The responses in this report follow the Department of Finance Response to the Program Review Recommendations of the University Program Review Committee. The Program Review Committee has provided recommendations that will be helpful to the continuous improvement of the Department. Some recommendations can be implemented by department action while others cannot be done, as the department has indicated, without college action because of broader implications. My additional responses follow.

**Mission and Focus**

The PRC recommendation that “the Department should undertake a discussion of its mission, attending closely to the core mission.”(II.1.) requires carefully consideration by the Department. The core mission needs to be clarified and affirmed. The department mission statement draft for review by the dean should be completed by March 1, 2005. The complexity of a broad mission and diffused missions is at once a serious problem in the operation of the Department and the challenge of visualizing and implementing alternatives. The PRC reports allude to numerous operational problems, including insufficient database support for research, excessive preparations per semester, scarce operating budget, and inappropriate class sizes. Solutions suggested by the PRC and outside review team members require challenging changes. This review recommends that changes be planned for and undertaken in coming years, despite short-term challenges, because the operational difficulties are likely to intensify if the status quo is maintained.

I strongly support the preparation of a long-term staffing plan. (II. 2.) The plan needs to address instructor and tenure-track faculty. Also, the plan needs to give priority to the courses related to the core mission. Also, concerns related to “Faculty Success and Retention” are of secondary but very important consideration. Other issues or objectives may be of such lesser importance that the staffing plan may need to deal with them as contingent possibilities. The department staffing draft plan for review by the dean should be completed by Fall 2005.

The admonition that “mission affects instructional workload” is an important guideline. (II. 3.) I interpret this phrase in conjunction with other statements by the review committee to mean that the Department needs to consolidate the curriculum as a precursor to reduction of workload. Fewer course offerings, in alignment with a tighter mission, leads to fewer sections per course and fewer different course preparations. In turn, each faculty member may receive fewer preparation requirements per semester. The reduction in preparations is a form of workload reduction. Further, the coordination activity time spent by both the Department Chair and the faculty are reduced by decreasing the variety of course offerings. Finally, the course related overhead efforts, like assessment, performed by the Chair and faculty may be reduced by reducing the variety of courses.

The PRC recommendation that the “Department should be prepared with position descriptions designed to serve current needs …” provides sense of forethought. Following the adoption of a revised mission statement by the CBA, the Department will be in a good position to prepare the descriptions and recommended numbers of positions.
Research
A very supportable recommendation of the PRC is focus more tightly on a research mission shared by most if not all the Department. While finding a mission congruent with the teaching, research, and service constituencies served by the Department is challenging, the search is worth the effort. Further, the mission of the future is an important guide to recruitment, and recruitment helps fulfill the visionary mission. Of course, such benefits usually come with some losses. I ask that the Department complete a brief concept paper to me with not only the vision of a narrowly focused mission but also the benefits and losses necessary to achieve it. I request that the report be finalized during the Spring 2005 semester. In light of the uncertainty and changes likely to ensue from the college strategic planning process, the time frames for completion of each step in this report may change. Advance notice by the Department of the reasons for a delay and the projected new deadlines is expected.

Revisit the merit document and reconsider the precise wording of “acceptability” for promotion and tenure qualification. By “precise” I mean that the merit document should be stated in terms whose meanings are readily interpretable using standard English-reference works.

The Department needs to extend the research productivity of a few members to the entire tenure track faculty. The AACSB and the BGSU academic plan envision faculty who are engaged individually as scholars.

I urge the Department to seek funding for the finance research data. Justification for such requests may be based on both the needs of students for faculty scholarship and the substantial tuition received by the University for courses taught by Department faculty. Further, the faculty should proactively express their special justifications beyond the College to the sources of funding. Part of the communications should include frequent examples of research output utilizing finance databases purchased by BGSU.

I commend the Department for its professional demeanor throughout the long and sometimes arduous review process. Personally, I have appreciated the collegiality of all the participants to the process and look forward to working with Department faculty and staff during implementation of recommendations for change.

Respectfully submitted to the Provost
by Robert O. Edmister, Dean, College of Business Administration

October 22, 2004

Reviewed by the Provost/VPAA __________________________ Date__________________

_____ concur ______ do not concur for the following reason(s) ____________________