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INSTITUTIONAL OVERVIEW

1. Contact Information

Name of institution: George Fox University
Name of business school or program: School of Business (GFSB)
Name/title of president/chancellor: Dr. Robin Baker, President
Name/title of chief academic officer: Dr. Patrick Allen, Provost
Name/title of business unit head: Dr. Dirk Barram, Dean
Academic year covered by the self-study: 2010-2011

The institution's self-study coordinator contact information:

Name: Dr. Paul Shelton
        Dr. Alan Kluge
Campus Address: 414 N. Meridian Street
City, State: Newberg, Oregon
Phone: 503-554-2827 503-554-2823
FAX: 503-554-2829
Title: Assistant Professor of Business
Title: Professor of Business
Country: USA
Zip/Postal Code: 97132
E-mail: pshleton@georgefox.edu
        akluge@georgefox.edu
Date of submission of this self-study: January 15, 2012

The primary institutional contact information during the accreditation site visit:

Name: Dr. Dirk Barram
Campus Address: 414 N. Meridian Street
City, State: Newberg, Oregon
Phone: FAX: 503-554-2822
Title: Dean, School of Business
Country: USA
Zip/Postal Code: 97132
E-mail: dbarram@georgefox.edu
Date of Submission of Self-study: January 15, 2012
Proposed date of accreditation site visit: March 4-7, 2012
2. Identification of Individuals Who Helped Prepare the Self-study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dirk Barram</td>
<td>Dean, School of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Paul Shelton</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Alan Kluge</td>
<td>Professor of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Colleen Huffman</td>
<td>Operations Director, School of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Rebecca Jensen</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant, School of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Amber Russell</td>
<td>Director, Part-Time MBA, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Annette Nemetz</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mary Olson</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Debra Worden</td>
<td>Director, Part-Time MBA, Boise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Craig Johnson</td>
<td>Professor of Business and Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Tom Head</td>
<td>Professor of Leadership Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Seth Sikkema</td>
<td>Director, Doctor of Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Christopher Meade</td>
<td>Professor Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Review of All Academic Activities

#### TABLE 0.1
Review of all Academic Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business and Business Related Programs</th>
<th>Administered by School of Business</th>
<th>To be Accredited by ACBSP</th>
<th>Degrees Conferred 2010/2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA Business Administration</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Accounting</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No¹</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Finance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No¹</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Global Business</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No¹</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Marketing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No¹</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No¹</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Economics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No²</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Business Administration (MBA)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Management (DMgt)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Business Administration (DBA)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Organizational Communications¹</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Foods and Nutrition in Business²</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Fitness Management²</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Management &amp; Organizational Leadership³</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Project Management⁶</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Health Administration⁶</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Management &amp; Business Information Systems⁶</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees Conferred Data Source: Registrar's Office, e-mail dated 8/5/2011

¹Current BA in Business Administration with concentrations in finance, international business, marketing, and management is being changed to separate BA degrees in Entrepreneurship, Finance, Global Business, Management and Marketing. New degrees were introduced in the fall of 2010. First expected graduates from these programs will be in the spring of 2013.

²While the BA in Economics is offered by the GFSB, the degree is not a business degree and does not include the common business core

³Offered by the Communications Arts Department, 10 of 39 hours in the major are courses offered by the GFSB

⁴Offered by the Family and Consumer Sciences Department, 12 of 43 hours in the major are courses offered by the GFSB

⁵Offered by the Health and Human Performance Department, does not include any courses in the GFSB

⁶Offered by the Department of Professional Studies administered by the School of Education, degree-completion programs for working adults
4. Organizational Charts

a. Institution's organizational chart

Source: Office of the President, e-mail dated 9/29/2010
b. School of Business organizational chart

Dean  
Dirk Barram PhD

Director  
Doctoral Programs  
Craig Johnson PhD

Director  
Full Time MBA  
Jeff Vanden-Hoek

Director  
Part Time MBA  
Amber Russell

FULL TIME FACULTY

Director  
Undergraduate Programs  
Ryan Halley PhD

Director  
Boise MBA  
Mary Olson PhD

Director  
of Operations  
Colleen Huffman

Administrative Assistant  
Kelly Borror

Administrative Assistant  
Rebecca Jensen

Administrative Assistant  
Darla Norgren

Administrative Assistant  
Joy Reinman

Dan Barram PhD  
Management

Alan Kluge PhD  
Marketing

Tim Rahschulte PhD  
Management

James Steele EdD  
Management

Justine Haigh PhD  
Marketing

David Liu DBA  
Management

Mark Sell DC PA  
Accounting

Jeff Vanden-Hoek  
Leadership

Tom Head MA  
Economics

Christopher Meade PhD  
Leadership

Debora Sepich MBA  
Marketing

Debra Worden PhD  
Finance

Ryan Halley PhD  
Leadership

Annette Nemetz MBA  
Leadership

Paul Shelton PhD  
Management

Chengping Zhang PhD  
Finance

Craig Johnson PhD  
Leadership

Mary Olson PhD  
Leadership

Seth Sikkema CPA  
Accounting

Gen Dykeren PhD  
Economics (1 year app)
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5. Conditions of Accreditation

a. Institutional Accreditation

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

b. Statement of Mission—Institution

George Fox University, a Christ-centered community, prepares students spiritually, academically, and professionally to think with clarity, act with integrity, and serve with passion.

c. Statement of Mission—Business School or Program

The School of Business is a learning community with a Christian worldview whose mission is to graduate students who are:

- Professionally competent
- Ethically grounded
- Globally engaged
- Socially responsive
- Servant leaders

d. Public Information

The university undergraduate catalog, graduate catalog, and student handbook are maintained on the university’s website. Page numbers provided below relate to the electronic copies.

1) Listing of the business degree programs:

Undergraduate degree programs, undergraduate catalog pages 58 – 75

Graduate degree programs, graduate catalog pages 36-51
   http://www.georgefox.edu/catalog/graduate/sob/index.html

2) The academic credentials of all faculty members:

   http://www.georgefox.edu/direc/faculty.html

3) The academic policies affecting students along with a clear description of the tuition and fees charged the students:

   http://www.georgefox.edu/offices/stu_fin_srv/costs.html
4) The statement of mission of the institution:

Undergraduate catalog page 7
Graduate catalog page 6
http://www.georgefox.edu/about/mission_vision_values/index.html

5) The statement of mission of the business school or program:

http://www.georgefox.edu/business/about/christian-mission.html

e. Accreditation of Doctoral Programs

The doctoral programs meet the stated requirements in the Standards as follows:

1) Institution is simultaneously applying for ACBSP accreditation of baccalaureate, master’s, and doctoral level programs.

2) This self-study addresses the six general standards and criteria relating to degree programs at the baccalaureate, master’s, and doctoral levels.

3) All programs including doctoral program (formerly Doctor of Management, now Doctor of Business Administration) have been approved by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities.

4) The doctoral program graduated its first two graduates in December 2009.

f. List all campuses at your institution at which a student can earn a business degree:

Newberg, Oregon – bachelor’s, master’s, doctoral
Portland, Oregon – master’s
Boise, Idaho – master’s

g. The business unit must routinely provide reliable information to the public on their performance, including student achievement.

The GFSB has shared limited performance information with the respective advisory boards of the undergraduate, MBA, and doctoral programs. We share news about student achievements and activities through regular press releases through our University public relations office, and through posts on George Fox MBA Alumni sites on LinkedIn and Facebook.

The School of Business needs to develop an internal process for communicating about undergraduate faculty activities including scholarship, publications and achievements, and student achievements. We rely on our university’s marketing and public relations department to do this. While they do an excellent job at this, a GFSB internal process would be an improvement. The MBA program utilizes an electronic newsletter for communications to alumni and the public. The DBA program also uses this method for
sharing news to current students and alumni. These newsletters are well received and effectively communicate news and information.

6. Business School Organizational Profile

The Organizational Profile is a snapshot of your business school or program, the key influences on how you operate, and the key challenges you face. It consists of two parts: Organizational Description and Organizational Challenges.

a. Organizational Description

Describe your organization’s environment and key relationships with students and other stakeholders.

1) Profile of the university: George Fox is Oregon’s nationally recognized Christian university, providing students with personal attention, global opportunities to learn and serve, and a supportive community that encourages academic rigor and spiritual growth. We offer bachelor’s degrees in more than 40 majors, adult degree programs, five seminary degrees, and 12 master’s and doctoral degrees. George Fox is accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, and in 2010-11 Forbes ranked George Fox in the top 150 colleges in America and among the nation’s top Christian colleges.

In keeping with our mission of Christian higher education, all employees – faculty, administration and staff – are committed Christians. More than 3,500 students attend classes on the university’s residential campus in Newberg, at its Portland, Salem, and Boise centers, and at other teaching sites in Oregon.

2) The business program at George Fox University includes one of the largest undergraduate majors on campus, while also offering two MBA programs and a doctoral program in business administration. The undergraduate program offers seven majors in accounting, finance, management, marketing, global business, entrepreneurship, and economics. Undergraduate business courses are offered on the main Newberg campus as well as the Full-Time MBA program and DBA program. The Part-Time MBA program is offered at the Portland and Boise campuses.

3) Organizational Environment

a) What are the delivery mechanisms used to provide your education programs, offerings, and services to students?

The primary delivery method for GFSB programs is face-to-face classroom delivery. All instruction in the undergraduate degree programs and the MBA degree programs is delivered using a traditional classroom model. The doctoral programs are delivered using a hybrid methodology with approximately half of the courses in the program delivered completely online, and half via online education combined with a one-week residency on the Newberg campus.
The GFSB uses classroom space in the university's teaching facilities in Newberg and Portland Oregon, and in Boise, Idaho. The GFSB has faculty and staff on each of the campuses with the primary home of the GFSB on the Newberg campus.

b) What is your organizational context/culture?

George Fox University is a Christ-centered, liberal arts college. We constantly strive to connect Christ with Culture inside and outside the classroom. Students are not required to be Christians, however all faculty are required to be committed evangelical Christians actively practicing their faith. While affiliated with the Northwest Yearly Meeting (Quakers), faculty and students represent all major Christian denominations.

c) What is your stated vision?

The stated vision of the University is:

Our vision is to become one of the most innovative and engaging universities in the western United States known for academic excellence and for connecting the message of Jesus Christ to the global challenges and opportunities of the future.

d) What are your stated values?

The stated values of the University are:

Living like Christ as Agents of Love and Reconciliation
We are a Christ-centered university rooted in the Friends tradition. We take seriously the challenge of Jesus Christ to be God’s agents of love and reconciliation in the world.

Creating a Transformational Learning Community
We maintain the highest standards for serving our community's academic and spiritual needs. We will continue to attract and nurture an authentic wisdom community of faculty and staff dedicated to providing a dynamic, diverse, and holistic spiritual and educational experience.

Pursuing Scholarly Inquiry
As a university, we seek to advance knowledge by engaging in and supporting scholarship. Working from Christian premises, we attempt to better understand God and God's creation. Doing so helps us to teach and serve others more effectively.

Engaging Globally and Connecting Culturally
We value worldwide experiential learning aimed at understanding and improving the human condition. We desire to connect genuinely with people from diverse cultures both locally and globally through relationships and reciprocal teaching and learning.

Reflecting the Diversity of God's People
All people are created in God's image. Therefore, George Fox University represents the ethnic, socio-economic, cultural, and gender diversity of the broader Kingdom of God. We
provide opportunities for students to dialogue about issues of diversity and to live and study in diverse communities.

Preparation and Risk Takers in Pursuit of God’s Kingdom
Our community inspires and equips students and employees to take responsible risks in pursuit of God’s kingdom and to discover creative ways to fulfill Christ’s purposes in our university life and the world around us.

Serving and Leading in Communities of Trust
We strive to be a community of trust, camaraderie, and respect where we practice collaborative leadership. We value the contributions of students, faculty, staff, administrators, and trustees and find unity through serving one another.

Promoting Peace, Justice, and Care of the Earth
Jesus Christ calls us to be peacemakers, to serve the poor, and to engage our world responsibly. We are a community that actively creates peace, promotes justice, and cares for the earth.

e) What is your faculty and staff profile? Include education levels, workforce and job
diversity, organized bargaining units, use of contract employees.

In the Fall of 2010 the GFSB was comprised of 19 faculty members on continuing appointments, 2 faculty members on one-year appointments, and 5 academic and administrative support personnel. During the self-study year we also made use of 4 faculty members from other areas of the university, and 13 adjunct faculty members. It is expected that GFSB faculty members have an appropriate terminal degree and appropriate industry experience. Of the last six new-faculty hires in the past two years, 5 had earned an appropriate terminal degree, and one with executive industry experience was actively enrolled in a doctoral program.

f) What are your major technologies, equipment, and facilities?

Campus Locations

The School of Business offers baccalaureate, MBA, and doctoral programs across three different campuses.

Newberg Campus. The primary campus of George Fox University is located in Newberg, Oregon, 17 miles southwest of Portland. The 108-acre campus is home to more than 1,800 undergraduate and graduate students, the faculty of both undergraduate and graduate programs, and the central university administration. On the main campus the GFSB delivers all of its undergraduate programs, its full-time MBA program, and its doctoral programs. The campus has complete university facilities including classrooms, offices, library, food service, bookstore, student housing, and athletic facilities. In the fall of 2010 there were 211 undergraduate students, 20 FT MBA students, and 28 doctoral students enrolled in GFSB programs.
Portland Center. The primary site for graduate education at George Fox is the Portland Center located in southwest Portland. The Portland Center serves as the primary location for delivery of the part-time MBA program. The campus is composed of two buildings that include classrooms, faculty offices, registrar, admissions, food service, library, and support services. The director and administrative assistant for the PT MBA, and two faculty members are housed at the Portland Center. In the fall of 2010 there were 184 students enrolled in the PT MBA program in Oregon. We attempted to launch a cohort in downtown Portland at the World Trade Center that is managed from the Portland Center. Because of low enrollment, once this cohort is completed we will no longer host an Oregon cohort of the PT MBA outside the Portland Center.

Boise Center. Since 1995 the University has operated a satellite campus in Boise, Idaho. This center that includes 5 classrooms and faculty and staff offices, is home to the Master of Arts in Teaching Program, the Adult-Degree Programs (degree completion), and the PT MBA. Two continuing GFSB faculty members and an administrative assistant support the MBA program in Boise. In the fall of 2010 there were 33 students enrolled in the Boise MBA Program.

Technology and Equipment

Online Systems and Support. The university provides and supports a Moodle platform named FoxTale for online support of teaching. The vast majority of faculty provide a FoxTale site for students to access resources, to ask questions, and dialogue regarding course content and assignments. Some faculty make more extensive use of this tool including online quizzing. University training sessions and one-on-one support are readily available to support faculty and staff in using this tool.

Computers. Every faculty member is provided a laptop computer that is replaced on a three-year rotation cycle. Information Technology on campus provides responsive hardware, software, and network support to faculty and students. Faculty requiring additional computer-related resources beyond those normally provided are able to obtain GFSB support to obtain such additional resources including external monitors, keyboards, docking stations, special printing capabilities, etc.

Classroom Technology. Most classrooms used by GFSB faculty on all three campuses are equipped with ceiling mounted projectors, sound systems, and DVD players. Special technology needs can be requested in advance and are delivered to the classroom and set-up by IT staff.
2) Organizational Relationships

   a) What are your key student segments and stakeholder groups? What are their key requirements and expectations for your programs and services? What are the differences in these requirements and expectations among students and stakeholder groups?

   Table 0.1 presents the fall enrollment in each of the programs of the GFSB over the past five years.

   **Table 0.1**
   **GFSB Fall Enrollment by Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Admin</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   | Graduate                          |      |      |      |      |      |
   | MBA                               | 226  | 193  | 181  | 211  | 237  |
   | DMgt/DBA                          | 12   | 20   | 25   | 28   | 28   |

   Source: *George Fox Fact Book 2010-2011*

   **Traditional Undergraduate Students** Students enrolled in the undergraduate programs of the GFSB, for the most part, arrive on campus as traditional age, 18-year old, freshman, residential students. For the fall of 2010:

   - There were 1,818 undergraduate students enrolled at the University
   - 61% were from Oregon, 14% from Washington, and 8% from California
   - 211 students were enrolled in the GFSB of which 64.5% were male and 35.5% were female
   - 39 business students were from China entering either as freshmen or transfer student as a result of our 2+2 agreements with two Chinese universities

   Of the 418 students who entered the University in 2006, 52.2% graduated in four years. Typically, an additional 5% or so will graduate after 5 years.
Undergraduate students in the GFSB are interested in having an engaging and rewarding four year experience while in college. While the accounting students are clear on their career options and career path, students in other majors are less focused on their path upon graduation and are looking for assistance and guidance in what to do upon graduation.

Parents of Traditional Undergraduate Students. Many students are at George Fox because their parents believe it to be a safe environment where their children can receive a quality education where their Christian faith will be supported and strengthened. Parents also want their students to graduate with a degree that will prepare them for a specific career, one with earning potential or strong social purpose.

Full-Time MBA Students. In the fall of 2010 we started the second cohort of our 11-month, full-time, residential, MBA Program. The cohort was composed of 20 students: 10 students from the United States, 8 students from China, and 2 students from Africa. For the most part, students in this program had completed their undergraduate degree within one year of starting the MBA program. All students in the program are looking for the MBA degree to improve their opportunities for employment upon graduation. International students are also looking to develop their understanding of American business practices, and improve their English language skills.

Part-Time MBA Students. The majority of students in the evening part-time MBA Program are in their late 20s and early 30s, are working full-time, and are looking to improve their opportunities in the workplace either by preparing to advance within their own organization, or prepare to move to a new organization. A growing number of students in the program are under-employed or un-employed, and are looking to the MBA to allow them to re-enter the workforce at a level they consider appropriate to their skills and abilities. These students want the MBA credential to differentiate themselves from others, and they want to obtain new management skills and knowledge to allow them to create value within their organization.

Doctoral Students. In the fall of 2010 there were a total of 28 doctoral students enrolled. In the spring of 2011 a new cohort of 12 students joined the program. In the spring of 2010 the program changed from being a Doctor of Management to a Doctor of Business Administration degree. Students in the doctoral program are from throughout the United States and learn about the program primarily through the internet and from colleagues at other Christian institutions. Approximately half of the students in this program are currently working in higher education and are seeking their terminal degree to become eligible for tenure-track positions in their institutions. The other half is primarily individuals working in business and industry who have a desire to teach, either part-time or full-time, at the college level. These students want to expand their knowledge of business, and receive a terminal degree from an institution that will be recognized for producing quality graduates who go on to be successful professors.
b) What are your key partnering relationships and communication mechanisms?

The School of Business utilizes undergraduate and graduate advisory boards made up of business professionals and alumni. The boards serve to advise the School of Business on curriculum relevancy, innovative business education ideas and expectations of student learning and development in preparing students for the world of work. These boards meet periodically on campus. The advisory boards are important business relationships as the School of Business looks to the future.

The Executive in Residence day occurs two times a year (fall and spring) and is designed to bring a business executive to campus to participate in business classes, network with students in an informal coffee reception, speak at a luncheon specifically for business students, interact with business faculty and speak at a public lecture.

The School of Business installed a television monitor in the outer office for the purpose of communication with faculty and students as well as to show stock market activities and current domestic and global business news (Bloomberg Business News channel). The television monitor has proven to be an effective communication tool.

The MBA, doctoral and undergraduate business faculty are active in bringing business professionals to their classroom. Some examples include executives from Intel, Google, Nike, Health Care and non-profits. The dean is active in working with the external business world, serves on the board of a business and a non-profit company, and is a member of the economic task force in Newberg.

b. Organizational Challenges

1) Competitive Environment

a) What is your competitive position? Include your relative size and growth in the education sector and the number and type of competitors.

Undergraduate Program

The George Fox University undergraduate program instituted significant curricular changes in order to remain competitive in the higher education marketplace. In 2010 the business program offerings were increased from three to seven undergraduate business majors. The semester hours in all of the majors was increased to a standard of 60 core business hours from the 42 originally. The purpose was to enrich the curriculum and provide students with a greater depth in their content areas. This change has strengthened our academic product line and given students a wider variety of majors to select from.

Our undergraduate business population is at 211 majors. We expect this to increase with the addition of these four new majors.
Our competitors can be broken down into three categories. First are the state schools in Oregon. Oregon State University and The University of Oregon offer business programs and we lose a small number of students to these schools. Yet with state schools increasing tuition this becomes less of a problem. Second are the small private liberal arts colleges. Again, we lose some students to this school, but given the George Fox culture as a Christian college the loss is small. Third are the religious liberal arts colleges both in Oregon and on the West Coast. These schools represent our most direct competitors: Seattle Pacific University (Seattle, WA), Westmont College (Santa Barbara, California) and Azusa Pacific, (Azusa, California).

Full-Time MBA Program

The regional competitors for the FT MBA program are as follows (in order). Full-time programs are not necessarily an "apples to apples" comparison.

- Willamette University, 100 FT students/year. Private, AACSP accredited.
- Marylhurst, around 150, mainly part-time and online students. No prof. accreditation.
- University of Portland: about 50 FT students. AACS B accredited.
- University of Phoenix: ACBSP accredited.
- Portland State: State School, AACS B certified. FT and online options.

Our relative size, with a cohort of 21 this year (2011), is very small in comparison. Our increase in student enrollment has gone from 14 (first year) to 20 (second year) to 21 (third year). We have a 100% graduation rate and a 0% attrition rate (since the program began).

Our competitive position is that we have small class sizes, and the students will "Be Known" by their professors. Also, a 10.5 month program is an advantage. A professional accreditation will set us apart from Marylhurst and UP. Another competitive advantage is that we offer cohorts to go through the program with classmates they know and trust and can learn from.

Another advantage is our ACLA program. We offer an international perspective in every class from international students who have already been through U.S. classes prior to the MBA.

Part-Time MBA Program – Oregon

Each year the Portland Business Journal ranks the top regional MBA programs by enrollment. The most recent ranking was in 2010, in which George Fox University’s MBA program was ranked fourth out of 15, with 204 students. In 2007 and 2008 our program was ranked fifth. We moved into fourth place in 2009.

Our primary competitors are the part-time MBA programs, of which eighty percent are private. Our top five Portland area competitors (part-time) are:

1. Marylhurst (private university, ranked first by enrollment)
2. Portland State (public university, ranked second)
3. Willamette University (private university, ranked third)
4. University of Portland (private university, ranked sixth)
5. Concordia (private university, ranked seventh)
Of these five competitors, all offer concentrations or specialized study via electives, except Willamette’s part-time program (students must enroll in a full time format at Willamette to have an MBA concentration.)

A competitor not listed in the Portland Business Journal’s rankings is the University of Phoenix.

Part-Time MBA Program – Boise

There are currently 40 students enrolled in the MBA program at GFU’s Boise Center. This number has remained fairly consistent since the launching of the MBA program in Boise in 2004. While enrollment dipped the past three years during the economic downturn, enrollment is trending upward. MBA Boise Center enrollment during the 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 academic years was 36, 39, and 40 respectively.

While the Boise Center’s MBA program is relatively small, it fills a distinctive market niche not met by any other institution in the Boise Valley by providing a face-to-face (as opposed to online), cohort-based, Christian education designed to meet the needs of working adults. Our primary competitors (in rank order) are Northwest Nazarene University (NNU), Boise State University (BSU), and University of Phoenix. Northwest Nazarene offers the MBA program most similar to GFU’s. Their program, however, is only 18 months in duration (as compared with our 26-month program) and requires students to attend classes two nights a week and many Saturdays. Prospective students wishing to maintain work/life/school balance tend to choose GFU over NNU based on the fact that our program is only one night a week with Saturday classes scheduled only every eight weeks. While we do compete with BSU, we tend to cater to a different group of students. In addition to the obvious difference of being secular rather than Christian, BSU’s MBA program has not been conducive to the schedule of working adults. The MBA program at University of Phoenix is primarily online and is considerably more expensive than GFU’s MBA program. Students desiring a competitively priced, face-to-face classroom experience tend to choose GFU over University of Phoenix.
### Figure 0.2
Program Comparison Boise MBA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>George Fox</th>
<th>Phoenix</th>
<th>Northwest Nazarene</th>
<th>Boise State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
<td>42 hours</td>
<td>36 hours</td>
<td>42 hours</td>
<td>37 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General MBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>26 months</td>
<td>18 - 24 months</td>
<td>16-18 months</td>
<td>24 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 night/week</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 nights/week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisites</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Up to 9 hours</td>
<td>Up to 12 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>NWCCU</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>NWCCU</td>
<td>NWCCU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NWCCU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rankings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NWCCU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US News</td>
<td>Tier 4</td>
<td>not ranked</td>
<td>Top Tier</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton Review</td>
<td>Best in West</td>
<td>not ranked</td>
<td>Best in West</td>
<td>not ranked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbes</td>
<td>Top 60</td>
<td>not ranked</td>
<td>not ranked</td>
<td>not ranked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top 10 Christian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>$545/hour</td>
<td>$715</td>
<td>$595/hour</td>
<td>$294/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books Included?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>Meridian/Boise</td>
<td>Nampa/Boise</td>
<td>Nampa/Boise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Method</td>
<td>Trad</td>
<td>Hybrid/Online</td>
<td>Trad/Online</td>
<td>Trad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Doctoral Program**

Our DBA program carves out a niche between the on-line and traditional DBA programs. Major on-line competitors are Regent University (Christian and probably the most direct competition of this group), the University of Phoenix and Grand Canyon. (We recently lost two students to Grand Canyon.). Our program most directly competes with Anderson University, which is also directed at the Christian business faculty market. Both our program and the Anderson program require two residencies a year.
b) What are the principal factors that determine your success relative to that of your competitors and other organizations delivering similar services? Include any changes taking place that affect your competitive situation.

Undergraduate Program

A principle factor determining our success is the university’s atmosphere. George Fox University is a blend of academic focus and community. The undergraduate business facilities are located in a central location on campus in the Hoover Academic Building. Our offices are visible and welcoming. We expect business students to take their studies seriously yet our faculty are supportive and very accessible. The university’s motto is for students to Be Known. Our business faculty know their students!

The summer Genesis Program is where “soon to matriculate” incoming freshmen come to campus in the summer, connect with an academic advisor, develop their entire first year academic schedule and register for all their classes. This strengthens the students comfort level with the university and retention. We take academic advising seriously in the School of Business. Every undergraduate faculty member is assigned advisees.

George Fox University is primarily a teaching university. We want our faculty to be the very best teachers possible.

Full-Time MBA Program

Our enrollment has grown in each of the past 3 years. Our 100% retention and graduation rate is a good indicator although data from our competitor’s is not readily available in these categories.

We could track how many of the students we admit go to another school. Of course, this is voluntary information from the applicant. Anecdotal information tells us that approximately 80% of the students who don’t come to GFU, after being admitted to the program, go into the work force, not another school.

Part-Time MBA Program – Oregon

The principal factors that determine our success relative to our competitors are our general focus on leadership and ethics, the cohort model, our Christian worldview, and our convenient, one-evening per week schedule.

Each of our top five competitors have program accreditation, and our goal is to join their ranks with accreditation through ACBSP. We are currently in the self-study portion of the accreditation process.

Eighty percent of our competitors offer concentrations. In the spring of 2009 we surveyed students and alumni regarding their interest in concentrations, and held focus groups to identify concentrations of greatest interest. We attempted to launch the concentrations to existing students and alumni in fall of 2010 with only a few months of lead time. Due to low enrollment, we instead opted to offer the concentrations beginning in 2012 when the students who entered the program in fall 2010 and January 2011 will be eligible to take them. We are reevaluating
whether to offer or require concentrations of all MBA students. Our recruiter is regularly asked by prospective students about the possibility of adding a concentration.

Another opportunity we’re considering is optional delivery models. Forty percent of our top five competitors offer online or hybrid delivery options in addition to the traditional in-person delivery model. Interestingly, the universities ranked first and second by enrollment in the Portland Business Journal offer alternate delivery options.

Part-Time MBA Program – Boise

There are changes taking place that may affect our program’s competitive situation. One such change is that BSU has purchased a building within a mile of GFU’s Boise Center that will offer programs designed for working adults. The majority of programs offered at that location will require attendance only one night a week. While only bachelor degree programs will be offered at this site initially, there are tentative plans to offer MBA courses at some point in the future. If this takes place, it will become even more important for us to emphasize our distinctives as a Christian, cohort-based, program.

Another change we are experiencing is local employers beginning to reinstitute tuition benefits for their employees. While this change will most likely positively impact all colleges and universities, we expect it to lead to higher enrollments in our MBA program in the immediate future.

Attached is a table providing a comparison of GFU Boise Center’s MBA program with the MBA programs at NNU, BSU, and University of Phoenix. One conclusion that may be drawn from this data is that GFU’s MBA program is competitively priced. This is obviously an advantage. There are however, two glaring areas in which our program is at a disadvantage. Those areas are accreditation and concentrations or specializations. GFU’s MBA program is the only one of the four programs listed that is not professionally accredited. It is one of two programs which do not offer concentrations or specializations. These are areas GFU’s School of Business must address in the immediate future if we are to remain competitive within the current market.

Doctoral Program

Our change from the Doctor of Management to Doctor of Business Administration program has made us less unique in the marketplace (we were one of only a few DMgt programs). However, the DBA is a much more recognized degree. Further, we are now focused on preparing educators, which was only part of our mission before. Students who enroll tell us that they still want a face to face component, which we offer, as well as a focus on ethics and spirituality. Anderson continues to be significantly cheaper than Fox (in the $400 credit hour range), which poses a continual competitive disadvantage to us.
2) **Strategic Challenges**

What are your key strategic challenges? Include education and learning, operational, human resource, and community challenges, as appropriate.

a) Enrich our undergraduate program by significantly strengthening the business core/new majors.
b) Remain competitive in the MBA market (goal is to stay in the top three in enrollment).
c) Increase business relationships in Portland business community.
d) Develop a stronger and more direct giving base with undergraduate/graduate alumni.
e) Develop a major strategic plan within the School of Business.
f) Hire additional accounting and finance faculty.
g) Strengthen our brand as a business program in the Pacific Northwest.
h) Gain approval for an internship director position/significantly strengthen existing Internship program.

3) **Performance Improvement System**

The university (Academic Affairs Office) directs the Assessment Program Plan. The School of Business established an assessment plan in 2010-2011. The plan is available in the Appendix 0.1. The School of Business assessment plan is reviewed by the Director of Institutional Assessment. Measurements of the following activities include:

a) Educational Testing Service (ETS) student scores
b) Communication and writing rubric
c) Senior capstone (business presentation rubric)
d) MBA Student Satisfaction Survey
e) DBA Student Satisfaction Survey
f) Faculty performance evaluation system
g) Faculty peer review system

How do you maintain an organizational focus on performance improvement? Include your approach to systematic evaluation and improvement of key processes and to fostering organizational learning and knowledge sharing.

Notes: Factors might include differentiators such as program leadership, services, e-services, geographic proximity, and program options.

Challenges might include electronic communication with key stakeholders, reduced educational program introduction cycle times, student transitions, entry into new markets or segments, changing demographics and competition, student persistence, and faculty/staff retention.

The faculty performance evaluation system is a regular and ongoing mechanism for collecting data on faculty performance in the classroom. Every course is evaluated on a number of variables including course content, organization and instructor performance. The undergraduate chair and graduate directors regularly review these performance evaluations. At the MBA level, students expect a high level of faculty performance. When an adjunct or regular
faculty member's performance is less than satisfactory, steps are taken to address student concerns. Composite data at the MBA level where all faculty performances are contrasted and compared has been particularly useful in assessing performance. The MBA program Student Satisfaction Survey has proven to be helpful in gathering data, not only on faculty but also on program services. A regular electronic communication instrument was created to foster greater communication with MBA students.

The undergraduate business program, while remaining one of the largest undergraduate majors at George Fox, could profit from gathering data. For the purpose of greater evaluation, several new initiatives were introduced recently, including a bi-monthly gathering of undergraduates called The Buzz (2011). Faculty and staff informally gather over coffee and light snacks. This has proven to be very popular and has become a good opportunity to listen to students. An electronic communication with undergraduate students is needed. There has been a noticeable interest in business internship opportunities. As a result, the School of Business included a new position for an internship director in its strategic plan. This new position was recently approved by the university administration. The undergraduate program is planning to implement a student satisfaction survey in an effort to gather student perception of the GFSB undergraduate program in business.
STANDARDS AND CRITERIA

STANDARD #1
Leadership

Administrators (chief academic officers, deans, department chairs) and faculty must personally lead and be involved in creating and sustaining values, business school or program directions, performance expectations, student focus, and a leadership system that promotes performance excellence. These values and expectations must be integrated into the business school’s or program’s leadership system; and the business school or program must continuously learn, improve, and address its societal responsibilities and community involvement.

Executive Summary

George Fox University is associated with the Northwest Yearly Meeting. The university leadership functions under a forty-two member Board of Trustees. The president of the university is the Chief Executive Officer of the university. The president's Executive Leadership team is comprised of the university Provost (Vice President for Academic Affairs), Executive Vice President for Financial Affairs, Executive Vice President for marketing and Advancement, Vice President for Student Life and the Vice President for Enrollment Services. The Academic Affairs Office (Provost) has five school deans reporting directly to the Provost. The School of Business dean is one direct report. The faculty members operate under a structure comprised of deans, department chairs and program directors. The Faculty Personnel Committee makes recommendations on all faculty promotions, including tenure. Dr. Dirk Barram, Dean of the School of Business, Dr. Paul Shelton, Assistant Professor of Management, and Dr. Alan Kluge, Professor of Marketing, have led the accreditation process in the School of Business.

Criterion 1.1 Process Leadership

The leader of the business unit is to be accountable for the development, execution and continuous improvement of the programs and processes in the business unit, and for their compliance with the ACBSP Standards and Criteria.

Criterion 1.1.a. Administrators and faculty must set, communicate, and deploy business school or program values and performance expectations.

One of the values embraced by all units at George Fox University, which stems from its roots as a Quaker institution, is the practice of consensus decision making. In all major decisions, including those related to setting program values and performance expectations, issues are presented to the faculty and staff for discussion and consideration. Each person present has the right to voice their opinion and concerns. The meeting is not allowed to move forward with a decision until all concerns have been appropriately heard and addressed.
Regular meetings are held at three levels in the George Fox School of Business.

1. Bimonthly GFSB business meetings (all faculty and staff)
2. Bimonthly GFSB Director's meetings (leadership)
3. Program level meetings (undergraduate, MBA/DBA programs)

On all major decisions, the GFSB acts as a single unit (as opposed to university-wide programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels). A meeting of the entire faculty and staff is held every two weeks (bimonthly) during the academic year (with faculty from Boise participating via teleconference). Through these regular meetings common opportunities, celebrations and concerns are addressed.

Common agenda items for discussion and communication at the school meetings are curricular issues such as new courses (i.e. adding an undergraduate Personal Finance course as an elective) and the substantial revision of the undergraduate program in which the common business core was increased from 30 semester hours to 42, and the four concentrations (finance, management, marketing and global) were significantly enhanced to become majors.

The directors of the five business programs meet every other week.

1. Undergraduate Business
2. Full-Time MBA
3. Part-Time MBA
4. Boise MBA
5. DBA

At these meetings, the directors deal with issues related to program quality, program development, faculty, faculty resource deployment, budget, student concerns and enrollment issues.

Recently, one agenda item was consideration and discussion of retooling the Part-Time MBA program to make it more flexible and attractive to the busy, working professional. This has been a highly successful MBA program since 1991 and we want to continue this success with necessary adjustments in curriculum and delivery.

The five different business programs hold meetings of their respective faculty to address issues such as program and curricular issues, faculty performance issues and assessment. It is at the program level that results of assessment of learning measurements are presented, discussed and acted upon. (See relative discussion under Standard 4.)

With regard to issues and concerns related to personnel or other sensitive issues, the dean will call together an informal group of four senior and tenured faculty members in the School of Business for advice and counsel.
Criterion 1.1.b. Administrators and faculty must review business school or program performance and capabilities to assess business school or program success and your business school’s or program’s ability to address its changing needs.

Through the meetings identified in Criterion 1.1.a., challenges and opportunities are constantly being discussed and acted upon to improve the success of the GFSB. Program actions taken in the past three years to address changing needs include:

- Decision to move forward with ACBSP accreditation to both improve the quality of our programs and to include the credibility of our programs in the marketplace
- Decision to add a Personal Finance elective
- Decision to transition from a Doctor of Management degree to a Doctor of Business Administration degree in response to the needs of our graduates to have a degree more appropriate for their likely responsibilities for teaching at the college level
- Decision to (and later decision to abandon) the option of add-on certificate programs in the part-time MBA program to make us more competitive in the marketplace
- Decision to move from a general undergraduate degree in Business Administration to separate degrees in Management, Marketing, Finance, Entrepreneurship, and Global Business to be more competitive with other business schools in the region

Annual meetings are scheduled involving the Dean, Provost, University Marketing, VP of Enrollment Services, and each individual program director to review project enrollments and program trends. From these meetings the GFSB is challenged to address changes in student needs and to develop programmatic responses to those changes.

Criterion 1.1.c. The business school or program must have processes in place for evaluating the performance of both administrators and faculty.

Faculty Review Process

Part III Section V of the University Faculty Handbook (Appendix 1.1) outlines the process for the review of faculty.

Annual Review. Faculty members prepare and submit annually a Faculty Growth Plan that reviews performance from the prior year and develops a plan for faculty development for the upcoming year. Each fall each faculty member is to be reviewed by the Dean of the GFSB.

Third Year Review. In the fall semester of the third year, faculty members prepare a portfolio which includes examples of scholarly work, evaluation of teaching performance, and essays on teaching, scholarship, service, and the integration of faith and learning. A three-member peer-review committee reviews the portfolio, and observes and evaluates the teaching of the faculty member. Each reviewer submits a written report evaluating the faculty member’s performance. The portfolio along with the peer reviews are reviewed by the University’s Faculty Personnel Committee composed of six elected faculty members. The Personnel Committee issues a review letter to the faculty member commending accomplishments and identifying opportunities for improvement. The Personnel Committee has the ability to recommend to the Provost that faculty members failing to perform at an acceptable level be placed on a performance improvement plan.
Sixth Year Tenure Review. In the fall semester of the sixth year faculty members again prepare a portfolio similar to that prepared for the third year review. As with the third year review, a peer-review committee is formed that must include a tenured faculty member and the faculty member's School Dean. The review committee evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate and each member prepares a written report. The portfolio and the evaluations are then sent forward to the University's Faculty Personnel Committee who makes a recommendation to the Provost whether or not candidates should be considered by the Board of Trustees for receiving tenure. At George Fox University, faculty not going forward for tenure in their sixth year may continue as faculty provided their performance remains satisfactory. Faculty members not recommended for tenure in their sixth year may request reconsideration again after two years have expired.

Administrator Review Process

Dean Review. The dean is reviewed annually. The Provost conducts a 360 evaluation of each Dean obtaining evaluations from senior administrators, peer administrators, and school faculty and staff.

Program Directors Review. The MBA directors are usually evaluated on an annual basis. The undergraduate department chair and DBA chair are evaluated through their classroom teaching. The two administrators will be given performance evaluations based on their administrative responsibilities in spring 2012.

Support Staff Review. Administrative support staff members are reviewed on an annual basis by their immediate supervisors. Part of the review process is to solicit feedback from faculty and other staff the staff member works with.

Criterion 1.2 Social Responsibility

Criterion 1.2.a. Administrators and faculty must create an environment that fosters and requires legal and ethical behavior.

George Fox University is a faith based institution founded and owned by the Northwest Yearly Meeting of the Friends church. Founded in 1891, the mission and purpose of the college is to offer young men and women the benefit of a liberal Christian education. The courses of study are arranged to give that broad culture which should be the possession of every intelligent man and woman. The founders recognized the great importance of religious training, and the work of the classroom is not merely consistent with Christianity, but decidedly Christian in its tendencies.

It is this belief in a decidedly Christian focus and faith integration that defines our environment and informs our behaviors and decision-making. University policies and expectations have their roots in the mission of George Fox as a Christ centered institution. To this end, our employees (faculty, staff, and administrators) are expected to demonstrate values, ethical behaviors and respect for legal requirements that strongly reflect the university's mission.
Criterion 1.2.b. The business school or program should address the impacts on society of its program offerings, services, and operations.

As a Friends (Quaker) institution, George Fox seeks to reflect the historical Friends tradition of service and social justice. University programs, policies and practices purpose to be consistent with social responsibility and action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Societal Requirements</th>
<th>Key Compliance Process</th>
<th>Measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business impact on low income and elderly</td>
<td>Tax assistance program for low income and elderly</td>
<td>150-200 Newberg residents helped annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business impact on local businesses</td>
<td>Internal control project for auditing local businesses</td>
<td>5-7 businesses helped annually with their auditing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business contribution to community personal finance</td>
<td>Personal financial workshop for the community</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business serving business students and local community with executive speakers</td>
<td>Executive In Residence Day</td>
<td>Participation in business class (3 or 4), speaking and luncheon. Meet with GFSB faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving local community</td>
<td>Annual George Fox University Serve day</td>
<td>Strong participation by GFSB faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Supporting a green environment</td>
<td>Recycling paper in business department</td>
<td>Ongoing participation by department – regularly fill four recycle bags</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 1.2.c. The business school or program should ensure ethical business and academic practices in all student and stakeholder transactions and interactions.

George Fox University's School of Business recognizes the rights of all students and faculty to be treated in an ethical, courteous and respectful manner. In order to maximize the student and faculty experience, it is expected that all interactions among students, faculty and staff be collegial, fair, and ethical, and reflect the highest academic standards of the university. Each program in the School of Business (Undergraduate, Full-Time MBA, Part-Time MBA, DBA) subscribes to academic policies that ensure fair and equitable treatment of students. Academic honesty, satisfactory academic progress, and eligibility policies are in place for each academic program. The School of Business utilizes Turnitin.com to determine plagiarism and academic dishonesty. Students who violate academic policy are provided with the right to appeal decisions. These policies are found in student handbooks for the FT MBA, PT MBA, DBA and Undergraduate programs.

The university at large holds to established policies and compliance regulations consistent with state and federal regulations. These include laws protecting students' rights and privacy (FERPA), student financial
aid regulations as mandated by the U. S. Department of Education and an annual external audit of the university’s finances by a certified public accounting firm.

George Fox subscribes to a number of policies that serve to ensure the safety and well-being of employees and students. These include the university’s Equal Employer Opportunity Policy where every employee has the right to work in surroundings free of all forms of wrongful discrimination. The Anti-Discrimination and Anti-Harassment Policy protects students and employees from any type of discrimination or harassment. The university also has a Whistleblower Protection Policy and Alcohol and Drug-free Workplace Policy.

**Figure 1.2**

**Ethical Behavior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Process for Measuring/Monitoring Ethical Behavior</th>
<th>Measures or Indicators</th>
<th>Frequency of Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within your Business School or Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Monitoring safe/ethical research practices</td>
<td>The university Human Subjects in Research Committee</td>
<td>Maintains/approves every resource study involving human beings annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Curriculum requirement</td>
<td>Turnitin software</td>
<td>Ethics course offered multiple times over fall, spring, summer semesters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Monitoring plagiarism</td>
<td>Academic Honesty Policy Student Handbooks</td>
<td>Used by faculty periodically over fall, spring, summer semesters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Monitoring academic/ethical behavior among students</td>
<td>Academic Honesty Policy Student Handbooks</td>
<td>Number of academic dishonesty issues reported by faculty annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Employee development and standards in university handbooks</td>
<td>Faculty manual and university Staff Manual</td>
<td>Confidential employee discipline; records maintained annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Procedures for ethical violations by students</td>
<td>Faculty Handbook, Appendix E</td>
<td>Records maintained in Academic Affairs Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With your Key Partners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Community Expectations</td>
<td>Community Lifestyle Policy (p. 37, Staff Handbook)</td>
<td>Each employee signs a lifestyle statement upon employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ethics and standards of behavior</td>
<td>Appropriate employee conduct (p. 61, Staff Handbook)</td>
<td>Ongoing expectations of all employees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 1.2 (continued)
#### Ethical Behavior

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Human Resources</strong>/Hiring faculty</td>
<td><strong>Pre-hiring background checks on all employees</strong></td>
<td><strong>Requirement of employment process</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. University Student Handbook</strong> – community policies</td>
<td>• Anti-Harassment and Anti-Discrimination Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sexual Assault Policy and Procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• General Safety and facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bias related incident and hate crimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Complaint process for harassment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### In your Governance Structure

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Expectations of faculty</strong></td>
<td>Faculty Handbook, Part Three, II, Guidelines and standards for appointment of faculty</td>
<td>Regular faculty teaching evaluator and faculty review process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Expectations of students</strong></td>
<td>Student Life Handbook, community accountability</td>
<td>Student accountability process and records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion 1.2.d.** The business school or program should have processes in place for monitoring regulatory and legal compliance.

The School of Business is committed to the regulatory compliance requirements currently in place at the university. The School of Business academic programs (Undergraduate, FT MBA, PT MBA, DBA) all have written policies in different student handbooks that are both consistent with university compliance regulations as well as policies unique to their own program. The program directors work with the dean of the School of Business when necessary to ensure these policies are followed. The dean and program directors work with the university Registrar and Vice President of Enrollment Services on compliance issues. Recently the U. S. Department of Education required a closer management of academic programs falling outside the traditional semester long period of 15 weeks. This is a compliance issue that required administrators from the university (Registrar, Vice President of Enrollment Services) to work closely with the School of Business program directors and dean.

The dean of the School of Business is a member of the Provost’s Council (Provost, five school deans, Associate VP of Academic Affairs), the University Budget Team and the President’s Executive Leadership Team. Membership in these latter two groups includes the university Vice President in Enrollment Services, Student Life, Financial Affairs, Advancement, the Seminary and Academic Affairs. These groups are cognizant of regulatory and legal compliance issues in these areas thus ensuring a university-wide awareness. The School of Business (and dean) sees the strength of this organizational structure as a process in place for regulatory compliance.
STANDARD #2
Strategic Planning

The business school or program must have a process for setting strategic directions to better address key student and program performance requirements. The strategy development process should lead to an action plan for deploying and aligning key plan performance requirements. It should also create an environment that encourages and recognizes innovation and creativity.

Criterion 2.1. Strategic Planning Process

The business unit must have a formal process by which its strategic direction is determined, its action plans are formulated and deployed, and innovation and creativity are encouraged.

Criterion 2.1.a. The faculty and staff members of the business unit should have significant input into the strategic planning process.

Describe your formal process for strategic planning.

The GFSB formal administrative structure is comprised of the dean and five program directors. This group meets regularly (two times a month) during the school year and periodically in the summer. The formal strategic planning process flows through this management team.

School of Business leadership meets at times throughout the year with external stakeholders to discuss strategic direction. Undergraduate and graduate Advisory Boards comprised of business leaders and alumni are instrumental in lending expertise to the School of Business. The dean meets with both Advisory Boards from time to time to discuss strategic direction. The undergraduate department chair, MBA director, and DBA director lead respective Advisory Boards.

The School of Business faculty are engaged in strategic activities whether in task forces considering a new program or initiative, or in the regular (2 times monthly) School of Business faculty meetings. In order for our strategic plan or initiative to move forward, the dean, program directors and faculty all carry discussion and decision-making responsibility.

The School of Business strategic plan was formulated by the dean after discussion and input from faculty and staff. Discussion began in September of 2010 at the School of Business faculty/staff retreat, extended throughout the academic year, culminating in a presentation of the strategic plan by the dean at the fall 2011, faculty/staff retreat.

During the 2010-2011 academic year, the dean engaged faculty and staff in strategic thinking discussions through the reading of articles and perspectives about the future of higher education as well as the future of business education. Curricular relevancy and the state of the MBA program in higher education were critical topics of discussion. Faculty and staff participated in discussion as well as an activity that asked each one to answer the following questions:

1. What do we want to be known for as a School of Business?
2. What do we want to come to the public’s mind (and consumer) when they hear the name George Fox University School of Business?
The dean met with the President’s Business Advisory Board and engaged in a rigorous discussion on the relevancy of the business curriculum at George Fox. The combination of these discussions and activities during the academic year significantly contributed to the GFSB strategic plan presented to the School of Business faculty and staff at the fall 2011 faculty/staff retreat.

The School of Business faculty and staff (as described above) were engaged in strategic planning discussion and activities during the 2010-2011 academic year. An example of this is the idea of a School of Business trading room in the strategic plan. The idea was brought forth by the undergraduate department chair at some point in the strategic thinking process and included in the strategic plan.

Criterion 2.1.b. The strategic plan should identify the business school’s or program’s key strategic objectives and the timetable for the current planning period.

The GFSB strategic plan is included in the appendix.

**Figure 2.1**

**Summary of Strategic Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Strategic Objectives</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Timetable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build an outstanding teaching reputation as a School of Business</td>
<td>1. 90% faculty have doctorates</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Annette Nemetz completes doctorate</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Seth Sikkema completes doctorate</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Teaching workshops</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Strong faculty corporate experience</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Faculty scholarship groups</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build a strong external relationship in the business community</td>
<td>1. Executive in Residence Day</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Executive in Residence Semester</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 90% faculty on external board of directors</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Internship director position approved</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Dean’s Advisory Board</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build strong undergraduate and graduate academic programs</td>
<td>1. ACBSP accreditation</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Retool MBA program</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Advanced standing UG program</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Revamp senior capstone</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Achieve ETS goals (95%)</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build outstanding, innovative and entrepreneurial programs in the</td>
<td>1. GFSB academic learning lab</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>2. Graduate Assistant program</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Flex/Hybrid MBA program</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. GFSB Academic Journal</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Business trading room</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Install T.V. monitor in department for business news and stock</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>market trading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Establish Graduate Scholarship program</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Establish Undergrad Business Scholarship program</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Develop plans for Fundraising Campaign for School of Business</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion 2.2 Strategy Deployment

Criterion 2.2.a. Strategic action plans should address both short- and long-term objectives. Note: If you develop your key human resource plans as part of your business school or program’s short- and long-term strategic objectives and action plans, please list “HR Plans (See Std. 5)” here, but describe those plans under Standard 5.

Human Resource Plan

The plan is to hire professionally and doctorally qualified faculty and staff in the following disciplines and administrative areas:

2011-2012 Accounting
2011-2012 Finance
2011-2012 Internship Director

Figure 2.2
Action Plan Measurement

Summary of Current year action plans:
- Implement five new undergraduate business majors increasing four concentrations to full majors and adding a fifth major, Entrepreneurship. We established a 42 credit common core (up from 30) and increased all five majors to 60 semester hours.
  - BA in Management
  - BA in Global Business
  - BA in Finance
  - BA in Marketing
  - BA in Entrepreneurship
- Install T.V. monitor for business and stock market news
- Hired three new business faculty
- Complete ACBSP accreditation report
- UG and Graduate Advisory Boards meet
- Executive in Residence Day
- Seventeen faculty published/presented
- Developed a hybrid undergraduate course
- ACBSP formal accreditation
Summary of Long-term action plans:
• Develop a retooled Flex/Hybrid MBA program
• Establish an Executive Business Center
• Significantly strengthen Internship Program/hire director/add placement feature
• 90% faculty with doctorates
• New Undergraduate Sports Management Major
• Advanced standing undergraduate business program
• Graduate Assistant program
• Launch GFSB Academic Journal
• Engage in GFSB fundraising activity (2012-2013)
• Establish graduate business student scholarship
• Executive in Residence semester program
• ETS goals/set a standard for achievement at 85% and above
• Develop an online MBA program
• Major revamping of senior capstone class

Criterion 2.2.b. The business unit shall have established performance measures for tracking progress relative to strategic action plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-Term Action Plans</th>
<th>Key Measures</th>
<th>Key Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement five new majors</td>
<td>Included in course academic schedule</td>
<td>Student enrollments in each major and classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of T.V. monitor for stock market and business news (Bloomberg)</td>
<td>Installed fall semester 2011</td>
<td>Student/faculty/public viewing increased communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit faculty position in accounting</td>
<td>Position approved and posted fall 2011</td>
<td>Position filled by August 15, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit faculty position in finance</td>
<td>Position approved and posted fall 2011</td>
<td>Position filled by August 15, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive in Residence Day</td>
<td>Secured executive speaker in late summer, 2011</td>
<td>Executive in Residence Day on October 12, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACBSP Accreditation</td>
<td>Self-study due January 15, 2012</td>
<td>ACBSP site visit March 2012 Decision spring 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.3 (continued)
Action Plan Measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBA program retooling proposal</th>
<th>December 2011</th>
<th>Faculty decision spring 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Business Center</td>
<td>Visit three trading rooms at other colleges/ Meet with designer</td>
<td>Architect rendering 2012 Begin fundraising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-Term Action Plans</th>
<th>Key Measures</th>
<th>Key Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a 100% online MBA program</td>
<td>Development &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>Launch 2013-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Business Center</td>
<td>Formal plans</td>
<td>Executive Business Center built 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial plans</td>
<td>Develop fundraising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a strong, qualified faculty</td>
<td>90% faculty with earned doctorate</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New undergraduate Sports Management major</td>
<td>Proposal to faculty fall 2012</td>
<td>Implementation fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business fundraising</td>
<td>Formal plan</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistant program</td>
<td>Funding in budget</td>
<td>Launch 2013-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major revamping of senior capstone class</td>
<td>Raise $60,000 for capital venture</td>
<td>Launch 2013-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowed chair in business</td>
<td>Raise $1,000,000</td>
<td>Launch 2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester Executive in Residence</td>
<td>Raise $60,000</td>
<td>Launch 2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen UG curriculum</td>
<td>ETS goals 85% and above</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced standing undergraduate business program</td>
<td>Materials/standards completed</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFSB Academic Journal</td>
<td>Design/format established First publication</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host CBFA conference</td>
<td>Schedule on university calendar</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFSB new business building</td>
<td>Approval/design/fundraising</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 2.2.c. The leadership of the business unit should communicate strategic objectives, action plans, and measurements to all faculty, staff, and stakeholders, as appropriate.

The School of Business strategic plan was communicated to the business faculty at the fall 2011 School of Business retreat. Faculty and staff received a copy of the strategic plan. The strategic plan included specific strategic objectives, timelines and fundraising goals. The next step is to communicate this plan to students and other key constituencies. The dean met with the MBA Advisory Board to review the School of Business strategic plan. A feature addition to the School of Business web page located on the university website will be utilized to widely communicate the GFSB strategic plan.
STANDARD #3
Student and Stakeholder Focus

A business school or program must have a systematic procedure to determine requirements and expectations of current and future students and stakeholders, including how the business school or program enhances relationships with students and stakeholders and determines their satisfaction. Stakeholders may include parents, employers, alumni, donors, other schools, communities, etc.

Criterion 3.a. The business school or program must determine (or target) the student segments its educational programs will address.

The student segments targeted for the undergraduate program are as follows:

Student Audiences:
- Traditional undergraduate students (16-24 years old)
- Non-traditional adult degree students (Adult Degree Completion Program)
- International students (agreements with several Chinese universities)

Prospective Students:
1. George Fox University has signed an agreement with Hunan University in China to accept students in transfer to George Fox who have completed two years at Hunan. This is called the 2+2 Program. A strong segment of George Fox international population comes from the program. In addition, faculty and admissions personnel visit China and Hunan University on a regular basis.
2. Undergraduate admissions counselors regularly schedule appointments for prospective students to meet with department faculty.
3. Bruin Preview, a Friday event, is held periodically during the year where visiting high school students visit the business department and meet business faculty.
4. During the summer prior to fall enrollment, accepted students attend Genesis, a day where they receive academic advising and their fall and spring academic schedule.

The student segments targeted for the full-time MBA (FTMBA) are as follows:

Student Audiences
- Students who have recently completed their undergraduate degree.
- Students with 0-4 years of work experience.
- Business and non-business undergraduate majors.
- Young professionals desiring to strengthen their undergraduate degree and refine their career path.

Prospective Students
1. Information meetings are held four to five times per year to present the program and answer questions. The dates for information meetings are posted on the website.
2. Admissions counselors and program directors are routinely available to answer prospective students’ questions about the program.
3. Admissions counselors and program directors invite prospective students to visit classes.
4. Admissions counselors attend transfer and graduate fairs with other local universities and community colleges.
5. Admissions counselors correspond with prospective students via physical mailings and email blasts on a routine basis to promote information meetings and application deadlines.
6. Admissions counselors and program directors/faculty members hold quarterly Speaker Series events to maintain relationships with alumni and increase the visibility of programs.
7. Admissions counselors and program directors attend specific GFU Senior Capstone courses each fall as well as specific business undergraduate functions and events where relationships can be built to increase awareness and interest in the program.
8. Specific GFU undergraduate international business majors are contacted in their junior year to begin building relationships and planting “seeds” for future discussions.
9. The International Admissions Recruiter takes at least two trips to China each year to build university relationships with various schools as well as work with in-country recruiting agencies.
10. A GFU delegation travels to China each May to build and develop International educational agreements and relationships that will support the efforts of the FT MBA program to have a portion of the enrolled students attend from another country. China is currently our focus.

The student segments targeted for the part-time MBA are as follows:

Student Audiences
- Adults with a minimum of five years of professional or managerial experience.
- Business professionals wanting to further their careers.
- Adults in professions outside of business who desire to gain expertise in leadership and the functional core areas of business.

Prospective Students
1. Information meetings are held on a monthly basis to present the program and answer questions. The dates for information meetings are posted on the website.
2. Admissions counselors and program directors are routinely available to answer prospective students’ questions about the program.
3. Admissions counselors and program directors invite prospective students to visit classes.
4. Admissions counselors attend transfer and graduate fairs with other local universities and community colleges.
5. As members of the Southern Idaho Education Consortium, admissions counselors attend education benefits fairs sponsored by local businesses.
6. Admissions counselors correspond with prospective students via physical mailings and email blasts on a routine basis to promote information meetings and application deadlines.
7. Admissions counselors and program directors attend various Chamber events when they are pertinent to program offerings.
8. Admissions counselors and program directors/faculty members hold quarterly Speaker Series events to maintain relationships with alumni and increase the visibility of programs.
The student segments targeted for the Doctor of Management (DMgt) program and Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) program are as follows:

Student Audiences
- Current executives desiring further certification (DMgt)
- Second half executives – experienced professionals desiring to change careers to teach (DMgt/DBA)
- Community college instructors (DMgt/DBA)
- Adjunct professors (DMgt/DBA)
- Full time university faculty lacking a terminal degree (DMgt/DBA)
- Christian business college faculty (DBA)

Prospective Students
1. Information appointments with the DBA admissions director and program director are held with individual students who come to campus. Phone appointments are held with those who live outside the area.
2. The marketing department keeps monthly statistics on the number of on-line inquiries about the program through the Google search engine.
3. Admissions staff and the program director routinely answer questions about program requirements from prospective students via email.
4. Two mailings have been sent to business deans of Christian College Consortium schools describing our program designed for faculty without terminal degrees.
5. Recruitment has also taken place at the Christian Business Faculty Association annual meeting.
6. Enrollment patterns were critical to moving to a Doctor of Business Administration program. The majority of our students want to teach, not to stay in their executive roles. This encouraged a shift to a more focused program that prepares business faculty.

Criterion 3.b. The business unit will have identified its major stakeholders, and found methods to listen and to learn from its stakeholders in order to determine both student and stakeholder requirements and expectations.

The School of Business has identified different methods to listen and learn about student and stakeholder requirements and their importance to enrollment. Those methods, organized by program, are as follows:

Stakeholders for the Undergraduate Business Program:
- Current undergraduate business students
- Alumni
- Employers
- Business community
- Prospective students
- Parents of undergraduate students

Describe how you use relevant information from students and stakeholders.

The School of Business undergraduate department regularly seeks student feedback in an effort to assess faculty performance in the classroom. Every regular full time faculty member as well as adjunct
instructor is required to conduct student course evaluations at the end of their course. Students complete both a computerized tabulated form and a form for written comments. Their evaluations are tabulated and given to the professor along with comments approximately eight weeks into the next semester. The undergraduate department chair reviews every undergraduate course evaluation. The chair is watchful for trends or concerns requiring attention.

In addition to individual trends, an aggregate course evaluation summary provides further faculty performance information. The aggregate summary (chart below) is for the undergraduate program from 2010 to 2011. The Student Evaluation of Instruction form utilizes scale (1-5) with 5 being the highest rating. The median is tabulated for twenty-seven statements relating to instructor performance and course effectiveness. Course median scores over 4.0 are generally expected of experienced faculty. Median scores in the 3.0 and above range are noted for improvement. Scores in the 2.0 to 3 range are cause for concern and intervention. Action at this level may include a Performance Improvement Plan for the faculty member.

### 2010-2011 Undergraduate Business and Economics Faculty Performance Evaluation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course as a whole</th>
<th>No. of Classes</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>No. of Classes</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower level</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.7 (.80)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.8 (.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper level</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.9 (.49)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.9 (.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.1 (.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.8 (.66)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>4.0 (.70)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students also have opportunity to offer additional feedback through written comments. Students' written comments are received and taken seriously. These handwritten comments are provided to the faculty member (typed format) for their review. Student comments are typed to maintain their confidentiality. The undergraduate chair reviews all undergraduate teaching evaluations. The department looks at single course evaluations as well as patterns ranging over a year or in some cases beyond a year. We had students voicing a concern over an economics professor whose pace and articulation (he was born in Liberia) made it difficult for students to understand what he was saying. The undergraduate chair met with him and shared the students' concerns. This helped him improve his class delivery and students grew to deeply appreciate him. Another example is an adjunct instructor in business statistics whose evaluations were less than satisfactory. The undergraduate chair worked with her to strengthen her teaching. The School of Business is particularly attentive to new faculty performance. In the last two years we have hired six new faculty members. In an effort to strengthen their chances of success, each new faculty member is assigned an unofficial mentor.

New faculty members are required to participate in the New Faculty Institute, a two year long program managed by the Academic Affairs Office. The program focuses on expectations of faculty members in the classroom and in scholarship. New faculty find the institute helpful in their transition to the university teaching culture.
Stakeholders for the MBA Program:

- Representatives from the non-profit organizations with which we partner for our Community Learning and Consulting projects complete evaluations of our students and the overall value they add to the organizations they served. (Part-time MBA.) See Appendix 3.1 for a copy of this evaluation.

- Members of the MBA advisory boards (in both Portland and Boise) provide information about current business needs and ways to strengthen our program offerings. In 2011, advisory board members for the MBA program based in Portland reviewed course syllabi and provided feedback and suggestions on course content. This feedback was shared with instructors.

- A member of the MBA advisory board evaluates presentations at the capstone Leadership Symposium.

- MBA alumni are invited to be panelists in several courses in the program.

- Adjunct faculty members, consisting primarily of business professionals in the community, participate in regular meetings to discuss the strengths of the program as well as opportunities for improvement. One example of a time when faculty feedback resulted in a change to the program is when faculty members voiced concern about the discrepancy in students’ preparation for the quantitative courses. While some students in the program are CPA’s, others have no accounting background. To address this concern, the School of Business began to require that all part-time MBA students complete an assessment through a Harvard University eLearning course in Financial Accounting. Those students scoring less than a 75% on this assessment are required to complete a learning module on accounting and pass the final exam prior to enrolling in GFU’s Accounting course. (Part-time MBA program.)

- Adjunct instructors present their course syllabi for review at MBA faculty meetings. Syllabi are reviewed, best practices are shared, and changes are made as deemed necessary. One such change was with regard to assigned reading. In response to a wide discrepancy in the amount of reading assigned each week across different courses in the curriculum, it was agreed that faculty will assign an average of 80-120 pages per week. This agreement has increased consistency across the curriculum. (Part-time MBA program.)

- Alumni of the MBA program are contacted for their opinions when curricular changes are being evaluated. In 2009, GFU’s School of Business was considering adding concentrations to the curriculum. MBA alumni, as well as current students, were sent an online survey soliciting their feedback on which concentrations topics they would like to have offered. (Part-time MBA program.) See Appendix 3.16 for a copy of this survey.

- Several members of the MBA advisory boards (Portland and Boise) are alumni of GFU’s MBA program and consequently represent this constituency.

- We host quarterly Speaker Series events and invite all MBA alumni for the purpose of staying connected with this group and listening to their needs and concerns. The FT MBA students are required to attend most of these events to make connections with alumni and external stakeholders.
• Program directors and faculty forge partnerships and maintain communication with area alumni, consultants, speakers, and organizations through various social media outlets (e.g., LinkedIn, Facebook groups, and an e-Newsletter).

Describe how you use relevant information from MBA students and stakeholders.

Note: Items below that pertain to only the full-time MBA program, will be followed by the designation (FTMBA). Items pertaining to only the part-time MBA program, will be followed by the designation (Part-time MBA or PTMBA). Items that include no such designation pertain to both the full-time and part-time MBA programs.

• New, incoming students who attend the MBA orientation session receive an online evaluation in which they are asked to provide their feedback about the orientation experience. See Appendix 3.2 for a copy of this evaluation.

• Part-Time MBA students complete a mid-course evaluation in each class to provide instructors feedback so that courses may be revised while still in session. See Appendix 3.3 for a copy of the mid-course evaluation.

• Some instructors conduct a weekly, session-by-session check/delta evaluation of their course sessions. See Appendix 3.4 for a copy of the check/delta evaluation.

• Students evaluate guest speakers throughout the program. Based on the feedback received, program directors decide whether to ask speakers to present in future classes. See Appendix 3.5 for a copy of the guest speaker evaluation form.

• Students complete an end-of-course evaluation of each class to provide instructors feedback for improving future courses. Directors also receive this information and follow-up with faculty as appropriate. There have been cases when, based on repeated instances of receiving unsatisfactory evaluations, adjunct faculty members have not been rehired. Courses have also been modified based on this feedback. One example of a 2011 change that was implemented based on student feedback was the adoption of a standardized syllabus format used across the curriculum. See Appendix 3.6 for a copy of the end-of-course evaluation form.

• Individual cohort reports are updated every seven weeks with the summarized results of students' end-of-course evaluations. The report shows the percentage of “Very Satisfied,” “Somewhat Satisfied,” etc., in each of eight categories. The director reviews a summary of students' overall satisfaction with the MBA program on a regular basis. This data allows the director to be aware of each cohort’s experience, and take action as necessary. See Appendix 3.7 for sample summaries of end-of-course evaluations.

• Students complete an end-of-program evaluation following their last course. Survey Monkey computes averages for the end-of-program evaluations. Aggregate responses (rather than individual comments) are shared with the faculty, and a bar graph is distributed to illustrate responses to the following two questions:
1. For each course in your program please tell us how much you learned from this course and its content.
2. For each course in your program tell us the overall quality of the course, how effectively the course was taught.

See Appendix 3.8 for a copy of the end-of-program evaluation. See Appendix 3.9 for summaries of end-of-program evaluation results.

- Students complete a peer evaluation to provide faculty members with feedback regarding team members' contributions whenever an assignment is group based. This feedback is one criterion on which students' grades for team projects are based. See Appendix 3.10 for a copy of the peer evaluation form.

- Students evaluate the Community Learning and Consulting (CLC) project by submitting a reflective paper that describes their project, relates it to theory, and evaluates the consulting experience. The feedback provided by students is used to modify and strengthen the program. One example of a change that was made based on evaluation information is as follows. Students consistently expressed frustration about lack of support and follow through from the organizational representatives with which we partnered. As a result, the coordinator of our CLC program now meets with prospective organizational partners to clarify expectations and responsibilities. Organizational leaders must now commit to fulfilling these expectations and responsibilities prior to being selected as recipients for our service projects. (Part-time MBA.)

- Miscellaneous surveys specific to the need for information about particular issues are designed and implemented as necessary. One such example of this took place at the Boise Center in 2005. At that time, the Boise Center MBA program was condensed into 20 months, making it necessary for students to attend classes twice per week for roughly half the duration of the program. Based on concerns voiced by students, a survey was designed and administered to solicit student feedback regarding the most desirable format for the MBA program. Based on the results of this survey, the Boise Center's MBA program was lengthened from 20 months to 26 months, a change which meant students would attend class only one evening per week throughout the duration of the program. (Part-time MBA.)

- The program directors meet with students at the end of their final course in the program to solicit verbal feedback about the strengths of the program and opportunities for improvement. There have been instances when this feedback has directly influenced decisions to modify the program. One such example took place at the Boise Center in 2009. Prior to that time, the Accounting and Finance classes had been separated by a period of several months. Based on students' feedback that they had difficulty retaining information during this time period, the sequence of courses was modified such that the Accounting and Managerial Finance classes are now scheduled back-to-back. (Part-time MBA.)

- Full-time faculty members make themselves available to students outside of class. MBA students frequently consult with them to talk about personal, professional, and/or school-related issues and concerns. The MBA directors as well as the Dean of the School of Business have open-door policies, which provide additional opportunities to learn about student concerns. An example of action being taken based on concerns voiced by students occurred after several Boise Center MBA students expressed dissatisfaction with the Accounting and
Finance courses. These courses are taught by adjunct instructors in Boise. In an effort to respond to the concern and improve these classes, the MBA Director in Boise brought a lead Accounting and Finance instructor from the main campus to Boise for the purpose of mentoring adjunct faculty teaching these courses. Course evaluations improved as a result.

- At the completion of every corporate visit that is completed through the Business Seminar Course (BUSG 553), an electronic evaluation is completed and reviewed by the director and faculty members. A few key questions focus on the “value” of the visit and the “changes that are recommended” for the next visit. (FTMBA.) See Appendix 3.11 for a copy of this evaluation.

- As part of their Business Seminar course (BUSG 553), students submit a monthly journal and reflection paper that helps students capture their learning and the integration of theory and practice. This assignment captures the student stakeholder values, questions and concerns. (FTMBA.)

Stakeholders for the DMgt/DBA Programs

- Practicum instructors conduct final interviews with managers and faculty who supervise our students.

- Doctoral faculty members participate in business breakfasts for alumni and current MBA students and gather information about current business needs and developments at these sessions.

- The DBA advisory board provides input on what business departments expect of new faculty.

Describe how you use relevant information from doctoral students and stakeholders.


- Classroom evaluations of faculty provide feedback about instructor effectiveness with our students. Based on this feedback, teaching assignments and courses are modified. See Appendix 3.13 for a copy of this form.

- The program chair periodically meets with individual students who provide input about program elements they find effective or ineffective.

- During residency periods, time is provided for question and answer/information/feedback sessions.

- Faculty members review individual student progress as needed. This has opened up opportunities for dialog.

- Our fifth graduate finished the program in October 2011 with three more students defending before the end of November. Plans are underway to develop an exit survey.
Criterion 3.c. The business unit will periodically review listening and learning methods to keep them current with educational service needs and directions.

Undergraduate Program

The undergraduate faculty teaching and course evaluations are a source of information regarding learning methods. For example, our information systems class consistently received poor evaluation by students. We determined to remove it from the curriculum until it could be updated when we hire a qualified faculty member. It is slated to be reentered into the undergraduate business curriculum.

Academic advising is another source of student satisfaction or dissatisfaction feedback. Our advisors are attentive to student comment and perspective.

The undergraduate department chair is very accessible for business majors. The chair is attentive to student concerns about curriculum and faculty performance.

Another service is the monthly Buzz, an informal 30-45 minute coffee event where students and faculty get together (2011-2012).

The undergraduate Executive in Residence Day (held two times annually) where we bring in a successful business executive to interact all day with our business students and faculty has allowed us to see more clearly the current trends in business education. Mohan Nair, Chief Executive Officer with a health care system provider, engaged our faculty in a dynamic discussion of determining our customer profile (2011-2012).

Our undergraduate Advisory Board provides us with relevant perspective on business curriculum. One of our members, a George Fox graduate and now working in finance at Microsoft, is highly motivated to help our finance and accounting students. The blend of teaching and practical experience will help us remain current and define our direction.

MBA Program

Note: Items below that pertain only to the full-time MBA program, will be followed by the designation (FTMBA). Items pertaining only to the part-time MBA program, will be followed by the designation (Part-time MBA or PTMBA). Items that include no such designation pertain to both the full-time and part-time MBA programs.

- MBA students complete an end-of-program evaluation (See Appendix 3.8). Faculty members review the survey questions and responses each time the evaluation is administered. This evaluation process was reviewed in 2009 at which time the Boise Center MBA program adopted the same end-of-program evaluation being used by the Portland MBA program.

- Faculty members use mid-course evaluations to solicit feedback on course curriculum and teaching methods while classes are still in session. This allows instructors to modify course content and pedagogical approaches mid-session rather than waiting until a class has finished and another is beginning. (Part-time MBA.) See Appendix 3.3 for a copy of the mid-course evaluation.
• Faculty members use feedback received on end-of-course evaluations to improve course content and teaching methods. Program directors review all end-of-course evaluations and work with faculty as needed. The course evaluation process is reviewed on a regular basis and was most recently revised in 2009. See Appendix 3.6 for a copy of the end-of-course evaluation.

• MBA directors across sites (Newberg, Portland, and Boise) collaborate to ensure that major evaluation processes are consistent across locations. The Boise Center MBA program adopted the Portland Center's end-of-program evaluation in 2009.

• The coordinators of the Community Learning and Consulting program consistently collaborate across sites (Portland and Boise) to refine the evaluation process and the instruments used to assess the effectiveness of that program. Organizational representatives were consulted for their feedback on the evaluation process in 2010. As a result of the feedback received, the evaluation process was changed. Initially, evaluations were sent to organizational representatives via email. They completed the evaluations, scanned them, and sent them back to the coordinator of the Community Learning and Consulting program. The evaluations are now distributed via Survey Monkey, an approach that has streamlined the process for all involved. (Part-time MBA.) See Appendix 3.1 for a copy of this evaluation.

• Faculty attend professional meetings of organizations such as ACBSP, Christian Business Faculty Association, Academy of Management, International Leadership Association, and the American Economic Association. Complete details about participation in professional associations may be found in individual faculty members' vitas. These meetings introduce faculty to new developments in the field of business as well as best new practices in teaching.

• Program directors meet with student cohorts during their last course in the program to solicit feedback on strengths of the program and opportunities for improvement.

• Advisory board members, who are business professionals throughout the community, are asked to critique programs and offer suggestions for improvement. The MBA advisory board at the Portland Center reviewed syllabi for all MBA classes in 2011, providing feedback on how courses could be revised to ensure they were current.

• The university's Marketing Communications department distributes a survey to recently admitted students to solicit input on their experience with the admissions process. See Appendix 3.14 for a copy of this survey. See Appendix 3.15 for a sample of data that were obtained by use of this survey. This information is used to improve practices in marketing, recruitment, and admissions.

DMgt/DBA Programs

• Annual satisfaction surveys.

• Attendance of doctoral faculty at national and international conferences. These meetings introduce them to new developments in the field of business as well as to innovative teaching strategies. These conferences include the Christian Business Faculty Association, the International Leadership Association, Academy of Human Resource Development, Association...
for Financial Counseling and Planning, Academy of Marketing, and the Academy of Management.

- Review of course evaluations by the program director to improve content and instruction.
- Faculty who engage in ongoing dialog with professors from other doctoral programs on campus.
- All doctoral committees require a reader from outside the School of Business who provides feedback about the quality of students' performance.

Criterion 3.d. The business unit will have a process to use the information obtained from students and stakeholders for purposes of planning educational programs, offerings, and services; marketing; process improvements; and the development of other services.

**Figure 3.1**
Student and Stakeholder Groups (undergraduate business program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student/Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Student/Stakeholder Requirement</th>
<th>Educational Program Addressing Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional undergraduates</td>
<td>Developing business networking skills</td>
<td>Executive in Residence Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing entrepreneurial skills</td>
<td>Senior capstone business class (students required to start their own business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career/vocational development</td>
<td>Internship program (developing plans to strengthen current program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deeper understanding of business principles</td>
<td>Undergraduate business core (42 hours – increased from 30-42 hours)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                           | Global perspective and awareness | Added new Global Business major  
|                           |                                 | Hired two Chinese business faculty  
|                           |                                 | University’s Juniors Abroad program added required core global business course |
|                           | Developing moral and ethical perspectives in business | Added a required Business Ethics course for all undergraduate business majors |

**MBA Students and Stakeholders**

*Note:* Items below that pertain only to the full-time MBA program, will be followed by the designation (FTMBA). Items pertaining only to the part-time MBA program, will be followed by the designation (Part-time MBA or PTMBA). Items that include no such designation pertain to both the full-time and part-time MBA programs.
Surveys are used to solicit student and stakeholder feedback regarding program design and curricular changes. Examples include the survey conducted with Boise Center MBA students to solicit their opinion on the format in which classes were offered. Based on the feedback received, the schedule of courses was revised from a two-night a week format to a one-night-per-week format. Another example is the Survey Monkey instrument: that was sent to current MBA students and alumni to solicit feedback on which concentrations they would like to have offered in the MBA program. Decisions regarding concentration offerings were based on the feedback received. (Part-time MBA.) See Appendix 3.16 for a copy of this survey instrument.

Students complete evaluations at the end of each class to provide information on teaching and course effectiveness. This information is reviewed by the individual faculty members being evaluated as well as by program directors. Faculty members modify courses and improve their teaching effectiveness as a result of this feedback. Directors use the evaluation information to mentor faculty, suggesting changes in course content and/or teaching methods as appropriate. There have been instances when course assignments have been changed based on evaluation information. There have also been instances when, based on repeated negative evaluations, adjunct faculty have not been asked to teach again.

During faculty and committee meetings, results of end-of-program surveys, as well as concerns raised during informal conversations with students, are discussed. An example of an outcome that has resulted from such discussions is the proposal (now pending) to eliminate the Community Learning and Consulting program from the MBA curriculum. This course has consistently been rated least favorably by students on the end-of-program evaluation.

MBA advisory board members are consulted regarding proposed curricular changes and offerings. An example of this occurred when we were discussing adding concentrations to our MBA curriculum. The MBA board members were asked to provide their feedback and suggestions. This feedback was a major factor in deciding which concentrations to offer. Advisory Board members for the Portland MBA program were consulted for their input on the Dean of the School Business’ strategic plan. Their feedback was shared with the Dean and will be considered in the final draft of the strategic plan for the School of Business.

MBA advisory board members are also consulted on marketing and services provided to alumni, students, and prospective students. Feedback solicited during the meetings is presented to the larger MBA team for consideration. Action items are assigned, and ideas are implemented. Recruitment strategies were discussed during the October 2011 advisory board meeting at the Boise Center. One suggestion is that we begin to have board members visit adult degree completion courses that meet at our site for the purposes of promoting the MBA program. This concept will be implemented in November of 2011.

The department of Marketing and Communications is committed to marketing the programs within the School of Business with integrity. Marketing and Communications conducts an enrolled student survey every year to understand what motivates a student to enroll and what forms of communication and advertising were most effective. See Appendices 3.14 and 3.15. They use this information to help tailor marketing messages used in various forms including online and outdoor advertisements, the School of Business website, publications and brochures. Research is also done to understand the demographics of the students who choose the George Fox University.
Fox School of Business in order to effectively target our marketing efforts. Student testimonials and alumni stories are gathered frequently for use on the School of Business website and publications, in the form of written or video expression, to authentically represent the George Fox School of Business experience.

Figure 3.2
Student and Stakeholder Groups (Part-Time MBA & FT MBA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student/Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Student/Stakeholder Requirement</th>
<th>Educational Program Addressing Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospective students</td>
<td>Business preparation, interest</td>
<td>Speaker Series, site classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective/current students</td>
<td>Maintain current employment</td>
<td>Part-time program format for the part-time MBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective/current students</td>
<td>Secure employment opportunities</td>
<td>FT MBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective/current students</td>
<td>Business leadership preparation</td>
<td>Business theory and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective/current students</td>
<td>Face-to-face contact</td>
<td>Cohort model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective/current students</td>
<td>Reasonable cost</td>
<td>Lower tuition in Boise market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective/current students</td>
<td>Relevant curriculum</td>
<td>Blend of academic/professional, FT MBA BUSG 553 course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective/current students</td>
<td>Changing careers</td>
<td>Applied business program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective/current students</td>
<td>Business/faith integration</td>
<td>Ethics, Christian faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective current students</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>One-on-one faculty/adjuncts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small colleges/universities</td>
<td>Teaching preparation</td>
<td>Functional business core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small businesses startups</td>
<td>Broad understanding of business</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship, marketing, core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>models/principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-profit businesses</td>
<td>Broad understanding of business</td>
<td>Functional core curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit businesses</td>
<td>Specialized business knowledge</td>
<td>Leadership, change, community consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>Community, networking, prestige</td>
<td>Alumni advisory board, community events, and cohort reunions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DMgt/DBA Students and Stakeholders

- The results of the annual survey are reviewed.
- Student concerns are regularly addressed during monthly doctoral committee meetings.
- Informal conversations provide feedback about courses and processes.
- Classroom evaluations are reviewed by the program chair, who may suggest course and teaching modifications.
Several outcomes have resulted from gathering information from students and stakeholders.

- The first year of the Doctor of Management degree education track requirements were modified in response to student input (the Human Resources course became an elective, for example, and the international requirement for the practicum was dropped).
- A monthly newsletter and an on-line program website called the Boardroom was created to meet student demand for more timely information about the program.
- The Doctor of Business Administration replaced the Doctor of Management degree in response to enrollment patterns and the needs of other faith-based institutions like ours.

**Figure 3.3**

*Student and Stakeholder Groups (DMgt/DBA Programs)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student/Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Key Requirement</th>
<th>Education Program Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prospective students</td>
<td>teaching preparation</td>
<td>educational theory and instruction courses, practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prospective/current students</td>
<td>maintain current employment</td>
<td>part time program, hybrid course structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prospective/current students</td>
<td>applied terminal degree</td>
<td>applied doctoral degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prospective/current students</td>
<td>face to face contact</td>
<td>residency periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prospective/current students</td>
<td>reasonable cost</td>
<td>lower tuition, limited residency travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small colleges</td>
<td>broadly qualified faculty</td>
<td>functional course core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small colleges/universities</td>
<td>specialized background in one discipline</td>
<td>12 hours marketing/management specialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Colleges</td>
<td>business/faith integration</td>
<td>Faith in Business course, spiritual course modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training departments</td>
<td>training preparation</td>
<td>educational theory and instruction courses, practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>businesses/nonprofits</td>
<td>broad understanding of business principles</td>
<td>functional core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>businesses/nonprofits</td>
<td>specialized business knowledge</td>
<td>marketing/management concentrations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion 3.e. The business unit should have processes to attract and retain students, and to build relationships with desired stakeholders.

Undergraduate Students:

To Attract Students:

The undergraduate business program believes students are attracted and retained by having outstanding teachers. The George Fox School of Business strategic plan consists of four strategic objectives. The first strategic objective is an outstanding teaching faculty.

The School of Business collaborates regularly with the university’s admissions department to meet with prospective high school students. These prospective students (prospective business majors) visit the business department along with their parents where they are warmly greeted. Faculty members consider these visits as an important part of their work at George Fox.

Our business senior capstone class (BUSN 491/492) where the students are given a $750 capital grant from the GFSB to literally go out and start their own business has become an attractive feature of our undergraduate business program. Since the course has launched, business majors have started over thirty actual businesses.

The undergraduate department chair meets annually with the undergraduate admissions recruiter to review the undergraduate business curriculum and note any changes or new features. This is an important meeting for undergraduate business program marketing and recruitment strategies. It also strengthens business faculty and admissions staff relationships.

The university’s marketing and admissions departments work with the School of Business on brochure and web page information. Currently there is a need for an updated undergraduate brochure to include our five new undergraduate majors. The university is moving more to electronic communication with prospective students, however marketing and admissions are allowing us to design a new undergraduate brochure.

To Retain Students:

The undergraduate business program faculty members are service oriented. This is evident in the accessibility of our faculty. Our philosophy and practice is to be student centered. It can be overwhelming for a college student (especially a freshman) to come to a faculty member’s office. We attempt to minimize this with a friendly welcome when they come through the main door. Students are consistently asked if they need help or who it is they want to see when they first walk in.

Accurate and timely academic advising will help retain students. Our faculty take advising seriously. All faculty are assigned advisees. Our registrar’s office assigns one of their counselors as the liaison to the business department. This has greatly enhanced services to both students and faculty.

Outstanding teaching will positively impact retention of business students. Our faculty must be relevant in their disciplines, connect well with students and be service oriented. Students are drawn to faculty who care about their learning.
The undergraduate business department believes that student retention is in measure related to a sense of belonging to the department. Identity as business majors is important. To this end, we have created the monthly Buzz (coffee with students and faculty) and have pictures of every current undergraduate business major and faculty member hanging on the walls of the department. This has created a buzz among students. We had three Chinese students come in and take pictures of their pictures on the wall probably with the intention of sending them to their families.

Students (and their parents) are value conscious. They want to know that their job prospects upon earning their Bachelor of Arts degree. We believe retention is tied to a strong internship program. Our current internship program needs strengthening. This has become one of our strategic initiatives.

**MBA Students:**

*Note:* Items below that pertain only to the full-time MBA program, will be followed by the designation (FTMBA). Items pertaining only to the part-time MBA program, will be followed by the designation (Part-time MBA or PTMBA). Items that include no such designation pertain to both the full-time and part-time MBA programs.

**To attract students**

- Monthly (part-time MBA) and bi-monthly (FTMBA) informational meetings are held to present our programs and answer questions from prospective students.
- An active website, that includes video and dates of informational meetings, is maintained and kept current.
- Our MBA website is optimized on a regular basis by Marketing Communications.
- Billboards promoting our MBA program and the University are rotated throughout the city.
- Program directors, faculty, and admissions counselors are available to answer questions of prospective students.
- Program directors, faculty, and admissions counselors encourage prospective students to visit a class.
- Admissions counselors attend outside events and educational fairs with admissions personnel from other universities and community colleges.
- Program directors, faculty, and admissions counselors correspond with prospective students via email, phones calls, and hard copy mailings to communicate application deadlines, upcoming community events, and promote informational meetings.
- As members of the Southern Idaho Education Consortium, admissions counselors attend education benefits fairs sponsored by local businesses. (Part-time MBA.)
• Program directors, faculty, and admissions counselors attend various Chamber and community events.

• Program directors and faculty offer leadership training events and speaker workshops to various community institutions and businesses.

• Program directors, faculty, and admissions counselors sponsor a quarterly city-wide speaker series to increase the visibility of programs.

• FTMBA program director and admissions counselor attend specific GFU undergraduate courses (e.g., senior capstone, international business courses, business club, etc.).

• The University International Recruitment Director concentrates his efforts building relationships with various universities in China and strengthening these relationships each year. (FTMBA.)

To retain students

• Program directors serve as advocates for students.

• A cohort model was established for the purpose of building strong relationships and simplifying the academic scheduling process for students.

• A sense of community is promoted through students and faculty sharing meals each class session.

• On the final night of their last class in the program, graduating students enjoy a pizza dinner and 30-minute small group conversations with the students finishing their first course in the program. The graduating students’ strategies for success are reiterated to the entire group by the new students.

• The MBA program provides an administrative assistant who devotes time to supporting students (e.g., helps with the registration process, provides textbook lists, keeps students updated on program announcements, answers questions, etc.).

• The FoxTALE Boardroom (for part-time MBA students) and “the COMMONS” (for FTMBA students) sites serve as ongoing communication platforms to both new and current students. These virtual platforms are a place to access pertinent information and helpful resources. New students gain access upon matriculation.

• Student-led study groups are established as needed.

• Students work in teams for many projects throughout the program.

• Faculty members (both full-time and adjuncts) are available to students out of class for mentoring and to offer assistance as needed.
• Feedback loops are intentionally built into the program (e.g., evaluations, personal conversations, interviews, and verbal audits).

• Program directors meet regularly with all business faculty to create smooth transitions from class-to-class in regards to students’ needs, concerns, potential challenges, and to offer special support where needed.

• All MBA students are required to complete a Harvard e-Learning Accounting module for the purpose of providing a baseline foundation for accounting principles which aids and bolsters student success rates in accounting and financial management courses. (Part-time MBA.)

• The FTMBA program requires an investment of satisfactorily completing four pre-requisite courses.

• Program directors and faculty intentionally build relationships with students both inside and outside of class.

• Program directors and faculty track attendance and are proactive in meeting potential program challenges with students.

• All MBA students participate in a Challenge Course team learning program within the first three weeks of their program. This quickly builds and creates significant connections and beginnings for cohort relationships.

![MBA Boise Retention Rate](image)

**The overall MBA Boise retention rate for the last five cohorts was 90%.**
The overall FTMBA retention rate for last two years (since the program's inception) was 100%.

To build relationships with desired stakeholders:

- Program directors established MBA advisory boards (in Boise, Portland, and Newberg) that consist of faculty members, alumni, and business professionals.

- Program directors and faculty garner relationships with alumni and other businesses and organizations through providing a quarterly speaker series.

- The BUSG 553 course builds relationships with various corporations in the Portland business community through corporate visits and real time course project work with various companies. (FTMBA.)

- Program directors and faculty forge partnerships with area alumni, consultants, speakers, and organizations through various social media outlets (e.g., Linked-in, Facebook groups, and an e-Newsletter).

- Various guest experts present in specific classes and serve on panel discussions. Some of these guests are alums.
• Faculty and students work with area non-profit organizations by providing student-led community consulting groups that aid the organizations in accomplishing various strategic projects, which ultimately aids them in fulfilling their mission and vision in our city and region. (Part-time MBA.)

• Faculty provide leadership development and training workshops for area non-profits (e.g., Meridian, Idaho Police Department). (Part-time MBA).

• Faculty provide teaching on leadership and deliver presentations to area high school students.

• Faculty provide consulting and expertise with various organizations (local, national, and global) providing strong connections to the global business community as well as informing teaching with current trends and practices.

DMet/DBA Students:

To attract students

• Continue to hold regular information appointments with prospective students.

• Target advertising to attract potential students from the ACBSP and the Christian Business Faculty Association.

• Continue to be a leading option for Google searches.

• Send letters and brochures to Christian College and community college deans.

To retain students

• An advisor/mentor was assigned to each student during the first three years of the program. Now the program director serves in that role for all students.

• The shift from a modified cohort model to a cohort model was done in part to build retention. A cohort model encourages the development of relationships and simplifies the academic scheduling process for students.

• Special meals are held for students during residency to build relationships among students and with faculty.

• Students entering the program have been supplied with an introductory book and reading list.

• The FoxTALE Boardroom site serves as an easily accessed informational tool for students.

• An administrative assistant devotes a good deal of her job description to supporting students (helping them with the registration process, answering inquiries, in the registration process, answering inquiries, and so on).
To build relationships with desired stakeholders

- A DBA advisory board, made up of business faculty members from other colleges and universities, has been formed.
- Students are placed in businesses and universities to fulfill their practicum requirements.
- DBA faculty present to stakeholder groups (e.g., universities, community groups, etc.).

Criterion 3.f. The business unit should have a process to seek information, pursue common purposes, and receive complaints from students and stakeholders.

Undergraduate Program:

Student perceptions as well as feedback are valued in the School of Business. Mechanisms are in place, both formally and informally. The dean of the School of Business and the undergraduate department chair strongly believe in and practice genuine open door access to all students.

The regular faculty performance and course evaluation process is a formal mechanism. The undergraduate chair regularly reviews performance evaluations. Written student comments are powerful and revealing.

The Educational Testing Service (ETS) Undergraduate Comprehensive Exam is given to every undergraduate business major.

Our internship program does not consistently solicit feedback as to the performance of our students. This is an area that needs to be addressed. Plans are underway to include this in the ongoing development of an internship program.

Feedback from our alumni on how well we prepared them is lacking. A process is needed to gather data from our alumni.

There is no formal system for undergraduate students to voice complaints, yet there is a strong informal mechanism. Our faculty members are extremely accessible and student centered, two qualities that naturally engender student feedback, including complaints. The dean and undergraduate chair teach in the classroom and are both accessible and student centered. The faculty performance evaluation process provides a good source for student concerns.

MBA Program:

Note: Items below that pertain only to the full-time MBA program will be followed by the designation (FTMBA). Items pertaining only to the part-time MBA program will be followed by the designation (Part-time MBA or PTMBA). Items that include no such designation pertain to both the full-time and part-time MBA programs.
Seeking Information

- Student evaluations are used to make improvements in the program.
  - Class check/delta
  - Mid-course evaluations
  - End-of-course evaluations
  - End-of-program evaluations

- Program directors and faculty members maintain an open door policy and are readily available to help resolve concerns and complaints.

- Program directors and faculty meet informally with students to conduct continuous verbal audits of the program and student satisfaction levels.

Pursuing Common Purposes

- Program directors and faculty develop and maintain partnerships with representatives from organizations in the areas of leadership development and training.

- Program directors and faculty at the Boise campus and the Portland campus intentionally collaborate on community consulting courses, processes, evaluations, speaker series, leadership capstone course, and course design. (Part-time MBA.)

- Program directors and faculty meet regularly in faculty meetings to share information.

- Program directors and faculty members meet with adjuncts to align in mission, vision, values, and goals. (Part-time MBA.)

- Program directors and full-time faculty regularly meet with adjuncts to align expectations regarding student reading and writing loads, APA format requirements, grading, and potential class concerns. (Part-time MBA.)

- Faculty members introduce and/or review the GFSB mission statement within every class and community event. Special attention is given to this in the first and last courses of the MBA program.

Receiving Complaints

- A class representative is appointed in each cohort, functioning as a student advocate and a liaison between students and faculty members as needed. (Part-time MBA.)

- The program directors and faculty maintain an open-door policy to resolve concerns and complaints.

- The program directors and faculty meet informally with students to do continuous verbal audits of the program and student satisfaction levels.
• Grievance procedures for resolving disputes are outlined in the student handbook and on the GFU website.

  o "Disputes or disagreements sometimes occur between students, or between students and faculty. You are expected to follow the biblical model for resolving such disputes by implementing the following steps (in the order presented):
    1. Discuss the issue directly and privately with the individual(s) involved. If this fails to resolve the issue, go to Step 2.
    2. Discuss the issue directly with the individual(s) involved and a mutually acceptable third party who can fairly listen and respond to the situation. If use of a neutral third party fails to resolve the issue, go Step 3.
    3. Bring the issue to the attention of appropriate program faculty or administration for assistance in resolution. If the issue involves another student or a faculty member, until you have taken responsibility to discuss the issue directly with the person(s) involved, the administration will typically not intervene."

• Program directors resource the MBA advisory boards (in Boise and Portland) to provide 360 degree assessments of the program.

**DMgt/DBA Programs (See Figure 3.10 as well)**

• As noted earlier, an annual survey of student satisfaction is conducted and includes suggestions for making improvements in the program.

• The doctoral committee meets regularly and assists the director in dealing with student initiated policy changes, complaints and concerns.

• The doctoral program director meets informally with local students and with students during residencies.

• Information, and question and answer sessions are held with students during residency periods.
Criterion 3.g. The business unit should have a system to determine student and key stakeholder satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Undergraduate Program

The formal mechanism of faculty performance and course evaluation assessment is one of the primary ways we address student satisfaction and dissatisfaction. These include opportunity for students to provide written comments. All of the feedback is considered confidential. In the School of Business (and the university at large) the possibility of student satisfaction ranges from 1-5, low to high. Faculty scores in the 4-5 range are considered good. Scores in the mid to low 3's and below are cause for concern.

Faculty peer review (3rd and 6th year) are another formal student satisfaction and dissatisfaction measurement tool. The peer review includes a three member faculty team who will visit the faculty member’s classes, review their performance evaluations, and talk with students.

The university’s Student Handbook contains policies that provide students with avenues to express concern. These include policies on discrimination, harassment, bias and hate-related crimes. Other policies include the university’s compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, Americans with Disabilities Act and the Right to a Drug Free Environment.

Academic advisors serve as advocates for their advisees.

MBA Program

Note: Items below that pertain only to the full-time MBA program will be followed by the designation (FTMBA). Items pertaining only to the part-time MBA program will be followed by the designation (Part-time MBA or PTMBA). Items that include no such designation pertain to both the full-time and part-time MBA programs.

Student Satisfaction

- Program directors serve as advocates for students.

- Program directors and faculty implement and maintain built-in feedback loops (e.g., evaluations, personal conversations and interviews, and verbal audits).

- Program directors meet regularly with all business faculty to create smooth transitions from class-to-class in regards to students’ needs, concerns, potential challenges, and to offer special support.

- FTMBA faculty members are highly encouraged and regularly collaborate to work towards increased integration of courses (e.g., Marketing, Organizational Behavior, and Entrepreneurship working together on an integrated project).
- Student evaluations are used to make improvements in the program and receive feedback about instructor effectiveness. Based on feedback, class execution is retooled and courses are modified. Evaluations include:
  - Class check/delta
  - Mid-course evaluations
  - End-of-course evaluations
  - End-of-program evaluations

- Faculty members intentionally allot time for question and answer/information/feedback.

- All faculty and adjunct instructors receive written documentation on course evaluations and are provided mentoring and coaching opportunities where needed by program directors.

- Program directors and faculty maintain an open door policy and are readily available to help resolve concerns and complaints as needed.

- Program directors and faculty meet informally with students to do continuous verbal audits of the program and assess satisfaction levels.

- Program directors and faculty initiate and maintain partnerships with local organizations in the areas of leadership development and training.

- There is intentional collaboration between the Boise campus and the Portland campus on our community consulting courses, processes, evaluations, speaker series, leadership capstone course, and course design.

- Program directors conduct regular adjunct faculty meetings for the purpose of discussing student needs, satisfaction, and outcomes. (Part-time MBA.)

Stakeholder Satisfaction

- Representatives from the non-profit organizations with which we partner for our Community Learning and Consulting projects complete evaluations of our students and the overall value they add to the organizations they served. (Part-time MBA).

- MBA advisory boards (Boise and Portland) provide input regarding what businesses expect of new graduates in the fields of management, finance, marketing, leadership, strategy, and accounting.

- Program directors and faculty participate in various offsite meetings with alumni and/or community business leaders and gather information about current business needs and developments at these sessions.

- Faculty attend professional meetings of organizations such as ACBSP, Christian Business Faculty Association, Academy of Management, International Leadership Association, and the American Economic Association.
• FT MBA BUSG 553 corporate participants are occasionally interviewed about the mutual benefit that came through a "real time" course project students completed with/for their organization. See Appendix 3.11 for an example of such an interview.

DMgt/DBA Programs (See Figure 3.10 as well.)

• As noted earlier, an annual survey of student satisfaction is conducted and includes suggestions for making improvements in the program.

• The doctoral committee meets regularly and assists the director in dealing with student initiated policy changes, complaints and concerns.

• The doctoral program director meets informally with local students and with students during residencies.

• Information, and question and answer sessions are held with students during residency periods.

• Conversations take place with faculty in other doctoral programs on campus.

• An advisory board made up of business faculty from other universities has been formed. The board has provided feedback on what colleges expect from DBA graduates to both faculty and students.

Criterion 3.h. The business unit should present graphs or tables of assessment results pertinent to this standard.

**Figure 3.6**

**Student and Stakeholder Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student/Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Satisfaction Measure</th>
<th>Dissatisfaction Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Advisory Board</td>
<td>Review/assessment of syllabi; informal feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current students</td>
<td>Formal course evaluation Unsolicited positive comments</td>
<td>Formal course evaluation Unsolicited negative comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive in Residence</td>
<td>Informal conversation</td>
<td>Informal conversation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MBA Program

Figure 3.7
Part-Time MBA Boise Center Annual Inquires

Figure 3.8
Part-Time MBA Boise Center Annual Conversion Rate
### Figure 3.9
**Student and Stakeholder Satisfaction (Part-Time MBA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student/Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Satisfaction Measure</th>
<th>Dissatisfaction Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospective students</td>
<td>Group Assessment Feedback forms</td>
<td>Group Assessment Feedback forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective students</td>
<td>Informal feedback through question and answers at</td>
<td>Informal feedback through question and answers at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informational meetings</td>
<td>Informational meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current students</td>
<td>Regular Check/Delta evaluations</td>
<td>Regular Check/Delta evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current students</td>
<td>Mid-course evaluations</td>
<td>Mid-course evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current students</td>
<td>End-of course evaluations</td>
<td>End-of-course evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current students</td>
<td>Informal conversations</td>
<td>Informal conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current students</td>
<td>End-of-program satisfaction survey</td>
<td>End-of-program satisfaction survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA Advisory Board</td>
<td>Informal feedback</td>
<td>Informal feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community business leaders &amp; organizations</td>
<td>Speaker series feedback survey</td>
<td>Speaker series feedback survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit businesses</td>
<td>Community Consulting student survey</td>
<td>Community Consulting student survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-profit businesses</td>
<td>Informal conversations</td>
<td>Informal conversations, Business Seminar executive interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(FTMBA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and community leaders</td>
<td>Guest speaker feedback forms</td>
<td>Guest speaker feedback forms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 3.10
**Student and Stakeholder Satisfaction (DMgt/DBA Programs)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student and Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Satisfaction Measure</th>
<th>Dissatisfaction Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>current students</td>
<td>annual satisfaction survey</td>
<td>annual satisfaction survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>current students</td>
<td>course evaluations</td>
<td>course evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>current students</td>
<td>feedback sessions</td>
<td>feedback sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>current students</td>
<td>informal conversations</td>
<td>informal conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colleges/universities</td>
<td>doctoral committee participation</td>
<td>doctoral committee participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colleges/universities</td>
<td>practicum interviews</td>
<td>practicum interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>businesses/nonprofits</td>
<td>practicum interviews</td>
<td>practicum interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox doctoral programs</td>
<td>meetings/informal conversations</td>
<td>meetings/informal conversations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STANDARD #4
Measurement and Analysis of Student Learning and Performance

Business schools and programs must have an outcomes assessment program with documentation of the results and evidence that the results are being used for the development and/or improvement of the institution’s academic programs. Each business school or program is responsible for developing its own outcomes assessment program.

ACBSP believes that the learning outcomes of the education process are of paramount importance. Student learning outcomes cover a wide range of skills, knowledge, and attitudes that can be influenced by the educational experience. Therefore, when implementing a student learning outcomes assessment program, careful consideration must be given to the learning outcomes that are most important to the missions of the institution and business school or program and the level of the degree awarded. Accordingly, a business school or program must have established a learning outcomes assessment program to indicate the effectiveness of the process, as well as new directions it might take.

The diversity of educational institutions, coupled with other characteristics unique to a given college or university, suggests that learning outcomes assessments may be conducted differently at each school. While the emphases may vary, the learning outcomes assessment plan implemented must approximate the learning outcomes assessment standard herein described.

Criterion 4.1. Learning Outcomes Assessment Program

a. State the learning objectives for each program (MBA, Ph.D., BBA, AA, etc.) to be accredited. Include learning objectives for concentrations as well as majors. For example, students completing the core BBA program and then concentrations in accounting, international business, or human resources, then you must have measurable learning outcomes for the BBA, accounting, international business, and human resources.

Undergraduate Degrees Learning Outcomes

1. Professional Competence:
   a. Discipline Knowledge - Demonstrates basic knowledge of functional areas of business and their relationship to each other.
   b. Analysis and Critical Thinking - Demonstrates ability to analyze and accurately interpret quantitative and qualitative information to drive effective decision making.
   c. Oral Communication Skills - Demonstrates ability to effectively communicate orally in front of a group.
   d. Written Communication Skills - Demonstrates ability to effectively communicate in writing related to a business topic.
2. Ethical Reasoning - Demonstrates ability to identify ethical dilemmas and responsible courses of action.
4. Leadership and Team Skills - Demonstrates ability to be an effective member of a team and understand the principles of effective leadership.

Accounting Major Outcomes

1. Professionally Competent:
   a. Discipline Knowledge** – Graduates demonstrate basic knowledge of accounting and other functional areas of business and their relationship to each other.
   b. Analysis and Critical Thinking^^ – Graduates demonstrate the ability to analyze and accurately interpret quantitative and qualitative information to drive effective decision making.
   c. Oral Communication Skills** – Graduates demonstrate the ability to effectively communicate orally in front of a group.
   d. Written Communication Skills** – Graduates demonstrate the ability to effectively communicate in writing related to a business topic.

2. Ethically Grounded*** – Graduates demonstrate the ability to identify ethical dilemmas and responsible courses of action.


4. Socially Responsive*** – Graduates demonstrate the ability to identify and respond to cultural issues in a socially responsive manner.

5. Servant Leaders^^ – Graduates demonstrate the ability to be an effective member of a team and understand the principles of effective leadership.

Business Administration Major Outcomes

1. Professionally Competent:
   a. Discipline Knowledge** – Graduates demonstrate basic knowledge of functional areas of business and their relationship to each other.
   b. Analysis and Critical Thinking^^ – Graduates demonstrate the ability to analyze and accurately interpret quantitative and qualitative information to drive effective decision making.
   c. Oral Communication Skills** – Graduates demonstrate the ability to effectively communicate orally in front of a group.
   d. Written Communication Skills** – Graduates demonstrate the ability to effectively communicate in writing related to a business topic.

2. Ethically Grounded*** – Graduates demonstrate the ability to identify ethical dilemmas and responsible courses of action.

4. **Socially Responsive**— Graduates demonstrate the ability to identify and respond to cultural issues in a socially responsive manner.

5. **Servant Leaders**— Graduates demonstrate the ability to be an effective member of a team and understand the principles of effective leadership.

By aligning these learning outcomes with the GFSB mission, the undergraduate faculty was able to better determine which objectives were: (1) most important to the overall success of our mission and (2) most measurable by the GFSB. We selected three (as denoted by ** above): discipline knowledge, oral communication skills, and written communication skills. We believe that these three objectives were essential and readily measurable for our graduates.

We are currently in the process of assessing two other objectives (as denoted by ^^ above). We have determined an assessment point (FINC 260 Finance) for the analysis and critical thinking objective and are currently devising a plan to implement a measurement tool across all sections of that course. We have also collected one data point (Spring 2011) using an approved peer assessment rubric for our servant leaders objective and are in the process of gathering more assessment evidence over the next two years.

The final three objectives (as denoted by ~~~ above) are being considered by the undergraduate faculty in conjunction with a complete implementation of our new business core for the 2012/2013 academic year. Appropriate assessment instruments and collection points will be determined for these objectives at our annual undergraduate assessment meeting in the Fall 2012 semester.

**MBA Degree Learning Outcomes**

1. **Professional Competence:**
   a. **Discipline Knowledge** - Demonstrates basic knowledge of functional areas of business and their relationship to each other.
   b. **Analysis and Critical Thinking** - Demonstrates ability to analyze and accurately interpret quantitative and qualitative information to drive effective decision making.
   c. **Oral Communication Skills** - Demonstrates ability to effectively communicate orally in front of a group.
   d. **Written Communication Skills** - Demonstrates ability to effectively communicate in writing related to a business topic.

2. **Ethical Reasoning** - Demonstrates ability to identify ethical dilemmas and responsible courses of action.

3. **Global Understanding** - Demonstrates knowledge of global business practices and awareness of globalization or people, business, and the economy.

4. **Social Responsibility** - Demonstrates commitment to identifying social need and responding appropriately.

5. **Leadership and Team Skills** - Demonstrates ability to be an effective member of a team and understand the principles of effective leadership.
Doctoral Degree Learning Outcomes

1. Students will integrate Christian faith & ethics into business practice & the classroom.
2. Students will develop a foundational understanding of functional areas of business to equip
   them to teach.
3. Students will understand learning and development theory and be able to apply effective
   pedagogical tactics, techniques and styles in the classroom.
4. Students will become discriminating consumers of research.
5. Students will develop an in-depth understanding of one functional area of business.
6. Students will demonstrate an ability to conduct scholarly research.
7. Students will understand global trends and issues and their implications for business practice
   and instruction.

b. Describe your learning outcomes assessment process for each program;

In the fall of 2008, there was some structured assessment of learning activity beyond the classroom in
the GFSB. During that year, we revised our school mission statement, identified our program learning
outcomes and began to develop to assessment measurements for each. Phase I of the plan was to
begin immediately administering the ETS MFT to our undergraduate students, and soon after to our
MBA students, to measure discipline knowledge. Phase II was to develop measurements for
communication skills at the undergraduate and MBA levels. We are now beginning the third phase of
annually developing and implementing one or two additional measurements to assess performance on
additional outcomes.

Undergraduate Program

Phase I of our assessment plan was to begin immediately administering the ETS MFT to our
undergraduate students to measure discipline knowledge. Phase II was to develop and implement
measurements for oral and written communication skills. Phase III includes the annual development
and implementation of one or two additional measurements to assess performance on additional
outcomes.

Generally, for each of the three selected learning objectives we have identified a course or activity in
which we will measure the outcome and the criteria to assess whether we have met our objective. The
ETS measure is gathered on a yearly basis. The oral and written communication measures are gathered
on a semester basis. These data can be reviewed under Criterion 4.2 below.

The undergraduate faculty have met annually to discuss the stage of each phase and to also consider the
preliminary results gathered from the ETS, oral, and written assessments. During these meetings we
evaluate the results, discuss any necessary improvements, and develop an implementation strategy for
any necessary changes. Criterion 4.3 discusses whether our assessment data meets our benchmarks.
We discuss how we have used these assessment results to improve our programs in Criterion 4.4 below.
**MBA Program**

Similar to the undergraduate program, the MBA program implemented the assessment in phases. In Phase I, MBA students began taking the ETS MFT test. This test measures discipline knowledge and allows us to measure our students against the national average. Phase II was implemented and oral and written communication skills were measured and assessed. Phase II is an ongoing process of adding and amending current assessment tools to better gauge our students learning outcomes.

Oral and written communication and ETS MFT data are assessed each semester.

**Doctoral Program**

The doctoral program at George Fox University is a smaller program than both the undergraduate and MBA programs. Additionally, the outcomes for the Doctor of Management degree are specialized even more so than an UG major. Assessment for assurance of learning for doctoral students occurs at the comprehensive examination stage. Once students complete their coursework and prior to defending their proposal, students are required to write and pass a set of comprehensive essays. The prompts for the essays address subject matter and research skills expected of one having recently completed their doctoral coursework. Additionally, a dissertation is required of all doctoral students. Each dissertation committee must include an external member.

---

**Figure 4.1**  
**Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Data**

We selected three learning outcomes for assessment for each program. Figure 4.1 documents these objectives along with the type of assessment information and data that we will gather and the measurement criteria selected. All external data is marked by a ** in Figure 4.1. Internal data is not marked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Program</th>
<th>Internal Data and Information</th>
<th>External Data and Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Programs</td>
<td>Writing Assessment</td>
<td>ETS MFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral Presentation Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA Programs</td>
<td>Writing Assessment</td>
<td>ETS MBA MFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral Presentation Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Program</td>
<td>Comprehensive Exams</td>
<td>External Dissertation Committee Member and Supervisor Business Teaching Practicum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Undergraduate programs**

**Accounting Major**

**Outcome**
1a. Discipline Knowledge  
Internal/External Data: ETS MFT**  
Criteria:  
- Mean Institutional score of 50th percentile  
- Accounting sub-group 75th percentile in accounting area  
- Accounting sub-group 75th percentile in finance area  
- Scored by ETS

1c. Oral Skills  
Internal/External Data: MKTG 260 Presentation Assessment  
Criteria:  
- 70% of students = 2 or more  
- Ranking by instructor

1d. Written Skills  
Internal/External Data: MGMT 260 Oral Assessment  
Criteria:  
- 70% of students = 2 or more  
- Ranking by instructor

**Business Administration Major**

1a. Discipline Knowledge  
Internal/External Data: ETS MFT**  
Criteria:  
- Mean Institutional score of 50th percentile  
- Management sub-group 75th percentile in management area  
- Marketing sub-group 75th percentile in marketing area  
- Scored by ETS

1c. Oral Skills  
Internal/External Data: MKTG 260 Presentation Assessment  
Criteria:  
- 70% of students = 2 or more  
- Ranking by instructor

1d. Written Skills  
Internal/External Data: MGMT 260 Oral Assessment  
Criteria:  
- 70% of students = 2 or more  
- Ranking by instructor

c. Identify **internal** learning outcomes assessment information and data you gather and analyze; (See Figure 4.1.)

Undergraduate Oral Presentation Skills

Each semester all students in the core course in marketing, MKTG 260 Principles of Marketing, prepare and present a team project on marketing. These presentations are video recorded and archived in the assessment office. Each individual student is evaluated using a 9-item rubric (Appendix 4.1) evaluated on a three-point scale where 3=exceeds expectations, 2=meets expectations, and 1=fails to meet expectations. (While the original scale has 10 items, the last item on ability to respond to questions was not consistently used as opportunities for questions were not always possible.)
As illustrated in Figure 4.2, each semester the median performance on the presentations has slightly improved. With a 9-item scale with 2=meets expectations, the minimum acceptable total score (target) would be 18. As shown, the upper three quartiles each semester have been at or above 18. Performance by the lowest quartile has consistently improved over the three semesters with the minimum scores being higher each time.
Figure 4.3
Undergraduate Oral Presentation Assessment Sub Scores

Average Presentation Skill Scores

- Spring 2010
- Fall 2010
- Spring 2011

Spring 2010 n=26, Fall 2010 n=40, Spring 2011 n=51

Analysis of individual scale items show that average performance is consistently at or above the level of meets expectations. The two items that show irregular performance and a slight trend down are Slide Quality and Use of Media. Faculty are investigating why students may not be quite as well prepared in the use of media as part of their presentations.

Figure 4.4
Undergraduate Oral Presentation Assessment Fail to Meet Expectations

UG Oral Presentation Percentage "Fail to Meet" Expectations
In the most recent semester, the percentage of students failing to meet expectations was for Slide Quality followed by Use of Media and Professionalism. In all other categories the number of students failing to meet expectations was trending down.

Undergrad – Writing Skills

Figure 4.5
Boxplot of Undergraduate Writing Total Scores

Boxplot of UG Writing Total Scores

Spring 2010 n=35, Fall 2010 n=8, Spring 2011 n=11
A majority of students (n=35) earned an overall satisfactory score on the writing skills using the assessment rubric. For those who failed to meet expectations, the top two reasons were language and grammar. We have a large Chinese population of students (agreements have been made between George Fox University and Chinese universities). We have already begun to work with our campus English Language Institute to implement programs to support English language learners becoming more successful. Additionally, we are working with the Academic Resource Coordinator to provide writing assistance to domestic and international students alike.
MBA Oral Presentation Skills-

Each cohort for the MBA program was assessed for Oral Presentations Skills from BUSG 556. These presentations are video recorded and archived in the assessment office. Each individual student was evaluated using a three-point scale where 3=exceeds expectations, 2=meets expectations, and 1=fails to meet expectations. A faculty member and alumnus from GFSB MBA used the rubric to measure oral presentation skills.

MBA Written Skills-

Faculty throughout the GFSB used the rubric and assessed writing outcomes from BUSG 551.
Figure 4.8
Part-Time MBA Program – Oral Presentation Skills

MBA Oral Presentation Total Scores

Adjusted Total

26- 24 22 20 18 16 14 12 10 8 6 4 2

46-2/09 47-10/09 50-2/10 51-10/10

Cohort

Cohort 46 n=7, Cohort 47/(48) n=14, Cohort 50 n=10, Cohort 51/(52) n=10

Average Score on MBA Presentation Skills

Cohort 46 n=7, Cohort 47/(48) n=14, Cohort 50 n=10, Cohort 51/(52) n=10
The MBA students scored at or above expectations for desired learning outcomes. The two strongest areas for students were organization and professionalism. This would be expected as our Part-time MBA is for working professionals. Additionally, each class in the MBA program has presentations (both group and individual) as part of the course requirements. The area with most room for improvement is with Media and Slide Quality. While we use a presentation text in the first class of the MBA program (Presenting to Win), we will begin to refer to the text in each subsequent class to help refresh students perspective on presentations.

The DBA program comprehensive exams

The DBA/DMgt program has a traditional curriculum experience for students. Once coursework is completed, the student must take and pass a set of comprehensive exams. These exams (which contain four questions) are required of all doctoral students and allow the student to demonstrate a synthesis of the knowledge gained throughout the program. There are three subject matter prompts and one research methods prompt. Each prompt requires the student to write a research paper of 12 pages in length.

Figure 4.9
Doctoral Program Comprehensive Essay Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctor of Management/Doctor of Business Administration Program</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Essay Accreditation Data; October 12, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DBA Cohorts</strong></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Taking Essays</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students passing without retakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students passing with one or more retakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who failed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students who passed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cohort 01</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cohort 02</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cohort 03</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cohort 04</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Essays</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As one can see, our sample size is relatively low so it is rather difficult to make trending assumptions.

d. Identify external learning outcomes assessment information and data you gather and analyze. (See Figure 4.1.)

The primary external assessment tool used by the GFSB is the ETS Major Field Test at both the undergraduate and MBA levels.
The GFSB has conducted the undergraduate ETS Business Major Field Test of all graduating seniors in the spring of their senior year for the past three academic years. Results are very similar to the national averages. In the most recent year our lowest quartile scores were higher than the national standards, and the highest quartile scores were higher than the national standards. From these results, we conclude that overall the GFSB undergraduate program is performing on par with other programs nationally. While we will always strive to improve our level of performance, we understand being an open admissions program that we will likely never have the highest scores when compared to the national results.
The GFSB has conducted the undergraduate ETS Business Major Field Test of all graduating seniors in the last semester of their senior year for the past three academic years. Our preliminary target was the 50th percentile, which we have met for all three years. The results are also very similar to national averages. In the most recent year our lowest quartile scores were higher than the national standards, and the highest quartile scores were higher than the national standards. There was marginal improvement from the first year and we expect further improvement as our curricular changes take full effect in the 2012/2013 academic year.
Figure 4.12
Percentile Departmental Summary Indicators of Undergraduate ETS MFT

With a target of the 50th percentile, the program has been achieving the target in Accounting, Economics, and Finance; in Accounting and Economics, the relative performance has been declining while in Finance performance has been increasing. In Marketing, performance has move from the 55th to the 45th percentile. Performance on Legal Environment has been inconsistent over the past three years. Performance in Management, Quantitative Analysis, and Information Systems has been consistently below the 50th percentile.
MBA Programs – ETS MBA Major Field Test

Figure 4.13
MBA ETS Major Field Test Results

BoxPlots (Quartiles) of ETS Total Scores

The GFSB began administering the ETS MBA Major Field Test to all MBA students as part of their final course in the program in January 2010. Results for all MBA cohorts are comparable to results observed in the national standard. In all but the latest Full-Time cohort, the median performance of each cohort has been at or above the national median. The overall performance of the three Part-Time MBA cohorts has been similar with respect to median score and quartile distributions. The two Full-Time MBA cohorts demonstrate significantly different levels of performance with the 2009/2010 cohort scoring substantially better overall than the 2010/2011 cohort; the latter cohort still doing comparable with respect to the national results.

The final cohort of the Executive MBA program (now discontinued) showed the greatest dispersion in performance which was indicative of what faculty in the program experienced, a wide range of knowledge and abilities.
The ETS MBA MFT has been administered at three different times to cohorts in the Part-Time MBA Program: on 1/2010 to Cohort 50 (n=10), on 9/2010 to Cohorts 51 and 52 (n=31), and on 1/2011 to Cohort 54 (n=24). Desiring to be at or above the 50th percentile, the most recent cohort shows we are doing well on Marketing, Finance, and Strategic Integration. In all three cases these three data points overall are trending upward. Accounting and Management most recently were at the 45th percentile, and Management has been trending downward.
Analysis of the Departmental Assessment Indicators for each of the first two cohorts of the Full-Time MBA shows a dramatic difference in performance between the two. Cohort FT1 (n=14), both overall and on departmental measures, consistently performed better than all other GFSB MBA cohorts in all programs. Cohort FT2 (n=20) performed at a significantly lower level than FT1, both overall and on all departmental indicators.
A major difference between cohorts FT1 and FT2 is that FT1 was composed of 14 American students, where cohort FT2 was composed of 10 American students and 10 international students of which 8 were from China. While the American students overall performed better than the international students in FT2, the American students in FT1 performed somewhat better than the American students in FT2.

DBA/DMgt external assessment

The DBA/DMgt program uses two methods for external assessment. The first is through the use of a business teaching practicum supervisor. All doctoral students are required to complete a business teaching practicum where they teach a business class under the supervision of a senior faculty member at the institution. This faculty member reports back to the doctoral director about the student’s ability in the classroom as well as subject matter expertise.

The second area for external feedback comes from the outside committee member on the dissertation committee. All doctoral students are required to complete a dissertation. As part of the dissertation committee there is an outside committee member. This person must be from outside of the GFSB and provides continual feedback on the dissertation and ability of the candidate.
Criterion 4.2. To identify trends, the business school or program should report, at a minimum, three successive sets of periodic assessment results.

As demonstrated above, GFSB has provided three data points for each assessment. As we progress, these tools and instruments will be refined to better measure student outcomes of learning.

External - ETS Test Scores
Undergraduate – three years of data reported above
Professional MBA – three cohorts graduating in different semesters reported above
Full-Time MBA – reported all cohorts of which there have been just two

Internal – Oral Presentation Skills
Undergraduate – three semesters of data reported above
Professional MBA – three cohorts or more in different semesters reported above
Full-Time MBA – reported on all cohorts which have been two

Internal – Writing Skills
Undergraduate – three semesters of data reported above
MBA – three cohorts or more in different semesters reported above
Full-Time MBA – reported on all cohorts which have been two

While trends have been identified above, 3 thematic trends have arisen from reviewing the data.

Trend 1 - We need to, as a school, be more intentional with our international student population in our FTMBA program. Without great care, external assessments might continue to decline. We will create a new plan in Spring of 2012 to address this issue. We have already made adjustments in recruiting the 2011-2012 FTMBA class.

Trend 2 – Clearly, the GFSB needs to place a greater emphasis on the quantitative side of business to meet a goal of the 75th percentile achievement. Discussions have already occurred regarding improving the quantitative learning opportunities in our curriculum.

Trend 3 – The MBA program has seen a need to improve the medial skills and organizational skills of students. The MBA program is considering placing more emphasis on this throughout multiple classes.
Criterion 4.3. Assessment plans should be designed to yield comparative information and data both over time and with respect to benchmarks

The GFSB uses two types of assessments (internal and external). The external assessments are compared to national trends and percentiles. The internal assessments are used to demonstrate expected levels of competency and trends as measured against previous years. See Figure 4.17 for a synopsis of the data found throughout Criterion 4.2.

![Figure 4.17](image)

Table for Comparative Information and Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate comparison:</th>
<th>Targets/Performance Improvements</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Information and Data</td>
<td>ETS MFT</td>
<td>50th Percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Assessment</td>
<td>70% of students score a 2 or greater</td>
<td>Met for all three semesters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Presentation Assessment</td>
<td>70% of students score a 2 or greater</td>
<td>Met for all three semesters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While we are pleased that we met expectations with these assessments, we are also planning on implementing other assessments and modifying these assessments to better measure student learning outcomes. But this continual improvement process, we hope to assure student learning grows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBA comparison:</th>
<th>Targets/Performance Improvements</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Information and Data</td>
<td>ETS MFT</td>
<td>See improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Assessment</td>
<td>90% students meet or exceed</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Presentation Assessment</td>
<td>90% students meet or exceed</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MBA faculty have met and discussed the results of the ETS MFT. Consensus of the meeting was that we need to respond to these results by stressing more subject matter competence. This was our initial attempt at using ETS and Writing and Oral rubrics as assessment tools. The current (2011) retooling of our MBA program clearly addresses the subject matter issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctoral comparison:</th>
<th>Targets/Performance Improvements</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Information and Data</td>
<td>Comprehensive Exams</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion 4.4. The business unit shall make use of the learning outcomes assessment results to improve its educational processes in the interest of continuously improving student learning outcomes. The business unit must describe specific improvements it has made to its programs based on information obtained from its learning outcomes assessment results.

2008-2009 Undergraduate summary
Evaluation
This was our first year implementing our assessment plan. The undergraduate faculty conducted an informal review and evaluation of programs relative to our GFSB mission statement. Through this process we began to identify several curriculum weaknesses. We also planned for the launch of our first assessment phase. Our conclusions follow:

1. This was our first year beginning with Phase I of our assessment plan, which largely entailed collecting ETS MFT data. At this time we were already evaluating what the undergraduate faculty believed were weaknesses in the current curriculum package provided to business administration and accounting majors. The first year of ETS scores confirmed and supplemented our anecdotal evidence.

Improvements
1. Through the use of department meetings and retreats, faculty began drafting a proposal to enrich the common business core for all majors, changing four concentrations into full majors (management, marketing, finance, and global business), adding a brand new entrepreneurship major, and enhancing the existing accounting major.

Implementation
1. We began drafting major curricular changes as described above. The changes were approved by the GFSB faculty and the entire university faculty in the spring of 2009.

2009-2010 Undergraduate and summary
Evaluation
This was our second year implementing our assessment plan. The undergraduate faculty conducted a review and evaluation meeting where we examined ETS data received and continued planning for the launch of our next assessment phases. Our conclusions follow:

1. The ETS data continued to suggest the same areas of weakness previously identified in the prior year. We believed that our curricular proposal was warranted and urged the full GFU faculty body to approve the changes.
2. The undergraduate faculty continued to deliberate and finalize which assessment objectives would be selected for measurement and mission fit, settling on the oral and written communication objectives to be collected each semester going forward.
3. The servant leader objective was also selected but projected as an annual peer assessment point requiring three years to accumulate the necessary data.
**Improvements**

1. We received full university faculty and administration approval for our curricular changes. These included the development of 5 majors, the revision of the accounting major, the improvement of the common business core and the hiring of 3-4 new full-time faculty members.

2. We developed Phase II of the assessment plan, which included the collection of oral and written evaluations initiated in the Spring of 2010. This included the preparation, review, and approval of two assessment rubrics to be used for these tasks.

3. We developed and received approval for our peer assessment rubric intended to assess the servant leader outcome.

**Implementation**

1. The curricular changes were phased in for the 2010/2011 academic year, with full implementation scheduled for the 2012/2013 academic year.

2. Oral and written communication assessment was launched in the Spring 2010 semester using the approved rubrics. Data was gathered for each of the four semesters thereafter, with the exception of the oral data for the Fall 2011 semester, as previously discussed.

3. Servant leader assessment data was accumulated in the Spring 2010 semester. We are currently on track to receive our second assessment data point in the Spring 2011 semester.

**2010-2011 Undergraduate summary**

**Evaluation**

This was our first year to extensively evaluate all of our learning outcomes data for the comprehensive essay. The undergraduate faculty conducted a review and evaluation meeting where the ETS, oral and written data were examined. In addition, previously discussed improvements and implementations are on-going as planned unless otherwise noted below. Our conclusions follow:

1. We decided that the ETS scores were not providing much clarity although we were able to see some positive trending of student performance in their core areas of study. We believe we are accomplishing our objective but are not sure to what extent we are accomplishing it. However, we believe that students have not taken the exam seriously (as observed from anecdotal evidence) causing at least some of the variation in scores.

2. We discussed a weakness in our assessment of oral and written communication skills. In short, we believe that the oral and written communication data is not adequately revealing the impact of our educational processes on student learning objectives because it is being assessed during the sophomore or junior year for most students. In order to improve our assessment measurement, we believe that we should be evaluating these objectives by measuring both input and output. Likewise, the course professor is the only evaluator for this assessment, potentially causing reliability problems.

**Improvements**

1. We decided to make the ETS test a graded component in our senior capstone course, with the undergraduate chair involved in previewing the pending exam and detailing its objectives.

2. We decided to move our written and oral communication assessment points to the Introduction to Business course (our first required course for all majors) as well as to the Business Capstone course (our last required course for all majors). This will allow us to perform a pre-and post-test of student’s skills and better measure the impact of our educational processes. We also decided
to sample the assessment data and have an independent evaluator measure the assessment. This should improve inter-rater reliability.

**Implementation**

1. The implementation of the ETS test as a graded component of our business capstone course will begin in the Spring 2012 term.
2. The implementation of the oral and written communication assessments will begin in the Spring 2012 term.

**2008-2009 MBA summary**

**Evaluation**

This was our first year implementing assessments for our MBA students. The directors conducted an informal review and evaluation of programs relative to our GFSB mission statement. Through this process we began to identify areas for improvement. We also planned for the launch of our first assessment phase. Our conclusions follow:

1. This was our first year beginning with Phase I of our assessment plan, which largely entailed collecting ETS MFT data. At this time we were already evaluating what the faculty believed were weaknesses in the current curriculum. The first year of ETS scores confirmed and supplemented our initial evidence.

**Improvements**

1. The directors began to look at the intellectual, social and spiritual growth through a caring Christ-centered learning community.

**Implementation**

1. We began to evaluate these variables internally in both qualitative and quantitative ways.

**2009-2010 MBA summary**

**Evaluation**

This was our second year implementing our assessment plan. The faculty conducted a review and evaluation meeting where they examined ETS data received and continued planning for the launch of our next assessment phases. Our conclusions follow:

1. The ETS data continued to show the same areas of improvement. We focus on continued improvement in subject matter areas and allowing individual faculty to review the results in order to improve learning in the classroom.
2. Continued discussion occurred and assignments were given to faculty to develop strategies for improvement. The assignments included rubric writing for oral and written assessment, embedded course assessments and plans for improvement.
Improvements
1. Faculty incorporated more direct skill set development in courses.
2. We embarked on Phase II of our assessment plan. This phase included collecting data to assess assurance of learning.

Implementation
1. Oral and written communication assessment was launched in the Spring 2010 semester using the approved rubrics. Data was gathered for each of the four semesters thereafter, with the exception of the oral data for the Fall 2011 semester, as previously discussed.

2010-2011 MBA summary
Evaluation
This was our first year to extensively evaluate all of our learning outcomes data for the three selected areas (discipline knowledge, oral communication, and written communication). Our conclusions follow:

1. ETS scores were not initially helpful as with three data sets, it was hard to determine specific trending. We expect that in the future, more data points will help to eliminate any anomalies with cohorts. Many of the students also have not taken the test seriously.

2. We discussed a weakness in our assessment of oral and written communication skills. In short, we believe that the oral and written communication data is not adequately revealing the impact of our educational processes on student learning objectives because it is being assessed during the first and last class of the MBA program. So, an assessment will take place in the first class and the final class in the future.

Improvements
1. We will move the assessment to the beginning of the MBA program and at the end. This should provide a starting point to determine how individual students are progressing throughout the program.

Implementation
1. The implementation of the oral and written communication assessments will begin in the Spring 2012 term.

2008-2009 DMgt/DBA summary
Evaluation
This was our first year implementing our assessment plan. Our conclusions follow:

1. The director addressed how to measure success in student learning; specifically, how to measure faith, integration, global trends and theoretical foundations. The assessment which was selected was using the comprehensive essay questions as these questions specifically address the areas of objective learning outcomes. A high failure rate on research questions was discovered.
Improvements
1. Due to the finding of research skill gaps in our program, curricular changes in the program were established.

Implementation
1. We began drafting major curricular changes as described above. The program was shifted from a Doctor of Management Program to a Doctor of Business Administration. Therefore, initial trending data, will begin next year to evaluate success of the new curriculum.

2009-2010 DMgt/DBA summary
Evaluation
This was our second year implementing our assessment plan. Our conclusions follow:
1. GFSB began collecting data on comprehensive examinations and pass rates as well as retention in the program. Currently, no other students will be admitted to the DMgt program and some DMgt students are “bridging” to the new DBA program.

Improvements
1. Preparations are underway to admit the first cohort for the new DBA program. Arrangements have been made to accommodate the current students in the DMgt program.
2. New faculty members with terminal degrees were added to the faculty and will begin work in the 2010 school year.
3. A DBA Advisory Board was formed.

Implementation
1. The director of the doctoral program met with the DBA advisory board. They provided feedback on curriculum requirements as well as expectations of graduates.
2. Faculty were hired for new positions with terminal degrees

2010-2011 DM/DBA summary
Evaluation
This was our first year to extensively evaluate all of our learning outcomes data for the comprehensive exam data. Our conclusions follow:
1. We found that we have below a 50th percentile pass rate on the comprehensive examinations.
2. Discussion occurred that using a MBA ETS field test is not the appropriate measurement for doctoral students.

Improvements
1. The committee decided to include a requirement of portfolios which will include some of their work throughout the program. This will allow the director and faculty another form of assessment.
2. Change in curriculum to include a global component.
Implementation

1. Portfolios requirements will begin with the incoming class in 2011.
2. Global business class was included in the new DBA curriculum.
3. DBA Advisory Board met with students over lunch to discuss future work opportunities and expectations.
STANDARD #5
Faculty and Staff Focus

The ability of a business school or program to fulfill its mission and meet its objectives depends upon the quality, number, and deployment of the faculty and staff. Hence, each institution seeking ACBSP accreditation for its business school or program must:

1. develop and implement policies and plans that ensure an excellent faculty, including a staffing plan which matches faculty credentials and characteristics with program objectives;
2. evaluate the faculty based on defined criteria and objectives;
3. provide opportunities for faculty development to ensure scholarly productivity to support department and individual faculty development plans and program objectives; and
4. foster an atmosphere conducive to superior teaching.

Section 5.1 Human Resource Planning

Criterion 5.1 The business unit will have a Human Resource Plan that supports its Strategic Plan.

In the fall of 2008, the GFSB faculty became committed to the goal of obtaining ACBSP accreditation. The faculty embraced the Standards for doctorally and professionally qualified faculty as discussed in Criterion 5.3.1.b. At that time, the School was somewhat dependent on professionally qualified academic faculty to deliver much of its curriculum. To meet the levels established in the Standards, which provide the foundation for sound academic programs, the School needed to hire additional doctorally qualified faculty in appropriate disciplines. The University administration committed to adding new faculty positions to the School, resulting in three new faculty positions being added and filled in the 2009/10 academic year, and three additional new faculty positions that were filled in the 2010/11 academic year. The faculty increased in size from 16 in 2008/09, to 19 in 2009/10, to 21 in 2010/11. While three new faculty members were hired for 2010/11, Dirk Barram moved from a faculty position to an administrative position as Dean of the School. In the tables below, his teaching is included as “full-time faculty” although it should be classified under “adjunct” faculty.

Dr. Barram’s faculty position was not replaced.

Section 5.2 Employment Practices

Criterion 5.2.1 The business school or program must show how the composition of the full-time and part-time faculty (in terms of their practical experience and academic credentials) matches program objectives.

a. How the composition of your faculty provides for intellectual leadership relative to each program’s objectives.

During the 2010/11 academic year, the School of Business was in a transition phase for its undergraduate curriculum. Prior to that year, the school offered three majors in the undergraduate program: Accounting, Economics and Business Administration with one of 4 concentrations--Finance, International Business, Management, and Marketing. The new curriculum not only expanded and
strengthened the existing Accounting and Economics majors, but also created new majors in Entrepreneurship, Finance, Global Business, Management and Marketing. While the curriculum was approved and included in the catalogue for the 2010/11 academic year, some classes would not be offered until following years. New faculty hires in recent years have been directed to fill the new curriculum needs.

As exhibited in Figure 5.0 below, each business school discipline is led by one or more full-time faculty members. Several of the full-time GFSB faculty provide support. A wealth of adjunct faculty and full-time faculty from other schools in the university provide experience and knowledge to the curriculum, both graduate and undergraduate.

During the study year, Gene Dykema, a primary faculty member in the Economics discipline, was on a one-year appointment filling in for a full-time GFSB faculty member on research leave (John Gorlorwulu). John resigned from his position in the spring of 2011, and Nathan Peach, doctorally qualified for Economics, was hired as a replacement.

A sudden area of need arose in Accounting and Finance because we lost a primary faculty member, Mark Selid, due to sudden death by cardiac arrest in summer 2011. We are still recovering from that loss and are in the process of seeking the replacement knowledge and experience for the future.

We currently have administrative approval to fill two open positions: 1) Finance and 2) Accounting/Finance.

With the introduction of the new Entrepreneurship and Global Business majors, we will need to hire additional professionally qualified adjunct faculty.
**Figure 5.0**

**Faculty Composition and Program Leadership/Support**

**2010/2011 Academic Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Primary Faculty</th>
<th>Supporting Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Seth Sikkema, Mark Selid</td>
<td>V. Crosley, C. Merz, A. Timmins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics/Statistics</td>
<td>Tom Head, Gene Dykema, Debra Worden</td>
<td>C. Zhang, D. Liu, C. Bedrosian, J. Sikkema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Ryan Halley, Mark Selid, Debra Worden,</td>
<td>B. Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chengping Zhang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International/Global Business</td>
<td>David Liu, Annette Nemetz</td>
<td>T. Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Dirk Barram, Craig Johnson, David Liu,</td>
<td>R. Halley, D. Herb-Sepich, A. Kluge, J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Meade, Annette Nemetz, Mary Olson,</td>
<td>VandenHoek, C. Conniry, R. Ellis, T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tim Rahschulte, Paul Shelton, Jim Steele</td>
<td>Laird-Magee, B. Moore, M. Russell, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weedon, A. White, C. Wolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Justine Haigh, Debra Herb-Sepich, Alan</td>
<td>A. Nemetz, J. Blythe, T. Laird-Magee, A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kluge</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Classes*</td>
<td>Craig Johnson, Eloise Hockett, Alan Kluge</td>
<td>G. Smith, S. Barram, C. Meade, P. Shelton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Subject Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Debora Herb-Sepich</td>
<td>J. Haigh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The "Specialized" Discipline includes courses in Business Law, Information Systems, Research Design/Methods, Doctoral Research, Teaching Practicum and Effective Teaching in Higher Ed. Some of these are taught by full-time GFSB faculty and some are taught by faculty from other Schools at the University or qualified Adjuncts.

b. How the composition of your faculty provides for required depth and breadth of theory and practical knowledge to meet your student learning outcomes.

The School of Business faculty is rich with knowledge and experience, with a blend of teaching and professional expertise, and a touch of global diversity. The narrative below gives a brief glimpse of the resources we have at our disposal. We have a handful of faculty members who have long tenure with the university and years of teaching experience. With them are six new faculty members who add business experience, scholarship and depth to our new majors. This narrative will end with a sample of the qualifications of some of our well-qualified (doctorally and professionally) adjunct faculty.

The School of Business is led by Dirk Barram, who joined the university in 1986. He brought with him experience as a division training and development manager at Hewlett-Packard in Palo Alto, Calif. Since coming to the University, Dirk has served in a number of administrative capacities, including vice president for Academic Affairs (1992-1998) as well as the interim dean and undergraduate chair of the Department of Business and Economics from 2002-2011. Because of his passion for teaching, Dirk continues to participate in the classroom by taking on the year-long Senior Capstone class for the
undergraduate business students. Dirk remains active in the business community by serving on the Board of Directors of PNE (Pacific Northern Environment) Corp. He has also published several journal articles that teach business concepts through case studies.

Tom Head, professor of economics, and chairperson of the International Studies program, is a long-term faculty member who joined the university in 1971 and brings a unique flavor to the GFSB faculty. Tom is a Quaker with a passion for interfaith dialogue and has had a longstanding interest in the integration of religion and economics. In pursuit of putting good and just economic ideas into practice, he has been actively involved with a number of NGOs, including the Quaker Institute for the Future, the American Friends Service Committee, and the Quaker United Nations Office, serving as a delegate to the World Trade Organization’s most recent Ministerial Meeting in Hong Kong and to the earlier United Nations Global Conference on Financing for Development in Monterrey, Mexico. One of Tom’s gifts to the School is the frequent offering of special “readings” classes to undergraduates who show a spark of interest in the field of economics. Tom’s writings have ranged from theological and spiritual pieces in such publications as The Christian Century, Friends Journal, and The Evangelical Friend, to professional writings in The Journal of Economic Literature, The International Journal of Development Planning Literature, Focus, and The A.C.E. Bulletin. In the 1970s, Tom was the only business and economics faculty member, when the department was a part of the Social Sciences division at George Fox. He has seen significant growth in our School over his tenure.

Craig Johnson is another example of the long-term nature of the commitment of the GFSB faculty, being at the university since 1988. He moved to the School of Business after serving as chair of the university’s communication arts department for 12 years. Craig is the director of the Doctor of Business Administration program and the director of the university’s interdisciplinary undergraduate leadership minor. Craig’s work in the areas of leadership and ethics are publicly recognized, and he brings a wealth of knowledge to graduate and undergraduate students. He has just published the 2nd edition of the text Organizational Ethics: A Practical Approach and the 4th edition of Meeting the Ethical Challenges of Leadership. Craig is also co-author of Leadership: A Communication Perspective (5th ed.) and has published research findings in various journals of leadership studies. Besides his scholarly endeavors, Craig has led and participated in service and educational trips to Kenya, Rwanda, New Zealand, China, Brazil, and Honduras, and has held volunteer leadership positions in a variety of religious and nonprofit organizations.

Another long-time faculty member is Debra Worden, who joined the GFSB faculty in 1994 and has been teaching economics and finance since 1983. Deb’s passion is undergraduate teaching, and she was co-winner of the George Fox Undergraduate Teacher of the Year honor in 2005. She is also extremely involved with her students, frequently opens her home to them, and continues to stay in touch with them for years after they graduate. Deb and her husband have been the GF Bruin Baseball team “parents” for the past decade, follow the team everywhere, and provide a liaison between parents, players and administration. Deb is also passionate about research and periodically publishes articles in the area of consumer finance. A 2010 publication in Business Economics was awarded the Abramson Scroll for outstanding contribution by the National Association for Business Economics.

The above mentioned long-term faculty members have been joined by several individuals in the past decade. They include a mix of professionals, young and not-so-young, who bring a wealth of talent to our school.
Debora Herb-Sepich is a faculty member with extensive business experience. Deb joined the GFSB faculty in 2005 after spending 25 years in the high tech business, 12 of the last years as cofounder and executive vice president and board member of Dolphin Software. Upon leaving Dolphin, Deb felt called to help others learn by sharing her experiences in business creation and development and she has lived up to this calling. Deb is very involved in the local business community as a business advisor with a specialty developing go-to-market strategies. She provides significant and effective contacts for the students to the business community, and has been the catalyst for many of our students to obtain internships and eventually jobs. Because Deb is our primary faculty member in the new Entrepreneurship major, she is felt drawn to seek her doctoral degree. Deb is starting a Doctorate of Education Program in Leadership at Creighton University. Her doctoral studies will begin in January 2012 and she plans to make entrepreneurship her emphasis.

Another faculty member who brings significant business experience to the classroom is Jim Steele, who has been with the university since 2004. Jim has more than 25 years of professional and management experience at organizations including Intel Corporation and Matsushita. He continues to serve as an advisor to area companies and as a consultant in the area of Human Resource Management. His passion in teaching management is to seek practices that encourage personal growth and respect the human spirit. He enjoys international travel and has led three groups of George Fox graduate students on study tours to Shanghai and Beijing, China.

Seth Sikkema is another recent addition to our faculty, especially valued because he was among the first students to earn a BS degree in accounting from George Fox when that major was first created. It is a pleasure to have “one of our own” return and give back to the university. Seth has experience in both public and private financial reporting and accounting, having earned his CPA license in Calif. Seth has served clients in the retail, high technology, service and regulated utilities industries. Prior to coming to George Fox, Seth prepared annual and quarterly SEC filings for Idaho Power Company and Albertson’s, Inc. Seth was also a senior auditor with Arthur Andersen and the finance director for The River Church Community in San Jose, Calif. Seth has a passion for international travel and culture and has served as board member for AHEAD Ministries, Inc., a nonprofit entity organized to promote the economic self-sufficiency of the third-world church in West Africa. Seth is known by our undergraduates as the “smiling tiger”; he always has a broad smile on his face, even when he is telling them “no” and demanding hard work and absolute integrity.

Several of our recent hires add global diversity to our classroom. David Liu is a new addition to the GFSB faculty who brings nearly 20 years of international professional management, entrepreneurial and teaching experience to the University. David has worked in senior managerial positions for two publicly listed companies in Hong Kong and Paris and traveled to more than 30 countries for business. He was the owner of a successful small and medium enterprise (SME) for nine years and taught English and business courses in China. David earned a doctorate of business administration from City University of Hong Kong. Our students refer to David as “Mr. DVD” because of his successful business in China. Another new addition is Chengping Zhang, who joined the GFSB faculty just after completing his PhD in Finance at Washington State University. Chengping brings depth to our new finance major, as he does significant research in the areas of financial modeling, asset pricing, and international finance. He is active with the Financial Management Association, the leading group for academics and practitioners in finance. The large number of Chinese students in our undergraduate population benefit from having faculty members who are natives of China.
Justine Haigh brings additional global diversity to our faculty, and depth to our marketing major. Justine, a native of England, joined the GFSB faculty in 2009, coming from Leeds Metropolitan University in Leeds, England, and the University of Huddersfield in Huddersfield, England, where she taught advertising and marketing. Justine also worked as a senior research assistant through the University of Huddersfield for the Cheshire County Council’s road safety department in the mid-2000s.

Another recent addition to the faculty is Paul Shelton, who joined the GFSB in 2010 to fill a position in management. Paul brings a mix of teaching, professional experience, consulting and scholarship to our school. What is unique is his 10 year career with the U.S. Department of Justice, ranging from border patrol agent to congressional liaison and deportation officer. Additionally, Paul has consulted with domestic and international companies in the areas of human resources, compensation, strategy and organizational development. Paul is a very active researcher, publishing articles in a variety of human resource, leadership and management journals.

Examples of Adjunct Qualifications:

Some of our adjunct faculty are full-time faculty from other schools at George Fox. For example, Ron Mock, who teaches Business Law for us, has been with the university since 1985. Ron received an MPA (Master of Public Administration) from Drake University, and a JD from the University of Michigan. After three years, he left the practice of law to pursue two callings - teaching and promoting Christian peacemaking at all levels, from interpersonal conflict to international conflict. Eloise Hockett, who teaches in our DBA program, has been with the university in the School of Education since 2000. Her research is in the areas of teaching effectiveness, mentoring and technology.

Another adjunct faculty member is on the administrative staff of the university. Greg Smith, who taught Information Systems, has been the university’s Chief Information Officer since 2004. He joined GFU after 8 years as Director of Information Technology for the Purdue School of Engineering and Technology at IUPUI in Indianapolis.

Steve Barram has been an undergraduate adjunct faculty member for several years in the area of Business Law. Steve earned his JD from the Northwestern School of Law at Lewis and Clark College and had an active law practice in Portland for a decade. For the past twenty years, however, he’s been the CEO of Integrated Services, Inc., a leading provider of management and point-of-sale software for the fast lube industry. As CEO, Steve’s responsibilities include overseeing product development, customer relations, business operations, and directing ISI’s international business operations. The blend of Steve’s law practice and education, and his experience as CEO of a successful firm, make him well qualified to teach for the School of Business.

Bob Ellis brings to the classroom 35 years of experience in the insurance industry, with Northwestern Mutual Life, Standard Insurance, and Hartford Life, where he is still a Senior Account Executive. Bob’s principal skills are in four areas: Training and Development, Operations Management, Sales/Marketing, and Consulting.

Tyler Laird-Magee adjuncts for us in the area of marketing and management. She’s a senior marketing leader with 25 years of experience identifying and created integrated marketing plans. Recent consulting clients include WebMD, OnPlan Solutions, Maxcse International and Process Path. In addition to her business experience, Tyler is currently employed as a full time faculty member at Linfield College and as an adjunct faculty member at the University of Portland, Marylhurst University and Saint Paul's University.
Martin's University. Tyler earned her DBA doctorate from Fox in Fall 2011. This will make her doctorally qualified as she continues to teach for us.

Casey Wolf is a doctorally qualified adjunct faculty member, with an MBA and a J.D. both from Willamette University. Casey, who is a financial advisor at Bank of America Investments, teaches Ethical and Legal Responsibilities in our MBA program. Bruce Moore is another doctorally qualified adjunct faculty member at our Boise location, with a Ph.D. in Global Leadership and Entrepreneurship and an MBA. He brings over 35 years of experience in business as a small business owner and financial consultant.

The above narrative only briefly touches on the broad spectrum of talent among the faculty who teach for the GFSB. Each faculty member's vita is included in Appendix 5.1 of this study and provides more detail on experience, publications and activities.

Criterion 5.2.2 In your institution's use of multiple delivery systems and/or your program's use of part-time (adjunct) faculty, your human resource management process must include policies for recruiting, training, observing, evaluating, and developing faculty for these delivery systems.

a. How you develop qualified full-time and part-time faculty;

All courses, with the exception of several in the DBA program, are delivered in person. More information on how we prepare faculty for traditional courses is provided below. The DBA program's administrative assistant oversees the online system for that degree and assists faculty with setting up and managing their courses. A system trainer from the University's IT Department is also available to train and advise faculty members in the use of the online system called FoxTale, a version of Moodle. Similar assistance is available to all faculty, including part-time faculty, in using FoxTale to augment their classroom courses.

b. How you orient new faculty to the program;

The University provides formal orientation for both new faculty and adjunct faculty. Program Directors normally take responsibility for orienting new faculty teaching in their programs, introducing them to personnel, equipment, supplies, materials, and resources they will need to complete their responsibilities. Administrative Assistants are available at all teaching sites to provide assistance to new faculty with classroom needs. Program Directors remain a ready resource to new faculty, checking in with them periodically to make sure their needs are being addressed.

c. How you orient new faculty to assigned course(s);

When possible, a full-time faculty member who has taught a course before will work with new faculty and adjuncts assigned to teach that course. In Boise we arrange for full-time faculty in Newberg to serve as a resource to adjunct faculty members there teaching the same course. Faculty teaching a course for the first time are provided past syllabi for the course and are expected to follow the content and pedagogy previously used until they can demonstrate sufficient experience with the course to make significant changes.
d. How you provide opportunity for part-time and/or full-time faculty to meet with others teaching the same courses;

GFSB faculty are generally very willing to assist someone teaching a course they have taught in the past. When more than one person is teaching the same course at the same time (which is rare), those individuals are encouraged by the Program Directors to coordinate their efforts and resources where it makes good sense.

e. How you provide guidance and assistance for new faculty in text selection, testing, grading, and teaching methods; and

New faculty and adjunct faculty are always provided copies of the syllabus for past semesters of the course they are to teach, and are encouraged to follow the tested methods of those teaching the course before them before making major changes to pedagogy and content.

f. How you provide for course monitoring and evaluation.

Course Evaluations. Student evaluation of instruction is completed for every course, every semester. Using the Instructional Assessment System from the University of Washington, students toward the end of each course are provided a standard, pre-printed, computer-scanned evaluation form with 31 questions, along with a sheet for written comments. Faculty are asked to leave the room and allow at least 15 minutes for students to complete the evaluations in class (doctoral students in online courses receive an evaluation to complete online).

At the beginning of the following term faculty members receive transcribed copies (to protect anonymity) of all student comments and a report with the results of the evaluation. Copies of these materials go to the dean and the respective program directors. Program directors who detect a reason for concern will share those concerns with the Dean and contact faculty members to discuss developing a plan for improvement. See Appendix 5.2 for copies of forms and sample faculty report.

Course Monitoring. As described under Criterion 1.1.c., the university review process requires class visitations by a team of peer-reviewers in the third year and sixth years of teaching. Program Directors routinely sit in on courses in their programs to observe teachers and better understand course content. The GFSB faculty members often participate in the classrooms of other faculty in the capacity of knowledge expert, panelist, and judge of students’ work and presentations. During these visits, colleagues have the opportunity to observe each other and provide feedback and assistance in ways to mutually improve each other’s experience in the classroom.
Section 5.3. Faculty Qualifications, Workload, and Coverage

Criterion 5.3.1. The composition of faculty must include sufficient academic credentials and business or professional experience to ensure appropriate emphasis on both business theory and practice to meet program objectives.

a. Present your faculty qualifications in a table as Figure 5.1.

Figure 5.1
Faculty Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Initial Appt</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Assigned Teaching Discipline(s)</th>
<th>Prof. Cert.</th>
<th>Type of Qualification</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barram, D</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Doct (9)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dykema, G</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Doct (1)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haigh, J</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Doct (1)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halley, R</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>PhD/MBA</td>
<td>Consumer Economics &amp; Personal Finance</td>
<td>AFC</td>
<td>Doct (1)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head, T</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>MS/MA</td>
<td>Marketing/Economics</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Prof (4)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb-Sepich, D</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Prof (4)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, C</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Doct (8)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kluge, A</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>PhD/MBA</td>
<td>Education - Integrated</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Doct (8)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu, D</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>DBA</td>
<td>Strategic Management</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Doct (1)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meade, C</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Doct (9)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemetz, A</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Prof (5)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson, M</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Doct (9)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahschulte, T</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>PhD/MBA</td>
<td>Human Resource Development</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Doct (1)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selid, M</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Taxation</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelton, P</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>PhD/MBA</td>
<td>Education/ Org Performance</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Doct (8)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikkema, S</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steele, J</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>EdD/MSM</td>
<td>Education/ Leadership</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>GPHR SPHR</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timmins, A</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VandenHoek, J</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Ministry &amp; Organizations</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worden, D</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Doct (1) Doct (8) Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang, C</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Doct (1)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.1 (continued)
Faculty Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Initial Appt</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Assigned Teaching Discipline(s)</th>
<th>Prof. Cert.</th>
<th>Type of Qualification¹</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conniry, C</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>PhD Theology</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Doct (8)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockett, E</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>EdD Education</td>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>Doct (8)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mock, R</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>JD/MPA Law</td>
<td>Business Law</td>
<td>Doct (2)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FULL-TIME FACULTY FROM OTHER GFU PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Initial Appt</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Assigned Teaching Discipline(s)</th>
<th>Prof. Cert.</th>
<th>Type of Qualification¹</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barram, S</td>
<td>JD</td>
<td>Law Business Law</td>
<td>Business Law</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedrosian, C</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Prof (5)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blythe, J</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Prof (5)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosley, V</td>
<td>MPA</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Prof (5)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis, R</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Prof (5)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laird-Magee, T</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Prof (2)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merz, C</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Prof (3)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, B</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Leadership/ HR</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Doct (1)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell, M</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Theology/ Leadership</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Prof (4)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikkema, J</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, G</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>MS Bioinformatics</td>
<td>Info Systems</td>
<td>Prof (5)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weedon, R</td>
<td>ABD</td>
<td>Education/ Leadership</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Prof (5)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, A</td>
<td>JD/PhD</td>
<td>Law/Education</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Doct (7)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf, C</td>
<td>JD</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Law &amp; Ethics</td>
<td>Doct (4)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART-TIME FACULTY

1Numbers in parentheses refer to type of doctoral/professional qualification based on the glossary in the Standards.

Of the 21 full-time faculty members, 14 have an earned a doctoral degree, two are currently enrolled in doctoral degree programs (Nemetz, Sikkema), and one is entering a doctoral degree program in 2012 (Herb-Sepich). A review of faculty CVs shows that the majority of faculty members in the GFSB, and in particular those who have yet to earn a doctoral degree, have significant work experience in business in positions of responsibility. Similarly, almost all of our part-time faculty members possess significant, current business experience.

b. Provide credit hour production data by faculty member, separately for full-time and part-time faculty. See Figure 5.2 below.
## Figure 5.2
Faculty Student Credit Hour Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Spring 2011</th>
<th>Summer 2011</th>
<th>Qualification Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>DBA</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barram, D</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dykema, G</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haigh, J</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halley, R</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head, T</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb-Sepich, D</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, C</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kluge, A</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu, D</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meade, C</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemetz, A</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson, M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahschulte, T</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selid, M</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelton, P</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikkema, S</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steele, J</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timmins, A</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandenhoek, J</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worden, D</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang, C</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FULL-TIME FACULTY OTHER GFU PROGRAMS

| Conniry, C     | 45       |             |             |        |       |     |
| Hockett, E     | 27       |             |             |        |       |     |
| Mock, R        | 57       |             |             |        |       |     |

### PART-TIME FACULTY

| Barram, S      | 69       |             |             |        |       |     |
| Bedrosian, C   | 96       |             |             |        |       |     |
| Blythe, J      | 48       |             |             |        |       |     |
| Crosley, V     | 116      | 105         |             |        |       |     |
| Ellis, R       | 66       |             |             |        |       |     |
| Laird-Magee, T | 54       |             |             |        |       |     |
| Merz, C        | 36       |             |             |        |       |     |
| Moore, B       | 75       | 45          |             |        |       |     |
| Russell, M     | 96       |             |             |        |       |     |
| Sikkema, J     | 78       | 72          |             |        |       |     |
| Smith, G       | 15       |             |             |        |       |     |
| Weedon, R      | 39       |             |             |        |       |     |
| White, A       | 69       |             |             |        |       |     |
| Wolf, C        | 126      |             |             |        |       |     |

### TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Spring 2011</th>
<th>Summer 2011</th>
<th>Qualification Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2261</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. Present your coverage of programs by doctoral and professional qualified faculty in Figure 5.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During the Self-Study Year:</th>
<th>Doctoral Faculty Members</th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty</th>
<th>Part-Time Faculty-OR</th>
<th>Part-Time Faculty-BOI</th>
<th>Total Student Credit Hours Taught by Faculty Members in the Business Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergrad Program</td>
<td>Full-Time MBA</td>
<td>Part-Time MBA-OR</td>
<td>Part-Time MBA-BOI</td>
<td>4,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>840</td>
<td>2,865</td>
<td>574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Student Credit Hours Taught by Doctoral and Professionally Qualified Faculty Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>840</td>
<td>2,688</td>
<td>574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total Credit Hours Taught by Doctoral and Professionally Qualified Faculty Members</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Credit Hours Taught by Doctoral Qualified Faculty Members</td>
<td>2,542</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>1,827</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total Credit Hours Taught by Doctoral Qualified Faculty Members</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 5.3.1.a. Document every full-time and part-time faculty member teaching courses in the business unit. A recent vita (not over two years old) for all business faculty should be provided and included as an appendix in the self-study report.

The CVs or resumes of all full-time faculty teaching in the GFSB are presented in Appendix 5.1.

Criterion 5.3.1.b. Historically, accredited programs have focused on faculty input as a basis for demonstrating quality. The following levels are considered appropriated:

- At least 80 percent of the undergraduate credit hours in business and 90 percent of the graduate (masters) credit hours in business are taught by doctorally or professionally qualified faculty.
- At least 40% of the undergraduate credit hours in business and 70% of the graduate (masters) credit hours in business are taught by doctorally qualified faculty.

One hundred percent of the doctorate credit hours in business are taught by doctorally qualified faculty.

As summarized in Figure 5.3, the GFSB meets the historically acceptable levels for professionally and doctorally qualified faculty at the undergraduate and the doctoral levels. The School also meets the acceptable levels for the Full-time MBA program and the Part-time MBA program in Boise. However, the Part-time MBA program in Oregon fails to meet the 70% acceptable level by 6 percentage points. Tyler Laird-Magee is one of the adjunct faculty members who teach in this program. Tyler earned her DBA degree just this fall 2011. When the numbers are re-calculated with Professor Laird-Magee's doctoral qualification, the percent increases to 72%, meeting the acceptable standard. It is expected that Professor Laird-Magee will continue to teach in our MBA program. In addition, one full-time GFSB faculty member who teaches in that program (Nemetz) is only 18 - 24 months away from
earning her doctorate. Another full-time GFSB faculty member who teaches in the program (Herb-Sepich) is entering a doctoral program in the spring of 2012. With these faculty in the pipeline, the School believes it can maintain the acceptable level for doctorally qualified credit hours.

Section 5.4 Faculty Deployment

Criterion 5.4. Each school or program must deploy faculty resources among the disciplines, units, courses, departments, and major fields to ensure that every student attending classes (on or off campus, day or night, or online) will have an opportunity to receive instruction from an appropriate mix of faculty to ensure consistent quality across programs and student groups. For each academic major offered, a school or program must provide sufficient academic leadership at each location where the program is offered to ensure effective service to students and other stakeholders.

Figure 5.4
Deployment of Faculty by Program by Number of Sections Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Number of Classes/Sections Taught in the Business Program</th>
<th>FTE2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG Day</td>
<td>UG Hybrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirk Barram3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Dykema</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justine Haigh4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Halley4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debora Herb-Sepich5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Head4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Johnson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Kluge4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Liu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Meade6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette Nemetz4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Olson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Rahschulte</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Sell4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Shelton4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth Sikkema4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Steele</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Timmins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff VandenHoek6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Worden</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chengping Zhang4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FULL-TIME FACULTY FROM OTHER GFU PROGRAMS

| Chuck Conniry          | 1 | 0.125 |
| Eloise Hockett         | 1 | 0.125 |
| Ron Mock               | 1 | 0.125 |

ACBSP 2010-11 Self Study
Figure 5.4 cont’d
Deployment of Faculty by Program by Number of Sections Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>UG Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
<th>Summer Semester</th>
<th>FTE²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>Night</td>
<td>Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Barram</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Bedrosian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Blythe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viriena Crosley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Ellis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Magee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia Merz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Moore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Sikkema</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ Weedon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey Wolf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Does not include dissertation supervision or independent studies
² 1.0 FTE assumes a 24 credit hour load per academic year.
³ Dirk Barram’s classes are 2 credit hours each.
⁴ 2010/11 was the last year that several 4-credit hour classes were in the undergraduate curriculum. The additional hour resulted in a few minor overloads and odd FTE numbers.
⁵ Deb Herb-Sepich taught 2 online classes in the summer - outside of her 9-month contract.
⁶ Adjusted so that three 1 hour sections of BUSG 552 equate to one prep/class per year

The standard load for a faculty member at George Fox is 24 semester hours on a 9-month contract. Because our graduate programs run through the summer, some faculty members are on 10 or 11-month contracts, adding additional classes per year. Faculty on 10- or 11-month contracts may show a total FTE greater than 1.0.

It should be noted that the study year was the last year that we offered 4 credit hour, senior level undergraduate classes. This often put undergraduate faculty in a position of teaching an overload by one credit hour. Moving forward, this will not be an issue, as all undergraduate classes have been converted to 3 credit hours.
Criterion 5.4.1. The business unit shall have at least one full-time doctoral or professionally qualified faculty member teaching in each academic program, major, or concentration at each location where the program is delivered.

**Figure 5.4.a.**
Full-Time Faculty Participating in Each Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty Participating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Program Newberg</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time MBA Newberg</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time MBA Oregon</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time MBA Boise</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA Newberg</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All programs have at least four full-time, doctorally or professional qualified faculty members teaching.

Criterion 5.4.2. The business unit must ensure that sufficient human resources are available at each location to provide leadership (including advising and administration) for each program and that assessment processes are in place to ensure that this leadership is being provided.

**Newberg Campus.** This is where the majority of human resources of the GFSB are located including the Dean; undergraduate, full-time MBA, and doctoral program director; two administrative assistants and the Director of Operations; and 15 GFSB full-time faculty members who are all involved in academic advising. Note: during the study year, there were two full-time faculty members who were hired for one-year appointments and advised only on an ad-hoc basis.

**Portland Center.** The GFSB maintains a suite of offices on the Portland Center that house the Director of the Oregon part-time MBA program who is available for student advising; an administrative assistant; and two full-time faculty members. The University also maintains the part-time MBA admissions counselor and full registrar services at this center.

**Boise Center.** In Boise the GFSB has a full-time Director of the part-time MBA program who is available for student advising and overseeing the program; one full-time faculty member; and an administrative assistant.

The Dean of the GFSB meets on an every other week basis with the Directors of all the programs to discuss concerns and opportunities (with the Director of the Boise program participating by teleconference).

**Section 5.5 Faculty Size and Load**

The number of faculty in the business school or program should be sufficient to effectively fulfill its mission of excellence in educating business students.
Criterion 5.5.1. ACBSP considers the following functions to be essential responsibilities of the faculty and staff. Though other qualified individuals may participate in these functions, the faculty must play an essential role in each of the following:

- Classroom teaching assignments
- Student advising and counseling activities
- Scholarly and professional activities
- Community and college service activities
- Administrative activities
- Business and industry interaction
- Special research programs and projects
- Thesis and dissertation supervision and direction, if applicable
- Travel to off-campus locations, and/or non-traditional teaching, if applicable

Teaching Loads:
The appropriate teaching load for a full time faculty member at ACBSP-Accredited Baccalaureate Institutions has historically been limited to not over 12 credit-hours per semester, with appropriate release time granted for administrative duties or for graduate teaching. Overload teaching has been prohibited as a business unit policy, and has been accepted by ACBSP only under emergency circumstances.

a. How you determine the appropriate teaching load for your faculty;

Based on the University standard, faculty members are expected to teach 12 semester hours each fall and spring semester. Faculty members on 10-month contracts teach an additional 3 hours summer semester; faculty members on 11-month contracts teach an additional 6 hours summer semester. The GFSB holds to not having any faculty member teach more than 12 hours in a given semester. New faculty receive 3 hours release time fall semester of their first year to participate in the University New Faculty Institute. Faculty members responsible for administering programs, or assigned to perform significant administrative tasks, receive appropriate release time. Faculty involved in research and scholarship beyond the normal level can receive release time to focus on that work.

b. how you demonstrate that faculty and staff are of sufficient numbers to ensure performance of the above nine functions;

All full-time faculty members are expected to be actively involved in teaching, scholarship, and service. With 85 percent of the total course load delivered by full-time faculty, sufficient faculty resources are available to accomplish all tasks identified by Criterion 5.5.1.

c. the institutional policy that determines the normal teaching load of a full-time faculty member;

The standard annual teaching load at the University is 24 semester hours for full-time faculty members on a 9-month contract (2008 Faculty Handbook page 46 in Appendix 1.1). No load adjustment is made for teaching at the MBA or doctoral levels.
d. Demonstrate that no faculty member (full- or part-time) has a combination of teaching and other responsibilities that is inconsistent with fulfilling all nine functions effectively;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Faculty Members</th>
<th>Semester Hours Taught/Academic Year</th>
<th># Preps/Year</th>
<th>Number of Disciplines/Semester</th>
<th>Advises (1)</th>
<th>Scholarly Activity</th>
<th>Prof. Activities</th>
<th>Committees (#)</th>
<th>Community Service</th>
<th>Administrative Duties</th>
<th>Business and Industry Interaction</th>
<th>Special Projects</th>
<th>Travel Offsite to Teach</th>
<th>Chair/Member Doctoral Dissertation Committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dirk Barram*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Dykema</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justine Haigh</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Halley</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Head**</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debora Herb-Sepich</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Johnson</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Kluge</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Liu</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Meade</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette Nemetz</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Olson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Rauchschulte</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Selid</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Shelton</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth Sikkema</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Steele</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Timmins</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff VandenHoek</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Worden</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chengping Zhang</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Summer graduate classes required in curriculum.
* As Dean, Dirk Barram is not a full-time faculty member, and teaches only the Senior Capstone Business course each year.
** As Chair of International Studies (outside of the School of Business), Tom Head has numerous (44) advisees in that area.
As shown by Figures 5.5 and 5.5.a, faculty assignments and loads for the most part are balanced to allow each faculty member to complete assigned responsibilities effectively. Adequate release time is available to allow faculty to complete additional responsibilities with integrity. The load is shared such that no faculty members are required to participate in all nine roles.

Given the transition to five new majors in 2010-2011, enrollments in some classes were low. These classes were canceled and the faculty member was given release time for research. This was a one time anomaly.
e. Explain how your part-time faculty members participate in these essential functions.

Part-time faculty members are usually hired to teach a single course where they are allowed to focus their efforts. Part-time faculty members normally work full time in business and industry providing that connection to our programs. Because our Boise Center relies heavily on part-time faculty, there they actively participate in monthly faculty meetings where issues, opportunities, and program improvement our discussed.

**Criterion 5.5.2.** A faculty member who is extensively engaged beyond what is normally expected in any one of the nine functions (e.g., one who teaches graduate level courses, has significant administrative duties, directs multiple graduate theses and/or dissertations, or is engaged in extensive approved research) should have an appropriate reduction in other professional responsibilities.

As illustrated by Figure 5.5.a, faculty members who have significant administrative roles receive release from teaching to fulfill those roles. Faculty members who teach graduate level courses do not receive load credit any differently than faculty teaching at the undergraduate level. Some faculty receive load credit for their research activities.

**Section 5.6 Faculty Evaluation**

**Criterion 5.6.1** Each business school or program must have a formal system of faculty evaluation for use in personnel decisions, such as the awarding of tenure and/or promotion, as well as retention. This system must also provide processes for continuous improvement of instruction through formative evaluations.

a. How you monitor/evaluate your faculty’s teaching;

This same information presented under Criterion 5.2.2.f)

**Course Evaluations.** Student evaluation of instruction is completed for every course, every semester. Using the Instructional Assessment System from the University of Washington, students toward the end of each course are provided a standard, pre-printed, computer-scanned evaluation form with 31 questions, along with a sheet for written comments. Faculty are asked to leave the room and allow at least 15 minutes for students to complete the evaluations in class (doctoral students in online courses receive an evaluation to complete online).

At the beginning of the following term faculty members receive transcribed copies (to protect anonymity) of all student comments and a report with the results of the evaluation. Copies of these materials go to the dean and the respective program directors. Program directors who detect a reason for concern will share those concerns with the Dean and contact faculty members to discuss developing a plan for improvement. See Appendix 5.4 for copies of forms and example faculty report.

**Course Monitoring.** As described under Criterion 1.1.c., the university review process requires class visitations by a team of peer-reviewers in the third year and sixth years of teaching. Program Directors routinely sit in on courses in their programs to observe teachers and better understand course content. The GFSB faculty have a propensity to participate in the classrooms of other faculty in the capacity of knowledge expert, panelist, and judge of students’ work and presentations. During these visits,
colleagues have the opportunity to observe each other and provide feedback and assistance in ways to mutually improve each other’s experience in the classroom.

b. How you monitor/evaluate your faculty’s student advising and counseling;

The undergraduate advising process was revised during the 2010-11 school year for implementation during the 2011-2012 school year. In the past, students selected their advisors. As a result, some advisors were advising outside of their disciplines and some were advising significantly more students than other faculty. Now students are assigned mentors in their majors and the director of the undergraduate program ensures that advising loads are more equally distributed. If students raise concerns about the quality of the advising they are receiving, the undergraduate program director meets with faculty members to determine if there is an issue (e.g. miscommunication). Periodic advising training sessions are held with undergraduate faculty. Senior faculty members train new faculty by conducting joint advising sessions with students. Major sheets are provided for all students.

In the PT MBA program, two faculty members and the director are in charge of advising. Spreadsheets have been created to track schedule anomalies, leaves of absence and withdrawals from the program.

The FT MBA director serves as the advisor for students in the program. He handles student questions, scheduling issues and other concerns.

The DBA program director serves as the advisor for all DBA students. He monitors student progress with the assistance of the DBA committee, develops programs of study when needed, deals with student concerns, approves leaves of absences, and enforces unsatisfactory academic progress policies.

c. How you monitor/evaluate your faculty’s scholarly, professional and service activities;

Faculty Growth Plan. Every spring each faculty member prepares and submits a Faculty Growth Plan. In this document, the faculty member reviews progress toward goals for scholarship from the prior year and sets goals for the coming year. Faculty Growth Plans are reviewed by the Dean who provides feedback to the faculty member.

University Faculty Review Process. In the University faculty review process, faculty members are reviewed at the beginning of their third year and their sixth year. Part of this peer-review process includes having the faculty prepare a portfolio that includes examples of their scholarship and an essay on scholarship. The peer-review committee reviews and evaluates the faculty member’s scholarship. The evaluations of the peer-review committee members and the portfolio move forward to the University Faculty Personnel Committee who reviews the materials and writes a letter to the faculty member commenting on accomplishes and opportunities for improvement in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and the integration of faith and learning.

d. How you monitor/evaluate your faculty’s business and industry relations;

e. How you monitor/evaluate your faculty’s development activities;

f. How you monitor/evaluate your faculty’s consulting activities;

We are combining our answers to these three questions (d,e,f). All full-time faculty members write an annual Faculty Growth Plan that reviews their teaching, scholarship, service, and integration of faith activities during the past year and sets objectives for the coming school year. They also submit updated
vitae. These documents, which are submitted to the Academic Affairs Office and reviewed by the GFSB dean, contain data on interaction with the business community, consulting, and professional activities. These materials are available for review during the site visit.

Evaluation of industry relations, development activities and consulting activities are also part of the university’s faculty review, tenure and promotion process. These components factor into the third-year, sixth-year, promotion and tenure reviews.

The GFSB also organizes collective programs to foster relationships with the business community. The annual Executive in Residence program brings seasoned executives to campus to share their expertise in classes and presentations. Past executives in residence include Marshall Stevens, founder of Oil Can Henry’s, Richard Reiten, former CEO and Chairman of the Board of Northwest Natural Gas, and John Dannemiller, former CEO and Chairman of the Board of Applied Industrial Technologies. In addition, faculty members invite industry representatives regularly to their classes and take FT MBA students on industry site visits. Here is a sample of the businesses and other organizations involved in class or site visits:

American Steel
Dolphin Software
E-Bike
Freebird Digital
ITS
Intel
Medical Teams International
Mentor Graphics
Nike
Oregon Mattress
Port of Portland
Price Waterhouse Cooper
Prudential Real Estate
State of Oregon
Tektronix
Towers Perrin
United States Export Office

The MBA programs host quarterly speaker series events for current students, alumni and the business community. At these events faculty and community experts present material on networking, human resource management, job hunting and other topics.

g. How your faculty and staff demonstrate and promote a student focus;

The university and the GFSB take pride its student focus, which is demonstrated in a variety of ways, including:

--faculty interact with students on a first-name bases

--faculty strive to learn the name of every student
--faculty members have students over to their homes for meals

--faculty periodically provide refreshments for class

--administrative staff provide ongoing assistance to undergraduate and graduate students

--an annual reception is held for graduating undergraduate and MBA students and their families

--undergraduate students play a role in organizing the Executive in Residence program

--faculty members have established lifelong friendships with some students

--faculty strive to understand the perspectives and needs of international students in their classes

--students can participate in overseas travel opportunities geared to their needs—Juniors Abroad, China MBA trip, mission trips

--the PT MBA program publishes an on-line newsletter for current students and alumni

--PT MBA students participate in an orientation session where they hear from recent alumna and receive tips for success; they also participate in a team-building challenge course

--a monthly GFSB undergraduate student-faculty reception was planned during the 2010/2011 school year and instituted during the 2011/2012 school year

--the DBA program hosts banquets and special luncheons for DBA students during their residencies

--the DBA program sends out a monthly newsletter to students

--both the PT MBA and DBA programs have on-line websites which contain schedules, policies, resources for students and other information

h. How your compensation and recognition approaches for individuals and groups, including faculty and staff, reinforce the overall work system, student performance, and learning objectives;

Compensation and recognition policies are set by the University. (See the Faculty Handbook in Appendix 1.1). Salaries are based on rank and years of service. Non-tenured faculty members are reviewed every three years (tenured faculty every six years). Non-tenure review committees are made up of members from both inside and outside the GFSB. Committee members evaluate the candidate’s portfolio, visit classes and draft reports. Committee reports are then forwarded to the University’s Personnel
committee, which makes recommendations to the Provost and the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.

Administrative staff members undergo annual reviews using forms and procedures provided by the Human Resources department. The HR department determines salary increases and job classification changes based on these reviews.

i. how you improve your faculty/staff evaluation system.

Adjustments to the faculty evaluation system are made by the AAO with input from the university personnel committee and faculty council.

Section 5.7 Faculty and Staff Operational Procedures, Policies and Practices, and Development

Criterion 5.7.1 Each institution (school or program) must have a written system of procedures, policies, and practices for the management and development of faculty members. Written information on all of these must be available to faculty and staff members.

A. Present in an appendix a copy of your Faculty Handbook, or equivalent, and here explain how it is disseminated in your institution. If this appendix does not address these bulleted items, please explain why not.
   • Faculty development, including eligibility criteria
   • Tenure and promotion policies
   • Evaluation procedures and criteria
   • Workload policies
   • Service policies
   • Professional expectations
   • Scholarly expectations
   • Termination policies

The Faculty Handbook is distributed electronically to faculty members and is available on the faculty resources section of the George Fox website.

B. Explain how your institution improves these procedures, policies, and practices.

Changes and improvements in these procedures are coordinated through the AAO with input from the faculty personnel committee, faculty council and the board of trustees.

Criterion 5.7.2 Each business school or program must provide an opportunity for faculty and staff development consistent with faculty, staff, and institutional needs and expectations. Part-time faculty should participate in appropriate faculty development activities.

a. How you determine faculty and staff development needs;

Faculty outline their development plans and needs in their annual growth plans. They also discuss their needs with the Dean.
b. What orientation and training programs are available;

First year faculty at Fox receive 3 hours released time to participate in a mandatory class which covers such topics as the university's Quaker heritage and developing a research plan. Second year faculty also attend a series of development sessions.

The Dean of Instruction provides a variety of pedagogical programs for faculty across the university. For example, in the spring of the 2010-11 school year, topics included process oriented guided inquiry learning, hybrid learning, lecture strategies that engage learners, social networking to enhance teaching and learning, and instruction on institutional technology. Faculty development activities also include ongoing professional learning communities and opportunities for consultation and class visits from the instructional dean. A lending library of teaching and learning resources is also available to faculty.

Part time faculty members participate in an orientation session. New faculty members are assigned faculty mentors within the School of Business and experienced faculty mentor adjunct faculty as needed.

To encourage faculty scholarship, GFSB faculty members are assigned to research groups made up of individuals from their disciplines. These groups meet periodically to not only share research progress and ideas but also to foster collaboration on research projects.

c. How you get input from the faculty and staff about their development needs;

Requests for university resources for sabbaticals, research leaves of absence and special research projects are made through the Faculty Development Committee and the Academic Affairs Office. Faculty also incorporate development goals into their annual growth plans.

d. How you allocate faculty and staff development resources;

The Academic Affairs Office allocates conference travel and research funds to each school, which then determines the amount available to each faculty member. The GFSB Dean, in conjunction with the GFSB operations director, makes the determination of funds available to individual business faculty.

e. How you make development activities available to part-time faculty;

All part-time faculty at the university attend an orientation session. Senior business faculty members also mentor adjunct faculty as needed.

f. Whether the faculty and staff development process employs activities such as sabbaticals, leaves of absence, grants, provision for student assistants, travel, clerical, and research support, etc.

The University grants sabbaticals and leaves of absence (see the Faculty Handbook for application guidelines). Faculty members receive full salary for a one semester sabbatical and two-thirds salary for a full year. Research leaves provide faculty with course load relief during the fall and spring semesters to pursue their scholarship. Summer research grants are also available.

As noted above, the University provides travel funds for faculty to attend and present at conferences.

When their duties allow, administrative staff and student assistants assist faculty in their scholarship by entering data, photocopying, editing and so on.
Section 5.8 Scholarly and Professional Activities

Faculty members must be actively involved in professional activities that will enhance the depth and scope of their knowledge and that of their disciplines, as well as the effectiveness of their teaching. The institution must demonstrate a reasonable balance of scholarly and professional activities by the faculty as a whole consistent with the stated institutional mission.

Criterion 5.8 Scholarship and Professional Activities

The charts on the following pages illustrate the variety of professional and scholarly activities that our full-time faculty participate in. See Figure 5.6 below.

5.8.3 Scholarship for Doctoral Programs

All faculty members who have major responsibilities in the doctoral program are expected to maintain an active program of scholarship involving teaching, discovery or integration. Eighty percent of primary doctoral faculty met this standard during the 2010/2011 school year.

In addition, two faculty members (Johnson & Rahschulte) receive load credit for supervising dissertations. Three load hours are granted annually to each faculty member for serving as chairs and readers on 5-7 projects.
### Figure 5.6
Scholarly and Professional Activities of Full-Time Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Faculty Members</th>
<th>Highest Degree Earned</th>
<th>Prof. Cert.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Scholarly Activity</th>
<th>Professional Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Papers Presented</td>
<td>Published Articles, Manuscripts, Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirk Barram</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>A=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>T=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>A=3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Dykema</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>One-year appointment, teaching only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justine Haigh</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>A=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>A=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>A=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Halley</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>AFC</td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>T=4, A=1</td>
<td>D=1, A=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>A=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>A=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Head</td>
<td>MS/MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>I=1, A=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>I=1, A=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>A=2, D=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debora Herb-Sepich</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>T=2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>T=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>T=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Johnson</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>I=1, T=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>A=1, I=3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>T=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Scholarship of Application  D = Scholarship of Discovery  I = Scholarship of Integration  T = Scholarship of Teaching
## Figure 5.6 (continued)

### Scholarly and Professional Activities of Full-Time Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Faculty Members</th>
<th>Highest Degree Earned</th>
<th>Prof. Cert.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Scholarly Activity</th>
<th>Professional Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Papers Presented</td>
<td>Published Articles, Manuscripts, Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Kluge</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>T=2</td>
<td>T=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>A=1</td>
<td>A=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>A=1</td>
<td>A=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Liu</td>
<td>DBA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>T=2</td>
<td>A=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>A=1</td>
<td>A=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>A=1</td>
<td>A=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Meade</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>A=1</td>
<td>I=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>A=1</td>
<td>I=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>I=1</td>
<td>A=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette Nemetz</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>T=1</td>
<td>A=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>T=1</td>
<td>A=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>I=1</td>
<td>A=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Olson</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>T=1</td>
<td>D=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>A=2</td>
<td>T=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>D=1</td>
<td>D=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Rahschulte</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>A=1</td>
<td>A=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>A=1</td>
<td>A=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>A=1</td>
<td>A=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Selid</td>
<td>MT CPA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>A=1</td>
<td>A=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>A=1</td>
<td>A=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>A=1</td>
<td>A=3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Scholarship of Application  D = Scholarship of Discovery  I = Scholarship of Integration  T = Scholarship of Teaching
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### Figure 5.6 (continued)
#### Scholarly and Professional Activities of Full-Time Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Faculty Members</th>
<th>Highest Degree Earned</th>
<th>Prof. Cert.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Scholarly Activity</th>
<th>Professional Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Papers Presented</td>
<td>Published Articles, Manuscripts, Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Shelton</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>D=1</td>
<td>D=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>T=1 D=3</td>
<td>D=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>T=1 D=1 A=2</td>
<td>D=1 I=2 A=8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth Sikkema</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>I=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td></td>
<td>I=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td>A=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Steele</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>GPHR</td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>I=1 D=1</td>
<td>I=3 T=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SPHR</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>I=1 D=1</td>
<td>I=3 I=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>I=3 I=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Timmins</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>One-year appointment, teaching only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff VandenHoek</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>A=1</td>
<td>A=2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td></td>
<td>A=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td>A=4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb Worden</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>D=1</td>
<td>D=2</td>
<td>A=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chengping Zhang</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>D=1</td>
<td>D=2</td>
<td>A=1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Scholarship of Application  D = Scholarship of Discovery  I = Scholarship of Integration  T = Scholarship of Teaching
### Figure 5.6 (continued)
Scholarly and Professional Activities of Full-Time Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Papers Presented</th>
<th>Published Articles, Manuscripts, Books</th>
<th>Unpublished Articles, Manuscripts, Books</th>
<th>Consulting</th>
<th>Prof. Related Service</th>
<th>Prof. Conferences, Workshops</th>
<th>Shared Course Materials</th>
<th>Prof. Meetings</th>
<th>Prof. Memberships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>A=4 D=3 I=5 T=11</td>
<td>A=5 D=2 I=5 T=1</td>
<td>A=6 D=4 I=1 T=0</td>
<td>A=9 D=0 I=1 T=2</td>
<td>A=26 D=1 I=3 T=1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>A=5 D=3 I=2 T=4</td>
<td>A=7 D=1 I=6 T=2</td>
<td>A=1 D=1 I=1 T=0</td>
<td>A=10 D=1 I=1 T=0</td>
<td>A=22 D=0 I=1 T=1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>A=5 D=3 I=2 T=3</td>
<td>A=10 D=3 I=4 T=0</td>
<td>A=1 D=0 I=0 T=0</td>
<td>A=8 D=1 I=2 T=1</td>
<td>A=21 D=1 I=1 T=1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Scholarship of Application  D = Scholarship of Discovery  I = Scholarship of Integration  T = Scholarship of Teaching
STANDARD #6.
Educational and Business Process Management

In order to prepare business graduates for professional careers, the curriculum must encompass not only business subjects, but also subjects dealing with the specifics of the global workplace and the more general aspects of global society. Since business graduates must be equipped to interact with other members of society, adapt to societal changes, and serve as business advocates, students must be encouraged to study global topics that will prepare them for these challenges.

Given these academic demands, business schools and programs are encouraged to be innovative and to provide flexible curriculum options. Two of the major goals of the curriculum should be the development of intellectual curiosity and the creative capacity for independent thought and action. However, regardless of their major, all business graduates are expected to have received a general exposure to economic institutions, the complex relationships that exist between business, government, and consumers, and a basic knowledge of the functional areas of business.

Thus, business students share common professional requirements. For this reason, certain common subject matter (the Common Professional Component, or “CPC”) as well as areas of specialization are expected to be covered in baccalaureate degree programs in business.

The CPC is an implicit graduation requirement for graduate-level business programs as well, whether required for admission to a graduate program, or delivered within a program as added coursework above the base of graduate program credit hours.

Financial resources, physical facilities, library and other learning resources, equipment including computing hardware and software, and resources at off-campus sites must be adequate to support a strong curriculum and excellence in teaching.

Each business school or program must have policies and procedures addressing the areas of recruiting, admitting and retaining its students.
Section 6.1 Education Design and Delivery

This section examines the key learning-centered processes that create student, stakeholder, and organizational value. Emphasis is on how processes are designed, delivered, and improved to maximize student learning and success.

Criterion 6.1.1 Educational Design.

The business school or program must describe and explain its approach(es) to the design of educational programs and offerings, its method(s) of making curricular changes related to the business school’s or program’s mission statement and strategic plan, and its use of student and stakeholder input in these processes.

The design and development of new course offerings and new degree programs flows from our assessment and strategic planning process. The School of Business bases changes on the goals of building rigorous, high quality programs with input from industry, alumni and University stakeholders. The Dean, the directors of each program, and the faculty work closely together to design the overall curriculum and specific courses. For new programs, course descriptions, objectives and outlines of course content are reviewed to ensure that the overarching strategic principles of the School of Business are met. New programs and courses go through a University approval process by the Academic Affairs Committee and the Faculty Curriculum Committee.

Curricular and Program Changes

The School of Business at George Fox University over the past two years has made significant changes to its programs and curriculum as summarized in Figure 6.1.

Undergraduate Degree Program Changes

Through the academic year 2009-2010, the School of Business awarded BA degrees in Accounting, Economics, and Business Administration only. Effective in the fall of academic year 2010-2011, the BA degree in Accounting was modified by adding substantial course changes to the curriculum and the BA in Business Administration was replaced and expanded to five separate BA degrees in the fields of Entrepreneurship, Finance, Global Business, Management, and Marketing. New students in the School of Business in academic year 2010-2011 were enrolled in either the modified BA degree in Accounting or one of the new BA degree programs. Returning students who had started in the Business Administration program were given the option of either completing that degree or changing to one of the five new degree programs. In addition the core curriculum requirements for the six majors were increased from 34 credit hours to 42 credit hours.

For the purpose of accreditation at the undergraduate level, we are requesting that the existing BA degree programs in Accounting and Business Administration be approved. Throughout the report, we will present information on both the existing undergraduate BA degree programs, and information on the proposed new undergraduate BA degrees. Once the new programs have been in existence for two years and have graduates, we will report those results in our annual report to move toward accredited status of the new programs.

(Nota reference: ACBSP Standards and Criteria for Demonstrating Excellence in Baccalaureate/Graduate Degree Schools and Programs, Revision A, April 2011, p. 11, item 3.b. para. 2: “When a new degree program in business is added after an institution has been accredited, it must be referred to in the
institution's annual report to ACBSP. The new degree program needs to be operational, with enrolled students, for at least two years and have graduates before it can be considered for accreditation.”

MBA Degree Program Changes

GFU School of Business has offered a 26-month part-time MBA degree program since 1992. The cohort-based program is targeted at adults who have five or more years of relevant working experience. Saturday and evening classes accommodate working schedules. In response to market demands for students who have limited or no prior working experience, a full-time, intensive eleven-month MBA degree program was initiated in academic year 2009-2010. The program is cohort-based and the first cohort graduated in 2010. The curriculum is similar to the curriculum for the part-time MBA program, with minor modifications to take into account students' limited work experience and the more intensive, shorter timeframe of the program.

Doctoral Degree Program Changes

In April 2006, the School began offering a Doctor of Management (DMgt) degree, which was modified to a Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) degree in April 2010 based on input from the doctoral advisory committee and market conditions. New doctoral students entering the program in April 2010 were enrolled only in the DBA degree program. Students who were enrolled in the DMgt program prior to April 2010 were given the option of either completing the DMgt degree or changing to the DBA degree. The DMgt program had its first graduates in the fall of 2009. The DBA program had its first graduate in the spring of 2011, which was a student who changed from the DMgt program. For the purpose of accreditation at the graduate level, we are requesting that both the DMgt and the DBA degree programs be accredited.

Figure 6.1
Educational Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Curricular Changes</th>
<th>Student/Stakeholder Input</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>New/modified curriculum for accounting majors</td>
<td>Industry advisory committee</td>
<td>Enrollment Placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Changed BA in Business Administration to five new BA degree programs in Entrepreneurship, Finance, Global Business, Management and Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>Added intensive 11-month full-time MBA Program</td>
<td>Student focus groups Program advisor committee University stakeholders</td>
<td>Enrollment Placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA</td>
<td>Change from DMgt degree program to DBA degree program</td>
<td>Doctoral advisory committee Student focus groups</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion 6.1.2 Degree Program Delivery.
For each degree program, the business school or program must describe its degree program delivery.

a. The length of time that it takes for a full-time student to complete the degree (both as catalogued and actually, on average).

b. The program delivery methods employed in each program (classroom, correspondence, independent study, computerized distance learning, etc.).

c. The number of contact or coverage hours required to earn three semester hours (four quarter hours of credit).

Note: Historically, 45 actual classroom contact or coverage hours have been considered the minimum acceptable to constitute three semester credit-hours. This number is equivalent to 15 weeks of classes at three scheduled classroom hours per week. (In some ACBSP institutions, a “scheduled classroom hour” is somewhat fewer than 60 minutes in duration to allow time for students to go from class to class.) For any program not meeting or exceeding this minimum, the business unit must justify with course content, learning outcomes, and/or stakeholder satisfaction data that the courses in its program are equivalent to semester-long three credit-hour courses.

Degree program delivery is summarized in Figure 6.2. Traditional undergraduate programs, the full-time MBA program and the DMgt/DBA program meet the historical standard of 45 classroom hours for three credits. The part-time MBA program is based on classroom instruction along with experiential learning time, following the academically recognized format for adult learner education in providing less seat time and more out-of-class learning time. Principles related to effective practice for adult learning have been developed to meet the growing demand by the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL), American Council of Education (ACE), and the Institute of Professional Development (IPD). Effective adult learning principles emphasize constructivist methodologies which are responsive to differences in the adult population including: 1) accelerated or intensive facilitation of learning by building upon existing knowledge and experience; 2) application of learning in work or practice; and 3) internal motivation for learning and mastery.1

MBA cohorts in the part-time program are divided into teams of four or five students and most courses require substantial out-of-classroom team projects relating to actual business or other organizational issues, often using the students’ own work or organizational experience. Class sessions are held for seven weeks for four hours in the evenings and each course also meets for two Saturday sessions of 12 hours total. There is a substantial amount of reading and writing for each class and students spend three or more hours outside of class for each hour in class. Instructors are able to cover the material more quickly compared to traditional undergraduate courses or the full-time MBA courses because these adult students start at a higher knowledge base and are better prepared for each class session. Less class time is spent on remembering, identifying and understanding concepts2 and much more time is spent on applying, analyzing, and evaluating concepts3 vs. real world problems and work applications.

1 References supporting the adult learning model are available upon request.

2 Lower level Bloom’s taxonomy tasks

3 Higher level Bloom’s taxonomy tasks
Criterion 6.1.3 Undergraduate Common Professional Component (CPC)

Each CPC area must receive a minimum coverage of two-thirds of a three semester credit-hour course (or equivalent), or approximately 30 coverage hours.

An Abbreviated Course Syllabus for each required course in the undergraduate business core is in the appendix 6.1. Figures 6.5a and 6.5b illustrate the CPC coverage for the core courses in the existing undergraduate Business Administration program and for the new majors, respectively.

Our preliminary self-study showed that, with the exception of the legal environments of business (19 credit hours) and the global dimensions of business (29 credit hours), the core requirements for the business programs have the required 30 hours of coverage. In addition, while there was significant coverage in business ethics, the faculty determined that the coverage of ethics was not adequate given the mission of the University and the School of Business. Consequently, the undergraduate business core was revised and expanded from 34 hours to 42 hours to include the following new courses:

- BUSN 290 Business Ethics
- GBSN 300 Global Business
- BUSN 360 Business Law
- BUSN 486 Strategic Management

To make room for the new courses, BUSN 491/492 Senior Capstone was reduced from four to three credit hours and BUSN 380 Information Systems was eliminated from the core. The topic of information systems is now addressed in an integrative fashion across the curriculum.
### Figure 6.5a
**Undergraduate Common Professional Component (CPC) Compliance**

**Previous Core Curriculum for BA in Business Administration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORE COURSES</th>
<th>a1 MKT</th>
<th>a2 FIN</th>
<th>a3 ACC</th>
<th>a4 MGT</th>
<th>b1 LAW</th>
<th>b2 ECO</th>
<th>b3 ETH</th>
<th>b4 GLO</th>
<th>c1 IS</th>
<th>c2 STAT</th>
<th>d POL/COMP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUSN 110</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 271</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 272</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 201</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 202</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSN 240</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMT 260</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKTG 260</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINC 260</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSN 380</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSN 491/492</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 6.5b
**Undergraduate Common Professional Component (CPC) Compliance**

**New Core Curriculum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORE COURSES</th>
<th>a1 MKT</th>
<th>a2 FIN</th>
<th>a3 ACC</th>
<th>a4 MGT</th>
<th>b1 LAW</th>
<th>b2 ECO</th>
<th>b3 ETH</th>
<th>b4 GLO</th>
<th>c1 IS</th>
<th>c2 STAT</th>
<th>d POL/COMP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUSN 110</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 271</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 272</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 201</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 202</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSN 240</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMT 260</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKTG 260</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINC 260</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSN 290</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBSN 300</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSN 360</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSN 486</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSN 491/492</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Change       | 10     | 8      | 1      | 38     | 42     | 2      | 45     | 42     | -23  | 2       |            | 43    |
Criterion 6.1.4.a. Curriculum Design Beyond CPC

For each program or major, curriculum design must provide breadth and depth beyond the Common Professional Component through advanced and specialized business courses and general education and elective courses, all aimed at meeting student and stakeholder expectations and requirements.

Criterion 6.1.4.b. Curriculum Design for General Education

Schools of Business and programs should demonstrate a sufficient foundation in general education which should generally be the equivalent of 40 percent of the hours required for the degree. Communication and critical thinking skills should be addressed.

Note: Each institution should have on file and available for inspection by the evaluators, syllabi, curriculum sheets, degree plans, degree audit forms, or other documents that reflect deployment of the curriculum design.

Figure 6.6
Baccalaureate Curriculum Credits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>Existing Curriculum</th>
<th>New Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum Credit Hours in General Education</td>
<td>Business Core Requirements Credit Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Business</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(1) ECON 201 or 202 satisfy a general education requirement. In this table, these courses are included as business core requirements. The University General Education package is 54 hours.
(2) COMM 100 is required for all business majors. In this table it is included as a general education requirement.

In Figure 6.6, the baccalaureate curriculum credits are shown for the minimum credit hours in general education, the business core requirements, business requirements beyond the core, business electives and general electives. The baccalaureate curriculum requires 126 credit hours for graduation.

In 2003, the faculty approved a statement of the general education mission at George Fox University. The General Education Mission Statement reads as follows:

As a contributor to the Liberal Arts undergraduate educational mission at George Fox University, the general education program seeks to graduate students who are motivated by
and skilled in the pursuit of knowledge, who are resourceful in exploiting multiple pathways to understanding, who are appreciatively yet critically aware of the roots of their own cultural practices and those of others, who are responsive to the ethical dimensions of living well, and who will be persons of influence within their various communities.

The general education component of undergraduate programs demonstrates an integrated approach. General education requirements at George Fox total 54 semester hours or approximately 43% of the hours required for the degree.

Certain lower- and upper-division courses in general education are required of all students. (see http://www.georgefox.edu/catalog/undergrad/curriculum/gen_ed.html). The specified courses and the course options provide knowledge and skills in support of cultural perspectives and major programs. Transfer students consult closely with their faculty advisors concerning their general education requirements. They are expected to fulfill the requirements of the catalog under which they entered George Fox University. See http://www.georgefox.edu/catalog/undergrad/curriculum/descriptions/geed.html for a list of GE courses. The University accepts the Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer degree (AAOT) and the Washington Transfer Associate of Arts degree (WAA) as meeting all George Fox University general education requirements except Bible and Religion.

The current general education package combines the strengths of the core curriculum with the flexibility of distribution requirements. This has been the university's approach for many years, although the balance has shifted slightly at times toward either the notion of a larger core curriculum or the desire to give students options from which to choose. Students must take classes from a common set of disciplines, in some (e.g. Theology) they all take the same class, and in others they choose from a few options (e.g., in social sciences) or many (e.g., the humanities or globalization). Every student must choose between a Bible Survey course or Literature of the Old and New Testament because the university considers it crucial that its graduates know the Bible, reflecting the centrality of Christianity in the University's mission and reason for existence. Every student must take courses in a wide and prescribed range of fields because the university believes that a broad liberal education is crucial in preparing people for living and leading well. Students are offered some choice within prescribed fields because the university wants to be responsive to the student's sense of vocation, equipping him or her for whatever God may have in store for him or her.

The General Education requirements are significant core experiences, involving spiritual topics central to the university's mission and an essential common experience. In addition, for the last decade, all freshmen have taken a freshmen seminar. The First Year Experience course, is designed to connect students with the university, fellow students, peer advisers, and a faculty mentor. Seminars are small in size, capped at 24 students, with two peer advisers assigned to each seminar, and a faculty member who teaches the course. Course topics vary, depending on faculty interests, with core experiences including information literacy, major exploration, and required meetings with peer advisors. Typically, there is a common topic explored through readings or film, and discussed in the course. In 2006, an interdisciplinary capstone course was required of all seniors. This course is intended not only as a formal capstone but also as an academic highlight and landmark in the student's life. Students work in teams with members of cognate disciplines to analyze a major social issue, and then work in cross-disciplinary teams to propose Christian responses to that issue. Parallel to this work they study various approaches to truth, the role of Christians in public life, and the application of their own
worldviews to the problems of modern life. Working in groups, the seniors share the results of their collaboration in an annual public poster presentation.

The university requires students to complete six semester hours of globalization coursework. A variety of courses in the curriculum were identified as offering significant content about cultures and worldviews outside the United States. As of today, students can choose from among 34 courses identified as having significant globalization content. These courses range from foreign languages (including upper division advanced courses in Spanish and French, as well as second, third, and fourth semester lower division courses in those languages, and Japanese), through various courses that carry international content (such as PSCI 250 International Conflict and Peace or regional history courses), and practical courses (such as RELI 360 Cross-Cultural Outreach and FCSC 380 Evolution of World Dress), to on-site exposure through GEED 375 Juniors Abroad.

The current general education curriculum takes students through a wide range of disciplines, ensuring that every student will have exposure to nearly the entire breadth of the classic liberal arts and sciences, including religion and Bible. The capstone course connects the university’s Bible core with each student’s discipline and students from different disciplines with each other. Our requirements also allow students considerable choice in how they fulfill many of the requirements, giving them the ability to tailor a portion of their general education work to their personal sense of vocation. The current general education curriculum largely embodies George Fox University’s unique Christian Quaker character, setting it in the context of a wide variety of “secular” academic disciplines.

All of the courses have identifiable outcomes for student learning aligned with the current GFU General Education program goals noted below:

- George Fox University graduates be broadly informed
- George Fox University graduates will think in nuanced and complex ways leading to sound judgments
- George Fox University graduates live skillfully amid cultural diversity
- George Fox University graduates act as people of influence in public life
- George Fox University graduates care for the interactions between God, nature, and humanity

The general education learning outcomes are aligned with the university mission and directly assessed by four objectives under the Core Theme: **Excellence in Liberal Arts Foundation**. These objectives are that students demonstrate depth of knowledge in their chosen field, students develop intellectual and practical skills, GFU students develop practical skills for lifelong learning, and students integrate a breadth of core disciplines across general and specialized studies into their academic work.

In the fall of 2011, the Provost charged the General Education committee to begin work on assessment of the general education program and a review of the current student learning outcomes. Using **Liberal Education and America’s Promise** (LEAP) campaign and its set of Essential Learning Outcomes as a frame, the current set of general education goals, identified in Standard 2.C. 9, and specific GFU student learning outcomes outlined below were aligned with the LEAP elements and core curriculum and courses. These outcomes were reviewed and a curriculum map was created to show where each outcome was assessed. Currently, we are in the process of collecting and reviewing the data during the fall and spring semesters 2011-2012 and will begin analyzing the data and making recommendations upon completion of this process.

The current GFU General Education Student Learning outcomes are as follows:
• Knowing the Bible and church history, and able to clearly articulate orthodox Christian theology and identify core Quaker testimonies.

• Demonstrating appropriate knowledge of Western culture (history, literature, art, music, philosophy, politics) in the context of other cultural traditions.

• Identifying and applying the fundamental laws and theories governing the natural world and the process by which they were discovered.

• Understanding how people create, recreate, and are shaped by human interaction, in small and large groups and through cultural, political, and economic systems.

• Analyzing complex real-world problems competently from the standpoint of their major disciplines, and integrating competent analyses from other disciplines.

• Employing skillfully a wide range of information resources and technologies.

• Reading texts for organization, purpose, understanding, and analysis, and as resources for good judgments.

• Recognizing and conducting well-designed experiments, and critically assessing and interpreting experimental results.

• Using algebra, geometry, probability and statistics to solve practical problems.

• Thinking historically, including recognizing and setting aside the presumption that their own historical period is normative or permanent.

• Analyzing institutions, social structures, relationships, and human behaviors, including their own participation at each level.

• Demonstrating the habits of intellectual humility, including the ability to recognize the limits of their data, avoid drawing unwarranted factual inferences, and come to reasoned conclusions.

• Being aware of how much of human life, including their own, is embedded in culture, and recognizing the influence of their own background and experience in shaping their beliefs and attitudes.

• Identifying points of congruence and contrast between their own culture and Christian worldview, understanding several models of Christian interaction with culture, and the strengths and weaknesses of each.

• Communicating effectively with people of backgrounds, cultures, and languages different from their own, including the ability to explore cultural and social differences in a reasoned and respectful manner.

• Seeing and empathizing with those who are oppressed or in the minority, and seeking justice within their realm of influence.

• Communicating ideas clearly and precisely, orally and in writing, adapting for the audience and the communicative purpose.

• Listening well, and thereby identifying the compelling and weak features of multiple, even opposing, points of view, including the presuppositions, relational dynamics, and interests underlying various claims.

• Advocating for positions based on reasoned judgments free from logical fallacies.

• Helping interdisciplinary and diverse groups assess critical issues to create and present valid and compelling calls for Christian response.

• Recognizing, appreciating, and creating beauty in a wide variety of settings and disciplines—in the arts and in everything else.

• Critically assessing the overall value and impact of technology and patterns of consumption on human life and ecological well-being.

• Intelligently disciplining them to be physically active, avoiding life-draining personal habits.

• Discerning the callings in their lives, and making educational, career, and personal choices in conscientious response to those callings.
Criterion 6.1.5 Other Business-related Programs

Other business-related programs must include sufficient coverage of undergraduate CPC topics to meet the long-term needs of students and other stakeholders. Other business-related programs that lead to bachelor's degrees must have a minimum of 25 percent of the total undergraduate curriculum devoted to business. Other business-related programs might include programs such as sports management, hotel and motel management, computer information systems, etc.

We are not offering any other business-related programs at this time.

Criterion 6.1.6 Curriculum Design in Graduate Programs

Master's degree programs in business should require at least 30 semester credit hours or 45 quarter hours (or equivalent) of graduate level work in business coverage beyond the basic undergraduate Common Professional Component (CPC). The undergraduate CPC (excluding the comprehensive or integrating experience) may be determined through a competency based evaluation or by completing undergraduate or graduate courses. The 30 semester credit hours (45 quarter hours) of graduate-level work beyond the CPC topics normally should be in courses reserved for graduate students. The Master's degree program may either be a general degree (such as the MBA) or a specialized degree (such as a Master's in Accounting). If the institution offers a specialized master's degree in business, at least 15 credit hours should be in the area of specialization.

Doctoral programs in business should require that graduates have completed the equivalent of the undergraduate CPC, the master's level degree requirements in a business field, and doctoral courses equivalent to 30 semester hours (45 quarter hours) beyond the master's level. Doctoral program requirements will normally include courses in research methods, data analysis and statistical inference, formal academic writing and publication, as well as independent research and the preparation of a doctoral dissertation. While it is acceptable for doctoral students to take some master's-level courses in a doctoral program, a substantial percentage of the required course work should be in courses reserved for doctoral students.

a. The hours of graduate level work in business coverage beyond the CPC;

b. How you determine the appropriate number of hours of graduate level work in business coverage beyond the basic Common Professional Components topics that will provide your students with a quality business education appropriate for graduate level learning;

Part-Time MBA Program

The Part-Time MBA program was originally designed so that all 40 credits are beyond the Common Professional Component. The curriculum was 40 credits from the program's inception in 1992 until 2004-2005, when it was increased to 42 credits. The 42 credit program was created by decreasing the 4-credit Transformational Leadership course to 3 credits, and by adding a 3-credit Community Consulting (experiential learning) course. In 2006 we replaced Communications with Financial Leadership.

In 2009 we began requiring admitted students to pass the Harvard eLearning Financial Accounting course as a leveling tool for our students who come from a wide range of disciplines in their undergraduate study. Our MBA students' second course in the program is typically accounting. Quantitative courses are
the most challenging for many students in the program. The Harvard eLearning course has raised the level at which the accounting course is taught.

Our MBA is cohort-based; students start and finish the program together. This creates a supportive learning community which helps with retention.

**Part-Time MBA Curriculum**

**BUSG 500 Mission and Vision (3 credit hours)**
This course covers both theory and application in the competency areas needed to be capable managers in individual organizational contexts: performance, relationships, values, crisis, and leadership. Sessions examine how managers manage (or should manage); what their contribution is and should be; what results mean in the organizational context; how performance is assessed; managers' responsibilities to themselves, the people who work for and with them, and the communities they operate within. Attention is given to how managers do all of the above with competence, character, effectiveness, and enjoyment.

**BUSG 503 Accounting and Financial Reporting (3 credit hours)**
We examine the fundamental assumptions, principles, conventions, and concepts underlying financial reporting, with the objective of developing the ability to read, comprehend, and perform a basic analysis of financial statements. We learn the basic accounting tools used by management for decision making and control.

**BUSG 507 Economics (3 credit hours)**
We seek to harmonize the world of theoretical economics with the reality around us. The received wisdom of neoclassical economics is challenged by the changing realities of economic practice. We also acknowledge ourselves as economic actors and agents and consider the options for a good economic life individually and collectively.

**BUSG 524 Marketing (3 credit hours)**
We review the basics of marketing, engage in the marketing planning process, and conduct research used to develop marketing plans and strategy. Specific topics include understanding the consumer, brand management, selection of target markets, and marketing mix decisions.

**BUSG 525 Global Environment (3 credit hours)**
As world citizens we are increasingly aware of the globalization of markets, economies, strategies, and structures in our world. This class offers an overview of the issues encountered in transnational enterprises, with a concentration on understanding the nature of international business, and the development of cultural awareness. Students will understand the functional differences in transnational organizations and be able to identify key issues to be resolved in internationalizing, recognizing that these processes produce both positive and negative results.

**BUSG 527 Managerial Finance (3 credit hours)**
We learn to evaluate the financial implications of business decisions. The tools include financial forecasting, managing growth, financial leverage, capital budgeting, risk analysis in investment decisions, and business valuation.

**BUSG 528 Financial Leadership (3 credit hours)**
This course offers a senior executive perspective on financial challenges facing companies. Class sessions will rely heavily on case studies to develop an overview of finance and accounting from a general
management perspective and to help to increase analytical skills. Emphasis will be on the interplay of operating decisions with financial results.

**BUSG 530 Creativity, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship (3 credit hours)**

We take the road less traveled, on occasion, to find new opportunities and challenges. The strategic requirements for exploiting these are formed into business plans.

**BUSG 534 Ethical and Legal Responsibilities (3 credit hours)**

This course introduces practical legal issues that arise in the work environment and the ethical tools to understand and inform day-to-day activities in the workplace. Issues such as contracts, human resources, tort, intellectual property, competition and sales, the judicial system, white-collar crime, forms of organization, and appropriate communications are covered. The threads of ethical decision making, alternative dispute resolution, and Christian values run throughout the course and are covered specifically in several topics.

**BUSG 544 Organizational Systems and Change (3 credit hours)**

We study the fundamental changes in the ways organizations are managed and led in an environment that is increasingly global, diverse, and unpredictable. We probe the nature of organizations, their culture, how they change, and the human impact of those changes. We will pursue integrity between our espoused theories and our theories.

**BUSG 551 Operations Management (3 credit hours)**

We investigate the systematic design, improvement, and control of processes in all areas of business. We study project management and the use of a project-based approach to managing processes in an organization.

**BUSG 552 Community Learning and Consulting (3 credit hours)**

This experience provides an opportunity for students to work with a public benefit organization to apply skills, theory, course concepts, and research-based decision-making skills. A faculty mentor will structure the learning, coordinate with the cooperating organizations, assess level and significance of student learning, and monitor the overall experience. Students

**BUSG 556 Transformational Leadership (3 credit hours)**

Explores both historical and contemporary leadership theories and models. Particular emphasis is given to evaluating leadership theories from a values perspective and determining the ways in which they can be applied to the most current developments in organizational change strategies. Using this knowledge, students are presented with ways in which leadership can be reconceptualized and applied to meet the requirements of today's increasingly complex organizations.

**BUSG 560 Strategic Thinking (3 credit hours)**

In the process of learning to think strategically, we become proficient in the use of strategic management tools and apply these tools and concepts to our own professional contexts. We seek to creatively anticipate alternative futures.

**Evaluating the Expansion of the Curriculum to Include MBA Concentrations**

In 2009 the MBA Curriculum and Policies Committee was charged by the Dean to determine whether there was a demand for concentrations. Ten to fifteen years ago, an MBA degree was considered almost a terminal degree in organizations. This was the final degree that was necessary to continue moving
through the organization to more responsible positions. However, that is no longer the case. MBA's are becoming more and more common. An MBA degree is no longer sufficient to "set oneself apart" in an organization.

There has been much anecdotal evidence from conversations with our alumni and current students stating their interest in further education beyond our general MBA program. In addition, prospective students often mention to the MBA admissions counselor that they wished we offered concentrations.

In spring 2009, after researching the concentration offerings of local competitors, including PSU, OSU, Willamette University, University of Portland, Marylhurst University, and Concordia, a survey was sent to 150 current MBA students and 325 alumni to assess their interest in concentrations, and to invite them to participate in one of three focus groups regarding their interest in concentrations. Survey respondents who indicated they would "definitely" or "most likely" enroll in a concentration ranked their interest from a list of possible concentrations. The number of respondents who listed Strategy or Finance as their first or second choice (Human Resources not being an option), is shown in Figure 6.7. Results indicated that approximately 30% of student and alumni respondents would be interested in pursuing a concentration in strategy or finance, with the interest split evenly between the two fields. A critical assumption is that those interested in pursuing an MBA concentration would be more likely to participate in the survey than those with no interest. Thus, the results are most likely an upper bound estimate.
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**Survey Respondents Who Indicated "Definitely" or "Most Likely" to Enroll in an MBA Concentration Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concentration</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Alumni</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Concentration</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Concentration</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Indicating &quot;definitely&quot; or &quot;most likely&quot; to enroll</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsequent to the survey, twenty-seven survey respondents agreed to participate in focus groups to indicate which MBA concentrations they believed held the greatest market appeal for themselves and their employers. Results showed that finance was the clear first choice, followed by strategy.

Since that time small groups of faculty have worked on fine-tuning the concentrations and, after extensive discussion, the faculty group added another concentration in Strategic Human Resource Management. This decision was made based on the marketability of the Strategic HR Mgt. concentration. The concentrations that were proposed was the first attempt to provide "the next level" of expertise for those professionals in various areas of business. No doubt there will be additional levels of education that will arise to meet the professional development needs of those working in organizational settings.

The objective of the proposal was to provide more in-depth study in certain areas to our current MBA students, MBA alumni, and MBA and other business related master's alumni from other institutions. To that end we proposed the following to the university curriculum committee:
a. The addition of three 9-hour concentrations in the MBA program. These concentrations are (a) Organizational Strategy, (2) Finance, and (3) Strategic Human Resource Management. Current and future students will have the option of choosing to complete our 42 hour MBA program or to complete a 51-hour MBA program with a concentration in one of the three areas above.

b. The addition of three 9-hour post-graduate certificate programs. MBA and other business related master’s alumni from George Fox or other institutions will be able to complete a 9-hour post-MBA certificate program in one (or more) of the above areas.

After approval, we attempted to launch the concentrations in academic year 2010-2011. In retrospect, we did not allocate enough time or a marketing budget to promote the concentrations. Seven students who entered the MBA program in the fall of 2010 signed up for the concentrations, but they were not eligible to take them until year two of their program. There was not enough interest from students who were close to graduating from the program to extend their MBA program by up to eight months, depending on when the concentration courses they needed would be offered. The other population expected to help fill the first two years of concentrations was our alumni. Our contact with MBA alumni is primarily through an eNewsletter sent to approximately 400 of our 1,000 alumni. The expected interest from alumni, who would help fill the initial concentration classes, did not come to pass.

Current Work on Reevaluating the PT MBA Curriculum

In response to the need to prepare students for increasingly complex organizations and careers, the faculty is currently in the process of evaluating our MBA curriculum and delivery model. A competitive analysis of MBA programs offered by universities in the Portland Metro area that will inform the evaluation process was completed in September 2011 and is available upon request.

Full-Time MBA Program

The Full-Time MBA is a cohort-based program. The specific elements of the curriculum and program design creates a learning environment where each student’s contribution to the process is integral to the learning process and results in greater peer accountability, as well as student retention.

The following data describes the curriculum plan, structure and description for the 42 credit hour, Full-Time MBA curriculum. This program was developed in 2008/09 and implemented in August 2009. The curriculum was primarily based on the Part-Time MBA program, with a few exceptions. These exceptions included adding two Business Seminar courses that addressed the needs of the limited business experience that the target student population represented. Other courses were designed with the same subject matter, but modified to be delivered in the specific ways and with specific emphasis to address the younger business student and their limited experiences and context.

Full-Time MBA Curriculum

BUSG 503 Accounting and Financial Reporting (3 credit hours)
We examine the fundamental assumptions, principles, conventions, and concepts underlying financial reporting, with the objective of developing the ability to read, comprehend, and perform a basic analysis of financial statements. We learn the basic accounting tools used by management for decision making and control.
BUSG 507 Economics (3 credit hours)
We seek to harmonize the world of theoretical economics with the reality around us. The received wisdom of neoclassical economics is challenged by the changing realities of economic practice. We also acknowledge ourselves as economic actors and agents and consider the options for a good economic life individually and collectively.

BUSG 524 Marketing (3 credit hours)
We review the basics of marketing, engage in the marketing planning process, and conduct research used to develop marketing plans and strategy. Specific topics include understanding the consumer, brand management, selection of target markets, and marketing mix decisions.

BUSG 525 Global Environment (3 credit hours)
As world citizens we are increasingly aware of the globalization of markets, economies, strategies, and structures in our world. This class offers an overview of the issues encountered in transnational enterprises, with a concentration on understanding the nature of international business, and the development of cultural awareness. Students will understand the functional differences in transnational organizations and be able to identify key issues to be resolved in internationalizing, recognizing that these processes produce both positive and negative results.

BUSG 527 Managerial Finance (3 credit hours)
We learn to evaluate the financial implications of business decisions. The tools include financial forecasting, managing growth, financial leverage, capital budgeting, risk analysis in investment decisions, and business valuation.

BUSG 530 Creativity, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship (3 credit hours)
We take the road less traveled, on occasion, to find new opportunities and challenges. The strategic requirements for exploiting these are formed into business plans.

BUSG 534 Ethical and Legal Responsibilities (3 credit hours)
This course introduces practical legal issues that arise in the work environment and the ethical tools to understand and inform day-to-day activities in the workplace. Issues such as contracts, human resources, tort, intellectual property, competition and sales, the judicial system, white-collar crime, forms of organization, and appropriate communications are covered. The threads of ethical decision making, alternative dispute resolution, and Christian values run throughout the course and are covered specifically in several topics.

BUSG 544 Organizational Systems and Change (3 credit hours)
We study the fundamental changes in the ways organizations are managed and led in an environment that is increasingly global, diverse, and unpredictable. We probe the nature of organizations, their culture, how they change, and the human impact of those changes. We will pursue integrity between our espoused theories and our theories.

BUSG 546 Market Research (3 credit hours)
The study and application of market research methodology to solving a variety of marketing issues faced by both the profit and non-profit sectors. A specific focus of this course will be the opportunity for students to work with a public benefit organization to apply marketing research to help the organization improve its decision making.
**BUSG 551 Operations Management (3 credit hours)**
We investigate the systematic design, improvement, and control of processes in all areas of business. We study project management and the use of a project-based approach to managing processes in an organization.

**BUSG 553 Business Seminar I (3 credit hours)**
This course involves in-depth student research, company visits, high-level corporate debriefings and student reports and presentations on a variety of businesses in the greater Portland area. There will be a strong global component to the businesses that are studied and visited. Educational objectives including critical thinking, financial analysis, specific discipline related issues, global awareness, primary research and communication skills will be emphasized. The format will consist of developing a teaching/learning environment that is built around interactions with Portland area business leaders, visits to a variety of organizations, and written and oral pre-briefings and de-briefings involving students and faculty.

**BUSG 554 Business Seminar II (3 credit hours)**
A continuation of Business Seminar I, the course will focus on continued organization visits and debriefings. There will be a culminating experience that will involve student presentations and interaction with the organization executives who have been involved throughout the two semester sequence. These two courses together will give particular emphasis to the major integrating curricular strands of the Residential MBA program, including critical thinking, verbal and written presentation skills, financial analysis, teamwork, global awareness and Christian world view.

**BUSG 556 Transformational Leadership (3 credit hours)**
Explores both historical and contemporary leadership theories and models. Particular emphasis is given to evaluating leadership theories from a values perspective and determining the ways in which they can be applied to the most current developments in organizational change strategies. Using this knowledge, students are presented with ways in which leadership can be reconceptualized and applied to meet the requirements of today's increasingly complex organizations.

**BUSG 560 Strategic Thinking (3 credit hours)**
In the process of learning to think strategically, we become proficient in the use of strategic management tools and apply these tools and concepts to our own professional contexts. We seek to creatively anticipate alternative futures.

**FT-MBA Curriculum Design**

The research conducted for the design of this program and curriculum is described as follows (excerpted from the 2009 program proposal):

The (following) curriculum was derived from the research of existing School of Management courses as well as those in practice at University of Portland, Harvard, Cornell, Pepperdine, Babson, Thomas More, Drexel, Regent and others. The intention was to leverage as much of the George Fox University's School of Management's MBA as possible with the incorporation of effective MBA program attributes from other institutions. From this research, the sentiments from Butler (2007) were confirmed in that 'communication, leadership, teamwork, and other so-called soft skills' (para. 3) distinguish MBA programs and candidates today. This does not diminish, however, the requisite need of the hard-skills. Quantitative ability from MBAs is still sought and as such finance, accounting, economics, statistics and quantitative decision sciences are needed. These ideas were all taken into consideration in the design of the proposed full time
MBA curriculum. Further, the advice from the Alliance for Management Education was heeded. Specifically this group concluded that scholarship and education within many business schools are often disconnected from real-world needs and businesses school research is too scientific and does not prepare students with skills to address complex management problems. It was noted that the “challenge most frequently identified by the participating business leaders was to find employees and further leaders capable of managing in environments marked by constant change (AACSB International, 2006, p. 8). Another skill necessary among today's leaders and managers is “the ability to work in teams and in collaborative situations” as well as “strong communication skills.” This information was used in the design of the full time MBA curriculum.

The curriculum was designed for the business undergraduate major as well as non-business graduates, in fields such as music, engineering, fashion design, and sports management. Requiring pre-requisites (Accounting, Marketing/Management, Statistics and Economics) allows for a non-business major to enter the program with a common business core understanding. Having approximately 20-30% of each cohort fit this non-business category creates increased diversification in classroom discussion as well as practical application. The Accounting and Marketing pre-requisite courses are offered in an online format, allowing both international and domestic students to prepare for a fall semester program start time.

The curriculum has remained unchanged since its inception. The schedule and delivery have been slightly modified to better meet the needs of the current students. The modifications include switching the BUSG 551 Operations Management from the May term (4 week intensive) earlier in the program during the spring semester. This change was made to provide project management skills training/instruction earlier in the program, provide a longer period of time to complete hands on project work for the course and to remove the BUSG 554 from the Spring Semester, thus allowing for an open Friday schedule, providing this day for students to pursue internships and intentionally begin job search and networking opportunities. Moving BUSG 554 to May term, allowed for the course to provide corporate visits on any day during the week (in collaboration with BUSG 525 Global Business Environment) and create a more intense time frame for project work with corporations. Increased integration of specific courses (Marketing, Entrepreneurship, Operations Management and Business Seminar) has provided increased learning connections and project flow. These changes were implemented in the 2010/2011 program and have proven to be successful based on student input and course evaluation data.

DBA Program Curriculum Design and Evaluation

The doctoral program offered a Doctor of Management degree when it began in 2006. Students could pursue two tracks: executive management or management education. The executive management track was designed for those who wanted to remain in business but expand their knowledge and skill base. The management education track was designed for those who planned to teach in higher education.

There are very few Doctor of Management degrees offered in the United States. This made it hard to market the program. In addition, enrollments were much higher in the management education track than in the executive management track. For these reasons we introduced the Doctor of Business Administration degree in 2009 while phasing out the Doctor of Management degree. The new curriculum was modified to include functional courses in economics and finance. Students now choose between

---
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marketing and management concentrations. The curriculum revision was undertaken under the direction of former dean Ken Armstrong, who helped develop the DBA program at Anderson University. Other doctoral programs in the United States were surveyed during the creation of both the Doctor of Management and DBA programs.

The revised curriculum reflects the sharpened focus of the program. The DBA program's primary mission is to prepare business educators to teach in Christian as well as secular institutions. In addition to getting exposure to the functional areas of business, students develop an in-depth understanding marketing or management. Every student is required to take a course in spirituality and business, ethics, and complete an education core (effective college teaching, contemporary issues in higher education, business teaching practicum), and a research core (introduction to research, research methods, research design, doctoral dissertation). The George Fox program differs from many other doctoral programs because it provides students with background and hands on experience in instruction.

The DBA program is a 56 credit hour program with online classes, web-enhanced hybrid courses and two residency session on the Newberg campus each year. Residency classes are conducted seminar style during four-day sessions, which are typically scheduled in mid-May, and during late July or early August. Class sessions are supplemented with reading assignments and projects, as well as participation in a vigorous online community. This online and hybrid delivery allows doctoral students to complete the program while working full time. Dissertation work generally takes place in the 4th year of study.

6.1.7 Education (Design and Delivery) Evaluation
The school and/or program must provide evidence that ongoing educational programs and offerings are systematically tracked and regularly evaluated. Please report and explain your methods and processes for program evaluation. These observations and/or indicators might include such measures as: enrollment and participation figures, student evaluations of courses and instructors, success/completion rates, attendance rates, dropout rates, complaints, student feedback, and observations by school and/or program leaders. Explain whether these evaluations are internal to the business unit, or required by your institution, and in either case, how and by whom they are used in the continuous improvement of the business school or program's offerings.

Undergraduate Program Evaluation

1. **Course Evaluations.** Student evaluation of instruction is completed for every course, every semester. Toward the end of each course and using the Instructional Assessment System from the University of Washington, students are provided a standard, pre-printed, computer-scanned evaluation form with 31 questions, along with a sheet for written comments. Faculty are asked to leave the room and allow at least 15 minutes for students to complete the evaluations in class. At the beginning of the following term faculty members receive transcribed copies (to protect anonymity) of all student comments and a report with the results of the evaluation. Copies of these materials go to the dean and the respective program directors. Program directors who detect a reason for concern will share those concerns with the dean and contact faculty members to discuss developing a plan for improvement. See Appendix 5.4 for copies of forms.

2. **Course monitoring.** As described under Criterion 1.1.c., the university review process requires class visitations by a team of peer-reviewers in the third year and sixth years of teaching. Program Directors routinely sit in on courses in their programs to observe professors and better understand course content. GFSB faculty members have a propensity to participate in the
classrooms of other faculty in the capacity of knowledge expert, panelist, and judge of students' work and presentations. During these visits, colleagues have the opportunity to observe each other and provide feedback and assistance in ways to mutually improve each other's experience in the classroom.

3. The University Factbook is published annually and contains demographic data on academic programs such as ten-year enrollments by major, generated student credit hours and size of majors by enrollments. This data indicates the standing of the Business major in relation to other majors as well as the growth rates and trends of the Business major in terms of enrollments and student credit hours.

4. Student oral presentation skills are assessed annually by Business faculty at the Senior capstone presentation night. Senior Business majors report on the final state of their businesses through a formal business presentation format.

5. Business majors are required to take the ETS Major Field Test in their final semester. Results are evaluated and compared with graduates from other schools.

6. The undergraduate advisory board reviews and provides feedback on course syllabi.

MBA Program Evaluations

Course evaluations, end-of-program satisfaction surveys and specific curriculum outcome assessments (as noted in Standard 4) are reviewed by the MBA Curriculum and Policy Committee to determine corrective action steps if necessary. The MBA Advisory board is also integral in providing external stakeholder perspective and input on the design and delivery needs of the MBA programs. The integration of these various program assessment tools provides a greater quality and informed response to program design and delivery evaluation.

Part-time MBA Program Evaluation

Evaluation of the part-time MBA program has multiple components.

Students complete an overall program satisfaction survey at the end of their final course in the 26-month program. A summary of each cohort's evaluation is reviewed at the MBA Curriculum and Policies meeting.5

Students' oral presentation skills are assessed by a panel of GFU MBA alumni at the end of the first 7-week course. Their oral presentation skills are again evaluated during their final course at a capstone event called the Leadership Symposium, by faculty, MBA alumni and/or an MBA Advisory Board member.6

Since 2009, all PT MBA students are required to complete the ETS MBA Major Field Test. Results are evaluated and compared with other MBA graduate scores across the U.S.

MBA Advisory Board members, all with extensive corporate experience, and five who are GFU MBA alumni, have given feedback on each of our fourteen syllabi.

5 Survey is available upon request.
6 The oral presentation rubric for the symposium is available upon request. The rubric for the first presentation is a simplified version of the symposium rubric.
A "cohort report card" is updated after every seven-week course for each cohort. The information is a summary of the students' course evaluation. The MBA program director is able to see and respond to the trends of student satisfaction in each cohort.

A class representative system is currently being created whereby two students (one is an alternate) from each cohort are selected by faculty to represent their cohort. The director and two faculty advisors will meet with the group of nine cohort representatives once each semester to discuss program updates and any issues brought forward by the cohort representatives. New cohort representatives are anticipated to gain insight from more experienced cohort representatives, and the faculty advisors will be aware of any concerns before they escalate.

Several years ago we initiated a program in which the students in the entering cohorts meet with the graduating cohorts meet on the final night of their first/last class, respectively, for pizza and conversation. The objective of the gathering is for the experienced students to share tips for success with the new students. The sharing of information encourages new students and helps with retention.

Three years ago we added the Harvard Financial Accounting eLearning course as an entrance requirement for the MBA program. Accounting is not a prerequisite for the program and we observed that the majority of students were not fluent in the language of business. The requirement to pass the course at 75% or greater has allowed accounting professors to teach the course at a higher level.

The average student retention rate for the past four cohorts is 83.5%, which is a decline from 100% for the prior two cohorts. The primary reason for student withdrawal from the program has tended to be job related. A chart showing the student retention rates for the past six cohorts is presented in Figure 6.8.

**Figure 6.8**
Part-time MBA Retention Rate, Portland Campus

Overall Part-time MBA retention rate for the last six cohorts is 89%.
Full-Time MBA Program Evaluation

The Full-Time MBA enrollment numbers are reviewed, evaluated and updated in University Projections meetings three times a year. The meetings include the MBA admissions counselor and directors, the School of Business program directors, financial affairs staff and academic affairs representatives. Included in the discussion is a focus on competitive analysis that informs potential program design and delivery models.

The Full-Time MBA program specifically solicits input from external, corporate project sponsors regarding the quality and value of the project work for their corporation. The program director and specific faculty members involved in the experiential learning projects review this information. The data evaluation is used to inform future experiential learning opportunities and process. Each corporate visit that is part of the BUSG 553/554 course is evaluated. This process was started fall 2011 and the first set of data will be evaluated/reviewed spring 2012. (Sample provided in Appendix 3.11.)

DBA Program Evaluation

The “DBA Program Assessment Documents” contains the regular tracking and evaluation of the DBA program. Included documents are abbreviated syllabi, comprehensive essay data and scoring rubric, learning outcomes data for individual courses, the program, and the School of Business, measurement rubrics, and data on student admittance & retention. A regular system of on-line course evaluations is used to review the course content, effectiveness, and faculty performance.

Student Evaluations for All Programs

A formal procedure by which students evaluate faculty and courses takes place according to the following guidelines as presented in the Faculty Handbook 2011 (See Appendix 5.4):

a. All faculty members new to George Fox University are evaluated using the student evaluation system adopted by the Academic Affairs Office in each of their courses and lab sections in each semester of their first three years at the University.

b. After the first three years of full-time teaching at George Fox University, each non-tenured faculty member is evaluated in one course or lab section each semester. The course or lab section to be evaluated is determined by the department chair or director of the graduate program in which the faculty member teaches. If the faculty member teaches in two departments or programs, the department chairs or graduate program directors, or both, decide how many courses or lab sections to evaluate and which courses or lab sections are evaluated.

c. In the fifth year of full-time teaching, and every fifth year thereafter, each non-tenured faculty member is evaluated in every course or lab section in each semester of that year.

d. Tenured faculty members are evaluated in one course or lab section each year, with the course or lab section evaluated selected by their department chair or graduate program director. If the tenured faculty member is a department chair or graduate program director, the course or lab section evaluated is selected by the School Dean. Every fifth year after tenure, the tenured faculty member is evaluated in every course in one semester. The semester of evaluation is selected by the School Dean.

e. A summary of results of each course evaluation is given to the instructor, the department chairperson, the School Dean, and the Provost for placement in the permanent file. Directors of programs may have access to the evaluations of those they supervise through their department.
The process for presenting and collecting student evaluation forms maintains student anonymity (e.g., handwritten evaluations do not have to be signed by students). Faculty are free to seek additional student feedback and evaluation with a separate evaluation process.
f. Additional student evaluations can be initiated at any time by the School Dean.
g. For others in less than full-time teaching positions, department chairs and graduate program directors determine which courses are evaluated and how frequently they will be evaluated.

Section 6.2 Management of Educational Support Service Processes and Business Operation Processes

Criterion 6.2.1 Education Support Processes
Each business school or program should describe its use of education support processes (counseling, advising, placement, tutorial, computer facilities, equipment, classrooms, office space, and libraries) and explain how they are designed, managed, and improved, including those at all educational locations and on the Internet.
a. How you ensure that education support processes are performing effectively;
b. How are the following types of information to evaluate your support processes:
   1. Feedback from students, stakeholders, faculty and staff
   2. Benchmarking
   3. Peer evaluations
   4. Data from observations and measurements

The School of Business utilizes a number of education support processes provided by the University. These include counseling services, health services, advising and placement services, library resources, classroom and office space, technology, and academic support services. The University infrastructure that provides these resources is well managed and responsive to student needs and faculty concerns. The Academic Resource Center (ARC) works with writing and other academic tutorial needs of students. School of Business faculty send students to the ARC for tutorial assistance as needed. The University library is very responsive to the School of Business. An assigned library liaison for the School of Business is helpful with new library offerings including online academic resources and periodicals such as Business Source Premier among others.

Figure 6.9 Table for Education Support Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Usage Rates</th>
<th>Success Rates</th>
<th>Student and Stakeholder Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>1806</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>97% mental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>89% out of 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7.62 out of 9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Space</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Adequate but tight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion 6.2.2 Business Operation Processes

The business school or program should ensure effective management of its key business operation processes (financial resources, secretarial and other administrative services, marketing, information services, public relations, etc.). Explain or describe:

a. Your key business operation processes;
b. How you determine your key customer requirements;
c. How you set measures and/or indicators and goals;
d. How you monitor performance;
e. How you evaluate and improve business operation processes to achieve better performance, including cost and productivity;
f. How you use the following types of information used to evaluate your key business operation processes:
   1. Feedback from students, stakeholders, faculty, and staff;
   2. Benchmarking;
   3. Peer evaluations; and
   4. Data from observations and measurements.

Key Business Operation Processes

The School of Business primarily works in collaboration with the George Fox University’s centralized administrative system. There are, however, key areas where the School of Business has a greater level of influence and control. These operational responsibilities are primarily controlled and managed by the dean, the undergraduate department chair, three graduate program directors, and the operations director. The programs are supported by four program administrative assistants.

The dean, chair, and program directors work closely with the office of Financial Affairs to develop the school’s operational budget with final approval coming from the university president and Board of Trustees. These budgets are managed by the program directors and administrative assistants. A unique benefit of having an operations director for a school of our size is the centralization of many of the academic processes. For instance, normally the assignment of faculty load and course schedules is completed at the university’s program level. However, because the School of Business faculty teaches in multiple programs it is more efficient to centralize this process internally in the School of Business. This is coordinated by the operations director in partnership with the dean and program directors. Recruitment of regular and adjunct faculty and staff are also the responsibility of the school. Orientations for regular and adjunct faculty are completed at the university level with program specific orientation completed at the directors’ discretion.

Academic student advisement is a key function that is primarily completed at the program level with additional support provided by the Registrar’s Office. Enrollment counselors in the Registrar’s Office are assigned to specific programs in order to increase efficiency and deepen knowledge of the programs they serve. This occurs at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

The undergraduate Business and Economics and Professional MBA programs are additionally supported with student employees. Each administrative assistant recruits and hires student employees. At the undergraduate level the student employees assist with grading exams and assignments, following a strict university guideline. The graduate student employee assists the program director and administrative assistant with program operations and event coordination and implementation.
Centralized business operations are accomplished through the following divisions:

**Academic Affairs**
- Assessment
- Athletics
- Faculty Development
- Juniors Abroad
- Library

**Advancement & Integrated Marketing**
- Development/Advancement
  - Alumni Relations
  - Church Relations
  - Grant Writing/Management
  - Parent Relations
- Marketing and Communications
  - Marketing
  - Public Relations
  - Publications
  - Web Design
- University Engagement

**Enrollment Services**
- Graduate/Professional Studies Admissions
- Registrar
- Student Financial Services
- Undergraduate Admissions

**Financial Affairs**
- Accounts Receivable
- Accounts Payable
- Bookstore
- Budget
- Human Resources
- Mail Services
- Plant Services
- Printing Services
- Purchasing
- Institutional Technology
  - Academic Computing
  - Administrative Computing

**Student Life**
- Academic Resources
- Career Services
- Food Services
- Health and Counseling
- Leadership
Measures and Goals

Measures and goals are set in conjunction with the ETS and assessment processes.

Business Performance Monitoring

George Fox University underwent a major performance review process evaluation during the 2008-09 academic year resulting in a major restructure of the business processes.

It is the university's policy to give all administrators and staff annual performance reviews. This policy is included in the Employee Handbook, Section 2.5, The Performance Review and Planning Process. In addition, new employees should receive a performance review before the end of the six-month introductory period. While not 100% of our employees have received a performance review every year, in FY2010-11, 79 (of about 90) supervisors completed a total of 198 performance reviews and over the past two fiscal years (2009-10 and 2010-11) combined, about 85 supervisors have completed a total of 255 performance reviews. There are approximately 300 staff and administrators.

Over the past three years, the process has been improved in the following ways:

- A task force developed a new form that has been well received by both supervisors and employees.
- Each employee completes an Employee Self Review form, which provides his or her perspective on the past year and a review of the job description. This input has increased and improved two-way dialogue between the employee and supervisor during the performance review process.
- The process and form puts more emphasis on planning for the upcoming year through goal setting with specific, measurable goals and timelines against which an employee's results can be measured each successive year.
- The performance review and planning process now includes anonymous peer feedback (Appendix 6.2) and feedback on supervisors (Appendix 6.3) through the use of the online survey tool, Survey Monkey. This feedback is used to inform the evaluating supervisor's ratings and feedback on the form.
- Senior administrators (VPs, provost, and deans) take a proactive role in modeling the performance review process and tracking and exhorting the supervisors in their organizations to complete the performance reviews timely and accurately. They also review each document by their direct reports prior to the employee seeing it to check for thoroughness and fairness.
- The Human Resources department provides a checklist and timeline of the process for supervisors to follow for each performance review. Supervisor feedback indicates that they appreciate this checklist and find it very helpful.
- The Human Resources director presented seven sessions of a three-hour refresher session for supervisors to review the performance review process, giving particular emphasis to fair and defensible ratings for each individual factor and overall, the requirement for second level review before giving the document to the employee, review of effective goals, and the timeline for submitting performance reviews.
Evaluation and Improvement of Business Operation Processes

Business operation processes are evaluated with the intention of continuous improvement through several methods as follows:

- **Feedback from students, stakeholders, faculty, and staff.** Student evaluations are conducted each term. All graduate courses are evaluated each term. Undergraduate courses are evaluated based on the following criteria:
  - Adjunct faculty: all courses
  - Regular faculty, first three years: all courses
  - Regular faculty, after three years: one course per semester
  - Regular faculty, every fifth year: all courses
  - Tenured faculty: one per year except fifth year

The School of Business encourages feedback from its program advisory boards which meet once per semester. In addition the school meets bi-weekly to discuss school business and make decisions on proposed changes. The university conducts monthly all-employee meetings to keep employees updated on university business.

- **Benchmarking.** In 2009/10 a new School of Business undergraduate curricular proposal was approved which transitioned the program from three majors (the Business Administration offered four concentrations) to seven majors. Implementation began in 2010/11 with the full roll out expected to be completed in 2012/13. (Appendix 6.4)

- **Peer evaluations.** Faculty members are reviewed by their peers through the Academic Affairs office. Peer review occurs as part of the faculty three and five year reviews as well as tenure review. As part of the staff evaluation process five or more peers are invited to complete a review of the staff through Survey Monkey. Peer input is may be used in the performance evaluation at the supervisor’s discretion.

- **Data from observations and measurements.** Also refer to Standard Four: Assessment. During the professional MBA program’s capstone course students participate in a leadership symposium. In February of 2010 an assessment was conducted of the symposium using a standard rubric to assess a subset of the student presentations. The consolidated report from that symposium can be found in Appendix 6.5. Evaluations from the MBA Speaker Series are also reviewed to measure success and determine changes to future series events. A sample evaluation can be found in Appendix 6.6.
Section 6.3 Enrollment Management

Criterion 6.3.1. Admissions Policies and Procedures
The business unit should include in an appendix or refer to the page in the catalog wherein are found the policies and procedures for undergraduate admission to its programs in the business unit.

a. the policies and procedures for admission of first-year students (freshmen); and

b. the policies and procedures for admission of transfer of students from within the institution to the undergraduate business programs.

General Undergraduate Admission Information

General information for undergraduate admissions can be found in the GFU online catalog at:
http://www.georgefox.edu/catalog/undergrad/admission/index.html

Specific Admission Procedures

Basis for Undergraduate Admission
http://www.georgefox.edu/catalog/undergrad/admission/basis.html

Admission Procedures for Freshman
http://www.georgefox.edu/catalog/undergrad/admission/freshmen.html

Admission Procedures and Policies for Transfer Students
http://www.georgefox.edu/catalog/undergrad/admission/transfer.html

Admission Procedures for International Students
http://www.georgefox.edu/catalog/undergrad/admission/international.html

Criterion 6.3.2. External Articulation Process

The business unit should include in an appendix (or refer to the page in the catalog wherein are found) the policies and procedures for articulation with relevant two-year business programs, and admission of undergraduate transfer students from other institutions to programs in the business unit.

a. What ongoing communication exists between the administration and faculty of the business unit and representatives of two-year institutions from which the business unit regularly receives transfer students;

b. The principal institutions from/to which the institution receives/sends transfer students;

c. The policies and procedures pertaining to the admission of transfer students from outside institutions into your business programs;

d. Any mechanisms in place to avoid requiring students to unnecessarily duplicate course work, and the student advisement process which counsels students as to the transferability of course work;

e. The policies for acceptance of transfer of credit from other institutions and the method of validating the credits for both undergraduate and graduate programs.

We accept the Associates of Arts Oregon Transfer degree, the Washington Transfer Associates of Arts degree, and any associates from California in which the student met the IGETC requirements as a block transfer. We also have an agreement with Hunan University in China for a 2 + 2 program where we accept qualified transfer students with two or more years of college transfer credit.
Criterion 6.3.3 Graduate Program Articulation & Admissions Policy

A graduate program must have an admissions policy that accepts students who can reasonably be expected to succeed in a graduate business school.

In addressing this criterion, report and explain or describe:

a. the admission policies of the business unit for each of the graduate level programs;

Part-Time MBA Program Admissions Requirements

Applicants seeking admission to the Part-Time MBA program must hold a four-year baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited college or university, with a minimum GPA of 3.0 in the final two years (60 semester hours) of coursework. In addition, applicants must complete the following to be considered for admission to the program:

- Master of business administration application form and application fee.
- Submit one official transcript from each college/university attended.
- Verification of five years of full-time work experience with at least two of those years in a professional or managerial role.
- Three letters of recommendation.
- A writing sample.
- A resume.
- An interview

Students whose GPA from the final two years of coursework does not reflect their aptitude for graduate work may choose to submit a GMAT test score for consideration in the admission process. The department may consider applicants who show significant promise but do not specifically meet all of these criteria.

Full-Time MBA Program Admissions Requirements

Applicants seeking admission to the Full-Time MBA program must hold a four-year baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited college or university, with a minimum GPA of 3.0 in the final two years (60 semester hours) of coursework. In addition, applicants must complete the following to be considered for admission to the program:

- Master of business administration application form and application fee.
- Submit one official transcript from each college/university attended.
- Three letters of recommendation.
- A writing sample/essay.
- A resume.
- A group interview.

Students must have completed the prerequisite courses in accounting, economics, statistics, and marketing or management. Students whose GPA from the final two years of coursework does not reflect their aptitude for graduate work may choose to submit a GMAT test score for consideration in the admission process. The department may consider applicants who show significant promise but do not specifically meet all of these criteria.
DBA Program Admissions Requirements

Applicants seeking admission to the DBA program must hold both a four-year baccalaureate degree and approved master's degree from a regionally accredited college or university (students holding both bachelor's and master's degrees from George Fox will not be admitted to the program unless granted a special exemption by the DBA admissions committee), with a minimum GPA of 3.0. In addition, applicants must complete the following to be considered for admission to the program:

- DBA application form and application fee
- Submit one official transcript from each college/university attended
- Evidence of appropriate professional experience
- Three letters of reference (as specified in admissions materials)
- GMAT test results (GRE results may be substituted with permission of the DBA Admissions Committee)
- Evidence of completion of the following prerequisites: one course in economics, one course in accounting and one course in finance (can be completed at either the undergraduate or graduate level)
- A sample of academic writing from prior coursework, which demonstrates the applicant's ability to gather, synthesize, organize, and evaluate research or an essay assigned by the DBA Admissions Committee
- A personal statement describing the applicant's vision for her or his future contribution as a result of completing this degree (not to exceed three pages)
- A formal interview (invitation will be extended to those meeting initial program criteria)
- Non-native English speakers must submit a TOEFL score of 550 or higher

b. the page numbers in the academic catalog that describe the admission policy for graduate programs in business;

The admission policies for the graduate programs in business may be found in the George Fox University 2010-2011 Graduate Catalog on the following pages:

- Full-time MBA Program pages 40-41
- Part-time MBA Program pages 37-39
- Doctor of Business Administration pages 42-45

c. identify each type of student classification given to graduate students in the business unit (i.e., unclassified, post-baccalaureate, non-degree, provisional, conditional, probationary, etc.) and describe how these classifications are administered. (Also, give the student catalog page number as a reference.);

Classifications assigned to students when admitted to GFSB graduate programs are:

Regular. The student successfully meets all requirements for application and admission to the respective program.

Provisional. The student meets most requirements for admission to the program but is lacking one or more elements to complete the application process (e.g. official transcripts, letter of recommendation,
prerequisite course). The student is admitted subject to satisfactorily completing the requirements prior to entering the program.

Probational. The student fails to meet one or more of the requirements (e.g. undergraduate GPA, professional work experience, concern for ability to write) for admission to the program but the admissions committee believes the student is capable of successfully completing the program. A requirement that the student achieve a certain level of performance at the start of the program (typically receiving a grade of B or better in the first two courses), or complete a certain remedial task (e.g. work with the Academic Resource Center to have papers in first two classes reviewed for form and style) is established by the admissions committee and monitored by the respective program director.

d. explain any difference between the day and evening graduate program in business in terms of admission and classification;

The Part-Time MBA program is an evening graduate program that is 26-months in length. Classes for each 7-week course are held at the Portland Center one evening per week from 6 – 10 p.m. Each course also meets for two Saturday sessions, and on average, all cohorts meet approximately one Saturday per month. One small cohort meets at the Portland World Trade Center from 5:30 – 9:30 p.m. This meeting place is being discontinued after this cohort completes the program. See above for admission requirements.

The Full-Time MBA program has classes that meet Monday through Friday during the day, with an occasional Saturday session. See above for admission requirements.

The DBA has been designed as a hybrid program, with online and residency components. See above for admission requirements.

e. Do admissions requirements allow entry to students who can reasonably be expected to succeed in graduate business studies? Please explain and give reasons for this conclusion.

Admissions requirements for all of the graduate programs are designed such that students who are accepted may be reasonably expected to succeed.

For the Part-Time MBA program, a 3.0 or higher undergraduate GPA is a stated requirement, however, exceptions may be occasionally made if the student has strong references and has submitted a reasonable explanation for sub-par academic performance.

For the Full-Time MBA program, admission is restricted to students with 3.0 or higher undergraduate GPA, in addition to a scored admission essay and three closely reviewed references.

For the DBA program, students must hold both a four-year baccalaureate degree and an approved master’s degree from a regionally accredited college or university with a minimum GPA of 3.0.
Criterion 6.3.4. Academic Policies for Probation, Suspension, and Readmitting of students will be clearly stated.

Part-Time and Full-Time MBA Programs

Academic policies for probation, suspension, and readmission may be found in the GFU MBA Handbook. Students must complete a minimum of 42 semester hours with a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or above. Students must achieve no grade lower than C+ in all but 6 credit hours of courses. If a grade lower than C is earned in a designated course, that course must be retaken. If a student receives a grade of C+ or below in a given semester, but the student’s cumulative GPA remains at or above 3.0, then the student may receive a letter of academic warning. This warning is not a part of the student’s permanent record, but it does alert the student to devote more time to study and to the potential loss of financial aid eligibility. The student is encouraged to contact the program director who will assist in the development of improved study plans and encourage better use of university resources. For the Full-Time MBA program, the MBA director collects and assesses mid-semester grades. Students who are performing below expectations meet with an academic advisor to develop academic success plans.

MBA Academic Probation

A student may be placed on academic probation when his or her cumulative GPA falls below 3.0. The student is given one semester on probation to achieve the above standard, after which a student may be suspended. Students may be given additional semesters on probation rather than suspension if they show a reasonable chance of meeting graduation standards.

MBA Academic Suspension

A student not making satisfactory academic progress may be given academic suspension. After one or more semesters have elapsed, the student may apply for readmission, and if admitted, reenter on academic probation. The university may suspend any student who: 1) fails to earn a GPA of 1.0 during a semester, regardless of classification or number of hours completed, or 2) any student who becomes so indifferent or disruptive that they no longer benefit themselves or the university community.

MBA Dismissal

A student not making satisfactory academic progress may be dismissed from the university. Students who are dismissed may not apply for readmission to George Fox University. The university may dismiss any student who: 1) fails to earn a GPA of 1.0 during a semester, regardless of classification or number of hours completed, or 2) any student who becomes so indifferent or disruptive that they no longer benefit themselves or the university community. The decision to suspend or dismiss a student will be made by the academic dean in conjunction with the Academic Affairs Office.

MBA Residency Requirements

A minimum of 33 of the 42 hours required for the MBA program must be taken in resident study at George Fox University. Reinstatement to the program after withdrawal requires Admissions Committee action and may subject the student to additional requirements for the degree.
DBA Program

DBA Residency Requirements

Nine of the 17 courses in the DBA program require a residency period. Residencies are held at the end of May (two weeks) and in early August (one week). Each residency week involves four full days of instruction. These courses are completed online after the residency period. Other courses in the program are offered entirely online.

Criterion 6.3.5. Academic Policies for Recruiting, Admitting, and Retaining Students will be clearly stated.

Describe the academic policies used by the business unit for:

a. Recruiting students;
b. Admitting students; and

c. Retaining students.

Part Time MBA Program

Recruitment

Part-Time MBA students are recruited through the Graduate Admissions office by a graduate admissions counselor through several methods:

- Informative Website. Search engine optimization is employed by the university’s marketing department, along with a web inquiry process. The admission counselor receives the inquiry via email and responds by email or phone. A follow up call list is generated after 14 days to ensure that each initial inquiry is followed up after introductory information is received.

- Employer Education Fairs. Part-Time MBA admission requirements include a minimum of five years of work experience, and the majority of applicants are currently employed. Employer education fairs offer access to our target audience.

- Referrals by Alumni and Current Students. Alumni and current students have contact with our target demographic group and are also aware from their own experience who would be a strong candidate for the part-time MBA program. Alumni and current students are encouraged to refer prospective applicants, and are always thanked in writing for their referrals.

- Information Sessions. Our primary recruiting tool is informational meetings which include a faculty presentation on the values and principles driving the Part-time MBA curriculum, a curriculum overview, sample course syllabi, an opportunity for prospects to speak with current students or alumni, and information about the admissions process and financial aid. A significant portion of prospects who attend an information session move forward with the application process.

- Prospective applicants are asked about their professional work experience and prior academic performance early in the recruiting process in order to encourage the candidates with a high likelihood of admission.
Admission

As stated in section 6.3.3 f. the admission requirements and process are designed to admit only students whom the admissions committee believes have a high likelihood of success in the program. This is accomplished by a three step admission process:

- Completion of an Application File This includes a completed application, current resume, official transcripts from each college or university attended, three professional references and an admissions essay to evaluate the applicant’s writing ability (see section 6.3.3 a.)
- Participation in a Group Interview. The group interview serves to evaluate the candidate’s ability to apply his or her professional experience to a hypothetical problem to be solved by the group, and his or her team interaction skills.
- Achievement of a Passing Score on Financial eLearning Course Test. Working knowledge of basic accounting terms, generally accepted accounting principles and basic financial reports must be demonstrated by passing an online test, or by completing an on-line e-learning course which includes passing a post-test.

Admissions decisions are made by a committee consisting of two MBA faculty members and the Part-Time MBA program director. The admission counselor observes the interview and offers information regarding the applicant to the admission committee as appropriate, but does not participate in the admission decision. The Graduate Admissions office is responsible for communicating the admission decision in writing in a formal letter. The admission counselor is responsible for all communication with the applicant prior to and following the admission process, until the student matriculates.

Retention

Policies and resources aimed at student retention include:

- Orientation process. A formal orientation session is scheduled for each cohort to educate new students about program policies and procedures, and resources available to them as graduate students. Students are also introduced to the dean of the George Fox School of Business, Part-Time MBA faculty members, and classmates.
- Team-building Experience. The first Saturday class of the first MBA courses consists of a full-day team building experience at a ropes/challenge course. This serves to build relationships, create unity through a shared experience, and foster teamwork.
- Cohort Model. The Part-Time MBA cohort model requires group projects and teamwork. This encourages relationship building and peer support that increases retention.
- Absence Policy. George Fox Part-Time MBA students may miss up to eight class hours per course, if arranged in advance with the faculty member responsible for the course. This allows students some reasonable flexibility to meet work and family responsibilities that conflict with class time, and cannot be rescheduled.
- Leave of Absence. George Fox Part-Time MBA students may take a Leave of Absence from the program, if necessary. A formal re-admission process is required to return to the program to ensure the returning student is in good financial and academic standing. Once a returning student is cleared for readmission, the program director will work with the student to create a schedule to allow him or her to complete the remaining courses required to complete the program.
• Portland Writing Center. Graduate students have access to free advising for improving their writing skills through the Portland Writing Center, located at the George Fox Portland campus.
• Dinner for Incoming and Outgoing Students. On the last evening of their first class, incoming MBA students share a pizza dinner with the graduating MBA students, who are in their last night of class. Strategies for success are shared in small groups, and then the new students share the tips they've heard with the entire group. It's inspiring for the incoming students to hear how busy, working professionals managed to successfully complete the program.

Full-Time MBA Program

Recruitment

Students are recruited through the Graduate Admissions office. Various recruitment methods are utilized including graduate fairs, specific recruiting days at target universities, information sessions where prospective students can hear from a current student and the director of the program as well as hosting specific students for campus visits upon request (including classroom visitation). Each of these activities provides an opportunity for the prospective student to learn more about the specific details of the program and ask questions about the program. An emphasis is put on listening to the customer in our admissions process. The Admissions Counselor for the Full-Time MBA assists all prospective students through the application and admissions process.

Admissions

As stated in section 6.3.3 f. the admission requirements and process are designed to admit only students whom the admissions committee believes have a high likelihood of success in the program.

The Graduate Admissions office is in charge of processing all application materials for prospective students. When a file is complete, the Admissions Counselor evaluates the application to ensure that all conditions are met to continue in the process. The MBA director then screens the applicant further prior to asking the applicant to campus for a group interview. The applicant group experiential interviews provide a great opportunity to determine student admission that includes assessment of their ability to work effectively in teams, their level of self-awareness and their ability to communicate and contribute with clarity and respect.

Following the group interview, the admissions committee makes a decision for acceptance, provisional acceptance, or denial. If any additional information is deemed necessary for decision-making, the Admissions Counselor completes this process and communicates with the admissions committee if necessary. The Graduate Admissions office is responsible for communicating decision information via email, phone, and formal letter.

Retention

Figure 6.10 shows that the retention rate is 100% in the first two years of the FT MBA program. This strong retention rate is supported by a 3-day orientation process, including a full day ropes/challenge course team learning experience, and a cohort model that builds healthy student support and team process.
Criterion 6.3.6. Results of Enrollment Management will be reported. Summarize results for enrollment management not reported elsewhere in the report.

Undergraduate Program
The undergraduate business program is one of the largest majors at the University. The major accounts for about 11% of the undergraduate student enrollment and generated over 5,000 student credit hours in 2009-2010. The change to seven business majors (moving finance, management, marketing, and international studies to majors) will eventually result in higher enrollments in the undergraduate business program. Currently we do not have a tracking system to generate retention data. The strategic plan includes an advanced standing initiative requiring all business students to actually make application to the business major. It is anticipated that this initiative will provide retention data.

Part-Time MBA Program
The average student retention rate for the past four cohorts is 83.5%, which is a decline from 100% for the prior two cohorts as shown in Figure 6.8 (Section 6.1.7). One reason for student withdrawal from the program has tended to be job related.

Full-Time MBA Program
Figure 6.11 illustrates the enrollment management tracking in the Full-Time MBA program. Enrollment has increased with each cohort, however, the recruiting goal for academic year 2010-2011 was 25 students and we did not meet that target, successfully recruiting only 21 students. This is due, in part, to international recruitment strategies that have increased English proficiency standards. It is expected that this will level out over the next 2-3 years.

---

Figure 6.10
FTMBA Retention Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTMBA Cohort</th>
<th>Finished Program</th>
<th>Dropped Out</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Retention Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 3</td>
<td>Not yet available</td>
<td>Not yet available</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Not yet available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recruitment strategies for the doctoral program have changed substantially over the life of the program. Originally, marketing was targeted to the Northwest regional area, primarily through print ads and informational meetings. The program is currently marketed online through Google. Instead of holding informational meetings, the DBA director and DBA admissions director meet individually with prospective students who come to campus or talk to them by phone. The composition of incoming classes reflects this shift in marketing. In the past, the program drew primarily from the Northwest, but now the student body is increasingly drawn from around the United States. The program’s focus on preparing educators should help in recruiting efforts by clearly identifying a market niche. The DBA director is working with the DBA admissions director to develop strategies to better target business faculty teaching at smaller colleges who need to complete their terminal degrees.

The retention rates of DBA students are shown in Figure 6.12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DBA Cohort</th>
<th>Beginning Size of Cohort</th>
<th>Students Retained</th>
<th>Retention Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Criterion 6.3.7 Improvement in Enrollment Management will be pursued on a continuous basis.**

**Undergraduate Program**

Recent improvements in enrollment management for the undergraduate business program include the following:

- Revised and more discipline-specific academic advising program
- The Buzz, a bi-monthly business majors/faculty coffee reception (2011-2012)
- The hanging display of every business student’s picture in the department (2011-2012)
- PeopleSoft database to improve academic advising

**Part-Time MBA Program**

Recent improvements for the Part-Time MBA enrollment process include the following:

- RSVP and Reminder Process for Information Sessions. Since Information Sessions are a key recruiting tool, an RSVP and reminder system was implemented to create a level of commitment to attend and a communication system for reminders, directions, parking information, etc. to enhance to prospect’s experience prior to attending the session. This information is shared with administrative assistants via Google docs.
- Implementation of an enterprise wide information system. The university’s PeopleSoft database allows information regarding applicants and admitted students to be shared easily among admission personnel, administrative support personnel and financial services personnel. This helps us to better serve our applicants and recently admitted students, especially with regard to those who need to move immediately into the financial aid process.
- Google docs are used for coordinating new admit communications. Google docs is a simple but useful tool that has proved very effective for sharing information between Graduate Admissions and the School of Business, especially during the interim period between when students have matriculated, but have not yet started attending class. Information shared using Google docs has allowed us to better serve this group.

**Full-Time MBA Program**

Recent improvements for the Full-Time MBA enrollment process include the following:

- The implementation of cohort reunion gatherings that supports our best method of recruitment, word-of-mouth.
- Increased and continued attendance at Graduate Fairs in California and the Northwest region.
- Clarification and simplification for international student application for the American Culture and Language (ACLA) program that is a feeder/preparation program for the Full-Time MBA.
DBA Program

Retention is an issue for the George Fox DBA program as it is for all doctoral programs. Our students drop out for a variety of reasons, including family illness, finances, job demands, and the demands of the program. Our goal is to ensure that 60% of students who start the program are retained and graduate within seven years. To reach this objective, we have strengthened admissions requirements (students must complete prerequisite courses and complete the GMAT exam) and are collecting data to determine what factors best predict student success. The research course sequence has been modified to better prepare students for completion of their dissertations.