Undergraduate Committee  
September 27, 2004  
Minutes

Present: Pat Dintrone, Annette Easton, Gary Grudnitski, Kathy Krentler, Bruce Reinig, Mehdi Saleizedeh

1. I.S. Program Change
The Committee unanimously approved adding IDS 481 to the list of options for students working toward a minor in Information Systems.

2. Assessment Report
The Committee reviewed the Department Assessment Results Report, which is due to the University in October. The Undergraduate Committee is charged with preparing the portion of each CBA department’s report that deals with general goals that exist for all students. Pat Dintrone agreed to prepare the section describing the use of the Business Assessment Test (BAT) to assess the goal of providing all students with an understanding of essential business principles. Kathy Krentler agreed to prepare the section describing the Committee’s efforts to develop a plan for delivering content that would address the ethical reasoning goal. Pat explained that no mention was necessary in the report of the two additional goals (written & oral communication and analytical & critical thinking), as they were not the focus of the Committee’s efforts in the past year.

The Committee discussed how to proceed in addressing the written & oral communication goal, which will be the focus of the Committee’s assessment efforts in the upcoming academic year. Pat Dintrone provided the Committee with two examples of rubrics that could be used in the assessment process; one for written communication and one for oral communication. The existing plan calls for written communication to be assessed in IDS 290 and through the Graduation Writing Assessment Test, and for oral communication to be assessed via presentations in the capstone courses for the various majors. Discussion ensued regarding the options that exist for implementing these assessments. Possibilities discussed were staff support from the Dean’s Office to the Committee and the Director of Assessment, the hiring of a graduate assistant to carry out the assessments, volunteer instructor swapping, and use of instructors teaching in the courses. It was generally agreed that the last of these was the least favorable option. The Committee did not arrive at a resolution or recommendation.
3. FYI –
   a. Scheduling Survey
      Pat Dintrone described a brief scheduling survey that has been developed and will be sent to all Business, International Business, and Hospitality and Tourism Management upper-division students. The survey was developed in response to expressed student concern regarding CBA course availability during the current semester. The survey asks students what, if any, courses they were unable to get this semester and the reasons. Further, it asks what courses the students most need for the spring semester 2005. An e-mail will be sent to all upper-division students containing a link to the survey, which is posted on-line. Results should be available in approximately one month.

   b. Planning Retreat Follow-up
      Kathy Krentler informed the Committee that the Steering Committee and the Executive Committee have met to discuss alternatives for moving forward with the momentum developed at the CBA Strategic Planning Retreat. It has been proposed that the four general areas covered at the retreat form the basis for working groups. Still under discussion is whether the working groups would be independently formed or be based on standing committees within CBA.

4. Ethics
   The Committee discussed inquiries it has received regarding the proposal to deliver ethics to our students through the development of a one-unit course which would be taught by the Philosophy Department. It was agreed that in the spirit of open communication, it would be a good idea to provide background (beyond existing Minutes) to CBA faculty regarding the process that has surrounded this proposal. The Committee reviewed a draft of a memo to the faculty and a chronology of the events surrounding the development of the Ethics course (see the following Appendix for both documents) prepared by Kathy Krentler. It was further agreed that the documents should be disseminated to the faculty following review and sign-off by Gail Naughton and Bob Wilbur.

Meeting adjourned 11:25 a.m.

Next Meeting: Monday, October 11, 10:00 a.m.; Dean’s Conference Room
APPENDIX

September 27, 2004

Memorandum

To: College of Business Administration
From: Kathy Krentler, on behalf of the Undergraduate Committee
Subject: Business Ethics

Members of the Undergraduate Committee have received several questions regarding the proposed cooperative effort between the College of Business Administration and the College of Arts & Letters to deliver material on business ethics to our upper-division students. In an effort to provide background on this initiative, a chronology of events based on Undergraduate Committee minutes has been developed and is attached to this message.

Please be assured that the proposed solution was not the first alternative pursued by the Committee, nor do we consider it to be an optimal approach for all parties involved. Accordingly, we welcome any ideas you may have that accomplish the learning outcomes for the proposed course within the CBA mandate we have been given, that the solution be resource-free.

Chronology of Events

| January 2004 | In response To AACSB and CSU mandates, the Undergraduate Committee begins work on the development of general learning goals for undergraduates in the CBA. |
| March 2004 | Three general learning goals are adopted in the areas of Written & Oral Communication, Analytical & Critical Thinking, and Ethical Reasoning. Specifics of the ethical reasoning goal are: ETHICAL REASONING
Distinguish and analyze ethical problems that occur in business and society, and choose and defend resolutions for practical solutions. Outcomes:

- Apply different moral philosophies to business ethics and explain a framework for understanding ethical decision making in business.
- List the legal, ethical, economic, and philanthropic dimensions of social responsibility of businesses, define the role played by corporate culture, leadership, motivation, and power in ethical decision making in business, and explain the effect on business ethics of the key correlates of intrafirm trust, commitment to quality, customer satisfaction, employee commitment, and profitability.
- Extrapolate how ethical principles and concepts apply in their career. |
| March 2004 | The mandate requires development of implementation and assessment measures for each goal. The Committee struggles with these items for Ethical Reasoning. The primary issue is: how to deliver to students the content required to allow them to achieve the goal and outcomes identified for the goal. |
Requiring all students to complete MGT 356 is considered and rejected as multiple majors do not have sufficient units available to add 3 units and remain within the CSU constraint of a 120-unit degree.

There is a maximum of one free unit across 6 of the 7 majors in the College. Marketing does not have a single free unit but Kathy Krentler agrees to discuss with the Department ways in which they could reduce their existing major requirements to free up one unit.

**April 2004**

The Committee discusses the potential for increasing the coverage of ethics without adding units by inserting the material in MGT 350 (course description indicates ethics coverage) to a level sufficient to achieve the stated learning outcomes. A meeting occurs to discuss this possibility. Attendees are Dave Hampton, the Management Chair, the MGT 350 faculty, Kathy Krentler and Pat Dintrone. The MGT 350 faculty indicate that there is not sufficient time in MGT 350 to add the required material.

The Committee then turns its attention to the development of a standalone, one-unit core course in Business Ethics to deliver the content. Kathy Krentler speaks with Craig Dunn about the idea. The Committee is informed by College administration, however, that solutions to the delivery problem must be developed without resource implications for the College.

The Committee invites Departments to develop proposals for delivering the content without resource implications but receives none.

**May 2004**

The Committee continues to discuss options for delivering the material:
- Without resource implications for the College
- Outside existing courses but with no more than one added unit

It is agreed that delivery is best restricted to upper-division to avoid lower-division transfer issues. It is further agreed that the delivery of learning outcomes related to the theoretical foundation of ethics and to its application in business situations cannot be accomplished in a single unit.

In the face of the one unit constraint, the idea of delivering theoretical foundation in some format not to exceed one unit and then following that by application material in existing CBA courses is developed. The Committee notes the challenges that will be faced in preparing CBA faculty to deliver the application opportunities and in achieving buy-in from the faculty.

Two ideas for delivering the theoretical foundation content **without resource implications for the College** surface:
- Development of an on-line or DVD based mini-instructional. This virtual “course” would not carry units with it but would be required of all business students as a requirement to declare upper-division.
  - Issues associated with this solution include: How to assess attainment of learning outcomes; Cost associated with development of material; Timing associated with completion of the course vis-à-vis students’ ability to declare upper-division (especially for transfer students).
- A partnership with another unit on campus qualified to provide it (precedence for this approach where key competencies exist with the College occurs in lower division statistics). The partnership would involve joint development of the course followed by the non-CBA unit teaching/delivering the class.
  - Issues associated with this solution include: Interest or willingness of outside unit to cooperate; CBA confidence in quality of delivery; CBA buy-in to concept of having material taught outside the college when competency exists within the college.

Acknowledging the issues associated with both ideas, the Undergraduate Committee agrees to explore
these possibilities further. Exploration and discussion produced the conclusion that the issues of assessment and timing for the on-line or DVD solution were insurmountable.

**Summer 2004**

Kathy Krentler, Gary Grudnitski (Chair of the UG Committee), and Pat Dintrone met and communicated multiple times with the Chair of the Philosophy Department, which was identified as a campus unit having the potential ability to deliver the content. Emphasis in meetings was placed on the Philosophy Department’s ability to deliver business ethics content, the ability of the Department to accommodate sufficient students to provide the course to all first semester upper-division students, and the willingness of the Department to work cooperatively with CBA faculty ethics experts to develop the content of the course.

During this period, Gangaram Singh, the new Management Department Chair, Craig Dunn, and Lori Ryan (the core of the CBA’s ethics faculty) were kept apprised of the situation and assured that should this solution move forward, they would be involved in content development for the course.

Also during this period Kathy Krentler again discussed the issue with Bob Wilbur in an effort to be certain that resource conditions within the CBA had not changed to the point where teaching the course “in-house” had become an option. It was indicated that this was not the case and was not expected to be the case in the future even if additional resources became available (as a priority had been established that any resources becoming available would be directed to managing student-faculty ratios within the College).

By summer’s end, verbal assurance regarding the stated conditions was received from the Chair of the Philosophy Department. At this point Kathy Krentler begins to alert all CBA Chairs about the potential of having all majors add a one unit business ethics course.

**September 2004**

The Undergraduate Committee determines that it has reached the extent of its ability to move a cooperative venture between CBA and CAL forward. Kathy Krentler and Gary Grudnitski meet with Bob Wilbur to suggest that should the “agreement” be finalized, it will have to be done between the Deans of the two Colleges. Bob suggests that a memorandum of understanding be drafted that could be discussed and potentially signed by the two Deans. The basic points in the memorandum would include joint CBA and CAL course development, sufficient seats offered every semester to accommodate demand, and a plan for course review vis-à-vis stated learning outcomes on some periodic schedule. Currently, the project awaits final approval and agreement by the Deans of the CBA and CAL.