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Factors Shaping Mission and Operations

Established in 1962 when the private University of Buffalo was incorporated into the State University of New York (SUNY), the University at Buffalo (UB) is one of four university centers in the state university system. The School of Management (SOM) was established as the School of Business Administration in 1927 and has been offering a full range of degrees since the 1950s. The School moved to its current building, the Jacobs Management Center, in Amherst in 1985. The Alfiero Student Center was added to Jacobs in April 2005.

SUNY is a relatively dispersed university system, with a total of 64 campuses (including community colleges, which are state and local partnerships). Although UB is the largest and most comprehensive of the four university centers, there is no universally recognized flagship campus in the system. There is still considerable central oversight (by both SUNY and the State Education Department) over programs and policies. Tuition, for example, remains centrally controlled; there are no variations across campuses for given programs, and only recently have differentials between business and other programs on a campus been recognized.

The University budget is largely enrollment-driven. Tuition and tax dollars are allocated to campuses by SUNY and then distributed to academic and academic support units. At UB this allocation occurs via a “compact” negotiated with the Provost’s office. There is no formulaic link between SOM’s budget and enrollment. In recent years, there has been an increasing reliance on tuition revenue relative to state support to fund University operations. Early in the current New York State budget crisis tuition was increased, but 80 percent was diverted to fund the general state-operating budget. In 2010 non-resident tuition increased by $265 per semester for Ph.D. and MS students, and $690 for MBA students. Resident MBA tuition increased by $385. The School is eligible to receive up to 50 percent of that increase ($230K) based on a satisfactory proposal to the Provost’s office.

Development came relatively late to UB; its first capital campaign, with a goal of only $50 million, was in the early 1990s. Although the situation is beginning to change, there is not a longstanding tradition of giving among alumni, and the development push that was launched at UB later in the 1990s required a period of identification and cultivation of prospective alumni and other donors that is still going on. The pace of actual fund-generation has quickened, but UB is still far behind most large state universities in this regard, not to mention the private universities with which it competes. The School’s endowment ranks near the bottom among AAU business schools falling to $10-11mm with the recent market decline, down from a high in the $13-$14mm range. The most significant development opportunity is the fact that the School remains “unnamed”.

UB occupies a central place in Western New York. It is one of the region’s largest employers, with an economic impact that is rivaled by few other institutions. Its relationship with the larger community is complex. It is an economic engine, a cultural asset, and a trainer of much of the area’s professional talent. There are periodic criticisms that the campus does not do enough to rescue the area from its longstanding economic travails and that it has abandoned the area around the South Campus. More recently, President Simpson’s UB2020 initiative generated considerable local interest based on its economic development dimension.
As noted, UB and SOM operate in a region of extended economic and demographic decline. Even when Western New York was prospering as a manufacturing center, it had few corporate headquarters, and now it has even fewer. The manufacturing base has contracted dramatically, even before the acceleration of that contraction nationally. The region’s continued population decline reflects this economic environment. Together, these trends mean a smaller local population of potential students and a more challenging local labor market for our graduates, many of whom want to remain in the region.

Relative Advantages and Disadvantages

The School of Management has a number of important advantages that it can and aims to build upon, as well as some significant challenges that it needs to face and overcome. The advantages include:

- We have, on the whole, a well-trained and productive faculty, including both senior people with strong institutional history and commitment and a cadre of recently-hired junior faculty from well-regarded doctoral programs.

- We have a talented and dedicated staff that provides excellent student services and program management.

- We have a new addition (Alfiero Center) that serves as an attractive and functional center for student services and student life.

- We have a culture and an academic environment that place high value on research, which in turn enhances our ability to attract new faculty from strong doctoral programs.

- We have active and dedicated alumni associations for our programs, both traditional and specialized (e.g., EMBA, CEL, overseas).

- The University is generally supportive of the School at the margin. We have been well treated with respect to recent budget cuts and taxes on our entrepreneurial activities. The University was also supportive of recent (2008-09) efforts to implement a student fee to support the Career Resource Center, a fee that was unique for both SUNY and UB. This fee is currently equivalent to 8 percent of our state-operating budget.

- We have a good reputation for the quality of our academic programs. A recent survey of all SOM stakeholders highlights our strengths: delivering programs with real-world learning, giving our students an international/global perspective, and having a community and economic impact. Aside from top 10 rankings in the discontinued Wall Street Journal rankings, the MBA program has also been well ranked when the focus is on rate of return (Forbes, BusinessWeek). Notably in 2010 our EMBA program was ranked 51st in the world by the Financial Times, while the full-time program was ranked in the BusinessWeek 2nd tier for the first time.

- For our size, we have a remarkable international footprint. We offered the first MBA program in China after that country opened up, and we have an alumni base there. We also have a successful Executive MBA program in Singapore that has recently enrolled its 15th intake. Our undergraduate degree is a cornerstone of UB’s larger undergraduate offering in Singapore. We also offer an MS degree (Management of ITS) in India, designed to be part of a potentially larger University partnership with Amrita University.
Against these advantages are arrayed a number of disadvantages with respect to reputation, resources, sponsors, and supporters, including the following:

- Our faculty size is small, and in some areas we face significant critical-mass problems. In particular, the small number of tenure-track faculty makes it a challenge to develop an institutional research presence in a discipline. In order to meet our instructional obligations, we rely on a cadre of non-tenure-track faculty, both full-time and adjunct, who teach large numbers of students very well, but do not contribute materially to our research mission.

- The School’s resource base is just 50-60 percent of that found in AAU public business schools or among aspirant schools. Our degree production puts us in the 60th percentile of all AAU publics, but our resources per degree ranks in the 9th percentile. The School’s total budget (BSQ) per degree is approximately $20,000 compared to $25,000-$40,000 in business schools at other public research universities. Given that we recently graduated 1300 students, each $1000 per degree differential is a $1.3mm resource gap.

- Undergraduate enrollment has increased exponentially without a commensurate increase in faculty size. This leads to increasing class sizes that put pressure on tenure track faculty, and are reaching the point where classes cannot be accommodated by University classroom space. The classrooms in the Jacobs Center and the Alfiero Center do give us some flexibility in scheduling classes, but they do not meet all of our needs in this regard, and they cannot accommodate any class with more than 80 students.

- We lack the ability to fully access potential tuition revenues. At present, general undergraduate and graduate tuition rates must be uniform across SUNY campuses. We don’t have the flexibility to set our own tuition levels for either the MBA or undergraduate degrees. Despite recent SUNY-wide increases, the tuition for our traditional MBA program, especially for non-resident (largely international) students is low relative to other AAU publics.

- There is not yet a strong tradition of alumni giving at UB. We are still identifying successful alumni from past decades who have not yet been cultivated to contribute back to the University. As a result, we do not have a large endowment built over the years by successive capital campaigns, and the inflow of money from annual-fund campaigns remains modest. Although we are well respected in the local business and professional community, the material support we receive from these sources is limited. As a consequence, the revenues we receive outside of tuition and tax dollars is modest. In 2010-11 the university allocated another staff FTE to the school for development, which is a positive counter to this challenge.

Challenges going forward

In addition to overcoming the foregoing disadvantages, the School faces a number of internal, environmental and competitive challenges. Among them:

- While the University’s budgeting model broadly ties resources to enrollments, it does not easily accommodate temporal shifts in enrollment that seem manageable on an annual basis, but over time are inconsistent with the underlying resource base. As evidence, the School produced more than 1300 degrees annual in 2009-10, compared to 750 in 1998, with essentially the same number of tenure track faculty.
• The current state budget crisis has resulted in a recurring round of budget cuts to the University and the School. Since the last review the School’s state operating budget has been cut by 5.3 percent, with another 3 percent already assessed in 2010-11 (plus a possible forthcoming mid-year cut). In addition, the University has imposed a turnover tax equal to a 40 percent of the annual salary in the year following the departure. This could be equivalent to 2 percent of the School’s state operating budget in a particular year.

• Since SUNY has chosen not to have a flagship campus, we are in competition for resources and students with other SUNY campuses. The private-school tradition in New York State also creates strong competition from that quarter both in Western New York and statewide. There has been, for example, a proliferation of MBA programs within SUNY and throughout the State. Our challenge is to establish ourselves as the preeminent public alternative in New York.

• Our programs have not developed reputations within the United States outside of New York State (and especially Western New York). Despite recognition in such rankings as BusinessWeek and the Wall Street Journal, we are better known in China than in Pennsylvania, in Korea than in Ohio, in India than in Indiana.

• We are much challenged by the competitive costs of students and faculty in our field. We have found it difficult to be competitive in the area of scholarships and fellowships for high-quality MBA and Ph.D. students, a challenge that will grow as tuition costs increase. At present our stipends for doctoral students are at the low end of the range in the industry. Similarly, the need to be competitive in faculty salaries, especially for new hires, has created a painful compression (and even inversion) in our salary structure. Our ability to pay competitive salaries and to provide expected levels of support for faculty research is strained by the resource limitations noted earlier.

Opportunities to enhance degree offerings

Notwithstanding the disadvantages and challenges outlined above, we are identifying and pursuing several opportunities for enhancing our degree offerings, opportunities that will, directly or indirectly, contribute to our resource base and our reputation.

• LeaderCORE™ promises to dramatically reshape the MBA experience. This program provides a unique combination of leadership experiences and personal coaching. Each MBA student has an opportunity to build his or her own leadership brand that is in turn integrated into their placement effort.

• The MBA/MS Program Committee has been engaged in serious discussion about meaningful revision of the full-time MBA core curriculum for the past year. There is a desire to create a core that is more integrated and dynamic while at the same time better prepares students for the world of work. We expect the program committee to present a new core curriculum to the faculty for review in spring 2011 for fall 2012 implementation.

• The doctoral program underwent a thorough review by a dean-appointed ad hoc committee in 2007-08. Several changes were made as a result of this review, including:
  o Funded Ph.D. lines are now distributed among the departments based on the strategically determined tenure-track faculty size.
The Ph.D. Committee has focused more closely on strategic outcomes and reporting of student progress.
- Stipends for supported students have been marginally increased and are expected to be further increased as the budget allows.

In addition, the Assistant Director of Graduate Programs has been assigned to provide staff support for the Ph.D. program. This has significantly improved the quality of advisement, attention to strategic measures, and overall level of student service.

- The School presented the Provost with a formal proposal to reduce undergraduate enrollment in October 2010.

- We are building on our successful EMBA experience in Singapore by playing a major role in UB’s four-year undergraduate program there, run in cooperation with SOM’s partner in the MBA Program, the Singapore Institute of Management.

- Our “digital access” offerings in 6 undergraduate core courses are fully integrated into the curriculum, and in recent years extended to include our Singapore undergraduates.

- The School’s MSS department has introduced an MS program in partnership with Amrita University, in Bangalore, India. The program has the potential to provide both meaningful incremental resource and research opportunities for the School and the University. First initiated in 2007, we continue to evaluate the long-term feasibility of such efforts in the challenging economic environment in both the U.S. and India.

The following degree programs are included in the accreditation review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2009-10 Graduates</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2009-10 Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.S. in Bus. Admin: Buffalo</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>MBA/JD**</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. in Bus. Admin: Singapore</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>MBA/MD**</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. in Accounting</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>MBA/PharmD**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>MBA/AudD**</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA Professional</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>MBA/MPH**</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA Executive: Buffalo</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>MBA/M.A. (Int'l Trade)*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA Executive: Singapore</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>MBA/M.Arch.***</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA Executive: China</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M.S. in Accounting</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S./MBA*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>M.S. in S.C.O.M.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. (Economics)/MBA*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M.S. in M.I.S.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. (Engineering)/MBA*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M.S. in I.T.S.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. (Geography)/MBA*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M.S. in Finance</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA/MSW**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Joint degree: student receives one degree as designated.
** Dual degree: student receives two separate degrees.
Section I-B
PROGRESS UPDATE ON CONCERNS FROM PREVIOUS REVIEW

The last review stressed that in particular, future planning should address issues identified by the peer review team, especially:

1. The shortage of senior research active faculty in the Department of Organization and Human Resources and the Department of Accounting.

   **OHR:** Shortly after the last review the School hired a senior assistant professor in OHR. The individual has since been promoted to Associate Professor (with tenure) and takes the lead responsibility for the departmental doctoral program. The department is also searching for a new hire at the rank of Associate or Professor.

   **Accounting:** Subsequent to the last review, the Accounting department hired a new faculty member at the rank of Professor (Bill Kross). Professor Kross provides departmental leadership for the PhD program and a source of scholarly leadership for the junior faculty. The department has also been authorized to search for an additional hire at the rank of Associate or Professor.

2. Conduct a strategic review of the role and value of the doctoral programs in light of resource needs, and develop strategies accordingly.

   In 2007 the Dean appointed an *ad hoc* chaired by the Associate Dean for Research to review the PhD program. In 2008 the faculty subsequently adopted the recommendations of the Committee including the following:

   (a) an allocation of PhD assistantships to departments based on a fixed ratio to tenure track faculty, with a minimum of 4 per department;

   (b) a recommendation that assistantship stipends be increased by $3,000 annual to reach the 50th percentile among aspirant schools;

   (c) an expectation that the PhD committee will monitor the performance of the overall PhD program, and that of each department, focusing on student applicant and placement quality, as well as evolving faculty productivity and student/faculty ratios. This includes a recommendation that the PhD committee provide a periodic performance report to the Dean, that might be the basis for a reallocation of assistantship lines across departments.

   (d) the development of departmental program web pages.
Section II-A
THE STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK

Background

In preparation for the 2005 accreditation review, the School of Management developed an entirely new approach to strategic planning and strategy management. Led by a newly constituted Strategic Management Committee (SMC), the School reviewed and sharpened its mission, vision and values statements consistent with emerging AACSB guidelines. More significantly the SMC developed a strategic framework that more clearly aligns faculty and staff decision making with the School’s strategic priorities. This means clarifying what is strategic and what is not, highlighting important strategic tradeoffs, and providing a strategic basis for significant resource allocation decisions. We believe this emphasis on improved alignment and strategy execution follows directly from the new AACSB strategy focused reviews. The School’s key stakeholders had an opportunity to provide feedback on each of these dimensions, from the mission, vision and values statements to the new strategic management framework. These are the mission, vision and values statements that continue to guide the School.

SOM Mission, Vision and Values

Given the depth of the review and conversation around these statements leading up to the 2005 review, one normally wouldn’t expect them to change over the course of a few years. These were intended as foundational statements that provide broad guidance to our strategic thinking and the direction of the School and they remain so today. The Mission statement is short and simple, reflecting the emphasis on scholarship and teaching at a major public research university. The Vision statement is designed to be forward looking and a more direct communication, as a directional compass, and as a strategy driver. The Values statement describes how we work together to achieve that vision.

Vision statements are seen as more pointed statements about what an organization is trying to achieve, existing between mission and strategy. Visions describe what an organization aspires to become, as it goes about accomplishing its mandated mission. Strategic planning is guided by this underlying vision. Missions are the most permanent, visions are long-term stable, and strategies are changing and flexible.

| Core Mission | Vision for the future | Strategic Planning |

SOM Mission Statement

Our Mission

The mission of the School of Management (SOM) at the University at Buffalo is to advance the practice of management within a global context, through scholarly research, education, and professional and community service.
Our Vision

We aspire to advance our standing as a leading, comprehensive school of management, furthering our global reputation for influential scholarship and for educational experiences that make a difference in the lives of our students. Through our actions and accomplishments, we will inspire pride among the diverse members of our community. We will be renowned for:

High Impact Scholarship. We will be known as thought leaders in both the relevant academic literatures as well as in management practice.

Adding Value. We will be known for creating learning experiences in our executive, graduate, and undergraduate educational programs, that provide a high return on investment over the course of a lifetime.

Engaged Service. We will be known for our desire to actively advance the welfare of our professional, university, and public communities.

Our Values

Our pursuits will be guided by a culture of responsibility and mutual respect. The SOM community recognizes an obligation to share the responsibilities of self-governance, the benefits of diverse points of view, and the need to conduct our affairs in an atmosphere of civility and mutual respect. This culture is reinforced by the following values:

Innovation: creating new ideas, testing them, and retaining the most valuable.

Professional Conduct: reflecting high ethical standards and integrity in all of our endeavors.

Efficiency: in the use and allocation of resources based on performance and contributions to strategic goals.

Entrepreneurship: by championing new initiatives and ventures that engage and benefit the multiple stakeholders of our SOM community.

Growth: involving the continuing professional development and renewal of the people in our community.

SOM Strategy: Initiatives, Implementation and Measurement

Two Strategies

The School of Management has two strategies to achieve its vision. The first, our academic strategy, describes how we will achieve our strategic goals for high impact scholarship and management education. The academic strategy not only outlines new initiatives designed to achieve those goals, but as importantly it clarifies and guides faculty and staff decision-making in our continuing activities. It does so by articulating the relationships between those higher-level strategic aspirations and the daily activities of faculty and staff who execute that strategy. It highlights what is strategic and what is not, and it is intended to influence decision-making in the Dean’s office, departments, and program committees, as well as by individual faculty and staff.
The second is our resource strategy. Our academic strategy will define a series of goals and targets that have implicit resource implications. While we consider those goals achievable, they are at the same time aspirations. Our success is in part contingent on the necessary resources to support those efforts. This requires a resource strategy. It will highlight the School’s primary resource categories (degree program enrollment, executive education, capital campaign, efficiency gains, etc.) and identify the source and magnitude of the resources required to implement the academic strategy. The incremental resource requirements of new academic initiatives will be directly linked to incremental resources in the resource strategy.

Developing these two separate strategies improves strategic management in SOM in two important ways. First, it should make for a clearer set of criteria for evaluating new initiatives. How does this new program or initiative advance our academic strategy? If incremental resources are required, what magnitude of resources are required and where are they found in the resource strategy? Second, it will serve to distinguish initiatives and programs (like Executive Education) that are largely designed to generate net new resources, but play only a minor role in our academic strategy. This will also underscore the critical role of these programs when their resource contribution is linked directly to specific initiatives driving the academic strategy. Third, this strategic framework provides importance guidance as we continue to implement the recent University-wide budget cuts.

The guiding focus of our strategic planning efforts has been not only to highlight our overarching strategic goals, but as importantly to develop a system of “strategy management.” The result will be more than a document that is filed away until the next strategy exercise. It includes an organizational performance management system that will guide faculty and staff decision-making on strategic matters, as well as track our strategic performance going forward. Therefore this document describes both our new strategic initiatives and the development of a performance management system for the overall strategy.

**Managing Strategic Performance**

At the foundation of our academic strategy are two clearly articulated strategic themes: high impact scholarship and a high impact MBA program. Each strategic theme comprises a set of linked activities and decisions that represent the key performance drivers in those strategic themes. In addition we identify three “strategic foundations” that support and leverage the two strategic themes. This approach follows from the Balanced Scorecard literature and constitutes a “strategy map” for the School. The purpose of the strategy map is threefold:

First, it provides a visual depiction of the linked set of performance drivers that describe our strategy. It makes the relationship between our decision-making and our strategic goals clearer and more transparent, and makes it easier to recognize strategic tradeoffs.

Second, a linked set of performance drivers provide the basis for measuring and managing strategic performance at all levels of the implementation process. This will make it easier to identify and pinpoint the source of any problems in achieving our ultimate strategic goals.

Third, articulating the strategic performance drivers and measures of success will guide the content, focus and magnitude of any new strategic initiatives. The rationale for a new initiative will be linked directly to specific strategic themes, and performance drivers, and the success of those initiatives can be evaluated against the relevant performance measures. The framework supports a more informed approach to continuous
improvement. For example, relatively straightforward conversations about measurement targets for the MBA program can surface fundamental philosophical differences about the direction of the program.

The result is an integrated analysis of what it takes to achieve our strategic goals, new initiatives designed to get us there and a set of performance measures to reflect our progress.

**The SOM Strategy Map**

The academic strategy map (Appendix II-A.1) is a hierarchical statement of the leading and lagging indicators of strategic success for the School of Management. It can be divided into three categories:

**Our Vision:** Achieving our Vision of the kind of School we hope to be is our ultimate goal. Drawing on the Mission Statement we articulate that vision in terms of recognition and impact, for both scholarship and management education. This is the strategic dimension of our Mission because recognition and impact describe success in what is a very competitive environment. It also acknowledges UB’s strategic emphasis on impact.

**Two Core Strategic Themes:** A strategic theme is simply a way to describe the focused set of activities, programs and resource commitments designed to achieve our Vision. We have two core themes: a high impact MBA program and high impact scholarship. These two themes reflect both the centrality of scholarly contributions in a public research university and the overriding influence of MBA programs in a business school’s reputation.

These two themes have been the implicit core themes for the School for more than a decade. Formally adopting this framework in 2005, however, gave greater focus to our resource decision making and a clearer litmus test for evaluating new “opportunities”. Equally important, it improved our strategy execution by making it much clearer what was strategic and what wasn’t.

**Performance Drivers:** Within each strategic theme, we have identified a linked set of key performance drivers. We rarely manage our reputation and impact directly. Instead they are the result of earlier decisions involving the MBA program, related support services, resource allocation decisions, and how well faculty perform their own research and teaching responsibilities. The strategy map is intended to highlight the significance of these leading indicators of success so they are better managed and supported. As we reviewed our strategic performance in the last 5 years, we also focused on whether we had the right performance drivers for each strategic theme. The strategy map reflects those revisions.

**Three Strategic Foundations:** In addition to the two core strategic themes, there are three School activities or programs that provide essential support for those two themes and serve to leverage their impact. These include:

- **The Undergraduate Program:** Our goal is to have an undergraduate program that is considered the flagship program in the SUNY system, based on high-quality instruction at an affordable price. The current enrollment-resource base is no longer consistent with the goal. The challenge is to right-size an undergraduate program that continues to grow without a commensurate increase in resources to accommodate that growth.
• **Relationship and Reputation Management:** Enhancing the School’s reputation for scholarship and programs with impact begins with our substantive performance. But reputations can also be managed directly through better relationships with rating sources, professional associations and alumni, and indirectly through a stronger presence in the business media. We need to be sure that the substantive contributions of our scholarship and MBA program are fully realized in our reputation for impact. In the last 5 years we have broadened the notion of reputation beyond media rankings. Based on a comprehensive survey of the School’s stakeholders, under the leadership of the School’s Reputation and Rankings Committee we have identified three reputational attributes of our programs that our stakeholders value. These three dimensions (Real-world exposure, Community and Economic Impact, and International/Global Perspective) are decision considerations as we implement our strategy more broadly.

• **Align with UB Strategy:** The School expects to be a partner in the larger University strategy (to improve standing among AAU public universities) and will emphasize those initiatives that are consistent the School’s strategy and resources. For example, the School has a significant involvement if University efforts to establish degree programs in India (Amrita MITES program) and Singapore (BSBA degree). Likewise the School has committed the majority of the salary costs toward several new lines intended to support UB2020 strategic themes. We also continue to explore ways to support the University’s increasing focus on health care and the health sciences. In the future this might take the form of offerings in health care management, on both a non-credit and credit basis.

**Measuring Strategic Performance**

A strategy map is in many respects a conceptual statement. The performance drivers, and even the higher-level strategic goals like “high impact MBA,” have much clearer implications for decision-making once we attach measures to those concepts. Therefore, the next step in this process is to attach a set of measures to as many of the performance drivers as possible. The measures not only provide meaning to these concepts; they also provide a way to measure our strategic performance, for both our ultimate strategic goals and the leading indicators of those results.

**In 2005:** Performance measures were developed by consulting with the faculty program committees and senior staff responsible for implementing the respective elements of the strategy. Their number and content will continue to evolve as the strategic management process evolves.

In many respects the most important measurement challenge is setting targets. As with the measurement development process, the Committee originally developed targets based on input from faculty and staff that are largely responsible for managing specific elements of the strategy. These included the MBA/MS Program Committee, the PhD Program Committee, the department chairs, and professional staff responsible for career services, communications and alumni relationships. The targets were based on the resource assumptions described in our resource strategy and focused on academic year 2007-2008.

**In 2009-2010:** Both the measures and the targets were revised based on consultations with the faculty committees, and professional staff, responsible for managing specific elements of the strategy. The revisions were modest, given that the revisions in the underlying strategy map were modest. Most of the changes focused on clarifying measures
that seemed to be ambiguous, and eliminating a number of measures that had been identified as “to be determined” (TBD) in 2005, but no longer seemed necessary or feasible. The targets were updated to 2014, and reflect the expectation that recent resource constraints are not likely to material change in the next few years. The list of those measures is provided in Appendix II-A.2.

Our experience with these measures as a strategic management tool has been positive, but mixed. They have served to reinforce the importance of a measurement culture in the variety of policy and resource allocation conversations that occur on a regular basis. This framework influences program reviews and, more importantly, the management of strategic performance drivers. We continue to struggle with the appropriate balance between the number and specificity of these measures, and the tension between the particular measure and the spirit of the underlying performance driver it is intended to capture.

**Strategic Initiatives**

A strategy map and related measures not only serve to clarify and articulate the key decision variables in our current strategy, they also serve as the foundation for the development of new initiatives. New strategic initiatives, whether proposed by the faculty or the Dean, should meet at least two standards. First, any new strategic initiative for our Academic Strategy should have a reasonably clear impact on one or more of the performance drivers in the strategy map. If it does not, either the initiative is misguided or the strategy map is wrong. Second, new strategic initiatives should always include an estimate of their incremental resource requirements. The incremental resources then must be identified in the Resource Strategy.

**Status of Initiatives from 2005 (Academic Strategy)**

While our Vision and our larger strategic focus remains stable over time, we continue to look for more effective ways to achieve those strategic goals. To the extent that there is significant strategic change in the School, it occurs through natural life cycle of our strategic initiatives. In this section we summarize the status of new initiatives proposed as part of the 2005 review. These initiatives were all contingent on incremental resources going forward. Unfortunately most were affected by a significant unanticipated decline in the New York State budget environment.

*Increase MBA student quality through more selective admissions:* Beginning in fall 2006, the entering full-time MBA class was reduced from 135-150 to approximately 100. This increased average GMAT scores from the 590’s to the 610-620 range. We also instituted telephone interviews for all academically qualified applicants. The emphasis on raising GMAT scores also resulted in decline in work experience as we tended to admit a younger applicant pool. The overall impression is that we have a more talented student body in the MBA program, though the lack of work experience has not improved the placement rates or starting salaries.

*Increase the size of the tenure-track faculty base* – Across a variety of benchmarks, SOM’s full time faculty size is 20-30 percent smaller than other schools producing an equivalent number of degrees. That assessment hasn’t changed since 2005. New resource commitments (see below) that would have allowed us to achieve our goal of 5 net new hires have been entirely offset by recent budget cuts.
Increase support for junior tenure track faculty – In order to achieve and sustain a strategic focus on high-impact scholarship, SOM must be able to hire outstanding junior faculty who are eventually tenured, and ultimately promoted to the rank of Professor. Our success in the early phase of this process needs to be improved considerably. The goal was to provide a one course reduction in teaching load for new faculty, for up to six years. To date we only offer three years of a reduced load, with the third year typically contingent on performance. However, we have been able to increase the funding for the summer research program by $30,000 and this program disproportionately benefits junior faculty.

Increase the number of supported PhD assistantships and raise the PhD stipends – The goal was to add one additional assistantship (over three years), increase stipends levels to the 50th percentile of aspirant schools, and provide regular increases to maintain the stipends at that level. As part of a School wide reorganization of the PhD program we did add one more funded assistantship, bringing the total to 26. In 2010 we estimated that assistantship stipends were nearly $5,000 below the 50th percentile of aspirant schools, despite increasing our stipends to $16,000.

Increase the number of MBA fellowships to compete more aggressively for high-potential MBA students – Our reputation for a high impact MBA program is in part a function of the quality of our students. Competition for the best MBA students has never been more challenging. SOM has repeatedly lost out in this competition in recent years due to an inability to offer financial support. The School committed $50,000 annually to fund fellowship offers for these high potential applicants.

New Strategic Initiatives During 2006-2010 (Academic Strategy)

High Impact Scholarship

- **Invest in Accounting Faculty:** Accounting faculty resources were augmented with the addition of one new faculty member at the rank of Professor, and the department has been authorized to search for two additional senior hires.
- **Increased faculty research support:** The Provost provided Dean Assad with $100,000 a year, for three years, to increase faculty research support. Those funds were used to increase the School’s summer research program, and initiate a Dean’s Faculty Fellows program.
- **5 net new tenure track hires:** The Provost provided Dean Assad with $500K in matching funds to support the addition of five new tenure track hires. We have completed three of those hires, but with the recent budget reductions, there has been no net growth in tenure track faculty.
- **Clearer research guidance:** Meeting with the department chairs, the Dean instituted a review of each department’s list of consensus “A” journals. Based on evidence of actual practice among AAU publics, each department sharpened the list of consensus “A” journals to better inform the research dimension of promotion decisions and reward allocations. The result has been a clearer articulation of the quality of publications expected of faculty, an expectation that begins with the offer letter to faculty candidates.
High Impact MBA

- **LeaderCORE™** (Certification of Readiness and Excellence): This comprehensive new certification program, which spans the complete two years of the full-time MBA experience, gives students the opportunity to study and navigate real-world business situations while developing a set of clearly identified management competencies that differentiate student accomplishments. The overarching vision of LeaderCORE is to ensure that our graduates will transition seamlessly from business school to leadership-track careers.

- **Broaden reputation focus beyond rankings**: We also include our reputation for providing real-world exposure, our community and economic impact, and the international/global perspective we provide.

- **MBA program review**: Our MBA/MS Programs Committee has focused its attention for over a year on completely reengineering the core curriculum of the full-time MBA program, including developing well-defined principles to guide content, structure, and quality of delivery. A significantly revised core will be launched in fall 2012. These changes are described in more detail in the Assurance of Learning section.

Strategic Enablers

- **Right size the undergraduate accounting program**: As part of the School’s larger undergraduate growth, the Accounting program reached a critical imbalance between enrollment and faculty size. In 2006-07 admission requirements were tightened with an expected reduction in undergraduate enrollment of approximately 25 percent. The department was also relieved of several service offerings in other undergraduate options and eliminated the concentration in Internal Audit.

Other

- **Restructure professional staff**: The staff is responsible for a good portion of our strategy implementation, yet historically they have had little insight or input into many of the key decisions for those programs. The representation of both senior, and more importantly, junior level staff has been increased on the School’s program committees. In addition we have instituted customer satisfaction surveys of all student service operations. Both changes have proven very productive.

New Initiatives Going Forward

Mindful of the difficult resource environment that is likely to prevail for the next few years the School will focus on a very limited set of new initiatives. These are described in more detail later in the report.

**LeaderCORE™ implementation**: 2010/11 is the program’s inaugural year during which enrollment is limited and the necessary culture change has just begun. The focus in subsequent years will be developing clarity about how specific courses are aligned with competency development, expanding co-curricular offerings to correspond closely with competencies that students want to develop, and instituting a fee structure to support the program’s delivery.
**Right size the BS Business Administration program:** The School’s undergraduate program continues to grow out of proportion to our resource base. Given the current faculty size, and our current mix of digital and “live” section capacity, we are proposing a 40 percent reduction in admissions to the BS Business Administration program (upper division courses).

**Strengthen Senior Faculty base:** It is important that the School has a core of senior scholars as the foundation of our research program. We will continue to add senior faculty drawing on the matching funds provided by the Provost and replenish several senior faculty due to anticipated retirements. Senior faculty replaced due to retirements will not necessarily be in the same areas as the retiring faculty.

**Maintain enhanced level of faculty research support:** The School has been able to increase annual faculty research support by $100,000 the last three years. We are committed to maintaining that increased level of support going forward. This will require that we identify new resources as the original funding from the Provost has expired.

**Successfully implement revised MBA core and review MBA options:** The School is in the final planning stages for a proposal that will significantly revise the MBA core curriculum. The proposal anticipates a start date of fall 2012. The next priority will be to review and revise, as appropriate, the options in the MBA program.

**Narrow market gap for PhD Stipends:** The current level of the School’s PhD stipend remains well the average of the Aspirant schools. The market average is close to $21,000. The goal is to increase our PhD stipends by $3000 over the course of several years.

**Resource Strategy**

Our Academic Strategy describes how we will achieve our vision for the School. A successful Academic Strategy, and in particular the ability to achieve stretch targets in this strategy, is in large part contingent on the success of our Resource Strategy. The Resource Strategy will identify the key resource categories (e.g. enrollment driven funding, revenue generating credit bearing programs like the PMBA and EMBA programs, capital campaigns, tuition increases, non-credit executive education, etc.), the potential incremental resources anticipated from each source and any new initiatives proposed to generate those resources. The sum of the incremental resources should match resource requirements of new initiatives for the Academic strategy. The School’s resource strategy is described in more detail in Section 4 of this report.
Overview

As described in Section II-A our strategic framework has two elements. The academic strategy articulates how we will achieve our vision of being internationally recognized for the impact of our scholarship and management education. Achieving that vision is in large part a function of the financial resources available to support our academic strategy. Our resource strategy emphasizes the magnitude and source of incremental funds that can be devoted to those efforts. In short, the academic strategy and our resource strategy are two sides of the same coin.

The school’s resource strategy has two distinct, yet related dimensions. The first is based on the integration of the school with the University budget and planning process. This process determines our core resource allocation from the University and provides an opportunity to negotiate incremental resources in support of our own strategic goals. In principle, this integration is formalized through a three-year “compact” between the School and the University. In practice, the rapidly deteriorating budget environment in NY State and the complexity of issues like uncontrolled undergraduate growth in the School, require a continuing dialogue and a more fluid expectation of both our resources and our strategic obligations to the University.

The second dimension of our resource strategy focuses on the School’s own effort to generate incremental resources. These resource initiatives, as well as their timing and magnitude, are described below. Taken together, the two dimensions of our resource strategy are linked directly to the strategic initiatives driving our academic strategy. As background, Appendix II-B.1 provides a statement of the FY 2010 sources of funds for the School.

Part I: UB2020, the University “Compact” and the state budget crisis

UB2020: Prior to the 2005 review, the University initiated a comprehensive academic planning process known as UB 2020 http://www.buffalo.edu/ub2020/overview/ that identified a number of strategic, interdisciplinary programs with strong potential for enhancing the overall academic reputation of the institution. The UB 2020 planning process culminated in a comprehensive University plan intended to guide the realignment of resources, strategic investment targets, the development of new partnerships, and recruitment of new faculty of the highest caliber. While existing resources were marginally reallocated in support of UB 2020, the cornerstone involving significant expansion of University enrollment, faculty size and campus infrastructure required legislative and gubernatorial approval in Albany. The legislation required to move forward with UB2020 was not approved in the 2010 legislative session, and therefore the timeframe for the strategy is being reconsidered at the University level. The School’s stretch goals for the resource strategy described in the 2005 review were largely contingent on full funding of the UB2020 initiative.

University Compacts: In 2006 the University initiated a system of “compacts” with decanal and administrative units. The initial Compacts were based on strategic plans developed by each unit and extensive conversation with the Provost’s office regarding the resource requirements of those plans. The key resource issues were the three-year enrollment targets the School, and the core budget allocation provided by the University. The compact does not have a formulaic link between enrollment and budget. Significant deviations from enrollment targets are to be the subject of subsequent discussions during
the life of the compact. Likewise, changes in the University’s budget environment, particularly a deteriorating environment, can (and have) result in midterm reduction in the budget allocations described in the Compact. While the Compact framework holds a good deal of promise, in practice it has had limited planning value given two trends. First, the initial compact codified an undergraduate enrollment increase from prior years that was inconsistent with our underlying resource base. This imbalance has worsened since the 2005 review. Second, the New York State economy and budget environment has deteriorated significantly in recent years, resulting in multiple budgets cuts to the School.

The role of our enrollment targets in the Compact also highlights the strategic role of different academic programs. Our academic strategy is largely focused on the full-time MBA program, and indirectly the PhD program as a key driver of faculty research. However, the School’s state operating budget is related to our total enrollment target. Therefore, the undergraduate program, the domestic professional and executive MBA, and our offshore programs are more appropriately part of our resource strategy. They either produce direct financial resources (see below), or indirectly support our academic strategy by meeting enrollment headcount targets. As part of our resource strategy our goal for these programs is to offer a high quality and competitive program, but not look to these programs to achieve the same level of distinction as the full-time MBA program.

Recurring budget cuts since 2008: Not unlike most business schools at public research universities, UB has experienced a deteriorating budget situation reflecting the larger state economy. Cuts to the University budget have been passed along in part to units. Since Dean Assad joined the School in the summer of 2008, the School has sustained permanent budget cuts of nearly 8.3 percent of the School’s State Operating budget.

Direct Support of the School’s Academic Strategy:

At the same time that the School has incurred a share of the larger University budget cuts, the Provost has provided the School with other forms of support for our academic strategy. Most significantly, in 2008 the Provost provided the new Dean with an additional $500,000 in matching funds to support the hiring of 5 new tenure track faculty. In addition, the School was allocated an additional $100,000 annually for three years to support faculty research. Finally the University has routinely supported efforts to increase the in-state and out-of-state tuition for our full time MBA program. At annual rates of $9,380 and $15,140 respectively, both rates are one of the lowest among public AAU Schools. The latest efforts met with some success. In 2010 non-resident tuition increased by $265 per semester for PhD and MS students, and $690 for MBA students. Resident MBA tuition increased by $385. The School is eligible to receive up to 50 percent of that increase ($230K) based on a satisfactory proposal to the Provost’s office.

The most significant current resource discussions with the University will focus on the School’s share of any future University wide budget cuts and the need to materially reduce the undergraduate enrollment/resource imbalance. Since any solution to the enrollment imbalance that focused solely resource enhancements would cost several million dollars, these conversations are focusing on enrollment reductions. The undergraduate program consists of (admitted) upper division students, and an equal number of lower division students taking the prerequisites for admission. The focus of the enrollment management conversation is an enrollment reduction in the upper division classes through a more selective admissions process. Based on the existing faculty size and mix, retention of all the existing digital courses, and an average class size of 45 in the non-digital courses, upper division enrollment exceeds our resource capacity by 700 students.
Part II: Incremental Resources Generated by the School

Based on BSQ data from ’08-’09 the median operating budget per degree was approximately $34,000 for business schools at AAU public universities. It was just under $19,000 at UB. Given that we routinely graduate more than 1000 students (more than 1300 in 2010), each $1000 gap in that budget/degree represents more than $1 million. In short, our annual resource gap relative to the typical AAU business school is in the range of $12-$15 million; a gap that has not changed since the 2005 review.

The faculty and staff take great pride in both the scholarly and programmatic successes of the School, considering our competitive resource gap. Nevertheless, our aspirations are to be known for more than just being able to do more with less. The resource base provided by the University is not sufficient to support the initiatives required to compete with business schools at other AAU public universities, nor do we expect it to be. The School’s current resource base includes significant resources generated beyond the state operating budget provided by the University. Narrowing the competitive gap with other public AAU schools will require increased contributions from both the School and the University.

The School generates additional resources through a range of different strategies. The most significant sources of incremental resources are generated as follows:

**Student fees:** In 2009, the School introduced a student fee to support our Career Resource Center. The SUNY budget model, and as a result the School’s State Operating budget, does not contemplate the significance of a high quality career resources function as part of well-regarded business school. The School could no longer support that function as part of our base budget. The student fee, assessed to all SOM students, covers the cost of the career resources function and provides for increased support for our large undergraduate enrollment. The fee in 2010-2011 is $217 per semester, and will generate $1.3 million annually.

**Domestic Executive and Professional MBA:** Both the part-time (evening) Professional MBA and the full-time Executive MBA programs are described in more detail elsewhere. Both are essential elements of the School’s resource strategy. Together they generated more than $1 mm in net incremental resources in 2009-10 and that contribution is expected to approach $1.3 mm in 2010-11 as enrollments increase. Both programs are priced based on a careful assessment of the Western NY market. The PMBA program is very popular, though growth is limited by class size constraints. Core classes typically enroll 70 students. At this point, plausible growth potential would not generate enough revenue to cover the additional sections required. The EMBA class has a growth potential of about 10 and we continue to work toward that goal. The 2010 class is 31, which is somewhat higher than the average of 25 of recent intakes.

**Off-Shore Degree Programs:** The School runs three off-shore degree programs that provide varying levels of incremental resources.

- **Singapore Executive MBA:** The Singapore EMBA program has generated modest resources over its 15-year history. In 2009, the School and its Singapore partner agreed to significantly restructure and refocus the local program management. Tuition was increased to levels similar to those charged by other US programs of comparable quality. More importantly we hired a program director that made immediate improvements in the marketing and recruiting efforts. Going forward we anticipate that the program should generate $200-$300K annually for the School.
• **Singapore Undergraduate program:** The School offers an undergraduate business degree in Singapore as part of a larger University presence. The terms of this larger relationship are outside the control of the School, and we serve more as a vendor in this relationship. Courses are taught largely on an overload basis, or as part of our digital access courses. The program nets the School approximately $120,000 per year. The terms of this arrangement with our Singapore partner are under review by the University.

• **Amrita University – MS in IT Management:** The department of Management Science and Systems, offers two MS programs in a partnership with Amrita University, India. This relationship is part of a broader alliance between UB and Amrita, but benefits from an enthusiastic effort on the part of the MSS faculty. From a resource perspective, the program struggles to generate significant resources because the low tuition rates require very large student intakes. The program is three years old, and typically generates net resources of $25-$50K per year. Going forward those returns will have to exceed $100,000 if we are to continue the program.

*Development:* The School’s endowment is very modest. Before the market decline it fluctuating between $13-$14mm, but has fallen to $10-$11mm. Our endowment income was $367K for 2009-10. In 2007, the School received a $1mm endowment for the H. William Lichtenberger Chair in Global Services and Supply Management (GSSM). In the same year the Dean’s Advisory Council raised approximately $200K in honor of former Dean John Thomas. The gift was used to build a state of the art technology lab to support the GSSM option. The School was also able to name a number of our student rooms with naming gifts in the $25K-$75K range. Annual giving to the School produced another $335K, a number that has been relatively stable in recent years.

**Linking Financial Resources to Strategic Action Items**

This section begins with a brief status update on strategic action items described in our 2005 review. We then identify new resource initiatives and extensions of current initiatives for the period 2010-2011 through 2012-2013, together with the magnitude of resources anticipated from each of those initiatives.
## Financial Resources for Strategic Action Items

*Update on Strategic Action Items and Resource Initiatives from 2005 Review*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>First Year Cost</th>
<th>Est. Annual Cost</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Travel for Full-time MBA Recruiting</td>
<td>Completed. Discontinued as investment did not appear to yield more students.</td>
<td>25K</td>
<td>25K</td>
<td>Internal resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Number of Supported PhD lines</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>25K</td>
<td>25K</td>
<td>Executive education revenue and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Department: Operations Management &amp; Strategy*</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>15K</td>
<td>10K</td>
<td>Internal resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levin Institute Program In International. Banking and Finance</td>
<td>Completed, but no longer viable given budget problems at Levin.</td>
<td>15K</td>
<td>15K</td>
<td>HSBC endowment and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA Fellowships</td>
<td>Funded at $50K</td>
<td>125K</td>
<td>175K</td>
<td>Executive education revenue and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Faculty Release Time for Research**</td>
<td>Release time typically through 3 years</td>
<td>110K</td>
<td>115K</td>
<td>Executive education revenue and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Stipends of Supported PhD students</td>
<td>Planned for $3000 increase but implemented at $1000 for fall 2010</td>
<td>26K</td>
<td>52K</td>
<td>Executive education revenue and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Access Classroom***</td>
<td>Completed plus Jacobs 214 addition</td>
<td>300K (Rehab)</td>
<td>50K</td>
<td>Development and matching support from University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Leadership Development Program</td>
<td>Completed, but subsequently abandoned with budget cuts.</td>
<td>60K</td>
<td>60K</td>
<td>Executive education revenue and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Entrepreneurship Program: New Faculty Line</td>
<td>Not pursued</td>
<td>150 K</td>
<td>150K</td>
<td>Executive education revenue and possible matching support from Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Senior Accounting Faculty Position</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>200K</td>
<td>200K</td>
<td>Internal resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy : New Faculty Line</td>
<td>Two offers, but no hires.</td>
<td>150K</td>
<td>150K</td>
<td>Executive education revenue and possible matching support from Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Education and Research: New Faculty Line</td>
<td>Completed with senior hire</td>
<td>150K</td>
<td>150K</td>
<td>Executive education revenue and possible matching support from Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Assurance: New Faculty Line</td>
<td>Not pursued</td>
<td>150K</td>
<td>150K</td>
<td>Executive education revenue and possible matching support from Provost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposed New Revenue Sources from 2005 Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>First Year Revenue</th>
<th>Estimated Continuing Annual Revenue</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PMBA Tuition Increase</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>60K</td>
<td>180K</td>
<td>Tuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMBA Enrollment Increase</td>
<td>Year to year variation, but generally completed</td>
<td>75K</td>
<td>125K</td>
<td>Tuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorola EMBA</td>
<td>Program Discontinued</td>
<td>80K</td>
<td>160K</td>
<td>Tuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development – Annual Appeal</td>
<td>in progress</td>
<td>40K</td>
<td>70K</td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development – Endowment and Other</td>
<td>in progress</td>
<td>~1.5M</td>
<td>Annual growth target of 6-8%</td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMBA in New York City</td>
<td>Project Abandoned</td>
<td>120K</td>
<td>240K</td>
<td>Tuition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Administrative costs for establishing new department.
** Program to support a course off for junior faculty for each year of the six year tenure period.
*** Digital Access is an internet based course delivery system currently adopted by several undergraduate classes. It will also play a major role in the system for measuring learning goals in the full time MBA program.

### Strategic Action Items and Resource Support: 2010-2013

#### Strategic Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>First Year Cost</th>
<th>Estimated Continuing Annual Cost</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LeaderCORE™</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>$50K</td>
<td>$75-$100K</td>
<td>Fee and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Size BS in Business Adm. Enrollment</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>$70K</td>
<td>$140K</td>
<td>Loss of fee revenue from reduction of 350 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Stipends of Supported PhD students by $3000</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>$26K</td>
<td>$75K</td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen Senior Faculty Base</td>
<td>Fall 2011-13</td>
<td>$250K</td>
<td>$750K</td>
<td>$200K Provost funds $350K Retirements $200 University sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain enhanced faculty research support</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>$100K</td>
<td>$100K</td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement revised MBA program</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>No significant cost</td>
<td>No significant cost</td>
<td>No significant cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### New Revenue Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>First Year Revenue</th>
<th>Estimated Continuing Annual Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMBA &amp; PMBA Tuition Increase</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>$40K</td>
<td>$90K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Fees (CRC) Increase</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>-$60K with lower UG enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development (spendable)</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>$800K</td>
<td>$800K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time MBA Tuition Increase</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>$250K</td>
<td>$250K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore EMBA Tuition and Enrollment Increase</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>$150K</td>
<td>$150K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section II-C
NEW DEGREE PROGRAMS

Master of Science in Management of Information Technology Services (MITS)

Since the last accreditation review in 2005, the School of Management has added just one new degree program to its portfolio of offerings. In 2007 the school established a Master of Science (M.S.) degree program in Management of IT Services (MITS) in cooperation with Amrita University (who will soon be initiating AACSB and EQUIS accreditation processes). The program is offered exclusively at Amrita’s Bangalore, India campus. It is a one-year, 31-credit-hour program for executives currently employed in the Indian IT services (ITS) industry. All students pursuing this M.S. program are also concurrently enrolled in either an MBA or EMBA program offered by Amrita.

The principal motivations for establishing the program were twofold: the growing size and importance of the ITS industry worldwide and the current lack of appropriate management education programs that precisely met the needs of a large and expanding ITS workforce in India. When the program was launched, the ITS industry in India accounted for nearly 50% of worldwide spending on such services. In addition, there had been a significant shift of focus in ITS from traditional services such as customer relations, transcriptions and data processing services to more knowledge intensive services such as IP research, financial analytics, equity research, risk analysis, vendor sourcing, and engineering design.

Young professionals who aspire to advance their careers in the fast-growing field of IT Services can achieve the required education through this program as it will develop their knowledge and expertise to manage business processes, technologies and other functional requirements in complex ITS organizations. They will also develop sound perspectives on leadership and refine their teamwork skills so that they can grow into executive positions and become effective leaders in the ITS industry. There are few fields in which the need for trained personnel is more pressing, so the employment market in India, and ultimately globally, is also well served by this offering.

The M.S. in ITS curriculum spans the following broad areas: (a) understanding different business strategies in the ITS industry and applying them in context, (b) learning the capabilities of information technologies and leveraging them in attaining ITS business objectives, (c) learning to manage ITS projects and teamwork, (d) understanding ITS markets, their behaviors and economics, and (e) learning how to negotiate and communicate with business partners and clients. Alongside these knowledge areas, as noted above, the program also emphasizes the soft skills necessary for success in this industry.

Synergies between our research and educational missions are also created through the M.S. in MITS. The faculty in our Department of Management Science and Systems has developed streams of research in Behavioral Information Science, Design-Oriented Information Science, Information Assurance and Globally Distributed Work. All these streams have direct linkages to the ITS industry. Therefore, the M.S. in MITS program, besides its educational goals, will also lead to research opportunities for our faculty in these streams. The research capabilities of the faculty will be leveraged to develop and deliver a first-rate Master's program, and the M.S. in MITS program will be leveraged to generate cutting-edge research opportunities in ITS.
Instruction is delivered through a combination of University at Buffalo full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty and selected Amrita University faculty. The school’s Department of Management Science and Systems must approve all Amrita faculty appointments. Applicants to the MITS program must satisfy all requirements for admission to the University at Buffalo main campus. The University at Buffalo is responsible for all academic matters including, but not limited to, evaluation of student credentials and admission to the program, selection of faculty, provision of curricula, grading and transcripts, and conferral of degrees. As a partner institution, Amrita University is primarily responsible for marketing the program, working with partner corporations such as Hewlett Packard to recruit students, identifying prospective Amrita faculty who are suitably qualified to teach in the program, providing the physical facilities for the program, and providing infrastructural and logistical support in India (e.g., securing lodging for UB faculty, making sure that books are available to the students on a timely basis, etc.).

All classroom, library, and laboratory facilities required for course delivery are provided by Amrita University. Appropriately qualified UB faculty members inspected these facilities prior to the start of the program and do so regularly during the delivery of the program. Due to the nature of this program, technology-enabled classrooms are essential; Amrita has been able to provide appropriate space for this level of instruction. Students in the program can also access all University at Buffalo electronic library files as they are assigned UB IT names upon initial enrollment.

In collaboration with Amrita University in India, the UB School of Management launched a new program in 2007, the MS in Management of Information Technology Services (MITS). Between 2008 and 2010, four learning goals were established for the program (see Appendix II-C). Since the entire program is delivered in India, we were mindful that coordination of data collection needed to be strategic and decided that courses taught by UB-affiliated faculty members would be where learning outcomes data were collected.

Appendix II-C provides a graphic overview of where (i.e. in which course) each of the four program goals for the MS in MITS is currently being assessed. This appendix also provides a snapshot of students’ performance on the learning goals (as of fall 2010), and presents data from two courses (MGS567 and MGS560) that were used to generate the performance snapshot.
Section II-D
INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

The Value

Briefly describe the value of the school’s intellectual contributions and how the “substantial cross-section of faculty in each discipline” is achieved.

The School’s Vision is to be internationally recognized for the impact of our scholarship and management programs. The impact of our scholarship is largely measured through the quality of our intellectual contributions. 80 percent of the tenure track faculty published at least one article in a referred journal during the last two years. More broadly 87 percent of the tenure track faculty had 5 or more publications or peer reviewed conference presentations since 2006. Tables 2-1 and 2-2 are included in the Appendix II-D.1 and II.D.2.

This pattern holds across disciplines illustrating that a substantial cross-section of are making intellectual contributions, measured both in terms of refereed journal articles and the broader category of publications. Likewise the faculty serves on the editorial boards of 25 journals, and as Editor or Associate Editor on 12 journals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>2009-2010¹</th>
<th>2006-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Tenure Track faculty with at least one peer reviewed journal article over most recent 2 year period</td>
<td>Percent of Tenure Track faculty with at least 5 ICs (articles, books, chapters, presentations) over 5 year period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting &amp; Law</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Managerial Economics</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt. Science and Systems</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Human Resources</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Mgt. and Strategy</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supporting Infrastructure

Briefly describe the infrastructure supporting faculty intellectual contribution development.

¹ These data are based on accompanying AQ/PQ data provided by faculty in support of Table 2-1.
The School has in place a broad infrastructure to support faculty research including the following:

**Individual budget accounts.** Nearly two decades ago, the School made a decision to consolidate the funds it had maintained for previously dedicated forms of faculty support (such as travel to conferences) and allocate the pool to faculty, giving them broad discretion in managing their accounts. These allocations are known locally as IBAs. They are intended to cover the routine expenses incurred by faculty in their professional work (primarily research), including travel, postage and shipping, photocopying, supplies, long-distance telephone charges, and the like. The accounts may also be used to pay for association dues, books, subscriptions, data, and indeed any expense associated with the job. Money may also be transferred between individual accounts and departmental accounts or from one IBA to another. The allocations vary (for tenure-track faculty) from about $3,500 per year to about $6,000 per year, depending at least in part on individual performance. Faculty IBAs may be supplemented by allocations from departments, which receive their own IBAs.

The IBAs are intended to afford faculty with maximum flexibility in determining how the School’s resources can best support their research and teaching activities. We have therefore tried to minimize categorical restrictions on the allocation of faculty-support funds, although we have made a few exceptions. These include summer research grants and supplements for IT purchases (noted below), and a policy to underwrite journal submission fees separately.

**Chairs.** The School has five endowed professorships, three of which are currently held by Professors Kee Chung (Finance), Isaac Ehrlich (Economics), and Chunchi Wu (Finance). We have an active search under way to fill one vacant endowed chair. The fifth endowed professorship is vacant, and unavailable, as the endowment is “underwater”.

**Sabbaticals.** The Policies of the Board of Trustees provide for sabbatical leave eligibility after a faculty member has received tenure and served on the faculty for at least six years after hire or after the last sabbatical leave. Sabbaticals may be at full pay for one semester or half-pay for one year. Faculty apply for sabbaticals to the Dean though their department chairs, setting forth their plans for the leave and explaining how the “deliverables” will benefit the School.

**Release from teaching.** In addition to sabbaticals, tenured and tenure-track faculty may otherwise be supported in their research through release from some teaching obligations. New hires are routinely relieved of one teaching assignment per year for up to three years, and where possible the three courses taught in a year may be concentrated in a single semester in order to provide one semester fully free of teaching requirements. Moreover, the School has a policy of limiting the number of preparations for junior faculty. Endowed chair holders are also relieved of one teaching assignment per year as long as they hold the chair. Other release may be granted (albeit rarely) on an ad hoc basis upon petition by the faculty member or the department chair.

The normal teaching load for non-tenure-track faculty is 12 hours per semester, although new hires have recently been relieved of one course during their first semester. In addition, NTT faculty may be relieved of some teaching assignments to support writing and publishing activities that represent contributions to learning and pedagogical scholarship or are aimed at practitioners.
**Summer support.** Newly hired faculty members are typically offered summer grants to help them advance their research programs. The grant is usually in the amount of two-ninths of the member’s base salary for two summers, although it can be used for either a summer stipend or research expenses. Faculty also have opportunities for summer teaching at up to $8,000 for a six-week course.

**SOM Research Committee.** The School also allocates a sum each year to support summer research by faculty not otherwise supported. In summer 2010 that sum was $103,000 that funded 19 grants. The Faculty Research Committee awards grants up to $10,000 per applicant competitively. Proposals are required to specify the top tier journal or funding agency targeted. Preference is given to assistant professors. Recipients are required to submit reports to the Research Committee after the summer about the outcomes of their projects and in any subsequent proposals to describe the outcome of previous support. An overview of the School’s research support is included in Appendix II-D.3.

The Faculty Research Committee also allocates a separate pool of $18,700 for small grants. These may be used to travel to another university to meet with research collaborators or to invite those collaborators, or other senior colleagues to Buffalo. Proposals are required to specify the top tier journal or funding agency targeted. Recipients are required to submit reports about the outcome of the funding to the Research Committee.

In addition to the grants programs, the Research Committee recommends and reviews yearly the funding of databases that are used by multiple departments in the School. The Core Databases fully funded at the School wide level (Expenditure of $92,370 of which the UB library funds $12,000) include the Wharton Research Data Services that provides CRSP, COMPSTAT and other databases. Through cost sharing between the Dean and Department Chairs, a set of 6 databases (Total expenditure of $22,377) are also available to all faculty.

Finally, the quality and quantity of faculty research performance is also recognized in a public way by the posting on the School’s research website every faculty member’s journal articles, books and membership on editorial review boards each year going back five years.

**Graduate assistants.** The School provides both teaching and research assistants to faculty. Teaching assistants are generally limited to faculty teaching large undergraduate lecture courses and core courses in the MBA Program. Teachers of large undergraduate courses are assigned assistants, who typically deliver recitation or lab sections and do much of the grading, in proportion to the size of the class and the pedagogy. Teachers in the MBA core receive one full-time teaching assistant in the semester during which they teach their course.

Most research assistants are Ph.D. students. The School fully funds 26 such assistantships, or approximately one for every two tenure-track faculty members. Assistants are assigned to departments and allocated to individual faculty by department chairs. There may be occasions when the allocation to a department is short because of a paucity of Ph.D. students, and in those instances supplemental funds to appoint MBA students as research assistants have been made available.
Information technology. The School provides a line of credit to new hires to purchase a new computer and peripherals. Replacement of or enhancements to the equipment (or additional computers) may be purchased through the faculty member’s IBA. In addition, each year the School allocates a sum of money ($15,000 for 2009-2010) for matching grants to faculty making hardware purchases. The School pays 40 percent of the cost of new equipment, up to $1000 per year. This is not, however, an open-ended offer. It only lasts until all of the funds are expended. The matching fund normally ends the year with a surplus.

The School allocates approximately $80,000 for the purchase and updating of financial and other databases used for both research and teaching. This expenditure is in addition to software purchases made by individual faculty and departments from their IBAs or through summer research grants.

The School maintains a five-person staff of IT specialists to assist faculty with the purchase and maintenance of their technology. The staff installs equipment, troubleshoots problems, maintains the School’s network and web sites, and helps faculty with their individual web sites.
Section III-A
PARTICIPANTS - STUDENTS

The period since the school’s last review has been marked by noteworthy enrollment changes. These changes have impacted nearly all our degree programs.

Enrollment Changes

- **B.S. in Business Administration (Buffalo):** Undergraduate enrollment has grown considerably, particularly at the upper division. In fall 2004, the school enrolled 988 upper-division undergraduates. This number had grown to 1,381 by fall 2009. Much of this increase is attributable to growth in internal transfers from a variety of majors including engineering, pharmacy, and those in the College of Arts and Sciences, as well as external transfers from other universities. University leadership has been engaged in ongoing dialogue about strategies to manage undergraduate enrollment, which resulted in no growth for fall 2010 and is expected to lead to reduction in enrollment in subsequent years.

- **B.S. in Business Administration (Singapore):** The B.S. Business Administration program in Singapore presently enrolls about 200 students; this program was in its nascent stages at the time of the last review. The university’s relationship with the Singapore Institute of Management (SIM) has been very productive, creating excellent opportunities for both SIM students to study in Buffalo and for UB students to study abroad in Singapore.

- **Full time MBA program:** In order to strategically address external perceptions of the full-time MBA program, the school reduced the size of the incoming cohort to 100 from 150 beginning in fall 2007. The goal was to enroll a more qualified class that would also have better success on the placement dimensions, both the percent employed three months after graduation and starting salary. Average GMAT scores increased from 595 to 619 in the first year of implementation and have since averaged about 625. The economy had entered a severe recession when this smaller class graduated, so the impact on placement has been negligible.

- **B.S. in Accounting:** Beginning in fall 2010, the school implemented a strategy to reduce the number and improve the quality of B.S. Accounting students. The Department of Accounting & Law confronted a mismatch between enrollment demands and faculty resources. The Department enjoys strong student demand for its undergraduate program, but also needed to manage the prospect of a significant increase in enrollment in its MS in Accounting program, as New York became one of the last states in August 2009 in the U.S. to implement a five-year educational requirement for CPA exam qualification. In order to continue to offer a CPA-qualifying curriculum, we needed to have the capacity to offer the MS in Accounting to qualified graduates of our undergraduate accounting program. Given limited faculty resources, expanded MS offerings required a reduction in our undergraduate enrollment. In addition, the MBA course offerings were scaled back by replacing the old CPA-qualifying professional accounting option with the new corporate reporting and control option.

- **M.S. Programs (Buffalo):** The school’s Master of Science programs have also experienced meaningful enrollment growth over the past few years. These programs, which were generally serving a small group of students at the margin, are now part of the school’s core strategy as enrollment reduction in the full-time MBA has been off-set by increased enrollment across the MS programs. Of particular note, in addition to the
MS in Accounting program referenced above, are the MS in MIS and MS in Finance programs. In fall 2005, these programs enrolled 11 and 12 students respectively. By fall 2010, they had quadrupled or more in size, with MS in MIS enrolling 42 students and MS in Finance enrolling 54. These students need to be supported with academic and career advisement, so we have adjusted resources accordingly to ensure that they are properly served.

- **M.S. Program (International):** The MS in MITS program in Bangalore, India enrolled its inaugural class in 2008 and the contract for the EMBA program in China in collaboration with Motorola has not been renegotiated and therefore is presently defunct. Therefore, while externally funded master's enrollment outside the country is essentially equal, it has shifted from China to India.

### Support Services

Student support services have also evolved significantly during the period since the school’s last AACSB review. The advisement staff in the undergraduate programs office has designed services that meet the needs of an exploding population. They now offer a series of small group advisement sessions. These sessions answer the questions, “What do I need to take next semester?” and “Is what I have planned appropriate?” These group sessions provide students with a brief review of basic requirements and a personalized semester recommendation prepared by an academic advisor. Advisors address individual questions during and at the end of the session, but the group format has created economies of scale. Members of the academic advisement staff at both the undergraduate and graduate levels have also dramatically enhanced the content that they provide students on the Web in order to allow for self-service as often as possible.

Career services offered to School of Management students have been transformed, particularly for undergraduate and MS students, over the past two years. In spring 2009, the school introduced a new, and within SUNY unique, student fee to generate revenue to fund the operations of the Career Resource Center (CRC) in the face of the unprecedented State financial crisis. The fee enabled the school to sustain strategic investment in the CRC and to allow the school to enhance its service to students in three key areas: job search and career development support; student outreach and advisement; and external outreach and opportunity development. Due to the ongoing recession, the job market for new graduates has obviously been very tight, meaning that the services provided by the Career Resource Center have been more important than ever. As an example of a new service, the CRC now offers the Coffee Cup Conversations series. This is an interactive weekly program targeted at undergraduate students that features guest speakers from a variety of professional backgrounds who will share their expertise on a range of topics, including exploring management career paths, tips and strategies for success in the workplace, and how to find the right fit and land the ideal internship or job.

The growth of enrollment in the MS programs necessitated a shift in academic advisement resources. The school now has a professional staff advisor who dedicates approximately 60% of her time to MS advisement and 30% of her time managing applications and program details for the Singapore EMBA and Amrita MS programs. A member of the graduate program staff has also been partially reassigned to support our PhD students. This assignment allows us to offer a customized orientation for PhD students, providing a more welcoming environment, and also creates the capacity to assist students with making choices that keep them on track for timely graduation.
Section III-B
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT

Policies for faculty management, including non-tenure track faculty:
Processes for recruitment, retention, and development for all faculty

I. Recruiting Procedures and Strategies

In 2007 the School developed a strategic staffing plan. The plan established a target tenure track faculty size for each discipline based both on external benchmarks and the School’s current strategy. The targets essentially allocate TT faculty lines assuming a full time (TT and non-TT) faculty size of 66. Faculty lines (not departments) have been divided into three groups. Strategic areas are those lines that directly support our strategic focus in finance, GSSM and information assurance. Core areas are those lines that, while not strategically prominent, require a tenure-track presence for the delivery of our overall strategy. Finally the Support area includes those TT lines that do not necessarily require a tenure-track presence to deliver our strategy. The targets in Finance, MIS and Operations are slightly higher than their external benchmarks reflecting their strategic prominence.

In a normal budget environment, department chairs can expect to replace any vacancies in either Strategic or Core lines, assuming they are below the target. Once a discipline reaches their target they would not be expected to conduct a search. This process replaces an annual “proposal” process with 2x searches for x available lines and hiring decisions with little relation to our strategic focus. There are no targets for the Support areas. This doesn’t imply that individual faculty in Support areas are not productive or making valuable contributions to the School. It does mean that if a faculty member in a Support area were to leave or retire, we wouldn’t necessarily replace that individual with a TT appointment in the same area. This provides an opportunity for reallocation consistent with our current, rather than a prior, strategy.

The current emphasis is on significant hires at the senior level. The School successfully filled the vacant Manufacturers and Traders Trust Company Professor of Banking and Finance chair with the appointment of Professor Chunchi Wu in September 2010. In 2009-2010 we reassigned the vacant Carmichael Chair to support a senior search in the Strategy area. In addition, the School has authorized two additional hires in Accounting, at the rank of Associate Professor and Professor. Given the market for talented senior scholars we anticipate that both of these latter efforts will take several years to complete.

The Dean’s Office will formally approve searches, and ultimately a hiring decision, based on available resources. In response to recent state budget cuts, Provostal approval is now also required for both faculty searches and hires. The School has never been denied a request for either. During the current year (2010-2011), tenure track searches have been approved for positions in Organization and Human Resources (replacement), Strategy (new hire), Accounting (2 replacements, one new hire).

After the department identifies the candidates it considers the most promising, the Chair discusses them with the Dean and/or Associate Dean. The Dean and/or Associate Dean meet with all visiting candidates. When the visits are completed, the department generates an ordered list of candidates to whom it wishes to make offers, and the terms of the offer are discussed by the Chair and the Dean. Market salaries are estimated by reference to AACSB data and any other available sources. Offers must be approved by the Provost.
In January 2007, the university implemented a comprehensive online recruitment system, UB Jobs, which is designed to make the recruitment process more efficient and accessible for both job seekers and hiring managers. UB Jobs completely replaced our former paper-based recruitment system and has greatly improved the management of the high volume of applications received annually, providing a much better recruitment and application experience for both those hiring and applying for positions. The system allows applicants to view and apply for job postings, including providing detailed attachments, using integrated online features. From a recruitment perspective, UB Jobs allows the hiring unit to better triage applicants as all the information is readily available and accessible via the Web. The university manages the distribution of postings to many outlets and reviews our plans to be sure that we have met Department of Labor and Affirmative Action guidelines. This systematic approach to the recruitment process has allowed us to significantly reduce the time between tentative verbal offers and formal written offers that require university approval.

II. Performance Review Processes

School of Management faculty receive performance reviews in various forms and for various purposes relating to personnel actions, rewards and development. While this section highlights those processes, a more detailed description is provided in Appendix III-B.1 (School bylaws). Some of these reviews cover both tenure-track and non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty, while others are limited to tenure-track faculty.

A) Annual reviews. All full-time faculty are formally reviewed at the end of each academic year. The process starts with a comprehensive report from the faculty member on his or her activities and accomplishments over the past year. The raw data are entered into a University web-based system. The School’s database includes unique SOM measures, such as background on the AQ/PQ status, and faculty generate a final report for their annual review. The report also includes an explicit section on the faculty member’s professional goals for the upcoming year. The form used for reporting this information is included in Appendix III-B.2, which periodically undergoes revision as institutional priorities change. The report is submitted to the Department Chair, who reviews it and prepares a summary and evaluation of the member’s performance, and then schedules a conference with the faculty member. Following that conference, the Chair may revise the evaluation. On rare occasions, the member may append a response or clarification to the evaluation. It is then forwarded to the Dean’s Office, reviewed by the Dean or Senior Associate Dean, and kept on file. This report also includes an annual evaluation of a faculty member’s AQ/PQ status based on a rolling five year window.

B) Discretionary salary increases. Faculty performance is also reviewed in conjunction with discretionary salary increases (described more fully below). Discretionary increases are awarded in most years, depending on the outcome of union negotiations. The department chairs review the recent performance of all faculty in their departments (especially performance over the past year) and recommend to the Dean which of their faculty should receive increases. The recommendations for salary increases are usually made in conjunction with the annual reviews described above.

C) Reappointment reviews. All full-time non-tenured faculty, whether or not on the tenure track, have term appointments not to exceed three years. A typical sequence for tenure-track faculty is three two-year appointments followed by a one-year appointment. Under the rules of the University, such a sequence requires that reappointment reviews be carried out in the third semester (usually fall of the second year), the sixth semester (spring
of the third year), and the tenth semester (spring of the fifth year). NTT faculty generally receive either two- or three-year appointments and are considered for renewal one year before the expiration of their contracts.

Reappointment is made following a performance review by the Department Chair and departmental faculty. For tenure-track faculty, the primary consideration is progress toward tenure, and particularly progress in developing a research record. For NTT faculty, the primary criterion will likely be evidence of excellence in teaching. The Chair assembles information on the member’s research (if applicable), teaching, and service performance and makes it available to department faculty. All department faculty with at least one year of service may participate in this process. The department may or may not meet to discuss a proposed reappointment, but in any case an advisory secret-ballot vote is conducted and transmitted to the Chair. The Chair then forwards the package, together with his or her own recommendation on reappointment, to the Dean. The decision on reappointment, including the duration of the new appointment, is made by the Dean. In the case of tenure-track reappointments, this decision is informed by a written recommendation from the Senior Associate Dean.

D) Fourth-year review. Non-tenured, tenure-track faculty receive a special review in the eighth semester after appointment. The purposes of this review are (1) to acquaint the tenured faculty of the School with the performance record of a colleague who will likely be considered for tenure two years hence, and (2) to provide the faculty member with an early assessment of progress from the group that will be making a recommendation to the Dean on the member’s tenure. A dossier is assembled by the Department Chair, usually including a vita, personal statements on teaching and research, samples of research, and course/teacher evaluations, but no inside or outside letters. The dossier is reviewed by the School’s Personnel Action Committee, which consists of five tenured faculty, at least three of whom must be full professors. The Committee prepares an assessment of the member’s record and transmits the dossier to the Dean. The record is reviewed by the tenured faculty of the School, which then formally meets to discuss the member’s progress and prospects for tenure. The sense of the faculty as reflected in the discussion is then summarized in a letter to the faculty member from the Senior Associate Dean, which may include suggestions for future focus or change in priorities.

E) Tenure and promotion review (including NTTs). The prescribed timetable for tenure-track faculty hired as assistant professors calls for a promotion and tenure review during the sixth year. (Faculty hired as associate professors without tenure should be reviewed in the second year.) The Department Chair, in consultation with senior faculty in the department and the faculty member being reviewed, assembles a comprehensive dossier on the member’s teaching, research, and service. The dossier includes a vita; personal statements from the candidate; publications and working papers; and evidence on the candidate’s teaching performance (including a “teaching portfolio”). The Department Chair also solicits letters of evaluation from outside referees (mainly on research) and inside referees (mainly on teaching, and service). There must be at least four outside letters from accomplished scholars in the candidate’s field who are full professors at major public universities (preferably members of the AAU), and at least two inside letters from the candidate’s colleagues.
When the dossier is complete, the Department Chair obtains advice from the tenured departmental faculty and then forwards the dossier to the Dean with his or her recommendation on whether the promotion and/or tenure should be approved. The case is referred to the School’s Personnel Action Committee, which conducts its own analysis of the record and prepares a recommendation to the tenured faculty of the School. The tenured faculty meets, discusses the case, and then votes on whether the case should be supported. This vote is advisory to the Dean. The Dean reviews the record, decides whether to recommend favorable action, and forwards the dossier to the University Provost.

Before reaching the Provost, the case is reviewed by a body called the President’s Review Board (PRB), a group of nine full professors drawn from across the University. After the case is docketed, the PRB assigns one of its members to present the case to the body as a whole, and following a discussion they then vote on whether the Provost should be advised to support the case. If the PRB votes to deny an action that has been supported by the School, there is a meeting among the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, the Chair of the PRB, the Dean, the Department Chair, and an advocate (if the candidate has chosen to appoint one) to attempt to clarify why the case was viewed differently by the School and the PRB. The Vice Provost reports the results of this meeting to the Provost, who conducts his or her own review of the record and makes a recommendation to the President of the University. The final decision rests with the President, although it is very rare for the President to reject the recommendation of the Provost.

In September 2004, the President and the Provost issued a joint statement on the “guiding principles” for promotion and tenure at UB. Some of the applicable comments were these:

- Research and scholarship or creative activity in appropriate disciplines will be the primary basis for promotion and tenure decisions.
- Candidates for promotion and tenure must have a demonstrated record of effective teaching and service.
- The quality and impact of the candidate’s research, scholarship or creative activity at the time of promotion is critical – not simply the length of the curriculum vitae.
- Review of the dossier by the department chair, dean, and external evaluators must include comments about the significance and quality of the scholarship.
- For external evaluators, the greatest weight will be given to letters submitted by full professors from AAU institutions. All letters should come from nationally and internationally recognized scholars.
- Granting promotion and tenure is based on achievement and the “promise to continue to achieve.”

Promotion to full professor follows the same procedure outlined above for promotion to associate professor with tenure, except that there is no prescribed timetable for such actions, and participating faculty on the Personnel Action Committee and in the School are limited to full professors.

The School has also established a procedure for the review and promotion of non-tenure-track faculty. Thus far there have been several promotions of such faculty to associate professor, but none to full professor. Teaching excellence by NTT faculty is a
necessary but not sufficient qualification for promotion. In addition, NTT faculty are expected to be engaged in significant service activities in the department, School, or profession. Service contributions must go beyond effective committee work, although that is a basic expectation where the candidate is assigned to a departmental or School-wide committee. A candidate for promotion should also have one or more major roles in a student-related activity of the School, such as placement, internships, advisement to student organizations, continuing education, and the like. The candidate should also be active in local or national professional associations, and generally maintain strong ties to the professional community. Publication of articles on professional topics in professional journals will also be considered as part of the candidate’s service contribution, and in some areas may be expected.

The internal procedures for promotion of NTT faculty are the same as those for tenure-track faculty. The dossier consists of a vita, teaching evaluations, samples of course materials, at least two letters from colleagues on teaching, at least two outside letters on service, written work prepared for professional audiences, letters from students, any other material deemed relevant by the candidate or the Chair, and the Chair’s letter (with departmental vote). The final decision is made by the Dean.

F) Review of Chaired Professors. Four senior professors hold endowed chairs in the School. (Two are vacant.) The term of these appointments is five years. In the final year of a term, the chair holder prepares a statement outlining his or her accomplishments during the preceding term and his or her planned activity and goals for a subsequent term. This statement, along with a vita, is sent to the Dean, who determines whether the individual should be reappointed to the chair.

III. Faculty Compensation Practices

A) Initial compensation. Compensation of faculty upon hire is determined by the Dean following consultation with the Department Chair and negotiation with the candidate. The Chair may provide field-specific information to assist in ascertaining the market range for new hires. In addition, the School has access to AACSB data on current salaries, including those of new hires, at groups of schools deemed to be operating in overlapping markets with UB. The School makes every effort to be competitive with market rates, although this frequently results in serious salary compression and even inversion.

B) Salary increases. The faculty of the State University of New York is unionized, and most salary increases are obtained through collective bargaining between the State and the faculty’s bargaining agent, United University Professions (UUP). Most of the negotiated increase is applied across the board on a percentage basis, and since 1996 there have been some years in which no increases were bargained. In years when increases are bargained, it is typical for one percentage point of the salary-increase pool to be allocated on a discretionary basis. Discretionary increases are awarded by the Dean, in consultation with the Senior Associate Dean and the Associate Dean for Academic Programs, after recommendations are obtained from department chairs. The department chairs are usually limited in the number of faculty they may recommend in a given year, and are required to rank order their recommendations. The allocation is based on both job performance and internal equity considerations.
C) **Equity and market adjustments.** From time to time the Dean may determine that the salary of a high-performing individual is significantly lagging those of other faculty by a magnitude that cannot be addressed through the discretionary-increase pool. In such an instance the Dean is empowered to award an "in-grade adjustment" to redress the inequity. There is no special source of funds for these adjustments; they must by underwritten by internal reallocations.

D) **Matching offers (retention).** Salary increases may also be granted in response to an offer by another school to a productive faculty member. Since 2006, three junior faculty have received competing offers. One accepted the offer, and the other two were retained after the offers were substantially matched. In one case a preemptive increase was provided to a senior faculty member to avoid a potential retention problem.

IV. **Faculty Recognition**

Faculty achievement is recognized by various citations and awards administered variously by the State University of New York, the University at Buffalo, the School of Management, and constituent groups. The more prominent of these awards are described below.

A) **Distinguished ranks.** For some time, the State University of New York has formally recognized certain faculty ranks that are considered promotions beyond full professor, including SUNY Distinguished Professor, SUNY Distinguished Teaching Professor, and SUNY Distinguished Service Professor. The School currently has four faculty at that rank, two appointed since 2006. Professor Isaac Ehrlich holds the rank of Distinguished Professor, awarded generally for an exceptional record of scholarship. Two SOM faculty, Ronald Huefner (now Emeritus) and Jerry Newman, currently hold the rank of Distinguished Teaching Professor, granted by SUNY following nominations from the campuses, in UB's case usually one or two per year. Professor Raghav Rao was recently appointed to the rank of Distinguished Service Professor. More recently, the University at Buffalo established a separate recognition, UB Distinguished Professor, for faculty who have achieved national or international prominence through their scholarship or creative activity. The rank is conferred by the President following review and recommendation by the Provost and the President’s Review Board (the University’s promotion and tenure committee). Three SOM faculty members, Isaac Ehrlich, Stanley Zions (now Emeritus) and Nallan Suresh currently hold this title.

B) **Chancellor's awards.** The SUNY Chancellor annually confers prestigious awards on faculty for excellence in teaching, scholarship, or service. Ten SOM faculty have been recipients of the Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching: Ronald Huefner (now Emeritus), Arun Jain, Frank Krzystofik, the late James Meindl, Jerry Newman, Philip Perry, Natalie Simpson, Arlene Hibschweiler, Lewis Mandell (now Emeritus) and Ken Kim. The awards for research and service are relatively new. Raghav Rao is our first recipient for Service.

C) **UB awards.** In addition to the UB Distinguished Professor rank, which is limited to a small and fixed proportion of unit's senior faculty, the University recognizes exceptional performance with one-time awards for research and teaching. Professors Kee Chung, Winston Lin, Ramaswamy Ramesh, G. Lawrence Sanders, and Nallan Suresh have received the UB Exceptional Scholar Award for Sustained Achievement.
D) **Student awards.** The campus-wide Student Association gives an annual recognition, called the Milton Plesur Award, to selected faculty for teaching and related student services. Several SOM faculty have won this award competitively. In addition, the undergraduate and MBA student associations give awards to SOM faculty for their teaching.

E) **Dean’s Faculty Fellowships.** In 2009-2010 the Dean established a program of Faculty Fellowships designed to recognize faculty with outstanding scholarly records, or junior faculty with evidence of developing such a record. The Fellowship includes a significant financial stipend that can be taken as salary or used to support one’s research program. The Dean makes these awards based on consultations with the Department Chairs and the Senior Associate Dean. The appointments are for one year, and there is no automatic expectation of renewal. The goal is to increase the overall level of support for faculty research, and at the same time avoid potential retention problems with high performing faculty. These Fellowships are supported through a three-year resource commitment to Dean Assad when he joined the School. In 2009-2010 five faculty were appointed Fellows, two Professors, two Associate Professors and one Assistant Professor. In 2010-2011, due to the increasingly difficult budget environment, the program was scaled back and limited to junior faculty. Three Assistant Professors were named Faculty Fellows.

At the same time the Dean initiated a fellowship program to recognition outstanding contribution to teaching. There was one recipient of a Dean’s Teaching Fellowship in 2009-2010, and two in 2010-2011. One of the current recipients is an NTT faculty member.

V. **Faculty Support Processes**

A) **Orientation and counseling.** The University, through the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, sponsors a two-day Orientation for new faculty during the summer of their arrival to the campus. In 2010, this program took place on August 23 and 24. The first day of the program is devoted to orienting new faculty to the University, and the second day to teaching. The orientation program includes presentations from various UB officials, including the President and the Provost, covering such areas as academic programs, human resources, student services and academic policies, research, diversity, educational technology, and promotion and tenure. The teaching session includes teaching tips from accomplished pedagogues and information on the UB student body. Arriving faculty also hear from a panel of recent junior faculty about their early experiences at UB.

Within the School, orientation and counseling of new faculty is largely informal, most of it taking place at the department level. In addition, new faculty receive a School of Management Teaching Handbook, prepared by a committee chaired by Distinguished Teaching Professor Jerry Newman, which deals with such topics as motivating students, dealing with diversity in the classroom, strategies for lectures and discussions, managing work groups and study teams, and testing. The University offers support through the Teaching and Learning Center. Within the School, the Teaching Effectiveness Committee works with faculty who demonstrate a systematic problem in the classroom. This intervention by the TEC is not optional.

Finally, the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and the Chair of the President’s Review Board run annual sessions for junior faculty to brief them on University-wide standards and procedures for promotion and tenure.

---

2 This section is exclusive of support for research which is described in Section III-D under Intellectual Contributions
B) Immigration assistance. A substantial number of School of Management faculty are foreign-born, and many must seek changes in their visa status in order to work. The University’s Office of International Students and Scholars Services (ISSS) has a legal staff that assists faculty in filing petitions for H1-B visas and permanent residency. The School underwrites a portion of the ISSS charge for these services, and it allows faculty to use their IBAs to cover any remaining charge to the extent funds are in the member’s account.
Criteria and processes for assessing, developing and maintaining academic and professional qualifications, participating and supporting status

I. Academic and Professional Qualifications

In preparation for the 2005 maintenance review, a faculty committee reviewed the emerging standards for AQ/PQ status and developed a recommended protocol for assessing and maintaining those faculty qualifications. The committee balanced the need to provide faculty with guidance on what constitutes an appropriate standard for AQ or PQ status with the considerable variation in faculty roles across departments and ranks. This committee ultimately recommended, and the School adopted, a process that clearly articulates the elements that contribute to qualified status, without specifying a particular mix of those elements.

The core of this process for current faculty (described below) relies on a 5-year retrospective self-assessment for each individual faculty member. The criteria for this assessment are provided to the faculty, but they are free to select the mix of those criteria they believe appropriately represents their qualification status. While the criteria are not limited to traditional forms of scholarly exchange (articles, books, conference presentations), the School’s research culture and informal guidance signals a preference for these particular forms of intellectual contributions. This assessment is done annually, as part of the annual performance review cycle. Each Chair then reviews that assessment and accepts or rejects the assessment. In cases where a faculty member might not achieve the appropriate qualification status, or is on the margin, the chair and faculty member will discuss appropriate development activities to bring the faculty member up to that standard. The instructions to faculty detailing this process are provided in the Appendix III-C.1.

The qualification status for new hires is typically not an issue for tenure track faculty. They either qualify based on a recent PhD or an outstanding research record. However, new NTT hires, or part-time instructors typically are considered only for PQ status. In both cases the selection process includes an assessment of an individual’s PQ status, and these faculty would generally not be hired if they failed to meet the PQ standard at the point of hire. The match between the level and length of professional experience relative to the likely course assignments is the guiding decision standard, in addition to the appropriate educational background.

II. Participating and Supporting Faculty Evaluations

Participating and Supporting status turns on the level of involvement in the School’s programs. Full time faculty qualify automatically. Part-time faculty can be classified as participating as their level of involvement in our programs, and the School, increases beyond just classroom teaching. Examples of this heightened level of involvement include curriculum and program reviews, participation in student recruiting and orientation, and career development and placement functions. Participation might also include a long term and substantive involvement in alumni activities or various advisory boards. On occasion, in the case of part-time faculty, the participation precedes the faculty appointment.
III. SOM Status on Faculty Qualifications and Sufficiency

Tables 9-1, 10-1, 10-2 are included in Appendices III-C.2, III-C.3 and III-C-4. The School’s status on both faculty qualifications and sufficiency is consistent with our strategic focus. The overall AQ percentage is 78 percent, ranging from 60-90 percent across disciplines. The combined AQ-PQ percentage ranges from 97-100 percent across disciplines. Likewise, the average percentage of participating faculty in the School is 83 percent, and ranges from 70-90 percent across disciplines. This pattern is similar whether measured on the basis of credit hours or sections taught.
Section IV-A
ASSURANCE OF LEARNING
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENTS

This section provides an overview of the major curricula revisions that have occurred since the last review.

Undergraduate Program: A comprehensive summary of developments in the undergraduate program is provided in the Appendix IV-A.1. The highlights of these developments include:

- The BS in Accounting was formally established as a degree separate from the BS Business Administration in 2008.
- In 2009-2010 the entire BSBA program is reviewed. Benchmarking confirms that the program is relatively “core intensive”. While the Undergraduate Committee would prefer a move to a smaller core, the same resource constraints that motivate the current model preclude a change in the near future. While the core content was judged to be current and appropriate, implementation problems involving intended sequencing created problems.
- A review of the undergraduate concentrations led to significant revisions in Operations and Service Management, Management Information Systems and the deletion of the Internal Auditing concentration.
- The Digital Access courses became a center piece of the undergraduate core experience, and five of the six Digital Access courses were extended globally to our Singapore undergraduates.
- Five new courses were added to the undergraduate curriculum.

Full time MBA Program: The full-time MBA program has undergone several important changes since the last review. These include:

- In 2007, the School of Management identified Finance and GSSM (Global Service & Supply Management) as focal concentrations. The rationale was to identify the strengths of the school’s MBA curriculum and to promote them as niche areas.
- In 2007, four major changes were made to the core curriculum:
  i. Added Business Communications to the core.
  ii. Added Ethics and Corporate Governance to the core.
  iii. Moved the core Finance class from the 2nd semester of the first year to begin in the middle of the 1st semester. This was intended to give students an earlier start on their option courses.
  iv. The “flex core” (Macro Economics, MIS, HR, and Government, the Law and the Firm) was removed.
- Beginning in 2007, the incoming class size of the full-time MBA students was reduced from 150 to 100.
• In fall 2009, the MBA/MS Committee began a systematic review of the MBA core. By late fall 2010, the Committee is focusing a proposal that would reduce the size of the core, move to a 2-credit hour modules for most core courses, allow students to get an earlier start on their option electives, incorporate new topics (MIS, Corporate Social Responsibility and Sustainability), formalize coverage of program goals like team skills and integrative analysis, add a capstone course, include a “boot camp” prior to the first semester and strengthen the oversight and quality of instruction in the core.

• In 2009-2010, planning for a new comprehensive certificate program called LeaderCORE™ (Certification of Readiness and Excellence) was launched. LeaderCORE will span the entire two years of the full-time MBA program and give students the opportunity to study real-world business situations while developing management competencies.

PhD Program: We have not achieved our target placement rates at AAU public and Carnegie Very High or High research universities. The following initiatives are designed to improve that performance.

• In 2007 then Dean Thomas appointed an ad hoc chaired by the Associate Dean for Research to review the PhD program. In 2008 the faculty subsequently adopted the recommendations of the Committee including the following:

  (a) an allocation of PhD assistantships to departments based on a fixed ratio to tenure track faculty, with a minimum of 4 per department;

  (b) a recommendation that assistantship stipends by increased by $3,000 annual to reach the 50th percentile among aspirant schools;

  (c) an expectation that the PhD committee will monitor the performance of the overall PhD program, and that of each department, focusing on student applicant and placement quality, as well as evolving faculty productivity and student/faculty ratios. This includes a recommendation that the PhD committee provide a periodic performance report to the Dean that might be the basis for a reallocation of assistantship lines across departments.

  (d) the development of departmental program web pages for doctoral students.

• In 2008 additional professional staff support was assigned to the PhD program, and added a bi-weekly newsletter to improve communications between students and the Graduate Office.

• In 2009 more formalized orientation for incoming PhD students was provided.

• Since 2008, teaching development for students has been upgraded and enhanced English language tutoring for non-native English speakers provided.

• Instituted much more detailed measurement of student progress, with attention to meeting research benchmarks at graduation.
Section IV-B
ASSURANCE OF LEARNING
ASSESSMENT TOOLS AND PROCEDURES

Background

The 2005 Review: The Assurance of Learning program at the UB was in its developmental stages, much like the thinking of the AACSB itself. Our three core programs (the undergraduate program in business administration, the full-time MBA program, and the PhD program) all had program—and course-level goals in place. The appropriate measures had been identified, but were not being collected on a systematic basis for any of these three programs. The problem was both system design (too complicated) and insufficient support.

2007-2008: Beginning in the 2007-2008 academic year, a Learning Outcomes Assessment manager was hired. This individual (a doctoral student in educational psychology) provided professional guidance on streamlining the system, as well as the necessary support to implement the system. In addition, this individual benefitted from attending several AACSB conferences on Assurance of Learning, and actively participated in the Assessment Forum in the AACSB Exchange (http://theexchange.aacsb.edu/)

We now had the right system as well as a clear and feasible timeline for data collection across nine academic programs. A standard reporting form was developed so that faculty teaching courses in the core curriculum for each academic program were able to report on student performance on specific course activities that mapped to course and program goals. These reporting forms helped to outline (a) which program goals mapped to the course, (b) specific learning activities that mapped to the goal, and (c) criteria for classifying students into three categories (i.e. “Meets Criteria,” “Marginally Meets Criteria,” or “Fails to Meet Criteria”).

2008-2009: Data collection was underway for the BSBA program, the MBA program, and the PhD program. We next focused our attention on the academic programs that had yet to establish program goals and started with the most populated MS programs: Finance and Management in Information Systems. Faculty members teaching in the respective core of each program proposed the overall goals of the course and identified measures of student performance on each of the identified goals. Finally we developed program goals by integrating this course-level information with the mission of each program. This “bottom-up” approach proved manageable and effective as were able to map course-level goals to learning activities while simultaneously creating program-level goals.

By 2009, we had collected two years of data for the three core programs (BSBA, full time MBA and PhD). Aggregating course-level data on student performance at three levels captured progress on program goals: “Meets Criteria,” “Marginally Meets Criteria” and “Fails to Meet Criteria.” These results were then submitted to the Undergraduate Program committee for evaluation and feedback. (Appendix IV-B.1 illustrates the process of aggregating data from a single course to the level of a program learning goal, using the MS program in Finance and Managerial Economics as an example)

2009-2010: Program goals were developed for all remaining programs: BS in Accounting, MS in Accounting, MS in Supply Chain and Operations Management [SCOM], and MS in Management of Information Technology Services [MITS]. Goals for the MS Accounting program had been postponed as the transition to the new 150-credit hour requirement was implemented. We followed the same “bottom-up” approach described above to develop program- and course-level goals for both accounting programs and were able to collect data for the BS in Accounting in spring 2010 and schedule data collection for the MS in
Accounting program for fall 2010. Program goals have been created for the MS in SCOM and MS in MITS and data collection for these academic programs is currently underway. Overall, the AACSB Assurance of Learning system in the UB School of Management has evolved substantially over the past three years and has been the impetus for various curricular and pedagogical changes made for the purpose of improving student learning. Faculty involvement and buy-in has increased and learning outcomes assessment is slowly becoming a part of the academic culture of the school.

**Progress to date**

Tables IV-B.1A-B summarize progress to on each learning goal for the undergraduate program, and Tables IV-B.2A-C summarize our progress to date on each learning goal, in each of the programs where complete data (i.e. data from two separate collection points) are available. Appendix IV-B.1 provides an example of how program goals are assessed at the course level using the MS in Finance as an example.

### PROGRESS ON LEARNING GOALS IN UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

#### Table IV-B.1A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor's of Science in Business Administration</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Meeting Criteria</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Marginally Meeting Criteria</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Failing to Meet Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate awareness of fundamental aspects within managerial environments</td>
<td>66% 2007-08</td>
<td>77.6% 2008-09</td>
<td>15% 2007-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will understand and employ tools used by highly-effective managers</td>
<td>81% 2008-09</td>
<td>88% 2008-09</td>
<td>11% 2007-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will synthesize managerial knowledge, skills, and tools</td>
<td>89% 2007-08</td>
<td>78.7% 2008-09</td>
<td>5% 2007-08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table IV-B.1B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor's of Science in Accounting</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Meeting Criteria</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Marginally Meeting Criteria</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Failing to Meet Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate proficiency in skill areas essential to accounting:</td>
<td>81.8% 2009-10</td>
<td>NA 2010-11</td>
<td>11.3% 2009-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to apply critical thinking skills, ethical standards and relevant accounting principles to unstructured problems</td>
<td>87.2% 2009-10</td>
<td>NA 2010-11</td>
<td>4.4% 2009-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to communicate effectively in professional accounting settings</td>
<td>89% 2009-10</td>
<td>NA 2010-11</td>
<td>5% 2009-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROGRESS ON LEARNING GOALS IN GRADUATE ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

**Table IV-B.2A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master's of Business Administration</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Meeting Criteria</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Marginally Meeting Criteria</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Failing to Meet Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will develop business knowledge in fundamental areas of management</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will develop conceptual foundations and business skills in fundamental areas</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will develop managerial skills necessary to function in an uncertain and changing world</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table IV-B.2B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master's of Science in Management of Information Systems</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Meeting Criteria</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Marginally Meeting Criteria</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Failing to Meet Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will understand how to use information technology to add value and efficiency to industry</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will develop analytical skills essential to problem-solving processes</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will practice critical and reflective thinking to evaluate solutions, performance, and effectiveness</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate expertise in the area of management information systems and sciences</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate cultural awareness and sensitivity</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will develop effective communication skills</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will be an effective group/team member</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table IV-B.2C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PhD in Management</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Meeting Criteria</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Failing to Meet Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-year</td>
<td>Fifth-year</td>
<td>Third-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will develop the ability to conduct state-of-the-art research in a management-related subject:</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will gain an understanding of the relevance of that research to the world of management practice and its impact on the larger society</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will develop the skills necessary to impart knowledge through teaching</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessment Schedule

The assessment program is now fully underway, and plans for alternating assessment periods across programs needs to be strategic. We have developed a tentative schedule through 2012-13 which is presented in Appendix IV-B.2.

### Closing the Loop

The Assurance of Learning process includes a review of the measurement results by the appropriate program committee, along with recommendations for change as appropriate. We normally require two rounds of data collection before evaluating the results to avoid the influence of one-time anomalies. Through fall 2010, the data collection for the foundational programs (BSBA, full time MBA and PhD) had progressed to the point where reviews were appropriate. Below, highlights from each of these three programs are provided.

#### Closing the Loop in the BSBA Program

**2007-2008**

- The existing two BSBA Program Goals were revisited and revised; a third learning goal emphasizing students’ ability to synthesize information, processes, and tools emerged out of the existing program goals.

**2008-2009**

- After collecting two years of data, information on students' performance on the learning goals was provided to the Undergraduate Program Committee and to the individual instructors. Reflecting on this data, the Committee began to explore how team membership and global awareness may be incorporated into BSBA Program Goals since these elements seemed to be underlying components of the program.

**2009-2010**

- In order to explore the possible extensions of program goals, all faculty members teaching in the core BSBA curriculum were surveyed on how students' global awareness was developed within the classroom and were asked to provide examples of direct measures for assessing students' global awareness (see Appendix IV-B.3A). After surveying faculty, direct assessment of students' global awareness was identified in one course and we are now in the process of determining if adopting global awareness as a program goal. Information on students’ team membership skills was identified for potential analysis of students’ self- and peer-assessments of such skills (see MGS351 team evaluation website).
2010- 2011
• The BSBA Program Goals were slightly re-structured with the intention of simplifying the Assurance of Learning process and clarifying meaning of program-level goals. The Learning Outcomes Assessment Manager brought recommendations for such simplification to the Undergraduate Program Committee.

Closing the Loop in the MBA program
2007-2008
• Evaluated opportunities for assessing existing fourth program goal regarding students’ areas of concentration. The decision was made to drop the fourth learning goal because concentration areas were still evolving.

2008-2009
• Collected feedback from faculty members of the core courses on the degree to which aspects of the third program goal (e.g. ability to adapt and innovate to solve problems) were directly addressed in each course. Faculty members had difficulty identifying direct means of assessing abstract learning goals.

2009-2010
• As part of an emerging leadership development program (LeaderCore™), we identified several assessments that measure students’ managerial competencies and map to aspects of the third program goal:
  o Inventory of Cross-Cultural Sensitivity [ICCS] was identified as an instrument for assessing students’ global awareness (i.e. understanding of international dimensions of management)
  o The Management Development Questionnaire [MDQ] was identified as an instrument for assessing students’ problem-solving skills and analytical-thinking abilities

2010-2011
• The MS/MBA Program Committee surveyed 84 alums of the MBA program (graduation date ranging from 2004 to 2008) and gathered feedback on students’ perceptions of how each course in the core curriculum contributed to (1) overall understanding of managerial concepts and skills, and (2) productivity and performance in respective position/industry. Results of the survey will guide the forthcoming curricular revisions to the full-time MBA program.
• All incoming students of the full-time MBA program (fall 2010) were assessed on global awareness using the ICCS
• All incoming students of the full-time MBA program (fall 2010) were assessed on problem-solving and analytical thinking using the MDQ
• The MS/MBA is developing a proposal to significantly revise the structure and content of the MBA. This process includes a reconsideration of the Learning Goals and how they will be mapped to the courses.

Closing the Loop in the PhD Program
2007-2008
• Program goals were revised to reflect new standards and incorporate recommendations from AACSB

2008-09
• We re-implemented Annual PhD Student Progress Reports and instantiated a policy wherein advisors complete annual progress reports for respective doctoral students. In 2008-09, progress reports were completed for all third-, fourth- and fifth-year students by academic department; future reports should reflect this time span, for comparison purposes.
2010-11

- **Student Teaching.** The way that the learning goals were revised in 2007 reflected that students need to obtain over a 3.0 on several indicators on UBCATS evaluations. Some students were not attaining this goal so we are re-evaluating if students should be required to attain a 3.0 on each indicator, or if an average of 3.0 across the indicators was sufficient. To aid in this decision, we created a spreadsheet that lists each PhD student with performance on each indicator as well as the overall average across all UBCATS indicators.

- **Database Features.** We addressed the issue of the Speak Test, which also came up at the last meeting as something to examine in relation to students' teaching; the database now reflects that domestic students do not have to fulfill this requirement (e.g. N/A)

- **Departmental-Level Reports.** In fall 2010, we created department reports of students’ progress on each of the learning outcomes. See Appendix 4-B.3B for example of departmental report.
Section V
OTHER MATERIAL

Identify any innovative and/or exemplary practices, innovations, activities, programs…
Provide a brief overview of progress relative to stated mission

This section highlights a number of strategic initiatives and innovations developed over the last five years. Each is intended to move the School closer to achieving its strategic vision to be “international recognized for the impact of our scholarship and management programs.” These include:

1. Full time MBA program: A comprehensive revision of the MBA core content, structure and management of program delivery. Development of LeaderCORE™ as innovative leadership development experience. Reduce the size of the incoming MBA class from 150 to 100 and interview each academically qualified applicant.

2. Faculty Scholarship: Significant increases in faculty research support, including the establishment of Dean’s faculty fellowships. Build our research base through selective hiring of senior scholars. Increased emphasis on publishing in journals of the highest rank.

3. PhD Program: Increase doctoral student profile by strengthening research and publication profile at graduation, as well as more comprehensive teaching apprenticeship.

4. Undergraduate Program: A systematic analysis illustrating how undergraduate enrollment has reach unsustainable levels relative to available resources. Present results to Provost with recommendations to reduce upper division enrollment by 700.

5. Executive Programs: Restructured the Singapore EMBA management structure by hiring a full time program director in residence, significantly upgrading the marketing effort, and increasing tuition to market levels.

6. Manage budget cuts strategically: Absorbed 8 percent cuts in operating budget provided by the University by limiting the impact on tenure track faculty levels. We benefitted from the cooperation of our professional staff and significant restructuring of those responsibilities. For the first time, cuts included course sections with the result that students were closed out of courses and graduation delayed.

Progress relative to mission

The School’s vision has two strategic foci: faculty scholarship and the full-time MBA program. We believe we have made progress on both and will see more progress in the future.

1. Faculty Scholarship: The developments for faculty scholarship have focused on strengthening our scholarly base and infrastructure. This has taken the form of increased support for research, strong junior faculty hires, increased emphasis on placing faculty research in the very best outlets, and selective recruiting for senior faculty. The most significant hurdle remains a critical mass that makes it difficult to establish an institutional presence and reputation in most literatures.
2. Full Time MBA Program: The School has made changes to improve the quality of our applicants, the content and quality of the program experience, and finally our placement effort. Placement and starting salaries continue to be a challenge given the high percentage of our graduates who choose to remain in western New York. Nevertheless, the program has recently been ranked in the 2nd tier of the Bloomberg-BusinessWeek rankings.