DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
TO THE 2002 PROGRAM REVIEW

The Department of Management faculty members appreciate effort on the part of the PRC and the external reviewers. The findings and recommendations should help the Department of Management continue to improve. This report will address each of the findings that were identified by the PRC as requiring action.

Findings Requiring Action and PRC Recommendation

1. Improved Success of Probationary and Mid-Career Faculty. During the interval 1995-2002, the Department has not promoted any associate professors to full professor, despite numerous candidates based upon time-in-rank. Due to retirements and administrative appointments, the Department has declined from a stable base of four full professors to one. In addition, only two assistant professors have been promoted to associate professor (one subsequently left the University). The PRC concurs with the external reviewers that a priority for the Department is to formulate individual plans for the success of its faculty at all ranks.

PRC Recommendation: The Department needs to develop individualized plans to improve the success of each of its probationary and mid-career faculty. Plans for current faculty should be developed by the end of fall semester, 2003.

The Department concurs that it is critical to improve probationary and mid-career faculty success. Improved faculty success should also help to address the problems of retention and research productivity. Individual career development plans will be developed by the end of fall 2003 as recommended.

2. Improved Faculty Retention. Retention is obviously linked to faculty success and several related action items. Salaries and issues such as salary-compression and even salary-inversion are institutional problems not likely to be solved by individual academic units. Nevertheless, academic units are not completely without recourse to improve faculty retention. Individual faculty success plans (discussed above) might, as appropriate, detail exactly how teaching assignments, differential teaching loads, course reductions, service expectations, and professional development efforts can be used over a period of years to enhance productivity, success, and morale. Departmental documents for promotion, tenure, and merit should be re-evaluated, as needed, to improve faculty success and retention. Overhead return funds from external grants or other externally generated funds can be used as seed money. The Department has recognized its problem(s), but then failed to use the self-study document to propose its own solution(s).

In discussing this problem with the PRC liaison, the Department faculty expressed concerns about the quality of temporary faculty if faculty time buyouts are used for improving retention and productivity. The Department would want to find a qualified replacement for an entire year
rather than for a course. This is an admirable position to take, but may make it difficult or impossible to obtain the release time needed to address these problems. The Department also noted that funds raised by corporate partnerships have their own "price" related to expectations for faculty time commitments. These legitimate concerns underscore the need for department-wide planning and strategy to address the serious problems of faculty retention and productivity.

**PRC Recommendation:** The Department needs to find practical ways to address the faculty retention issue consistent with success plans delineated above and existing departmental resources. A departmental retention plan should be developed in consultation with the Dean, by the end of spring semester, 2004. Such a plan might include an amended or modified differential workload policy, if necessary.

The Department agrees that a faculty retention plan should be developed and in place by the end of spring 2004. In addition, the Department was successful in hiring Dr. John Ryans, Full Professor and James R. Good Chair of Global Strategy and Dr. Amelia Carr, Associate Professor and Director of the Supply Chain Management Institute. Dr. Ryans and Dr. Carr are both accomplished researchers and will be able to be mentors to less experienced faculty members.

3. Improved Faculty Research Productivity. The Department recognized that its research productivity is relatively low. The reviewers concurred. The Department noted recent efforts such as a Research Incubation Discussion Group, an IOE sponsored annual research series, and plans for rewarding researchers with course releases. This issue is obviously related to the above two action items, and the Department is to be commended for initiating these efforts. The PRC believes there is a clear need to reaffirm a departmental commitment to a research culture. As an academic unit, the Department should re-evaluate its business partnerships (which have been primarily instructional and service-related) in terms of opportunities for applied and basic research. There is a clear need to set goals and evaluate the progress of these efforts to increase research productivity.

The Department has established an expectation of one quality publication per year per faculty member. The self-study then discusses department averages with respect to this goal. It is not clear from the provided information if there is a wide disparity between faculty with respect to research productivity. Such concerns mandate the need for individualized success plans as opposed to use of averages. In addition, the department governance documents authorize the use of differential teaching loads, but there is no information about whether or not such policies exist. The external reviewers concurred with the potential use of such differential teaching loads.

The PRC notes that there are aspects of research productivity other than publication in journals. First, the Department has had some success securing external funding, but must continue to build on that success. External funding is most likely to be available through selling of certificate programs or specialized graduate programs, or through supply chain opportunities with specific companies. Department governance documents should be re-evaluated to see if these do not adequately recognize or reward the importance of external grants or other funding. Second, consistent with the mission of the Department of Management as an academic unit, the activities of the IOE and SCMI should be directed towards applied and basic research. Can the institutes
provide additional opportunities for funding directly in support of faculty research? Can the institutes better provide for undergraduate and graduate student research opportunities? Third, can internships have a better designed research focus?

**PRC Recommendation:** Consistent with the Department of Management's mission as an academic unit, there needs to be a re-affirmation of a research culture that becomes the primary standard for all of the department's activities. The Department needs to prioritize improved faculty research productivity (as measured by publications, grants or other external funding, and supervised undergraduate/graduate student research) as part of its goals to improve faculty success and retention. Plans for increased productivity should be incorporated into the individual and departmental success/retention plans discussed above. The Department should consider re-evaluating its promotion & tenure and merit documents to see if there is proper weight on research activities. The Department might also wish to reconsider the intended role of student internships as professional development tools—Could these be better defined as research experiences? Finally, the Department may wish to re-evaluate whether or not business partnerships (including activities through the institutes) adequately serve the primary research focus of the Department.

Research productivity objectives will be incorporated into the individual faculty success plans as well as the retention plans. The Department believes that the tenure and promotion documents and merit documents currently put the appropriate weight on research which, given that we do not have doctoral programs, is to be balanced with teaching. However, workload issues such as multiple course preps, increasing class size, faculty recruiting, and service activities absorb time that could be spent on research. In its planning process, the Department will address workload issues.

We agree that business partnerships through the SCMI and IOE can and should play a greater role in research. The SCMI members have been used as in case studies and for pilot testing of survey instruments. Three papers resulting from research with SCMI members are currently under second review at journals.

However, there are opportunities to further engage the SCMI members in research. Dr. Amelia Carr will be joining the faculty as Director of the SCMI in fall of 2003 and is committed to increasing the opportunities for collaborative research with the SCMI members. Dr. Carr has a proven research record and has conducted collaborative research with companies such as Honda and John Deere.

As the new director of IOE, Dr. Jane Wheeler, envisions the institute as a vehicle for faculty/student research. Dr. Wheeler initiated an Excellence in Leadership speaker series that brings accomplished researchers to campus for interaction with faculty and students. In addition, she already has a collaborative project underway with Michelin Tire involving other faculty members and students.

In addition, money generated from the SCMI funded three summer research grants (one in 2002, two in 2003). SCMI funds have been, and will be used to support actual research expenses such
as survey costs. The SCMI has also been used to fund faculty travel for research presentations. The MOD Executive program and IOE activities will also be used to provide research support.

4. Improved Department Long-range Planning. The PRC understands the difficulty the Department has faced due to loss of senior faculty (retirements or resignations) and turn-over at Chair. It is hoped there will be a period of stability and continuity at the leadership positions.

In the meantime, the Department shows some effects of lack of centralized planning and prioritization. The department goals, as stated in the self-study report, show little cohesion or effort at prioritization. There is an over-emphasis on routine curriculum review and revision, the unending advance of classroom technology, the near constant need for alumni relations and fund raising, and so on. The Department fails to articulate a clear vision of where it wishes to be in seven years. It does not detail the necessary steps to take in order to reach those goals. Aside from general comments about resources, there is no real attempt to detail the adequacy of resources with respect to those goals.

The PRC is left with fundamental questions regarding department priorities. Is the goal to attain/maintain national recognition of the MOD/EMOD graduate program? If so, what are the implications with regard to faculty, graduate student, and financial resources? How will this prioritization impact upon other programmatic needs? Or is the goal to re-establish the primacy of the Supply Chain Management specialization? Or to build the Human Resources Management specialization to the level of a recognized strength? In short, the Department has limited resources and shows a tendency to dissipate its efforts. This comes at the expense of lower faculty research productivity and faculty burn-out.

When meeting with the PRC liaison, the Department agreed its efforts may be dissipated, but noted that it has no choice but to staff the MBA required classes, that the MOD and Supply Chain Management sequences are the department's strength, that the International Business component has been recently added, and many courses are requirements of other programs.

While these are legitimate observations, all academic units perform important service components for the University community, and each finds a way to sets its goals and proactively manage its resources. Planning is most needed and most effective during times of high demand and stress. The Department may wish to consider mechanisms to facilitate long-range planning in the face of a history of turnover at the leadership positions, such as forming an Executive Committee within the Department, or an expanded external Advisory Committee.

**PRC Recommendation:** The Department needs to articulate its vision of how it wishes to change over the next seven years, prioritize its goals, evaluate its ability to successfully attain each goal, and articulate the steps it plans to follow. A fully-articulated plan should be developed and presented to the Dean for his approval by the end of spring semester, 2004.

*The Department will explore establishing an Executive Committee and will develop a strategic plan by the end of the spring semester 2004. To facilitate the strategic planning process, a day-long meeting will be scheduled for fall 2003.*
5. **Department Resources.** The PRC cannot evaluate the adequacy of resources because of the central lack of planning delineated above. The Department should be commended for its success seeking academic-business partnerships that provide resources (both financial and otherwise). Such success might be enhanced by focused efforts in accord with a long-range plan.

There are major resource issues the Department needs to address. There needs to be an objective appraisal of the roles of the two institutes (IOE and SCMI) in the Department. Both were established and championed by now-retired faculty. Are they (individually and collectively) an asset to the Department or a detriment? Have their roles changed? Do they provide resources or draw upon resources? Are there limits to their demands for faculty involvement and time? Should they be consolidated? Can their activities be shifted toward an applied or basic research focus? Should there be an effort to shift certain resources, such as scholarship funds, more towards endowed accounts? Do corporate sponsors still value these institutes? Has there been an attempt to objectively assess if student professional development is best served through these institutes or by some other combination of methods? How much of the faculty's attachment to these institutes is tradition and inertia?

**PRC Recommendation:** The Department cannot fully evaluate its resources without articulating its goals and priorities. Its outreach efforts (e.g., academic-business partnerships) must be a means to an end, not an end in itself. Its institutes need to be re-evaluated to determine if they are assets or detriments in their present form, or how they can be modified to meet current needs. The Department should complete a review of its institutes and their role in the Department, and present the results of this review to the Dean by December, 2004.

Actually, the SCMI is only in its third year. Although the University approval for the SCMI was driven by a retired faculty member, Dr. Chan Hahn, current faculty and staff obtained the 15 charter members and have coordinated all of the SCMI activities including the three on-campus meetings. The SCMI provides important opportunities for placement, internships, and professional development for the undergraduate SCM program as well as research opportunities for faculty. We believe that the SCMI has an essential role to play in maintaining the national reputation of the undergraduate SCM program. The SCMI is one factor that helped us to attract Dr. Amelia Carr to come to BGSU.

The IOE was inactive for several years after Dr. Glenn Varney retired. The current Director, Dr. Jane Wheeler is using the IOE to increase faculty research productivity and research opportunities for students. We also believe that the IOE can play a critical role in maintaining the national reputation of the MOD program.

However, as recommended, the Department will evaluate the SCMI and IOE as part of the strategic planning process and thus will complete this by spring 2004.

6. **Assessment and Learning Outcomes.** The Department has concerns about curriculum review and revision. There is no discussion about the basis for making decisions about curriculum revision. Using its knowledge of the profession and benchmarks from peer institutions, the Department should develop models for learning outcomes and find ways to assess progress toward those educational goals, in accordance with the articulated goals of the
NCA re-accreditation report (2003). Each specialization should have a separate evaluation of student achievement of learning outcomes. Such assessment of student outcomes should reveal which courses fit together, the integration of the entire program, and the role of internships as part of the learning outcomes. This approach will provide a justification for departmental requirements and efforts.

**PRC Recommendation:** The Department's desire to review and revise its curriculum should be based upon assessment of student achievement of articulated learning outcomes for each specialization. Learning outcomes and a plan for assessing student achievement of those outcomes should be implemented by the beginning of the 2004-2005 academic year.

*The MOD program does have a set of learning outcomes and performance against those outcomes was assessed at the end of the 2002-2003 academic year. Currently, the practice in the College of Business Administration is for learning objectives to be developed and assessed at the College level at the BSBA or MBA level. At the undergraduate level, individual specializations account for less than 20% of the overall hours taken by the students, and many students specialize in more than one area. In addition to the College learning objectives, the Department does have specialization specific learning objectives that were developed several years ago. They will be reviewed and revised if needed and a plan for assessment will be implemented as recommended.*

The Department of Management will report annually to the Dean of the College of Business Administration, with a copy to the Provost, on the implementation of these recommendations.