

Undergraduate Curriculum Management and Assurance of Learning Committee

Meeting Minutes

Monday, September 14 2020, 1:00 p.m.

Meeting Facilitator(s): Fang Lin and Mary Jo Goedeke, Co-chairs

Secretary: Mary Jo Goedeke

In Attendance: Jae Choi, CIS
Bienvenido Cortes, Economics, Associate Dean for Graduate School of Business
Linden Dalecki, Marketing
Mary Jo Goedeke, Accounting
David Hogard, Academic Advising
Fang Lin, Finance
Shipra Paul, Management
June Freund, Economics

Not in Attendance:

Committee Meeting

The co-chairs of the UCM&AOL Committee, Fang Lin and Mary Jo Goedeke, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. by Zoom meeting, due to social distancing restrictions in place at the University.

I. Curriculum Management.

The committee considered two items of curriculum change requests. Dr. Lynn Murray submitted two requests for curriculum changes:

1. New course request: MKTG 201 Marketing Fundamentals
2. Request for Revision to Course: MKTG 330 Principals of Marketing

The items were presented to the committee for consideration. Fang Lin explained to the committee that the purpose of the revision was to differentiate between a non-major focused and a major-focused course. The revised 330 course was modified to better reflect a more rigorous upper-division course, while the new 201 course was developed to be a non-majors course, and appropriately a lower-division course designed to meet the PittState Pathways general education requirements. Further, community college students transferring credits to the university would be able to transfer credit for the 201 course, however, the 330 course, a required course for the Kelce core, would not typically be eligible for transfer credit. June Freund noted that as a prior member of the University Curriculum Committee she had concerns specifically regarding the Principals of Marketing course and whether the proposed revisions would be viewed as sufficient by the University-level committee. An in-depth discussion took place regarding the revised course description. David Hogard noted that 201 course request should be modified to correct the date of initial course offering to Spring 2021, rather than Spring 2020. A vote was held and the committee agreed unanimously that the matter should pass, with the noted correction on the 201 course.

II. AOL

a. AOL seminar update

Fang Lin and Mary Goedeke completed the AOL I seminar. Both agreed that the process was helpful and produced many ideas regarding assessments, learning objectives, and development of rubrics.

However, one of the purposes of attending the seminar was to get an update on the newly passed 2020 standards, and the seminar did not go into detail about the new standards. Mary Goedeke will be attending the AOL II seminar at the end of the month. Fang Lin will wait to take the second seminar and will hopefully get more up to date information about the newly revised standard at that time.

b. Mission Statement

Mary Goedeke brought up the next item for business before the committee, being the Kelce College of Business mission statement.

Fang Lin presented the committee with a copy of the Kelce College of Business Mission Statement:

“The Kelce College of Business prepares future business professionals within a student-focused environment by empowering students from diverse backgrounds to succeed within the global business community. We provide a foundation for life-long learning and a spirit of engagement by delivering affordable, high-value undergraduate and graduate business education programs. We accomplish this through small classes, committed faculty, scholarship, and community outreach.”

The committee discussed the mission statement in terms of the AOL learning goals and objectives. The committee discussed that much of the mission statement relates to the college’s commitment to providing an effective learning environment. The committee discussed that the mission statement indicates that it is our goal to produce graduate who are “future business professionals” who can “succeed within the global business community.”

The committee discussed what goals promote our students and graduates being “future business professionals” and the general consensus was that our current AOL goals of communication, critical/analytical thinking, teamwork, and information technology were directly supportive of that mission statement. It was decided that no modifications were necessary to the current AOL goals and objectives regarding this portion of the mission statement.

Next the committee considered the “success within the global business community” portion of the mission statement. The committee briefly discussed what objectives would be appropriate for this segment of the mission statement. June Freund noted that a learning goal regarding ethics might be helpful to assess this portion of the mission statement. Mary Goedeke noted that one of the modifications of the revised standards was to emphasize “societal impact” and suggested that perhaps we needed to add a learning goal related to societal impact and that perhaps such a new objective could incorporate the global business community aspect of the mission statement. The matter was tabled for further consideration.

c. Assessments update

For the Fall 2020 semester the AOL goals regarding teamwork and critical thinking are up for assessment. An update regarding the progress was provided to the committee:

i. Teamwork assessment

Mary Goedeke advised the committee that she was working with Mary Judene Nance and Stephen Horner regarding the teamwork assessment in MGT 690 Business Strategy. The learning objective as adopted by the committee is: “Graduates will be able to work collaboratively to produce professional deliverables.” Mary Goedeke, Stephen Horner, and Mary Judene Nance will meet this week to discuss the team project that Mary Judene Nance uses in her course to determine how the assessment will be conducted. Mary Goedeke is working on a rubric for assessment to take into account both aspects of the objective, including “working collaboratively” and “professional deliverables.”

The committee discussed the term “professional deliverables” and how the term should be defined. June Freund noted that when the objective was developed in Fall 2019, the term was broadly defined and might mean a variety of things, including an oral presentation or written report, but also anything a client would want to obtain from a business professional, such as a marketing plan or even services. The committee discussed the meaning of the term, and then decided to consider the matter further at the next meeting.

Mary Goedeke then suggested to the committee that the group project from MGT 690 could also be used to assess oral communication. Stephen Horner mentioned that it can sometimes be problematic to assess oral communication in a group project. Shipra Paul asked whether the students each gave an individual portion of the oral presentation in the group project. The matter was again, tabled for consideration.

ii. Critical/Analytical Thinking Assessment

Fang Lin then updated the committee on his progress with respect to the assessment of critical thinking. He advised that both Shipra Paul and Choong Lee are teaching MGT 420 Quantitative Decision Making this semester. He is working with both of them to develop common questions for assessment. The questions will be determined by faculty, but will likely be objective format such as multiple choice and true/false. The learning objective for critical thinking is: "Graduates will be able to apply theories and methods to solve problems within their respective disciplines."

The committee discussed whether based upon the language of the objective one assessment would be sufficient or whether a separate assessment would be necessary in each discipline. Fang Lin will look into the AOL standards and will further investigate this concern.

The meeting was adjourned.

Mary Jo Goedeke, Secretary and Co-Chair