

CIR Team Report (Business)

CIR Team Report (Business)

I. Introduction

I. Introduction

The Continuous Improvement Review (CIR) process is forward looking and focused on continuous improvement, strategy and consultative issues. The CIR process minimizes the reporting burden on accredited institutions and peer review teams as it is not intended to be a standard-by-standard review. Therefore, the objective of the CIR visit team report is to be strategic and consultative, offering guidance and feedback to the school to improve its overall high quality. By focusing the review on educational improvement, strategic management, and fulfillment of mission, the members of Peer Review Team will be particularly attuned to educational quality issues and problems that may be revealed in the process.

In preparing the School's Team Report, the Peer Review Team will assimilate the relevant information, constructively assess and perform a macro analysis to (1) assess the School's overall high quality; (2) determine how the School's policies and practices foster continuous improvement; and (3) consider whether or not the School's processes lead to outcomes that are consistent with its mission and objectives

II. Team Recommendation

II. Team Recommendation

The team recommendation reflects the opinion of the Continuous Improvement Review Team only. It will be reviewed for concurrence or remanded to the team by the Continuous Improvement Review Committee. The role of the Continuous Improvement Review Committee is to ensure consistent application of the AACSB International accreditation standards and processes across peer review teams.

Within ten days of receipt of this report, the applicant should send the team any comments and corrections related to faculty information noted in this report.

Please choose one of the following recommendations:

(Select one)

Extension of Accreditation (may include optional continuous improvement recommendations to be addressed over the next five-year review period): The recommendation of the Peer Review Team is that the accreditation of the selected degree programs in business offered by the institution be extended for an additional five years with a Continuous Improvement Review to occur in 2020/2021. Concurrence by the Continuous Improvement Review Committee and ratification by the Board of Directors are required prior to the confirmation of the accreditation decision. Following ratification by the Board of Directors, the applicant will be notified. The applicant must wait for this official notification before making any public announcement. AACSB International provides a list of applicants achieving accreditation to its members and the public.

 X

Continuous Improvement Review 2 (CIR2): The recommendation of the Peer Review Team in its Continuous Improvement Review of the selected degree programs in business offered by the institution has identified substantive concerns with alignment with AACSB accreditation standards; therefore, the CIR process is continued for an additional year. The educational quality issues relating to the business accreditation standards and expectations for resolution are listed below. Concurrence by the Continuous Improvement Review Committee is required prior to official notification. CIR2 does not require ratification by the Board of Directors because an extended review process does not change the accredited status of the applicant and no public statements are made regarding this outcome as it is viewed as an integral part of the CIR process.

Revocation of AACSB Accreditation: The recommendation of the Peer Review Team is that the accreditation of the selected degree programs in business offered by the institution be revoked. The educational quality issues relating to the accreditation standards that have not been satisfactorily addressed are listed in Section III of this report. Concurrence by the Continuous Improvement Review Committee and ratification by the Board of Directors are required prior to the confirmation of the accreditation decision to revoke AACSB business accreditation. Following ratification by the Board of Directors, the applicant will be notified. Revocation decisions ratified by the AACSB Board of Directors may be appealed in accordance with AACSB appeal procedures.

The Continuous Improvement Review Committee will review this report during its next scheduled review cycle. The School's Staff Liaison can provide a general timeline for review.

III. Item(s) to Address

III. Item(s) to Address

Summarize the team's analysis of the applicant's response and actions to address concerns that were stated during the last accreditation review (initial or CIR), and address the following:

The review team was satisfied that the RSCOB has adequately addressed concerns that were stated during the last CIR visit in April 2011. There were four specific concerns noted, and each has been addressed as noted below.

1. Quote from previous review: "The College should continue to develop and sustain processes, procedures, and policies necessary for supporting its high quality academic programs, operations, and continuous improvement (e.g., ensure that faculty activities that are counted for AQ and PQ status are specifically related to advancing the College's mission). (Standard 10: Faculty Qualifications)."

The RSCOB has implemented several initiatives including professional development funds and leaves for faculty to enhance their teaching and research, more focus and success in generating external grants, and a more streamlined process for getting faculty approved for graduate faculty status.

2. Quote from previous review: "In the spirit of continuous improvement, the College should review and strengthen its maintenance of qualifications definitions for AQ faculty, particularly related to the quality of journals, and PQ faculty to ensure the activities are consistent with the mission and that such activities result in positive impact. (Standard 10: Faculty Qualifications)."

In light of the new faculty classification scheme in the 2013 standards, the RSCOB has developed a detailed plan based on a point system for classifying faculty. The new guidelines were developed in a very collaborative manner. A checklist (used in conjunction with information in Digital Measures) is used to monitor faculty status on an annual basis, and shared with individual faculty members.

Over the past five years the RSCOB has seen significant improvements in the quantity and quality of peer-reviewed journal publications. This has been driven, in part, by the hiring of 14 new extremely motivated junior faculty over the past five years. However, it is in the opinion of the visiting team that RSCOB must continue to improve on its articulation of the quality of journals and this is noted below as an item to address before the next CIR visit.

3. Quote from previous review: "The College should continue to use and mature its Assurance of Learning (AoL) program and more effectively demonstrate widespread faculty involvement and ownership in all aspects of the program and its implementation and assessment (Standards 15, 16, 18 and 19: Assurance of Learning)."

The RSCOB has perhaps one of the more sophisticated AoL systems and processes that both team members have seen at other schools. The system is based on a software developed by the current associate dean and has resulted in a rather mature AoL process with high levels of engagement and buy-in from all faculty.

4. Quote from previous review: "The College must provide information that supports the continued exclusion from review of the Bachelor of Science in Organizational Leadership, Master of Science or Master of Arts in Business and Organizational Management Counseling, and any other related degree programs with business language, titles, or marketing at any level in the College of Education and Human Services or elsewhere in the University. (Criteria D: Defining Scope)."

The Master of Arts in Business and Organizational Management Counseling has been renamed the Master of Arts in Organizational Counseling. The RSCOB has no control over these programs but has worked with

the University to ensure that in all branding initiatives, the term “Business” is used to describe only programs offered by the RSCOB and covered by this accreditation.

Prior to the next Continuous Improvement Review, specific recommendations relative to AACSB standards that should be addressed and reported in the next CIR application and at the time of the next Continuous Improvement Review, or

Identification of areas that must be addressed in one year during the Continuous Improvement Review 2, citing the specific business accreditation standard(s) relevant to the issue(s) to be addressed and the reporting that is required.

Relevant Standard	Items to Address/Recommendations
Standards 1 and 2	<p>The RSCOB’s current mission statement was drafted in 2012 and has not been updated to reflect the new standards. When the new standards were adopted in April 2013, Dean Li (in consultation with her leadership team and advisory board) decided to wait until after the current CIR visit and update the mission statement in a strategic manner rather than rush through a revision. This approach was endorsed by the review team chair, Dr. Lance Nail. As the RSCOB embarks on this revision, they need to be mindful of how the pillar of impact is addressed, especially with regards to research. It is clear that when it comes to the pillars of engagement of innovation, the RSCOB has clear expected outcomes, and strategies for how they intend to achieve these outcomes. Likewise, the impact of their teaching, service, and outreach is clearly defined and measured. However, as mentioned in their previous review in April 2011, their measurement of the quality of their peer reviewed journal publications and its impact is not well articulated. There is no journal list, and the quality of the journals does not seem to be a factor in annual evaluations as well as P&T decisions. The RSCOB does not claim to be a pure teaching school, and does expect and value research from its faculty. Intellectual contributions (PRJs) are a critical component for faculty to maintain SA status per RSCOB’s own guidelines for faculty qualifications, and the lack of a quality measure must be addressed prior to the next review. While this is a significant concern (and one that was noted even in the previous review), the review team strongly believed that the other positives far outweighed this deficiency. We also note that the RSCOB operates in a strongly unionized environment where the collective bargaining agreement does not allow too many options for incentivizing and rewarding quality.</p>
Standard 15	<p>The RSCOB will be expanding their degree offerings to a Lake Campus that is about 85 miles from the main campus. While not covered by the current review, the Lake Campus will be included in the next review. The RSCOB needs to ensure that all courses and programs offered at the Lake Campus adhere to the same standards as the main campus with regards to, for example, deployment of qualified faculty, assurance of learning, and availability of support staff. This is especially crucial since all programs at the Lake Campus (business and others) are to be managed by a separate Dean.</p>

This question allows additional rows.

IV. Justification

IV. Justification to support the Peer Review Team's accreditation recommendation

Provide rationale for the Peer Review Team recommendation in Section I. This should include the Peer Review Team's assessment of the school's overall high quality, a summary of the continuous improvement environment and the school's ability to achieve desired outcomes. This should be provided in the context of the four areas of AACSB's standards. Specific reference to deficiencies related to any accreditation standard should be described.

Strategic Management and Innovation

The team was impressed with the broad level of stakeholder input in the strategic management process and in identifying opportunities for innovation and improvement. Dean Li held many listening sessions with various stakeholders and incorporated their input into developing a strategic plan that aligns with that of the university yet also offers innovations unique to the college and its mission. For example, the university's mission is centered around the notion of a transformative education. The Raj Soin College of Business has embraced the university's mission in its own distinctive way through high levels of stakeholder interaction and a promotion of experiential learning that emphasizes applied knowledge and enhanced career opportunities for students. This message was consistent among all of the stakeholder groups interviewed by the team – faculty, staff, students, and advisory board members.

The strategic management process, along with other processes in the college such as promotion and tenure, appear to be clearly defined. Interviews with various groups revealed consistency in how planning and review processes operate and are perceived. Financial resources, while constrained, are allocated in an efficient and optimal manner from what the team observed. Even in a constrained resource environment, the college manages its resources in such a fashion that the current mission is achieved. As noted in other parts of this report, the team did find that staff support is insufficient for the college to fully achieve its mission in serving its students and that faculty development budgets are quite small for a business school. In the future the college will require greater levels of staffing in career services and academic advising to continue to fulfill its mission of transformative education through experiential learning with a large number of first generation students. A highly committed and very interactive faculty has been substituting for the role that career services and academic advising should be playing. The college is very fortunate to have such committed faculty. The college has also hired a very impressive group of tenure-seeking faculty in recent years who demonstrate the potential and desire to publish to in leading journals in their field. Retaining those faculty will require more professional development funds and the ability to supplement salaries beyond what is articulated in the collective bargaining agreement. However, the tenure seeking faculty expressed that they feel that their research efforts are supported at the department and college level. Maintaining the high level of morale and buy-in exhibited by the stakeholders on this visit given the resource constraints in place exhibited strong strategic management processes in place and reflected strong positive leadership of the college by Dean Li. As documented in Section VI below, the team found many examples of innovations that demonstrated a commitment to continuous improvement.

Participants

One consistent observation made by the team was the extremely high level of interaction taking place in the college. This extended beyond the traditional faculty-student interaction on which so much attention is focused. Not only was the interaction between faculty and students very positive and encouraged, but the team witnessed a high level of collegiality and support among all of the college's stakeholders. We heard several examples of an advisory council member creating an internship for a student and working with faculty to identify students who they knew personally. Advisory board members interacted with faculty and students with ideas and innovations to advance the college and its students. Dean Li had a strong connection with the students through the dean's student advisory

board. Students are very engaged in the college through student organizations and competitions/conferences within and external to the college. The students felt strongly supported by the college in their activities. Faculty members took pride in their sense of community and supporting each other. The collegiality and support shown by all participants in the college was viewed as a tremendous positive by the team.

The college deploys participating and credentialed faculty sufficient to fulfill the college's mission. While Standard 15 is not necessarily specific to degree levels, the team did find that the college falls below the 60% benchmark for SA+PA+SP at the undergraduate level. Student-faculty ratios are in line with peer schools but may be a bit high given the high level of student-faculty interaction displayed in the college. Faculty performance evaluation processes are clearly defined. Expectations for promotion and tenure seemed well articulated and understood by all parties. The merit process is driven more by the collective bargaining agreement but there is a slight differentiation between top performers and the rest of the faculty. The faculty expressed great satisfaction with their level of support for teaching and general satisfaction with some concern about the level of research support. While the tenure seeking faculty expressed some concern over their level of research, this concern was also shared by several department chairs who were concerned about retaining their best tenure-seeking faculty. The team reached the same conclusion – the recent additions to the faculty are impressive and the college will likely require a greater investment in faculty support to retain them.

Policies and procedures are in place that guide student admissions, progress, and success. The students, while admittedly hand-selected, were excellent representatives of the college and shared nothing but praise for their college, dean, faculty, and staff. The team believed their praise and satisfaction to be genuine and well-earned. The students were very pleased with the DAR advising overall. They shared their disappointment with central advising and general satisfaction with college advising. However, their exposure to academic advising in the college is limited. The team is concerned that only four advisors serve the entire college – placing the ratio of students to advisors between 450 and 500. This ratio is too large in the opinion of the team – even with a successful DAR system. A ratio of 250:1 is more the norm for regional institutions based on the team's experience. That ratio could be larger with the students experiencing successful self-advising and peer advising with DAR, but the typical advisor dedicates about 1,200 hours per academic year to one-on-one student advising. A ratio of 300:1 basically allows four hours per student advised per year or two hours per semester. The current ratio at RSCOB translates into less than an hour and a half per student per semester. The ratio at RSCOB needs to be closer to 300 than 500 – especially with the high number of first generation students enrolled. The greater concern is the lack of resources committed to career services. One dedicated staff member to a school this size is simply insufficient given the college's mission of transformative education and career entry focus. At a minimum there should be at least one staff person dedicated to job/career search, one for internships/co-ops/external experiential learning, and a support staff person. Possibly a graduate level staff person would be in order too. At many institutions these operations are funded by student fees because career services operations tend to be clear and transparent uses of student fees. The team is not advocating new fees, but the resources for career services is grossly inadequate for the size and mission of the college.

One caveat the team needs to mention is the Lake campus where business courses and degrees will be awarded in the future. This campus will need to be monitored closely to ascertain that the same level of faculty deployment and staff support is offered to the students at the remote campus as on the main campus. This was also explicitly noted in Section III as a situation that must be monitored during the next review cycle.

Learning and Teaching

Without doubt, the college excels in the teaching and learning space. The AOL process is one of the most sophisticated that the team members have ever seen and the level of faculty buy-in for assessment is very high. The process is used as intended by the standards to guide curricular innovation and not as a “check the box” process. The team met with faculty members and advisory board members involved in the curricular process and the level of involvement was beyond the norm experienced by the team on prior site visits. The faculty provided examples of

how AOL feedback had driven curricular change and the advisory board members provided examples of how their suggestions had been worked into the curriculum or within co-curricular activities in the college. Almost every faculty member the team met discussed their pride in teaching excellence and the college's strong support of teaching effectiveness. Even one junior faculty member who professed being more dedicated to research than teaching described how she was using AOL feedback to change her course and working with her colleagues to develop a new course in the major. Curricular review is a tedious process but it is well defined. All faculty members the team met felt invested in curricular review.

The team found the curriculum content and coverage appropriate at the undergraduate and graduate level. The high level of student-faculty interaction is very positive and certainly aligns with the college mission. However, that high level of interaction requires either lower student-faculty ratios than peers schools or higher levels of staff support to sustain such high levels of quality.

Academic and Professional Engagement

As stated previously, the team found highly engaged faculty and students and a college that is invested in transformative education through experiential learning and career entry preparation for a largely first generation student base. This was seen through examples like the student managed investment fund and the student-run Rey-Rey Café. Students were engaged on campus through campus organizations and off campus through conferences and student competitions that were in part funded by the college with the students raising the remainder of the funds for "skin in the game." Many of the faculty members were professionally engaged with the business community – creating career and internship opportunities for their students. The dean and faculty appeared to translate their interaction with the business community into applied research projects, enhanced teaching efforts, and career opportunities for students.

The only executive education program offered by the college was a dedicated leadership program for a local business. The client was represented on the advisory board and expressed great satisfaction with the program. The team found that there were appropriate learning goals and outcomes associated with the program.

The college deploys participating and credentialed faculty sufficient to fulfill the college's mission. However, as noted earlier, the team did find that the college falls slightly below the 60% benchmark for SA+PA+SP at the undergraduate level. This should be corrected and could be accomplished with 1-2 new SA/PA/SP faculty lines dedicated to undergraduate teaching. While the faculty ratios for Scholarly Academics (SA) are met, the standards for defining SA faculty are lacking in the opinion of the team. The consistent message received was that quantity of intellectual contributions is the more important measure than quality of contributions. This limits the impact of faculty scholarship as the incentive structure for merit, promotion, and tenure is based more on quantity than quality. Recognizing the constraints of operating under a collective bargaining agreement, the team is still concerned about the ability to continue to recruit and retain strong scholar-teachers without stronger incentives for and support of impactful research. Some measure of journal quality needs to be incorporated into the merit and P&T process. The college does not subscribe to the WRDS database which severely limits the empirical research efforts of faculty in Accounting, Finance, and other disciplines. And the level of summer research support is simply inadequate. Most business schools with any kind of research mission such as RSCOB's offer guaranteed summer support for tenure seeking faculty through at least the first 2 or 3 years. The team recommends that Dean Li conduct a faculty research support comparable analysis to see what peer schools are offering.

V. Engagement, Innovation, and Impact

V. Engagement, Innovation, and Impact

Identify and assess the business school's success in demonstrating engagement, innovation, and impact outcomes. The team should describe the most noteworthy activities in each of the three areas with particular attention to changes since the last review.

The RSCOB has undertaken several initiatives to demonstrate outcomes in engagement, innovation, and impact. Noteworthy among them are the following:

- To provide a highly customized, client- and student-centric service to make internships or full-time placements for business students more effective and efficient, the RSCOB has enhanced the centralized career division with its own career management unit. In October 2014, the College secured funding from community partners to build a Center for Career Management. The College anticipates to utilize data analytics to collect intelligence for business students and employers in connecting internship and full-time placement.
- The Institute for Innovation and Entrepreneurship (IIE), established in 2014, is an innovative model to allow students to participate in commercialization, technology transfer, business venture, and entrepreneurial projects. With financial support from central administration, the RSCOB created an alliance between students, faculty, and businesses to form a three-way partnership to execute our experiential learning model.
- A student-managed cafe has been set up at the RSCOB, funded by an industry partner and the university. Students were involved in all business model planning and strategy sessions, and the café is currently managed by student board. Revenues of this cafe will be used to sustain and provide scholarships for fellow students.
- Funding from the state of Ohio has been used to set up a Data Analytics and Visualization Environment lab (DAVE) to provide physical space for students, faculty, and business leaders to engage in real time data analytics. The plan is to use the DAVE facility to engage all six academic departments to innovate curricular changes and aspire partnerships.
- Established the first Wright Venture to provide an innovative funding venue for student entrepreneurs. The winner of this venture gets a minimum of \$5,000 as seed money to start his/her business.
- The college has created the InTeams program in which it acts as a clearing house to match internships that do not follow an academic calendar with students who want to gain experience in multiple projects and diverse learning models.
- The college's Professional Business Institute (PBI), which provides a hands on learning experience and allows students to complete case studies based upon real data to help a current business be successful. It has been a great success for the college to build connections and partnership with businesses in the community and showcases the College to students and parents alike.
- Young Business Scholars (YBS). YBS works with a group of 20-25 high school students to teach entrepreneurship thorough hands-on exercises over a 12-week period. These programs allow the College to gain experience in subsequent initiatives such as the Wright Venture and InTeams program.
- The RSCOB has created a Degree Completion Program for students who have college credits but not a degree, in an effort to provide economic diversity in the College. The program offers scholarships and one-on-one advice to students to come back and finish their degrees.
- The RSCOB has expanded its strategic alliances with other university partners and quasi-government agencies in China and India.
- The RSCOB's undergraduate accounting program is ranked #10 in 2014-15 by the Public Accounting Reports and the graduate Accounting program is ranked #18.
- The RSCOB's accounting students with graduate degrees taking the CPA exam for the first time in 2014 had a pass rate of 88.9%, the best in Ohio. For those with just an undergraduate degree, the pass rate was 61.5%, which was 8th best in the state.

VI. Commendations of Strengths, Innovations, Unique Features and Effective Practices

VI. Commendations of Strengths, Innovations, Unique Features and Effective Practices

Commendations for Strengths, Innovations, and Unique Features and Effective Practices

Provide a brief description of strengths, innovations, and/or unique/distinctive features of the applicant and examples of effective practices that demonstrate leadership and high quality continuous improvement in management education.

Level of engagement by all college stakeholders

As mentioned several times in this report, the high level of stakeholder engagement in the college must be commended. The greatest strength of the college is this high level of engagement because it reflects the positive culture present in the college.

Rey-Rey Café

The student-run café is a perfect example of the experiential learning that the college promotes. Students hold managerial and operational positions within the café and offer business solutions to promote greater efficiency, better service, and improved margins. This is a great example of the college fulfilling its mission and touching on innovation, impact, and engagement within a single initiative.

Data Analytics & Visualization Environment (DAVE)

DAVE is a cutting-edge lab space designed for collaborative data analytics. This is a forward-looking initiative that utilizes infrastructure efficiently (and elegantly) with cross-curricular potential driven by the needs of regional business. The initiative is too new to determine impact at this point, but the team was impressed by the strategic thought that went into its design and purpose.

Trading Room

The trading room is a showcase room for internal and external stakeholders. Internally, the room is utilized by the student managed investment fund and for computer-based instruction. Externally, the room is used for investor education and portfolio competitions among regional high schools and junior high schools. This is a great example of innovation, impact, and engagement with facility utilization.

Assess My Program (AMP)

This proprietary software developed in-house is a best practice that other colleges may want to emulate. The software serves as a monitoring repository of all AOL data with report generating capabilities that greatly simplifies the assessment process and enables greater faculty buy-in because of its ease of use and highly informative feedback. The team recommends that the college consider submitting proposals to present AMP as an assessment best practice at AACSB, deans', and assessment seminars/conferences.

VII. Opportunities for Continuous Improvement

VII. Opportunities for Continuous Improvement

Relevant to the accreditation standards:

Address those areas where improvements, in the opinion of the team, are recommended relative to improved alignment with the accreditation standards. These recommendations should be different from the issues identified in Section II. These recommendations should not be sufficiently material to threaten accreditation or result in a recommendation of a Continuous Improvement Review 2 (CIR2) and an extension of reporting requirements.

Relevant Standard	Recommended Improvement
Standard 7	The RSCOB prides itself on offering its students an engaged environment focused on experiential learning. However, the availability of professional staff in the career center, as well as in the student advising center, is not consistent with this intent. For example, there is only one career management person for the entire college. A primary constraint to address this concern appears to be a lack of adequate discretionary financial availability (Standard 3).

This question allows additional rows.

Consultative report on matters not related to the accreditation decision:

Provide consultative advice that is not relevant to the continuous improvement review of accreditation, but may be useful in the context of continuous improvement. That is, any issues raised should be unrelated to standards, or problems related to standards and should not be sufficiently material to threaten accreditation.

Consultative advice

The team would like to offer a few observations made in conjunction with RSCOB leadership that we believe could offer continuous improvement possibilities for the college.

- The team previously mentioned the inadequate career management staffing, but the locations of a career services space in the building would also greatly benefit the students. Almost all business schools the size of RSCOB have a dedicated career services office. Conversations with the dean and advisory board members indicated that private funding had been secured for such a dedicated space within the building. The team strongly recommends moving forward with this space ASAP.
- While Standard 15 does not specify that faculty deployment must exceed 60% (SA+PA+SP) at each level of instruction, the team was a bit concerned that the ratio fell below 60% at the undergraduate level because of the use of adjunct faculty. The addition of 1-2 full time SA/PA/SP faculty members to cover undergraduate courses would alleviate this concern.
- The college would be well-served to find greater resources to support faculty research. Most peer schools are offering substantially higher summer research stipends and faculty development budgets than RSCOB. Even small stipends of \$10,000 per summer awarded on a competitive basis would be a start. Although WRDS is an expensive database, not subscribing to it will harm the retention of empirical researchers in Accounting and

Finance. The team recommends that the college survey peer institutions to determine their level of faculty research support and how they obtain the resources to fund that support. The college could then construct a faculty development strategy from this benchmarking.

VIII. Visit Summary

VIII. Visit Summary

Descriptive Information: Brief description of the school, including its size and institutional setting.

In 1964, the Dayton Campus of Ohio State and Miami Universities was opened with an initial enrollment of 3,200 students. By 1967, enrollment had grown large enough for the institution to achieve status as an accredited independent university. The newly named Wright State University (WSU) became Ohio's 12th state assisted university. Enrollment grew rapidly in the 1970s and 1980s, reaching a high of 17,657 in 1992. Enrollment subsequently retreated to a low of 15,398 in 2000, but has since rebounded to a new all-time high of 19,793 in Fall 2010. Wright State now offers 115 undergraduate degree programs and 79 graduate and professional programs including the M.D., PsyD, and Ph.D. in selected disciplines. Currently, the main campus of the University has an enrollment of 17,070 and the lake campus has an enrollment of 1,172 students, with a total enrollment of 18,059 (unduplicated accounting for students attending both campuses).

The Raj Sooin College of Business began as a Division of Business at the Wright State Campus branch of Miami University. The division became a separate College of Business and Administration in 1972. Its undergraduate program was initially accredited by AACSB in 1974, with graduate programs receiving initial accreditation in 1980. The Accountancy program was separately accredited in 1990. In addition to the MBA, the College has long offered an MS in Applied and Social Economics. In the 1980s an MS in Logistics was offered but discontinued in the 1990s only to be revived in 2004 with a new instructional format and a new emphasis on supply chain management. In 1998, a Master in Accountancy was approved with the first class graduating in 2000. In 2007, a Master in Information Systems degree program was approved. As of Spring 2016, the College has 1,818 undergraduate majors and 480 graduate majors.

Degree Programs: Please confirm that all degree programs are appropriately listed below.

Name of Degree Program	Level	Location(s)	Date Established (Year Only)
BS in Business	Undergraduate	Main Campus	1972
Master of Business Administration (MBA)	Masters-Generalist	Main Campus	1972
Master of Accountancy	Masters-Specialist	Main Campus	1998
MS in Logistics and Supply Chain Management	Masters-Specialist	Main Campus	2007
Master of Information Systems	Masters-Specialist	Main Campus	2008

This question allows additional rows.

If there are any additional programs that should be included in the accreditation review or required changes to degree titles, majors, etc., then please include this information below.

List of Comparison Groups

Comparable Peers (School Name)
Duquesne University (A. J. Palumbo School of Business Administration)
Texas State University (McCoy College of Business)
University of Central Missouri (Harmon College of Business and Professional Studies)
University of Michigan - Dearborn
University of Wisconsin – La Crosse
University of Wisconsin – Oshkosh
University of Wisconsin – Whitewater

This question allows additional rows.

Competitive Schools (School Name)
Kent State University
Miami University (Farmer School of Business)
Ohio State University (Max M. Fisher College of Business)
Ohio University
University of Cincinnati (Carl H. Lindner College of Business)
University of Dayton
Xavier University (Williams College of Business)

This question allows additional rows.

Aspirant Schools (School Name)
Miami University (Farmer School of Business)
Northern Arizona University (The W.A. Franke College of Business)
Northern Illinois University
Texas Tech University (Rawls College of Business Administration)
University of Alabama at Birmingham
University of Texas at Arlington

This question allows additional rows.

Visit Team Members: On-site review dates and names of the full team

Review Visit Dates:	Start Date	End Date
	2/21/2016	2/23/2016
Team Members:	Name	Role
	Lance Nail	Chair
	Raju Balakrishnan	Business Member
	Casper Wiggins	Accounting Chair
	William Stout	Accounting Member

This question allows additional rows.

Continuous Improvement Review Visit Schedule: Please use the "Documents" link above to upload an updated copy of list of persons and activities followed during the visit for the review process.

Optional: Provide any additional information the team received outside of the Continuous Improvement Review Report that may not be included in myAccreditation (i.e. updated faculty tables, etc.). Additionally, please upload the applicant's response to the team report, if provided.
