

UNDERGRADUATE COMMITTEE MEETING

September 19, 2008

Attending: Craig Tapley; Dominique A Desantiago; Douglas G Waldo; Jebi Mathew; John D. Kammeyer-Mueller; Richard J Lutz, Dean John Kraft, Larry A Dimatteo; Mahendrarajah Nimalendran; Tawnya Means; Horace Tucker; Wendy Thornton; Haldun Aytug.

Dean Kraft spoke first about challenges the state is facing concerning financing, which will not get better soon. Since this is an accreditation year, we will have to work through those challenges.

This is the first year we are working under an administrative structure that includes three separate schools, the Hough Graduate School of Business, the Fisher School of Accounting, and the School of Business. Each of the units is headed by a director – Brian is Director of SB. That is the organizational structure going forward. More emphasis will be placed on each of the schools, rather than majors.

As the state adjusts to the economy, there will have to be a better budget model for funding undergrad education. There will be a shortfall for the next couple of years, and the schools are dealing with the loss of 8 faculty positions. While they're spread over a number of majors, they did result in the elimination of two minors, entrepreneurship and real estate, which adversely impacted the undergraduate program.

Another issue affected by the budget cuts is the restriction of the number of Community College transfer students accepted into UF. That number may be restricted again in the future. There is a plan to find a donor who will name the School of Business, and a plan to solicit donations for a new SB building.

A decision was made to discuss the problem of a disproportionate number of finance majors while Dean Kraft was in attendance at the meeting. Dr. Ray explained that we have tried to distribute majors evenly across the programs, but still have irregularities in the numbers of students who want finance as a major.

Dr. Lutz brought up the fact that funding was requested for a new finance position. Dean Kraft has requested funding for finance from Tigert, but the resource base is actually shrinking. Faculty funding in accounting and finance was requested, but we will probably get only a portion of the requested funding.

Dean Kraft discussed the possibility of adding adjuncts. We'll probably fund 5th year PhD students in finance, which will allow for some expansion. Dr. Nimalendran pointed out that the number of PhDs who could teach has been severely restricted. For example, two years ago they had eleven Ph.D.s who could teach. Last year they had 5. Next year it might be 2 or 3. So funding is a problem, but also human resources are a problem as well.

Brian said he would fund Nimal's 5th year students rather than have 48 bodies in a classroom. However, the bigger issue is, are we preparing students correctly from a curriculum sequence perspective? Dean Kraft said that the number of undergraduate students have actually been shrinking so in the future that might allow us to better manage our shrinking resources. But there is currently no link between the number of students we teach and the resources we get.

Dr. Nimalendran said that, since they have several people on leave, their classes are maxed out. Brian added that the number of sections is one part, but the number of bodies is another. It is frustrating that students outside the major, or students who are below senior standing, can't get the courses they want. Right now, 99.9% of all seats are filled with senior finance majors.

Dr. Nimalendran said that if we had a better forecast of what the numbers would be, we could plan better. But forecasting these numbers is difficult to do. Dr. Tapley asked why we couldn't just restrict the number of Finance majors by requiring higher grades in some of the earlier courses to reduce the number of finance majors.

At the suggestion that we add requirements for a higher grade in Financial Accounting, Dean McCollough suggested in a previous meeting that students be required to have a set score on the SATs in order to go into Finance. Dr. Waldo suggested ranking students using FIN 3403, and then allow them in based on that ranking. Discussion ensued about the efficacy of this proposal.

Dr. Tapley asked that the committee reconsider a previous proposal to require a B+ in FIN 3403. Dr. Lutz said again the resource limitations become a factor. Dr. Nimalendran added that it's not clear whether this overload in finance majors is a permanent situation or not.

Brian pointed out that overall SB had 10% fewer juniors this semester, but we still have more finance juniors than last year. Two important points need to be made:

1. If we change a prereq it won't take effect until Fall 2010 and
2. The SAT score wouldn't kick in until next fall's incoming class.

Dr. Nimalendran agreed to go back and discuss the proposal with his faculty and then return for the October 10 meeting.

Minutes from the meeting of March 31, 2008 were approved. There was no old business.

Dr. DiMatteo's Business Law course, BUL 4261, was discussed next. Dr. Lutz requested a motion to approve the course outline. It was moved and seconded. Dr. Ray pointed out that management is one of our majors that requires four courses. Dr. Lutz also told Dr. DiMatteo that he appreciated the writing tips from the BUL 4261 handout.

Dr. DiMatteo taught the course as a 4930 class in fall 2007. He had 35 students. He felt that the students were very engaged, even though it was an early morning class. Most of the students were pre-law. Dr. Waldo said that there was a population of management students who would

appreciate the course. Dr. DiMatteo said that his course piggybacks on the Business Law class. Dominique Desantiago suggested students taking the class be required to be juniors or seniors.

The course was approved unanimously.

Dr. Ray discussed the new admissions model for Summer 09. There was some discussion about the Community College Articulation Agreement. Students don't necessarily have to be accepted into a specific university, college, or major. Our new model is that the students must have a 3.0 overall and a 3.7 preprofessional GPA. The core GPA should then mirror native students. We should get about 130 students for summer, fall and spring. SB may end up entertaining more petitions from students who have a 2.9 in the pre-professional courses.

Dr. Ray then discussed the Annual Report highlights. The good news is that we now have 7 full time advisors. We now have fewer than 100 freshmen per advisor.

Warrington Welcome and FLA are going very well. Study abroad enrollments continue to grow. Soon we will start a new program in Paris with St. John's. They've been a very good partner. We're not going to partner with the University Center there because there is a \$4,000 price difference per semester.

Concerning the ETS exam, 30 students in summer 08 were tested and scored in the top 5% in all nine areas. Thirty-six freshmen took the test last week. Results are due soon, and can be used as a baseline. There will be 159 tested this fall. Next fall/spring, the exam will be administered to hundreds of students.

Dr. Ray also presented results from the EBI survey. Beginning in 2004, every freshman and sophomore entering had a 3.0. The year 2006 was the first year all incoming students had a 3.0 in the program. The select six we were compared against were Michigan State, Wisconsin at Madison, Arizona State, Colorado, Florida State and Arkansas.

In the area of Critical Thinking and Problem Solving, the students did very well. Also, the quality of advising demonstrates that we perform well in this area, even in comparison to smaller schools. Dr. Ray attributed this to the Warrington Welcome and Professional Development programs, as well as the hard work of the advising staff.

Dr. Ray also gave an overview of the revenue generated by the online program. This year, the program should bring in a little over two million dollars in revenue. The average head count every semester is about 420 and they take about 2.1 courses per term.

Dr. Lutz asked how this program was affected by the change in transfer enrollment quotas. Dr. Ray answered that the problems with the University transfer decisions caused a reduction in the number of IBA students. But we now have a half-time person at Valencia and Miami Dade, so this should help improve enrollment in those two key communities. Dr. Lutz asked if there was

any data that would indicate a problem with the student experience in the program. Dr. Ray will check with the Associate Director, Jill Lingard to see if data is available

Dr. Lutz asked about changes in community colleges possibly leading to four-year business degrees. Dr. Ray said that at this point, these colleges are all planning to offer AS to BAS programs. It's possible this may change in the future as the community colleges begin to offer more options.

Regarding head counts for the SB, Dr. Ray pointed out that the BABA senior head count has leveled off at about 150. The total number of seniors has stayed the same over the four years. Brian was concerned about the lower division head counts. Starting in 2004, all freshmen and sophomores were required to have a 3.0 GPA. The freshmen and sophomore students have decreased in most UF colleges, and our college enrollment was in line with those decreases. Attention from the new Chief Financial Officer may make a difference, particularly once we get to the point where the budget model is based on head count and credit hours.

Dr. Ray pointed out that we would expect our head count to be lower for Fall 08, because we went from 280 transfer students admitted annually to 110 or 120 for the year. Even though these head counts have gone down, the finance head counts have gone up.

Dr. Lutz asked Dr. Ray to discuss the possibility of requiring either an Internship or Study Abroad for our students in order to graduate. About a quarter of SB students study abroad and about sixty percent report doing an internship. Brian recommended that students be required to do one or the other as part of their graduation requirements.

With 100 students to each advisor, this is a reasonable project. Students would sign up for GEB 4941 for a 1-credit internship. They would complete a 10-page paper and a 150-hour internship in a semester. If they didn't want to do an internship, they could study abroad.

Dominique suggested that the paper requirement be changed to an online discussion, where students log in once a week to a discussion board to share ideas and address problems.

Dr. Ray said that, according to the EBI data, 27% of our students go straight to grad school. They avoid challenging themselves over the summer. This might force them to find out whether they want to go to grad school or not.

Dr. Tapley suggested students could write up a 2-page paper for other students. That way they could advise other students about the internships that are available. The same idea might work well for the study abroad program. The discussion boards are very successful, as well.

This topic will be continued for discussion at the October 10 meeting.

The next topic for discussion was the suggestion of a cap for non-proctored online testing. Responsibility for the decision on this subject has been shifted to the Teaching Committee but Dr. Lutz would like to get the Undergraduate Committee's opinions on the subject.

The concern about online assessments is that it is too easy for students to cheat. Tawnya Means responded that using the online program allows you to continually access your students. If you restrict that, you lose ongoing assessment ability. You severely limit the benefit of using the technology. Dr. Waldo felt there should be a limit but was unsure what it should be set.

Per Tawnya, there are online tools being developed to proctor exams, or you can have a person in the room to proctor. There is an 86-seat room Technology area being developed. Tawnya's group is also planning a pilot study for online proctoring. She felt that the online tests could result in two positive attributes:

- They encourage learning and
- They make assessments easier.

If a student can take a test several times, you can assess them automatically. By forcing the student to retake the test until they learn it, you reduce ease of cheating and eliminate the value of cheating. Dr. Tapley said his quizzes are open for a week and a half. Students can take the quiz 3 times. If they don't keep up, they'll get caught on exams. Students are also writing 5000-6000 word essays so he knows they're learning the material.

Dr. Lutz felt there were two issues involved in the discussion:

1. Regulating current practice, which in most cases means multiple choice exams
2. A broader view of assessment.

Jebi Mathew wanted a distinction made between a final test and an ongoing project. There is less probability that people will cheat on a large project, even if it is online.

Dr. Lutz pointed out that the problem remains with online testing, not projects. Capping the percentage would still make sense. You have some control in a smaller class but in a large class, it is easier to cheat online. Tawnya felt there were ways you could limit cheating.

Dr. Lutz suggested this restriction be applied to the EP courses, Lower division ECO 1 and 2 and IBA courses, and that the Undergraduate Committee refer this information to the Teaching committee. The following proposal will be referred to the teaching committee (see attached):

1. The restriction should cover only tests and quizzes, not projects.
2. Online assessments should be limited to 5% each and 25% overall
3. If an instructor needs a higher percentage, they can appeal to the Teaching Committee or the Program Director.

Tawnya added her office would be willing to assist with online assessments. Her proposal for implementing broader assessment procedures is also attached.

The next meeting will cover the Finance over-enrollment problem, and the Study Abroad/Internship proposal. Any other proposals should be sent to Brian before the October 10th meeting, which will start at 10 a.m.