

**Weber State University**  
**Five-Year Program Review Site Visit Report**  
Business Administration and Marketing Department (BAM)  
Goddard School of Business & Economics

**Introduction**

This report constitutes faculty responses to recommendations made by the Review Visit Team Report. In the academic year 2018-19 the Business Administration program undertook a full five-year Regents review process. (Note: Due to changes in departmental structure during this period, the review did not include the Supply Chain program or courses, as these are now part of the new SC/MIS department. This review covers the new Business Administration and Marketing Department, which includes majors in marketing, business administration, and human resource management (which is actually not a major but rather an emphasis under the business administration major), and minors in entrepreneurship and leadership.

Rather than detailing items/areas the committee indicated were **strengths** or **meeting expected standards**, this document will provide a list of **concerns/weaknesses, recommendations, and suggestions** made by the committee, along with detailed **faculty responses** to them. (A full list of commendations can be found in the committee's report.)

**Recommendations with Faculty Responses**

Business Administration and marketing faculty agree with the visit team's recommendations and make the following responses.

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:**

Develop metrics (for Department Mission Statement.) Gathering feedback from alumni and employers might also provide an ongoing procedure to calibrate the mission statement and core values mid-review cycle (2.5 years out).

**Faculty response:** This is a very important recommendation that will be implemented via the creation of an advisory board. The faculty already met (during a retreat during Fall of 2018) to discuss the formation of an advisory board comprised of both alumni and employers (among other stakeholders). Several potential candidates have been identified. The next step will be to approve a list of candidates with the department faculty and to extend invitations. Once this advisory board has been formed, formal feedback can be obtained from these stakeholders regarding the type of metrics that ought to be devised in support of our department's mission statement.

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:**

There appears to be an insufficient number of marketing faculty given the courses

(graduate and undergraduate) and students being taught. Regular scheduling is possible only because faculty are willing to teach overload. (For more detail, see Standard E: Faculty). A few faculty felt there are challenges in keeping up with short IT product cycles—in some cases, three months—and how best to keep abreast of these changes so as to meet student needs. Almost without exception those we interviewed indicated a need for 1-2 new tenure track Marketing faculty hires, especially if current faculty take administrative roles. Currently, many faculty are teaching heavy overloads with large class enrollments, and some courses are not able to be taught due to a shortage of Marketing faculty (MBA Marketing Management, International Marketing, for example). In addition, key classes in the program are taught by adjuncts. Though adjuncts are well-qualified, the impression we received is that faculty would prefer to have full-time faculty teaching the core classes.

**Faculty Response:** This is perhaps the *most severe problem our department currently faces*. When comparing the ratio of marketing majors to numbers of T/TT faculty in marketing with similar ratios in other departments, it's clear that our marketing faculty are unfairly bearing more challenging teaching loads than faculty in every other department. The marketing faculty cannot continue to teach overload at the rate they have been doing, nor can they continue to rely on adjuncts for teaching critical, fundamental skills. *Immediate action must be taken on this problem by hiring an additional T/TT faculty member*, which will be highlighted and addressed in our department strategic plan (to be submitted May 15<sup>th</sup>, 2019).

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:** The Strategic Management capstone course (BSAD 4780), required for all college graduates, currently only has two regular instructors (Drs. Shaun Hansen and David Noack). The consequences are that this course has become a significant bottleneck for students at times and that it (directly and indirectly) requires regular overload teaching on the part of several, if not most management faculty. Although temporary solutions are possible, future discussions should be held about how to resolve this problem, long-term via the hiring of T/TT faculty.

**Faculty Response:** This is perhaps the *second most severe problem our department currently faces*. When comparing the ratio of faculty who are qualified to teach strategic management with the number of sections that must be covered, it's clear that *an additional T/TT line will be required within one year*. This is especially true for this course because it is our college's core, required *capstone* course, with the crucially important responsibility of integrating all core coursework and preparing our graduates to succeed in top managerial positions at the helm of organizations. Given the strategic importance of this course to our college, adjuncts cannot be relied upon.

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:** Nearly all interviewed for this review indicated a need for Goddard students to improve their communication skills and writing. (Faculty expressed some concern about how business communication, as a learning outcome, is measured (outside the business school). Dr. Hansen and Dr. Fox-Kirk have indicated that a recent hire (Jeff Good) with

a Masters degree in Communication will begin teaching the required Managerial Communications 3200 in Fall 2019. The long-term plan is for Jeff Good to work closely with the WSU English Department to develop an effective course and appropriate pedagogy to “greatly strengthen” student communication skills. The course will be refined and revised and then made available to all faculty teaching the course, including Jeff Good and select faculty from English.

**Faculty Response:** This is a definite need that we are currently acting on. Whereas Jeff Good has already been selected and hired, the next step will be for our faculty to solicit input from each of the faculties in our college regarding which key communication skills graduates of our college should graduate with. From this survey, Jeff Good will be able to start working with select faculty from the WSU English department to develop a new Management 3200 course to be taught under the careful supervision of our department chair with an eye towards continuous improvement.

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:** “Soft skills” such as people skills and leadership skills might be made more prominent in the curriculum.

**Faculty Response:** This is the #1 skill set employers are asking for (see the last 5 years of F.A.C.E employer surveys). Business schools who provide this training will add great value to the education their students receive. Our plan is to hold a series of meetings with the intent to consider how to change and/or add coursework and to change the curriculum required for the business administration major such that currently “elective” courses are made required courses, etc. Once needed changes have been agreed to by faculty, action will be taken.

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:** The HR program could benefit from partnership with other university departments (e.g., English, Communication, and Statistics) to direct students toward minors with skill sets that will complement the HR degree.

**Faculty Response:** This is an interesting observation that will be looked into. There is agreement among our faculty that a more analytical and preparatory angle be taken with the HR program. An initial “email meeting” has occurred regarding the topic of how to “revamp” the HR major. Subsequent meetings will be needed to reach an agreed strategy for change.

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:** In terms of scheduling, at least one student felt that more online options where feasible would be attractive to students...Student surveys may provide feedback on preferences of online, hybrid, face-to-face and weekend offerings. Indirect student assessment may help gain insights into annual and semester course schedule adjustments.

**Faculty response:** This is a very important recommendation. We plan to act on this specific recommendation, at least via through in-class verbal surveying but also via online **surveys**.

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:**

Given the changing nature of the business landscape, many senior faculty felt that the department will need to make a concerted effort to communicate to students that successful graduates will possess creative, analytical and critical thinking skills in light of the fact that many students seem focused on short-term goals: amassing credits, checking off boxes on a rubric and so forth. The department may need to at least once per semester, either in an event or in each course, have a discussion with students about the difference between an education and a degree. Finally, implementing these ideas will require developing a strategy to map these qualitative skills / long-term learning outcomes across courses and programs.

**Faculty response:** A faculty discussion needs to be held to discuss how to accomplish this. This may be one avenue for establishing metrics that allow us to determine whether our department outcomes are truly aligned with our mission statement. One idea might be to include a new section (several paragraphs) to be included on all department course syllabi and to be discussed by all instructors at the beginning of all courses in the department. Other avenues are also under consideration.

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:**

BAM relies on Goddard learning goals which may not reflect the uniqueness of the Department's mission statement and core values. It is recommended that student learning outcomes (and indirect metrics with alumni/employers) be developed and measured to demonstrate the successful implementation of the mission and core values. Feedback from hiring organizations regarding the core values and mission statement would be useful. Also see comments under Standard A and Standard B.

**Faculty Response:** This is a continuation of an above discussion regarding the need to ensure that our department mission is truly being enacted by developing specific outcome metrics for measurement purposes. Our faculty will need to decide on a set of metrics (perhaps pre, post-test?) and then implement.

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:**

Though core values and guiding principles are not learning outcomes, they do provide clear guidance for curriculum development. There should be methods (assessment, curriculum grid) in place to demonstrate that the values and principles are influencing curriculum, student learning, and alumni success.

**Business Administration Faculty Response:** This is a continuation of the above discussion regarding the need to ensure that our department mission, values, and guiding principles are truly being enacted by developing specific outcome metrics for measurement purposes and/or guidance for curriculum development. The first step

will be to develop a sub-committee to lead on the development of BAM learning outcomes to which a new curriculum map will align. Again, our faculty will need to decide on a set of metrics (perhaps pre, post-test, assessment, curriculum grid) and then implement.

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:**

Funding for faculty scholarship activities (e.g., cost of data, surveys, conferences), though available through multiple sources could be enhanced. Some tenure-track faculty noted the disincentive to co-author with GSBE colleagues due to having to split RIP funds. Could there be an incentive provided for more inter-faculty, inter-department collaboration? Could there be a pay bonus for publishing in a very top journal?

**Business Administration Faculty Response:** This is problem nearly all faculty members agree upon. The RIP (research incentive program) is a college-level program that needs to be developed further in a way that motivates collaboration and top-notch research. Whereas RIP is a college program, our faculty intend to lead an effort to start a college-wide discussion on this program with the objective of improving the RIP program. Depending on the outcome, our faculty may wish to discuss a department-level research incentive program or perhaps suggest that funds from the college be given to department chairs to motivate research within departments (whereas excellent research in different fields can be very different). If this were to occur, secondary, department-level “safe harbor journal” lists would need to be created.

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:** No formal mentoring processes are in place, though things are said to run smoothly. The department might consider establishing a mentoring committee or assign a pair of peer mentors to each new hire. (This has worked well in the English Department).

**Faculty Response:** Informal mentoring seems to be working fine, however, a faculty discussion is merited regarding this issue to see if action is necessary.

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:**

When hired, new faculty would like a greater amount of clarity about how much research funding is available.

**Faculty Response:** Our faculty agree that a lack of clarity exists here. Whereas funding comes from the college budget, our faculty intend to lead an effort to help the Dean develop a transparent process for allocating research funding to faculty- perhaps similar to how travel funds are allocated.

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:**

Untenured faculty would like to see consistency across departments in terms of the expected number of preps per year, in part because fewer preps equals greater research productivity.

**Faculty Response:** This becomes a problem when our department faculty are rated by senior faculty from other departments with little knowledge of how departments differ. Our department intends to lead an effort to persuade the college executive team to take up this issue. Transparent allocation of teaching responsibilities is needed.

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:** Transitions in leadership at the Department Chair level (three chairs in as many years) will require attention from incoming Interim Dean to be sure tenure-track faculty are aware of the standards for “Effective Creation”, “Improvement” and “Innovation”. These might be defined and shared with faculty. In addition, changes at the Dean and Provost level has untenured faculty seeking clear expectations from all levels that their expected tenure and promotion requirements will in fact be those they are measured on. BAM might consider developing a written policy to help the untenured faculty understand exactly what is required for service and teaching workloads. (English has done this and it has eliminated uncertainty about “how much” and also eliminated perceptions of favoritism or unfairness in workload assignments).

**Faculty Response:** This is a significant problem. Our department chair will need to discuss this with the interim and new dean, while remaining in communication with all faculty members. A plan and a policy will be devised to solidify, clarify, and clearly communicate expectations.

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:** Given the emphasis on student success from the Provost’s office many untenured faculty would like to see “student success” better built in to faculty job descriptions and annual reporting. Faculty want to be involved but need more ‘bottom line’ recognition for the purposes of tenure and promotion. This would seem to be an easy fix—perhaps allow ‘student success’ projects such as mentoring students (projects, applications to grad school & for employment to roll up to the Service component of the T&P process, or perhaps to the Teaching component because the latter is typically given more weight in Tenure and Promotion decisions.

**Faculty Response:** This issue is related to the one immediately prior. Clear, transparent, and well-communicated expectations are necessary. If “student success” (which involves a variety of variables and potential metrics) is truly a university-level priority, it should be one at the college level. Whereas a new Provost will join WSU in 2020, our intention is to hold off on taking action until clarity is possible.

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:** One commentator noted that there is a Learning Outcome deficiency in that these need to be more specifically connected to teaching.

**Faculty Response:** Our faculty will discuss AOL learning outcomes and how they are, or should be, connected to teaching and measured in our department. This

discussion will take place as a part of ensuring that our department is actually enacting our mission statement in our teaching outcomes (see above).

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:**

The recent addition of a leadership minor (which aligns closely with the mission and core values of BAM) could place further staffing pressure, particularly in HR courses, should enrollments increase dramatically.

**Faculty Response:** Above, we discussed the need to examine our curriculum with regard to how well it supports our mission statement, values, etc. Here exists an opportunity to re-vamp our curriculum for all majors/emphases, in ways that simultaneously address faculty resources. (Note: this does not include the faculty shortage issues with regard to marketing faculty and strategic management faculty—these issues can only be solved in the long-term via the hiring of T/TT faculty.)

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:**

“[Regarding]...strong demand for classes in the HR program, but a shortage of faculty enthusiastic about teaching in the program”: Here, the Dean and Chair might ask if it is the current curriculum that constrains faculty, making them less willing to teach in the program. If so—and an anonymous survey would provide an answer—perhaps a curricular redesign could spark renewed interest among faculty qualified to teach in the program. If the issue is that current faculty feel the HR classes are not in their wheelhouse, then this would seem to point to a question of hiring new faculty—perhaps those with dual expertise in BAM and HR who evidence enthusiasm for both disciplines.

**Faculty Response:** Our intention is to act on this recommendation as it is. Curricular re-design may solve this problem, but is possible a T/TT hire (and additional adjuncts) may eventually be required.

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:**

Faculty diversity is limited; BAM is the least diverse department in the college. Efforts should be made to increase diversity in future hiring, both as a way to increase the diversity of perspectives in the department and also to model for students that BAM and HR careers can be for everyone. Connecting with the Diversity Office on campus prior to searches can help place job postings in appropriate venues that may help attract more diverse job candidate, including women. Doing so may have recruiting benefits as well, as it would seem to be a first step toward attracting greater numbers of female students and students of color.

**Faculty Response:** With aforementioned hiring needs in marketing, strategy and HR, this will be a priority.

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:**

Classroom technology is not ideal and limits the ability of faculty to teach concepts. Faculty would like to see better projectors, a general technology upgrade, dual projectors and screens in classrooms and two computer screens per classroom. IT

support on the Ogden campus needs improvement. Consider whether the purchase and installation of the above (especially more dual projector classrooms) would be beneficial. Explore the issues with IT support—does the designated person need more hours or better training?

**Faculty Response:** This merits departmental and college-level discussion and we will pursue it.

**Review committee-identified weakness/concern/recommendation/suggestion:** Though not technically “external communities”, other departments with the Goddard School would like to be better connected with BAM and engage in a more collaborative relationship.

**Faculty Response:** Most of this has likely occurred as a result of having rapidly changing leadership in our department. Our goal is to rectify this with more stable leadership in the future.