August 17, 2016

MEMORANDUM

To: WCBA Faculty and Staff

From: John Kraft

Subject: AACSB Continuous Improvement Review, Accomplishments and Guidance

The college continues to make solid progress in the areas that are important for our AACSB Continuous Improvement Review (CIR), a review that takes place every five years. As you recall, we had a very successful visit in Spring ’14. The members of the review team were impressed with the college’s accomplishments as well as our outlook for future success. The review team did not find any areas of concern that required further review.

Accomplishments to Date and Guidance for the ’16-’17 and ’17-’18 Academic Years

The college just completed the third year of our five-year AACSB CIR cycle. Our next CIR visit, which will take place between October ’18 and March ’19, will occur under AACSB standards that have a few modifications compared to our most recent review. The three overarching themes of the revised standards are innovation, impact, and engagement. The following link offers an explanation of these three themes.

http://www.aacsb.edu/~/media/AACSB/Docs/Accreditation/Standards/2013-bus-standards-update.ashx

In my most recent CIR guidance memo (August ’14), everyone in the college was encouraged to incorporate and document these three themes in various ways (e.g., annual reports, narratives describing the activities of the college’s centers, etc.).

PLANNING GUIDANCE

Update of WCB’s Strategic Plan

In Spring ’16, I convened a committee to revise/update the WCB Strategic Plan that was adopted in Spring ’13 (www.warrington.ufl.edu/mywarrington/docs/StrategicPlan.pdf). The committee, chaired by Rich Lutz, was convened in year three of our five-year CIR cycle due to the uncertainty
of the university’s budget model. Once the main points of the new model were finalized (i.e., the mid-point of Spring ‘16), the WCB Strategic Planning Committee began its work. The committee has three areas of emphasis.

The first area of review is a thorough analysis of the draft planning document, examining assumptions, and fleshing out various components (i.e., situation analysis, objectives, strategies). Andy Naranjo is leading this effort with assistance from Steve Asare, Haldun Aytug, Jon Cannon, and Brian Ray.

The second area of review is a careful consideration of the metrics to be used. Several candidate metrics exist: those specified in the current strategic plan, those associated with the University’s pre-eminence initiative, and those underlying the Academic Analytics report. The goal is to identify a set of key metrics that map to those that are prioritized by the University. Joyce Bono is leading this effort with assistance from Janice Carrillo, Selcuk Erenguc, Rich Lutz, and Gary McGill.

The third area of review is a detailed focus on the specialty master’s programs and the recruiting strategies that can be pursued to expand enrollment. Enrollment expansion is the only viable route for enhancing the college’s revenue. As such it is a linchpin of the draft plan. Fiona Barnes is leading this analysis with assistance from Erica Byrnes, JC Marvin, Mahendrarajah Nimalendran, Ana Portocarrero, Alex Sevilla, and Jenny Tucker.

The committee’s intent is to complete its work and have a revised plan for faculty consideration and adoption by the end of the Spring ’17 term.

**Faculty Qualifications**

Under the previous AACSB standards, there were three faculty qualification designations: academically qualified (AQ), professionally qualified (PQ), and other. Under the revised standards, these categories were adjusted in the following manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustained engagement activities</th>
<th>Academic (Research/Scholarly)</th>
<th>Applied/Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Practitioners (SP)</td>
<td>Instructional Practitioners (IP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Academics (SA)</td>
<td>Practice Academics (PA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial academic preparation and professional experience</td>
<td>Professional experience, substantial in duration and level of responsibility</td>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scholarly Academic (SA): Sustain currency and relevance through scholarship and related activities.

Practice Academics (PA): Sustain currency and relevance through professional engagement, interaction, and relevant activities. Normally, PA status applies to faculty members who augment their initial preparation as academic scholars with development and engagement in activities that involve substantive linkages to practice, consulting and other forms of professional engagement.

Scholarly Practitioner (SP): Sustain currency and relevance through continued professional experience, engagement, or interaction and scholarship related to their professional background and experience. Normally, SP status applies to practitioner faculty members who augment their experience with development and engagement in activities involving substantive scholarly activities in their fields of teaching.

Instructional Practitioners (IP): Sustain currency and relevance through continued professional experience and engagement related to their professional backgrounds and experience. Normally, IP status is granted to newly hired faculty members who join the faculty with significant and substantive professional experience.

As a research-one institution, the college has set the following goals in this area:

- **SA**: >70%
- **SA+PA+SP**: > 75%
- **SA+PA+SP+IP**: >90%

WCB continues to exceed these goals. WCB’s ’15–’16 faculty sufficiency data are as follows:

- **SA**: 79.9%
- **SA+PA+SP**: 95.1%
- **SA+PA+SP+IP**: 97.9%

Assurance of Learning (AoL)
The college’s AoL program was cited for excellence during the Spring ’14 Continuous Improvement Review. Building on that momentum, the faculty lead for each of our degree programs, along with the appropriate review committee, has focused on measuring and evaluating the learning goals and objectives of each degree program. AACSB standards require that this be done at least twice for each degree program during the five-year CIR cycle (e.g., ’13–’14 through ’17–’18). 11 of the college’s 13 degree programs have already “closed the AoL loop” at least twice. The two degree programs that have not yet done so are on track to meet this standard by the end of the ’17–’18 academic year.

Specifics on the college’s AoL program (e.g., faculty lead, membership of review committees, degree program goals and objectives, curriculum maps, timelines, etc.) are available at [www.warrington.ufl.edu/centers/ctla/assurance.asp](http://www.warrington.ufl.edu/centers/ctla/assurance.asp).