

Management Department Fall Meeting Minutes

August 8, 2017

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Adamson Hall – Conference Room

Attending: Dr. Tom Gainey, Dr. John Upson, Dr. Mary-Kathryn Zachary, Dr. Faramarz Parsa, Dr. Doug Turner, Dr. Jeannie Pridmore, Dr. Joan Deng, Dr. Leanne DeFoor, Dr. Erich Bergiel, Mrs. Samantha White, Dr. Susana Velez-Castrillon, Mr. Rick Sigman, Dr. Jon Anderson, Dr. Kim Green, Ms. Mariana Sanchez, Mr. Philip Reeves, Dr. Brad Prince, Mrs. Monica Smith, Mrs. Liz Runyan

Topic #1: Department Meeting Resource Book – A notebook with items such as previous department meeting minutes, assessment reports, and Engage West survey results was distributed. This notebook was used to facilitate discussion during the meeting and can be used as a resource for faculty during the year as we continue our assessment efforts.

Topic #2: Promotion and Tenure (2017/18) – Jon Anderson is up for his five-year review, John Upson is eligible for promotion to Professor, and Susana Velez-Castrillon is eligible for tenure. These candidates have the option of submitting an electronic dossier or paper dossier. Next year electronic submission will be mandatory. The dossiers are due by September 15th. There will be a meeting of the department committee on Tuesday, September 26th.

Topic #3: WEAVE – Weave is a new online assessment system for entering SACS data. Essentially, this database will hold annual assessment information for both the Management and MIS programs. Tom Gainey is in the process of entering the information from the past two years.

Topic #4: Management Program Assessment (2016/17) – Measurement/Discussion of the student learning outcomes related to the Management program is ongoing throughout the academic year. However, during our department meeting, we briefly reviewed the direct and indirect measures for each of the four student learning outcomes. We now have two years of results for each measure. This information will be uploaded to the WEAVE system.

Topic #5: MIS Program Assessment (2016/17) – Measurement/Discussion of the student learning outcomes related to the MIS program is ongoing throughout the academic year. However, during our department meeting, we briefly reviewed the direct and indirect measures for each of the four student learning outcomes. We now have two years of results for each measure. This information will be uploaded to the WEAVE system.

Topic #6: Business Law – Field Exam Results (2016/17) – The two questions that continue to have the lowest results are Q3 (47.8% correct) and Q8 (43.8% correct). Q3 deals with the three branches of the federal government. During 2016/17, instructors used some remedial videos to help students better understand the roles of the executive, judicial, and legislative branches. And there was some improvement. The number of students who answered Q3 correctly increased from 41.8% correct to 47.8% correct. For the upcoming year, we have requested that the word “enact” in the question be changed to “passes”. We discovered that a number of our students did not know what the word “enact” actually means. Q8 deals with the board of director’s responsibility in a corporation. During

2016/17, we changed the word “management” to “direction” to clarify the question for students. However, this did not improve results. In fact, results on Q8 decreased from 47.3% correct to 43.8% correct. We are not certain why our students cannot recall the role of the board of directors. We have asked for an answer distribution for this question so that we can better understand our students’ thinking on this question. We feel that we can take more effective correct action if we better understand how students are approaching this particular topic.

Update: Since our departmental meeting, we received the answer distribution for Q8 from the Spring 2017 field exam. Q8 reads, “Responsibility for the overall direction of Retail Stores, Inc., a corporation, is entrusted to _____.” The question was answered by 210 students. The distribution of answers was as follows: (a) The board of directors (50%), (b) The corporate officers and managers (28%), (c) The owners of the corporation (20%), and (d) The promoters of the corporation (2%). This gives us a little better understanding of how students are approaching this question. It will allow the instructors to elaborate a little more in class on the roles of the board of directors, owners, managers, etc.

Topic #7: Management – Field Exam Results (2016/17) – Last year our corrective action focused on Q7 and Q8. And results were positive. On Q7, the percentage of students that answered the question correctly improved from 47.9% to 58.4%. On Q8, the percentage of students that answered the question correctly improved from 48.8% to 51.5%. For 2017/18, we decided to focus on Q3 (A _____ manager for a McDonald’s fast food restaurant would be responsible for placing orders for food and paper supplies, and for setting up weekly work schedules). Only 58.9% of the students got this question correct. The instructors teaching MGNT 3600 will focus this year on using a handout and/or exercise to help students better understand that there are “first-line”, “middle”, and “top” managers in each organization and that the nature of their duties and responsibilities differ significantly.

Topic #8: MIS – Field Exam Results (2016/17) – 2015/16 was the first academic year that we used MIS questions on the field exam and results were not as encouraging as we had hoped. After reviewing the results last year, the consensus of the MIS faculty was that many of the questions were worded in a manner that may have been confusing to the students. Thus, during Fall 2016, Dr. Pridmore, Dr. Deng, Ms. Sanchez, and Mr. Reeves were part of a task force that revised the ten MIS field exam questions. However, the new questions were not ready to be integrated into the field exam before it was administered in Fall 2016. To maintain the consistency of the field exam during 2016/17, the decision was made not to include the new MIS questions until Fall 2017. Because the original questions continued to be used, we continued to see rather low results. Specifically, across the 404 students who answered the ten questions, only one question was answered correctly by more than 45% of the students. Overall, only 9.4% of the students “meet” or “exceeded” expectations. We do plan to pilot test the new questions with our two MIS Graduate Assistants before the field exam is administered again to make certain additional minor adjustments are not necessary. However, we are anxious to see the 2017/18 results to determine if the new questions are more user-friendly. We can then focus on specific areas where corrective action may prove useful.

Update: Since our department meeting, we ran a pilot test with two of our graduate students on the new MIS field exam questions. They both found a minor error in the wording of Q67. This has been communicated to Mary Kassis. As for results, one of the students got 7 of 10 correct (missed Q63, Q64, and Q69). The other student got 8 of 10 correct (missed Q63 and Q69). This is encouraging. Hopefully, the 2017/18 results may be a bit better with the new questions. Also, based on a very small sample, it

suggests that our corrective action may focus on Q63 (Which of the following relates to the integration of data?) and Q69 (Of the factors below which one requires NO user action to cause a website to crash?).

Topic #9: Management Department Unit Assessment (2016/17) – We briefly reviewed our progress on the Unit Assessment Goals over the past year. Particular emphasis was placed on Unit Goal #4 (Create a work environment in which faculty and staff are engaged and satisfied). This covered our three Engage West goals from last year, including the results and improvement plan on each goal.

Topic #10: Engage West Survey Results (2017) - The results of the 2017 Engage West Survey were distributed and discussed. In summary, the lowest average scores were in the broad areas of “Benefits”, and “Pay”. Results of individual questions were then discussed. From this conversation, three unit goals were established for the 2017/18 academic year.

Topic #11: Engage West Goals (2017/18) – Based on the 2017 Engage West Survey, the department established the following three unit goals for the 2017/18 academic year: (1) Better define what broad survey items such as “fairly”, “discrimination”, and “comfortable” actually mean to our faculty when it comes to workplace climate (Q49, Q50, Q51, Q52, Q56), (2) Work with HR representatives to find out how our retirement-ready faculty can get answers to their questions in a timely manner and better understand how HR addresses local concerns such as the recent issues with West Georgia Internal Medicine (seemed to be more faculty-driven than HR-driven) (Q67, Q68), (3) Improve open, honest, and effective communication with UWG senior leadership (Q19, Q46, Q47, Q48).

Topic #12: Update – MIS Tenure Track Position – Thus far, we have 46 applications for the MIS tenure track position. Doug Turner, search committee chair, plans to attend the AMCIS conference in mid-August to interview 28 candidates.

Topic #13: Management and MIS Projected Growth - We reviewed projections from the Provost’s Office of each of the majors in the RCOB. Both Management and MIS are expected to increase over the next four years. In terms of the Management Department as a whole, the number of majors are expected to increase from 756 in Fall 2017 to 809 in Fall 2021. To maintain growth and perhaps find a partner for study abroad trips, we may examine some opportunities with other majors. Some suggestions from faculty included: Sports Management, Biology, Psychology, Sociology, Political Science, Nursing, and Public Administration. Tom Gainey will try to initiate some preliminary discussions.

Topic #14: Study Abroad Faculty Rotation – The directors of our study abroad program (John and Erich) have suggested that we try to find a fair way to give other faculty members in our department an opportunity to travel on study abroad trips. In the past, we have had no trouble finding individuals for the more popular destinations and this sometimes creates some friction regarding who should be allowed to go. In sum, we just need a fair way to handle this situation. The basic idea would be to create a list of individuals who have never been on a study abroad trip (at the top) followed by those who have been. Then, if John and Erich continue to serve as the directors and we do not have a female faculty member going on the trip, the opportunity would go to first female on list. If a female faculty is

already going (perhaps from another department), the opportunity would then go to the first person on list (regardless of gender). If an individual declines to go on the trip, their name would be moved to the bottom of the list. Some faculty suggested that we should also take into account other factors such as individual language skills or cultural knowledge that may be relevant to a particular trip. It was mentioned that a “SCIP” process used by the UWG Office of Education Abroad may be a useful guide.

Topic #15: Budget Requests (New Faculty Lines, Assessment Director, etc.) – The following suggestions were made for budget requests: (1) A part-time or limited term instructor position to help provide additional resources that are currently being consumed by the WebMBA program and the MBA concentration initiative, (2) A full-time Assessment Director for the college (3) a full-time line strictly for the WebMBA program, (4) An additional Graduate Research Assistant, (5) another Advisor – especially someone who could offer office hours after normal hours for the nontraditional students.

Topic #16: e-Tuition Update – There is serious concern that e-Tuition funds may be reduced or even eliminated. Our department is unquestionably dependent on these funds to properly carry out our expected responsibilities. Hopefully, if UWG continues to get positive budgets, some of the lines so dependent on e-Tuition can be funded.

Topic #17: Summer Classes Update – While the final numbers from summer were not available, analysis during the summer suggested that we adequately covered the \$242,539 in salaries and benefits. One issue that we had in the May session is that our enrollments in CISM 2201 and BUSA 2106 dropped significantly. We believe this may have been due to students being dropped for nonpayment on the same day as drop/add – after being dropped, students could not add the course back to their schedule. We have communicated our concerns about the May session schedule to UWG administration. In Administrative Council meetings, Michael Crafton suggested that if we covered our expenses, we should be fine. There is also a rumor that students may have access to Pell again next summer. We anticipate that this would give would have a positive impact on our summer enrollment. There was also some concerned expressed about the number of courses that some students try to complete during an individual summer session. Monica Smith will look into the current policy and we will discuss possibly putting some restrictions in place.

Topic #18: Miscellaneous Information Items – (1) Samantha White reminded everyone of the social media sites that she had set up for the department and encouraged individuals to get her information on items that might be of interest to students, and (2) Jon Anderson noted that some universities pay their faculty for taking on extra courses during the fall/spring semesters – this is something we may want to investigate given our limited resources during certain semesters.