The program review committee has reviewed the self-study and documentation of the Management program.

I. **Strengths**

1. The Business Administration program appears to be growing steadily at TAMUK and the System Center in San Antonio as indicated by the undergraduate SCH in business management (MGMT) courses and the overall number of business MGMT majors.

2. The programs relevant faculty meet formally twice annually to discuss the goals and objectives common to all Business Administration programs and strive to ascertain the achievements of the respective goals and objectives.

3. The TAMUK MGMT majors’ MFAT scores are higher than the national average and job placement of graduating Business MGMT majors is above the 70th percentile.

4. Relatively high standards are in place for admission into the Business Administration program which probably contributes to the high MFAT scores.

5. There is no indication of faculty overloads; therefore, it is assumed that students are able to receive a better education due to minimal restraints on the time allotted for student-teacher interaction.

6. An additional faculty member has been hired at the System Center in San Antonio to enhance the productivity of the learning environment.

7. The faculty seek outside sources of funding and in doing so have attained private funding to support travel to conferences or meetings in order to increase professional growth.

8. The faculty is continually seeking externally funded research grants with which to enhance scholarly activities.

II. **Weaknesses**

1. The consistently low MFAT scores at the System Center in San Antonio indicate that a problem exists in the productivity of the learning environment.
2. There is no indication of recruitment efforts of students to the program although it appears to be a topic that is discussed during the twice annual program review meetings.

3. The SRIs are reported to be unusable because of the way they are computed, instead the “raw scores” on various SRI items are used as indicators with which to counsel faculty.

4. The various SRI items were not included in the review.

5. The relevance/outcome of the program is unclear particularly after reviewing the responses to selected questions by graduated Business MGMT majors completing an Alumni Survey.

6. The respondents rated the relevance of the degree as low and rated the overall quality of the degree as low.

III. Recommendation

1. Seek the reasons for the low scores to help the program better prepare graduating seniors for the job market, make the students more competitive in the job market, and in doing so recruit more students to the program.

One-Year Follow-Up

IV. Dean’s Comments

1. II-01 (Weaknesses)

SC-SA MGMT faculty are addressing the issue of lower MFAT scores.

2. II-02 (Weaknesses)

CBA staff and/or faculty participate in all university-organized recruiting events. We have a particularly good relationship with Del Mar College. There is room for improvement in the organization of and participation in external recruiting activities.

3. II-03 (Weaknesses)

The responses to II-03 and VII-06 were not sufficiently descriptive. All of the SRI items are used individually as indicators of faculty performance. However, it is the overall score on the SRI section of the annual evaluation that is not used because it is unrealistically inflated by the scoring formula. This problem has been corrected by the recent development of a new scoring system for the teaching effectiveness section.
4. II-05 (Weaknesses)

The narrative for Section II-04 failed to mention that the response values shown in Table II-04.4 were based on a five-point scale. Thus, while we are always striving to improve our scores, the scores given are not really “low.” This has been discussed with the review committee chair.