied or Integration/ Application Scholarship | Teaching and Learning Scholarship | Total | Peer-reviewed journal articles | Additional peer- or editorial-reviewed intellectual contributions | All other intellectual contributions | Total | Percent of Participating Faculty Producing ICs | Percent of total Full Time Equivalent (FTE) faculty producing ICs |
| Accounting | 28.33 | 37 | 47.17 | 112.5 | 24.5 | 48.5 | 39.5 | 112.5 | 89.50% | 86.30% |
| Economics | 9 | 174 | 7 | 190 | 34.5 | 54.5 | 101 | 190 | 100.00% | 85.90% |
| Finance | 16.5 | 65 | 8.5 | 90 | 13.67 | 44.5 | 31.83 | 90 | 100.00% | 84.00% |
| Management | 103.83 | 267.5 | 106 | 477.33 | 65.5 | 198.5 | 213.33 | 477.33 | 90.90% | 74.10% |
| Marketing | 65.67 | 136.5 | 38 | 240.17 | 39.83 | 140 | 60.33 | 240.17 | 82.40% | 72.20% |
| Total | 223.33 | 680 | 206.67 | 1110 | 178 | 486 | 446 | 1110 | 91.80% | 79.20% |

Part B: Alignment with Mission, Expected Outcomes, and Strategy

Provide a description of how the portfolio of intellectual contributions by faculty and by units within the school, where appropriate, align with mission, strategies, and expected outcomes.

As a regional comprehensive state institution, GVSU’s mission is to “...educate students to shape their lives, their professions, and their societies. The university contributes to the enrichment of society through excellent teaching, active scholarship, and public service.” Seidman has aligned its mission and activities to integrate its efforts across these areas of focus. Scholarship activities result in intellectual contributions that contribute to student learning, to the discipline, and to engagement with the community.

In January 2015, a task force was created to address the impact and alignment of intellectual contributions to Seidman’s mission and related activities. The Impact and Alignment policy was approved by faculty in December 2015. The policy documents “...given the characteristics of the College and its mission it is expected that a large percentage of ICs will come from applied scholarship, followed by pedagogical scholarship and discipline-based scholarship.” The Impact and Alignment document created by the task force also provides guidance on how impact could be measured.

TABLE 8-1

Part C: Quality of Five-Year Portfolio of Intellectual Contributions

Identify the qualitative and quantitative measures of quality used by the school and apply these measures to analyze and evaluate the portfolio of intellectual contributions.

In December 2011, Seidman implemented a journal ranking list (see Seidman Journal Ranking List in the ancillary material) as a tool for measuring quality and impact of peer reviewed journals in the respective disciplines and incorporated it into the personnel evaluation process. The list was a result of reviewing several other ranking lists considered to be best practices among accredited business schools. A process for adding or removing journals from the list was also developed. As in other lists, the higher a journal is ranked, the greater the quality and potential impact of the research. The list is reviewed using Cabell’s predatory journal list to ensure that faculty are not given credit for predatory journals. Seidman uses its ranking list in the faculty performance and merit evaluation processes. As would be expected for a college that balances teaching and research, the majority of our peer reviewed journal (PRJ) publications appear in A and B ranked journals.

A study by Iglesias and Pecharroman (2007) looking at all articles in the Institute of Scientific Information (ISI) database at the end of 2005 found that a business or economics article has an average 4.2 citations which is consistent with the median Seidman median of 4.0. More than 50 percent of Seidman associate professors have a citation rate higher than this.

The second method provides a more comprehensive measure of research output, the Hirsch Index (H-Index). The H-Index is calculated for each faculty member using his/her publication record since 1990, specifically, the number of articles and the number of cites per article. For example, if a faculty member has three articles with at least three cites per article then he/she has an H-Index of three. A study by John Mingers (2009), looking at business faculty who were Fellows of the British Academy of Management (BAM), Fellows of the Institute for Operations Research and the Management Sciences (INFORMS), or Members of the Committee of Professors in OR (COPIOR), found an H-Index between five and 15 for faculty with comparable years of experience to Seidman associate professors. These are high end scholars at research focused schools, yet, the average H-Index is 5 showing that most faculty at Seidman are writing multiple articles that are being cited multiple times.

Part D: Impact of Intellectual Contributions

Finally, additional measures of quality and impact are demonstrated by the numerous honors and awards received by faculty for their scholarship and their research activities with students which align with Seidman’s mission and our balance between teaching and research. Some examples are included below; others were in section one of this report.

(i) Analyze the impact of the portfolio of intellectual contributions on the theory, practice, and/or teaching of business, including qualitative and quantitative evidence.

| Department | Faculty | Award | Organization |
|------------|-----------|--|--|
| Accounting | Sergeant | Best Education Paper | Midwest American Accounting Association |
| Economics | Batmaz | Best Paper Award of General Economics Track | The American Society of Business and Behavioral Sciences |
| Management | Akbulut | Best Paper Award | WASET |
| Management | Baid | AOM Best Paper Award | AOM Boston, MA (2019) |
| Marketing | Good | Organizational Frontlines Young Scholar Research Award | American Marketing Association Services SIG |
| Marketing | Robideaux | Best Paper Award Winner | Academy of Business Research |

TABLE 8-1

(ii) Provide exemplars of the societal impact of the school's intellectual contributions.

Aslim, Montanera, Simons, Muller - Annual West Michigan Health Care Economic Forecast;
McKendall – paper on The Flint Water Crisis (Case Research Journal);
Sicilian – paper on Economic Freedom and the ACA: Medicaid Expansions and Labor Mobility by Race and Ethnicity (Public Finance Review);
Lehnert – paper on The Effects of Competency, Negatives and Experience on Women's Aspirations to Leadership;
Lowen – presentation on The Effect of Title IX on Women's Health Outcomes (Midwestern Economic Assoc Annual Meeting);
Akbulut – paper on A Gender Based Investigation of Stereotypical Barriers in Management Information Systems Profession;
Walsh – Gender and Context in Incivility Experiences of Overqualified Employees (Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management);
Isely - currently 4 funded projects and 1 federal grant on stormwater and water quality issues;
Walsh – paper on aspects of shiftwork influence on off-shift wellbeing of healthcare workers;
Aslim – paper on Macroeconomic Effects of Maternity Leave Legislation in Emerging Economies;
Motwani – paper and conference presentation on building green infrastructure across university campuses (Infracon);
Ogura – paper on Urban Growth Controls and Intercity Commuting;
Essila – paper/presentation on Principal Component-Based Regression Model to Improve Healthcare Inventory forecasting (Decision Sciences Institute annual meeting);
Mboko – paper on Understanding the Social Capital in Refugee Entrepreneurs (Advances in Management);
Giedeman – paper on monetary policy-race;
De – paper on Effects of Monetary Policy on Food Inequality in India (Journal of Development Studies);
Giedeman & Muller – paper on Racial Differentials in the Long-term Wealth Effects of the Financial Crisis of 2007-2009 and the Great Recession (Journal of Economics, Race, and Policy);
Giedeman – paper on More on the Impact of Economic Freedom on the Black/White Income Gap (Public Finance Review)

Crawford – paper on mnemonic communities and bringing people together to protect natural wonders (Strategic Organization);
Hinsch – paper Going Green to be Morally Clean (Psychology & Marketing);
Lehnert – paper Materialism and Religiosity on Consumption Values in Emerging Consumer Markets;
Hinsch – best in track paper at summer AMA on topic of relationship between religiousness and environmental concern;
Lehnert – paper on Formal and Informal Institutional Pressure on CSR: A Cross-Country Analysis;
Lehnert – paper on Financial Performance and the Competitive Effects of CSR;
Crawford – paper on enforcement tactics used by ordinary citizens to uphold environmental integrity (Organization Studies);
DeWilde, Lehnert, Gondhalekar - The Trustworthiness Project Reports and grant;
Dahlquist – papers on the role of CSR in GenZ decision-making;
Pope – Grant regarding CSR strategies and challenges during a global crisis

Note: Please add a footnote to this table summarizing the school's policies guiding faculty in the production of intellectual contributions. The data must also be supported by analysis of impact/accomplishments and depth of

Note: In Spring 2019-2020, less than 20% of users have administrative data records. Some footnotes for this year have been suppressed.

Note: In Spring 2018-2019, less than 20% of users have administrative data records. Some footnotes for this year have been suppressed.

Note: In Spring 2017-2018, less than 20% of users have administrative data records. Some footnotes for this year have been suppressed.

Note: In Spring 2016-2017, less than 20% of users have administrative data records. Some footnotes for this year have been suppressed.

Note: In Spring 2015-2016, less than 20% of users have administrative data records. Some footnotes for this year have been suppressed.