

---

**Internal Review  
Division of  
Business Administration**

---

MidAmerica Nazarene University  
2030 East College Way  
Olathe, KS 66062  
<http://www.mnu.edu>

**Response to Self-Study Report**

**Submitted to:**

Doug Henning, Acting Chair, MNU Outcomes Assessment Committee  
Mark Ford, Chairman, Division of Business Administration

**Submitted by the Internal Review Committee:**

Sondra Cave, Chair  
Linda Alexander  
Jeanne Millhuff  
Kelvin St. John  
Barth Smith

Notes regarding process:

The Internal Review committee (IRC) for the Self-Study Report (*Report*) of the Division of Business Administration held its first meeting on November 16, 2005. A copy of the *Report* was distributed at this meeting to each committee member and a plan for review and subsequent timeline was established at the first meeting. Each committee member was assigned/volunteered to review one of the five Criteria. The Criteria were reviewed as follows: Barth Smith, Criterion 1; Jeanne Millhuff, Criterion 2; Linda Alexander, Criterion 3; Kelvin St. John, Criterion 4; Sondra Cave, Criterion 5.

The committee met for a second time in February 2006. At this meeting, each member presented his or her analysis and preliminary report. At the conclusion of this meeting, a report was given to Mark Ford, Chair of the Division, requesting more information and suggested corrections. (Copy of the request is attached at the end of this report.)

A revised self-study was received in response to the committee requests on March 20, 2006. The IRC met on April 5<sup>th</sup>, 2006 to discuss the revisions and to establish the final timeline. It was agreed that each member would review his or her criterion, write the analysis for the assigned criterion and submit his or her portion to the committee chair. The IRC report was finalized and submitted to each member electronically for feedback and final review. The Internal Review Committee final report was presented to Doug Henning on May 10<sup>th</sup>, 2006. Doug Henning is taking the place of Mark Ford as “Outcomes/Assessment coordinator” due to Mark Ford’s role also as chair of the Division of Business Administration which is under review.

## **ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW – Division of Business Administration**

### **Criterion One: Mission and Integrity**

***Criterion Statement:* The division operates with integrity to ensure the fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff, and students.**

The division's *Report* provides ample evidence to suggest it operates with integrity. The division articulates its mission through a formal mission statement that is clear. It is also in line with the mission and goals of the University. The division has established appropriate statements and educational objectives that guide the division. Internal and external constituencies are explicitly defined.

#### **Core Component 1A – The division's mission is clear and articulates publicly the division's commitments.**

The division's mission clearly articulates its commitment to high academic standards, to the students, faculty and university as well as to those members of the greater external community. The statement is appropriate for a business emphasis. It also articulates the goals for student learning. The division makes its statement publicly available in the University catalog and on the University website. In addition – the division regularly evaluates its mission and revises as necessary. The most recent revision was in November 2004.

#### **Core Component 1B – In its mission statements, division recognizes the diversity of its learners, other constituencies, and the greater society it serves.**

The division mission statement represents the importance of encouraging diversity within the faculty and student body, specifically giving consideration to this issue prior to the most recent faculty appointment. The division encourages discussion within the classroom regarding the importance of ethics and appropriate behavior in the workplace, including that of being a Christian.

#### **Core Component 1C – Understanding of and support for the mission pervade the division.**

The *Report* clearly indicates the support of the mission, a clear understanding and the pervasiveness of this throughout. Each faculty and staff member is interviewed and evaluated to ensure their commitment and adherence to the University's mission. Each student is informed of the significance of the mission of the university as well as the mission of the division and signs a lifestyle covenant indicating this understanding. Likewise, the division's budget priorities and expenditures, including classroom equipment and faculty development, show evidence of support for the university mission.

**Core Component 1D – The division’s governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the division to fulfill its mission.**

The division’s structure and governance is well-documented. It appears there is a balanced effort of collaboration on the part of each faculty member, not only for work within the division but also in representation within the university community. Also evident is the collaborative effort regarding curriculum decisions, evaluation of structures and processes. Formal division meetings are held on a consistent basis as well as informal meetings among division members. In addition to peer review, course evaluations and faculty evaluations, the division employs the use of surveys, focus groups and other methods of evaluation.

**Core Component 1E – The division upholds and protects its integrity.**

The *Report* narrative and evidence provides sufficient confirmation that it is upholding and protecting the integrity of the division. The division is to be commended for the display of effort toward fulfillment of this sub-Criterion.

Overall, the division does a nice job of presenting a clear mission and objectives. It appears there are ample processes and in place enabling the division to evaluate, govern and collaborate, in order to effectively fulfill its mission.

While the Internal Review Committee (IRC) recognizes a comprehensive mission and commitment to upholding the integrity of such, the committee has interest in the phrase “academically rigorous majors” – the question is raised as to how the division weighs the mission of teaching business with rigor and [major], with the Christian perspective? In addition – what is the marker indicating such rigor?

## **Criterion Two: Preparing for the Future**

### **Core Component 2A - The division realistically prepares for a future shaped by multiple societal and economic trends.**

The *Report* gives ample proof that this task is being monitored through a series of checks and balances. Especially strong are citations of regular examination by business accrediting bodies and university accountability systems as well as regular division internal evaluations.

An aspect that is not included in environmental scanning might be a board of outside professional business consultants and alumni who could offer insight as to needs and innovations for the future. These advocates might offer valuable comments as to trends, weaknesses, and strengths in the quality of the education our students are receiving. This is noted as external constituent support under 2D section of this *Report*. But specific examples of an instance where these were surveyed or used might be included here.

History and heritage preservation might be defined in more specific terms. Is there a means of emphasizing the philosophy or mission of the division by other means besides the guidance of faculty and standards for hiring? Faith and learning issue is strong, but are there any unique historical factors that help form the vision upon which the Business Division operates that need to be verbalized or conveyed? What makes your business school a stand out among all the programs being offered in schools of comparable size? Clear direction in this sets the standard for all future planning.

### **Core Component 2B - The division's resource base supports its educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future**

Clearly the gap between the quality of programs that the Division hopes to maintain and the resources available to provide for them is a serious one. This *Report* distinctly and realistically cites the areas of need. Additional plans for adding to these resources and nurturing those already being used are commendable. Developing new sources for revenue will be a part of the solution and requires additional creativity. Ways to attract additional donors should be and probably is a part of future planning.

Human resource development has many impressive aspects backed by multiple examples of how it is being done. Obviously, the division is making the most of resources that the university and the division itself make possible.

The IRC questions whether the division actually has all the qualified personnel to teach all the majors they are trying to offer? It seems they might be short of resources – having six majors and seven faculty members. How is this being done with some of the division faculty also teaching in the graduate and innovative adult education programs? It seems perhaps the division is branching out too fast in too many areas without adequate resources to cover.

**Core Component 2C - The division's ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence of institutional effectiveness that clearly informs strategies for continuous improvement.**

The division obviously could serve as a model of how effective assessment should be done. Samples included in Appendix K illustrate a system that is being worked to the advantage of the division to improve programs and performance. It is also a united effort.

In the *Report* the division also concludes realistically the need for faculty development funds for outcomes assessment though no reasons were given or possible uses for the funds cited.

Another question from the IRC: Should the viability of the Business Education Major in light of comprehensive assessment be included in this discussion?

**Core Component 2D - All levels of planning align with the academic organization's mission, thereby enhancing its capacity to fulfill that mission.**

Levels of planning do take into consideration the mission of both the university and the division. There is provision for examples following assertions.

The IRC suggests that when writing that the division supports the mission of the school, designate division or university, and cite which aspect of the mission the particular examples demonstrate. Broad connections need to be made more specific.

Under external constituents involved in planning, the IRC suggests giving indications as to how frequently such groups are employed and from what sector they are drawn to enhance the authority of the individuals in the group. This is an excellent consideration that the division is taking.

Overall, the IRC finds that the division is using available resources to its best advantage and is exploring many avenues for improving their excellence as educators who are committed to their mission.

The IRC suggests the division's immediate needs are to find new sources for revenue to provide for improving the physical facility of offices and classroom needs.

### **Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching**

#### **Core Component 3A - The division's goals for student learning outcomes are clearly stated for each educational program and make effective assessment possible.**

The division, which offers only undergraduate programs, clearly differentiates its learning goals for each major by having separate educational outcomes for each major. These separate outcomes for each major are listed in full in Appendix K, pp. 12-14. Effective assessment of these learning outcomes can be seen at the course, program and institutional level in various forms. For the individual courses, assessment of the effectiveness of the program is seen in course evaluations and course syllabi. Alumni surveys, the Data Master sheet, and the Division's outcomes assessment plan are all ways to see effective assessment at the program and institutional level. Also each student learning outcome has at least two direct and two indirect measures of student learning. These measures are explained in Appendix K, pp. 17-31.

#### **Core Component 3B - The division values and supports effective teaching.**

The two basic components of effective teaching are having qualified teachers and quality curriculum. These two components are evident in the Division of Business Administration. The division showed that qualified faculty is very important to them. For the Business Division, which has seven full time faculty members, three are doctorally qualified and four are professionally qualified according to IACBE standards. The faculty vitas found in Appendix D, illustrate that each faculty member has appropriate work experience and academic experience for the classes each teach. This further supports the idea that the institution and the division hires and values faculty who are highly qualified. The second component of effective teaching which is having quality curriculum is also demonstrated in the curriculum chosen for the individual courses and the programs for the division. Aligning the curriculum and outcomes with an outside accrediting institution such as IACBE adds another layer of accountability that ensures quality curriculum.

#### **Core Component 3C - The division creates effective learning environments.**

The division has a formal process it follows to discuss assessment data and analyze the data for improvements in curriculum pedagogy, instructional resources, and student services. Several meetings each year are dedicated to analyzing outcomes assessment data for course/program improvement and student satisfaction surveys also become the basis for improvements in pedagogy and resources. To create an effective learning environment the student must also be considered. The division strives to create an environment that supports all learners. Diversity of religious denomination, age, gender, race, color, national origin, academic experience and industry experience are important issues addressed within the division. Also, through the support of the Kresge Center, the division seeks to support those with special needs. Individual students will find an effective learning environment that is developed to support their own learning needs.

**Core Component 3D – The division’s learning resources support student learning and effective teaching.**

The *Report* indicates the division is mindful of the needed resources to support student learning and effective teaching. Technology is as important to academic divisions as their actual buildings. For this division, they have many resources they have developed to help the student understand and use technology in their academic experience. Computer labs, copiers, fax machines, Blackboard and Micrograde software are all examples of technology available to students and/or faculty members. Each classroom is also equipped with a computer, team board, DVD player and VCR for faculty and student use. It is clear that the knowledge and use of technology is important to the division. Along with technology, there are other resources needed to support student learning and effective teaching. The division has addressed this issue also. The division library budget allows adequate library resources to be collected and used by the students. Also the division uses current workforce employees in the internship experience of the students. This is a rich resource cultivated by Professor Clark. Adjustments in the use of its learning resources are adapted through ideas collected from the course evaluations and alumni surveys.

Overall, the educational mission for the Division of Business Administration is set forth in Appendix A. Therefore, to be an effective department, evidence must be found to support the student envisioned in that educational mission statement. The educational mission statement directs the division to develop a student:

- who has sound Christian practices and leadership skills
- who is grounded in the general education program of the institution
- who has experienced an academically rigorous program
- who has developed specific skills in problem solving, teambuilding, leadership, working in multicultural environments, using business technology, and adapting to change.

Through a systematic data collection process, the division has used student feedback and other assessment data to create a division where the development of a student that can meet the educational mission is possible. Continuous improvement is not only a topic for businesses, but a process for the division. They have shown substantial evidence that their students are learning the targeted outcomes and that teacher effectiveness is a conscious and deliberate part of that process.

## **Criterion Four: Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge**

### **Core Component 4A – The division demonstrates, through the actions of its administrators, students, faculty, and staff, that it values a life of learning.**

The division capably demonstrates through all of its personnel that it values a life of learning. The division readily participates in life-learning opportunities afforded by the university such as graduate work for current faculty, faculty appreciation day, honors convocation, professional development, professional travel and professional licensing.

Two of the division faculty received honors for exhibiting lives of learning: Yorton Clark was honored with the Donald S. Metz Teacher of the Year award and Michael Gough became a Henry Bloch fellow. Daniel Song'ony continues to publish work on the economic impact of AIDS in Africa.

In addition, the division highlights achievements of its students at the FEI banquet, the senior awards banquet and by maintaining a wall of fame in the division offices. The division also strives to publicize exceptional student work through the media.

The IRC does offer recommendations and poses questions as follows:

- On page 37 of the *Report*, statement 2 mentions student internships. It would be helpful to quantify how many students are involved in internships each semester over the last few years.
- On page 38, statement 5 notes that Professors Clark and Wegley did not attend because of a “conflict with their graduate work.” Was this the case or was it because of the careful monitoring done by the division (#4) to “ensure that they have enough time to complete their degrees”?
- Also on page 38, statement 9 raises the question as to whether the training opportunity provided for division staff is off site?
- Page 39 indicates the division “publicize[s] student accomplishments...in the media” yet fails to mention the MNU student newspaper, the *Trailblazer* with the other listed media.

### **Core Component 4B – The division demonstrates that acquisition of a breadth of knowledge and skills and the exercise of intellectual inquiry are integral to its educational programs.**

The explanation and statistics offered (Table 14) for the General Education Core was easy to follow and clearly demonstrates that MNU Business Majors acquire a “breadth of knowledge and skills...integral to its educational programs.” This is supported by the four General Education courses offered by the division.

SIFE and the “On Purpose” colloquy also contribute to this same “breadth of knowledge and skills.” The strongest measure is that “Business majors are getting into graduate schools and successfully completing their programs.”

While there is demonstration, the IRC recommends the following:

- On page 43, there is promise of “Examples of SIFE projects” yet the four areas that SIFE engages do not detail or describe past SIFE projects that would be aligned to these areas.
- On this same page, the committee suggests listing the topics addressed in the “On Purpose” colloquies to further demonstrate support of this core component.
- Also on this page – mention is made of “embedded projects” however there is not definition of description elsewhere in Criterion 4. The committee suggests providing examples.
- On page 44 – the statement is made “the best evidence is the fact that Business majors are getting into graduates (sic) schools and successfully completing their programs.” While this is impressive and sounds nice – how does this quantify and compare to Business majors in other schools or to MNU majors in other disciplines? The IRC recommends this be quantified and compared to some external standard.

**Core Component 4C – The division assesses the usefulness of its curricula to students who will live and work in a global, diverse, and technological society.**

The division uses a variety of measures to assess the usefulness of its curricula. The division also leverages environmental scanning, student satisfaction surveys, exit surveys, alumni surveys and focus groups to evaluate its curricula.

Further comments and questions from the IRC in reference to this component are:

- Focus groups are used that are comprised of Business professionals. Perhaps mention whether or not MNU business interns have worked in any of the companies represented by the focus group members.
- A mentoring program is mentioned (page 46) without any reference to an appendix. How mission critical is this program? What does it look like? Is this program referenced in any of the other core components?

**Core Component 4D – The division provides support to ensure that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly.**

The business division avails itself of the university’s policies and tools in applying knowledge responsibly. The division refers to faculty, students, and staff to the university’s academic integrity policies. Professors also use *TurnItIn.com* to ensure the academic integrity of its students.

Clearly, the division provides substantial evidence that it promotes a life of learning. Two words describe how the division accomplishes this: balance and thoroughness. The division achieves balance by fostering learning opportunities for its faculty and staff through both terminal degree programs and knowledge based seminars. Its students are led to learning through the General Education core, areas of concentration, and co-

curricular activities. They study under professors that demonstrate a life of learning through prior and current studies.

The division achieves thoroughness in looking at every aspect of their program through multiple perspectives. There is an inward examination provided by student and alumni evaluations and surveys. There is outward examination realized through environmental scanning, focus groups of local business professionals and through professional business organizations.

This balance and thoroughness is best typified in the *Report* itself. "Oversight" is a word of rare contrast. On the one hand it can mean "a mistake resulting from inattention." On the other hand it can mean "supervision: management by overseeing the performance or operation of a person or group." The Division of Business Administration has done a highly commendable job of oversight as based on the second definition.

## **Criterion Five: Engagement and Service**

### **Core Component 5A – The division learns from the constituencies it serves and analyzes its capacity to serve their needs and expectations.**

Without a doubt, the division is continually evaluating its capacity to meet the needs and expectations of its constituents. This evaluation comes through focus groups. Outside professionals offer feedback regarding the curriculum and programs. Accrediting agencies, independent from the University, provide important feedback.

Students within the division are required to complete community service hours which again, emphasizes and upholds not only the mission of the division but the university mission. Class projects are completed resulting in students learning from members and businesses in the community and the community learning from the students. Professors offer their services as consultants and trainers.

### **Core Component 5B – The division has the capacity and the commitment to engage with its identified constituencies and communities.**

Through division chapels, “On Purpose” leadership series, class projects, and SIFE – clearly the division is not only committed to being involved in the community, it has the capacity for engagement. In addition – students have opportunity for hands on experience with constituents through internships and mentoring programs.

### **Core Component 5C – The division demonstrates its responsiveness to those constituencies that depend on it for service.**

The division continues to pursue relationships with outside accrediting agencies in order to increase accountability and maintain quality instruction and offerings to students interested in majoring in business. This pursuit demonstrates the desire of the division to be competitive, maintain membership in professional organizations that ensures additional academic opportunity for students – in particular in the International Business Institute program. MNU’s division of Business Administration also creates an environment that is supportive of the mobility of learners by accepting most transfer credits from other accredited colleges and universities. Members of the local community also testify to the value of the SIFE program.

### **Core Component 5D – Internal and external constituencies value the services the division program provides.**

Appendix O presents a sampling of letters from external constituents praising the work of MNU business students who have served as interns. In addition to these letters that exhibit the value of our students and their service, external feedback is gained through the use of focus groups and alumni surveys. External constituents not only benefit from the

use of the classrooms for their group and/or organizational needs, they also provide service to the division as guest lecturers, judges, intern supervisors and more.

Internal constituents have opportunity to express the value of the services provided by the division by completing exit surveys, student satisfaction surveys, and participating in focus groups. Samples of these focus group transcripts, student satisfaction survey results and exit survey results can be found in Appendix F.

### **Summary:**

The Internal Review Committee would like to commend the Division of Business Administration on a job well done. The *Report* gives a detailed description of the inner workings of the division, means of assessment, articulate mission statement, involvement and partnership in the community, commitment to excellence not only through effective teaching but in student learning, and more. The IRC recognizes a strong commitment to collaboration and shared responsibility among the faculty within the division. We also appreciate your commitment to faculty development and life-long learning as evidenced by your attendance (as a whole division when possible) at the annual conference, those in doctoral programs, and professional activities in which your faculty involve themselves.

Rather than have a compiled and final list of strengths, concerns and opportunities, the Internal Review Committee has presented these pertaining to each Criterion and corresponding core components.

The Internal Review Committee encourages you to continue your focus on scholarship, academic excellence and the fulfillment of your mission statement as you prepare young men and women to be committed Christians fulfilling the call of God in their chosen profession.

## **APPENDIX**

Memo to the Division of Business Administration  
From the Internal Review Committee

Request for additional information and documents, corrections and revisions.

February 2006

**To:** Dr. Mark Ford  
Chair, Division of Business Administration  
**cc:** Dr. Doug Henning

**From:** Dr. Sondra Cave  
Chair, Program Review Committee

**Re:** Self-study report

The Internal Review Committee for the Business Administration division has reviewed your self-study report. The committee is submitting this letter as a result of our initial review and discussion. We would like to request that consideration be given to make corrections and also to add or present additional information that we think is necessary in order to finish our review and make a final report.

Before itemizing the requests for more information – first, we offer suggestions regarding general “housekeeping” items and corrections. You may or may not want to address these. Some of these suggestions are based on our belief that this is a formal document and should be written as such. Therefore, some items are particular to being written in a formal way. Also, some of our suggestions may be our preferences and you may choose to disregard them.

Overall suggestions and/or corrections:

- In the table of contents – Criterion 4 is missing.
- Many of the responses are too casual. It seems there should be an “introduction” to the response. For example on page 10, under core 2B, the first bullet – *Are the division/program’s resources adequate...?* Rather than begin with “Budget increases have been...” we suggest an overall statement such as, “Resources are inadequate to provide for growing needs in professional development funding and renovation of Business Division facilities. Budget increases...”
  - Another example of this abrupt start for answering the question is on page 12, the second bullet – *How are your ...planning processes flexible...downsizing or growth?* A more sophisticated (if you will) response, would be something along the lines of “faculty have, in recent months, made necessary sacrifices to save funds for MNU by choosing to skip CBFA....”
- There are some typing errors – words misspelled, a word omitted, etc. In some places the font size is **really big** and should be corrected. Example – page 8 at the end of item one near the bottom of the page. Also on page 22, 27, 37, etc.

- From Kelvin – in the self-study the term “smart board” is used however, the correct name is “Team Board.” He suggests using a “find and replace” to make the correction.
- We would like to suggest Appendix K have page numbers added. This appendix is 89 pages in length. Throughout the report – when Appendix K is referenced, the reader has to “wade through” many pages to locate the information. It would be very helpful, when referencing the Appendix in the self-study document, indicate K-pg # for ease of locating the supporting information.

Request for additional information and/or clarification re: submitted information:

#### Criterion One: Mission and Integrity

- Please include a copy of the MNU mission statement. Rather than “*see MNU catalog*” we would prefer to have the self-study contain all auxiliary information rather than being directed to additional resources to which the reader does/may not have immediate access.
  - This would go in Appendix A and/or C.

#### Criterion Two: Preparing for the Future

- Pg. 8, number 1 – outside accreditation bodies are not listed. What are examples or specific names of those bodies?
- Pg. 9 – last two words “*innovation happens*” – Back this up by using professional evaluation and give examples. Describe how the innovation has changed or improved.
- Pg. 10 – next to last bullet – “*what division plans exist...*” An example is given however it doesn’t answer the question as to “what plans” – no plan is laid out.
- Pg. 11 – this table would be more easily understood if there was some type of ledger available to identify the abbreviations.

#### Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching

- Pg. 16 – top response – include the MNU Data book or the information from the data book that supports this statement. As suggested above – all referenced information contained in one place.
- Pg. 16 - Bullet 3 – How does your division involve faculty...
  - Your response indicates you have “several meetings” and “scheduled division meetings” – how often are these meetings? And minutes are shown for only two meetings – one in March of 2004 and one in March of 2005.
    - Were there other meetings, are the “several” and “scheduled” meetings bi-annual, etc.?
- Pg. 16 – Core Component 3B –
  - “*Prove...*” – the response identifies IACBE as requiring from you “...taught by doctorally-qualified and professionally-qualified faculty

members” however, there is no proof. “Qualified” is not enough – and there is only mention of faculty as qualified but not meeting evidence (proof) of discussion for curriculum and strategies for instruction.

- Pg. 18 – item #4 – “*the division supplements this amount.*” By how much and how? From your budget, fund raising, etc.
- Pg. 19 – Item #4 – list books bought in a two year period – titles, topics...accountability evidence. What books are the faculty requesting? Are the books for enhanced instruction, supplemental to course assignments, etc.??
- Pg. 21 – bottom bullet – key words in that question are “regular review.” In your response you report “...*processes provide a regular review...*” What is regular? We would like to see a timeline showing regular review...how often focus groups, alumni surveys, etc. are used for review?
- Pg. 22 – above last bullet – correct font size and also spelling for internship *sites*. And how many internship sites?
- Pg. 24 – first bullet – Internships – provide a list. The letters don’t provide information regarding how many and with whom/where students conduct internships. Also provide a list or examples of the mentoring programs mentioned.

#### Criterion 4: Acquisition, Discovery, and Application:

- Pg. 26 – item #2 at top of page – faculty sponsorship for internships...when listing (as suggested above) the internships, also include the names of the faculty members who sponsor internships.
- Pg. 26 – numbering is off - there are two #5’s
- Pg. 26 – both #5’s and #6 are identical to the information provided on page 19.
- Pg. 26 – the first #5 – who attended the last conference? Do all attend or a certain percentage of your division?
- Pg. 27 – item #1 – Mike Gough’s name and accomplishments is not highlighted in Appendix M-7.
- Pg. 27 – item #8 – “*student accomplishments in the media...*” add “*such as the Olathe News and the Accent, the alumni magazine*”.
  - Also item #8 - what type of banners? Could you provide an example in the appendix or give an example here?
- Pg. 28 – Core component 4B – response beginning “According to...” indicates a 40% statistic. In the table, the last column shows 37%. Also in this last column and row – the “titles” spacing needs to be corrected so the “e” for percentage is on the same line and the “ns” is with “communicatio” on the previous line.
  - Can this table all be put on one page – it is split between page 28/29.
- Pg. 29 – response above the last bullet – please provide examples of the critical skills sets and also the admissions requirement for the Business and Accounting majors.
- Pg. 30 – top bullet – SIFE is well defined, yet the question of linkage supporting inquiry, practice, creativity, and social responsibility is not answered.

- Using this same bullet – the last paragraph beginning with “on purpose”... Who are the speakers? Students, faculty, experts in the field and how is this linkage measured?
- Pg. 30 – bottom paragraph – “*three outside Business accrediting agencies*” – please identify who they are.
- Pg. 32 – Table 8 – Why not give a table for each major or is this the only major in compliance? What are the target CPC totals?
- Pg. 32 – paragraph beginning “finally...” – could we see a sample of the surveys and result of the monitor to evidence that the major have benefited?
- Pg. 35 – second bullet – response references the student handbook. Please include in the appendix. Also referenced is the course syllabi, however only one syllabus is provided. Should there be more than one example?
- Pg. 36 – top – the response is the same as that given on page 35, except that academic integrity and intellectual property rights are replaced. ??
- Pg. 38 – top paragraph “division chapels...” and first response under Core Component 5B are the same.
- pg. 39 – Core component 5C – IACBE – could you describe/define it in the same manner as you define IBI in the following paragraph?

Specific suggestions/questions by Appendix:

- F –
  - pg. 5 – who are the members of this focus group? Was – or how was - the information used for improvement? Is there a list of questions used for the focus group?
  - Pg. 10 – what has been done with the results of question 4?
  - Pg. 13 – how do questions 4 and 5 differ except in responses – to the identical question?
  - Pg. 14 – how were the responses to question 13 addressed and improvement made?
- K –
  - Pg 7-22 – good information and nicely organized but repetitive. Items 5-76 each begin with “this is a course....” And how do these relate to outcomes?
    - Might it also be possible to place the information in a table format for comparison? For example:

Student Outcomes	Direct Measure	Indirect Measure	Meets outside accrediting agency?

- Pg. 22 - D – empty. Where is the information??
- Pg. 24 is titled “Intended Educational (Student) Outcomes. The following eight pages provide “outcomes assessed...” On the bottom of page 34 is the title “Intended Educational (Student) Outcomes” but they are not the

same as those outcomes pages 25-32. Are these to be the same, different or titled differently?

- Pg. 83-85 – we suggest removing the students’ names. Is there any FERPA violation by having the student name and test score?
- M –
  - Pg. 7 – Highlight Mike Gough’s accomplishments.
- N – Is it possible to provide the year of the degree and/or how many years of the program this represents?
- O – Provide a list of internship sites and faculty sponsors – letters serve as support for the value/benefit for employer.
  - Mentoring programs – provide list or examples.

We do not intend to appear “nit picky” and overly particular, and some of our requests and suggestions may not be significant or important. When you have responded to our requests, for more information and suggestions for corrections, to your satisfaction – please submit additional documentation, etc. to me so that our committee can make our final review and complete the report.

Thank you, Mark.

Sondra Cave, Ed. D.  
Review Committee Chair person

Committee Members:  
Linda Alexander  
Jeanne Millhuff  
Barth Smith  
Kelvin St. John