

**Blueprint for Academic Excellence**

**Darla Moore School of Business**

**2015-2016**

## Executive Summary

**UG metrics:** Investments by DMSB in innovative and quality programming, student services, and instructional resources allowed for returns in terms of enrollment, student aptitude, and employability. DMSB also strives to affect retention and timely graduation via efforts to prevent course bottlenecks, distribute critical course offerings to prevent graduation delays, and identify students potentially at-risk. While DMSB has worked to affect retention and graduation rates by offering engaging educational experiences with linkages to career outcomes, resource constraints do limit breadth of access. **Graduate metrics:** While variance exists across programs, investments in program design, technology, and career-related resources are generating progress, with improvements observed in enrollment and career outcomes. Market dynamics suggest that progress will require continued innovation, investment in program quality, and portfolio review. **Faculty and research metrics:** While DMSB increased the size of its faculty via FRI hires and working to replace departing faculty, this growth is expected level off starting in the 2014-2015 academic year. As a result, with the growth in undergraduate enrollment, increases in the student-faculty ratio will be observed. Faculty research productivity remains strong, with high levels of output in highly ranked outlets. While important questions remain about the validity of the different rankings of business school research productivity, we ranked 54<sup>th</sup> worldwide in the *Financial Times* ranking and 32<sup>nd</sup> in the most recent North American ranking generated by the University of Texas at Dallas. While funding challenges exist with regard to the doctoral program, we addressed pressing needs with one-time funding. This year, fifth year doctoral student funding was prioritized. We have been placing graduates with some regularity at peer institutions, and fifth year funding was allocated to facilitate progress in this area. **Non-traditional revenue metrics:** We have enhanced levels of philanthropic giving and reversed negative trends recently observed within executive education. **Contribution to performance parameters:** *Teaching:* Continued efforts were made to introduce pedagogical innovation at the undergraduate and graduate levels, and to encourage a range of experiential learning opportunities. *Research:* Resources to support research have enabled DMSB faculty to engage in impactful scholarship. *Service:* Faculty and staff are engaged in: a) economic development, policy analysis, and outreach to business organizations; b) leadership roles in professional organizations; and c) governance in the school and university. *Enterprise sustainability:* DMSB has developed realistic five-year budget models and is working to prioritize initiatives with the potential to affect revenue from academic and non-academic programs. **Strategic priorities:** a) Addressing challenges created by enrollment growth. Targets for the student-faculty ratio have been established. Requests for resources have been submitted as part of an effort to ensure quality programming at DMSB. Plans for efficient and impactful resource deployment are being developed; b) Moving forward with curriculum development initiatives for the undergraduate program. Develop and begin implementation of plans to enhance rigor, enhance employability, and provide distinctive opportunities for our most motivated students. Plan for continued implementation in subsequent years; c) Expanding upon progress made with regard to the data analytics initiative and experiential learning; d) Continuing progress made with regard to graduate programs, with attention to program delivery, efficiency, revenue generation, and reputation and quality. Progress will require continued process improvement, portfolio review, and efforts to leverage existing strengths and capabilities; and e) Enhancing DMSB's capacity to attract top faculty and staff in an increasingly competitive labor market and resourcing capability development.

**Dashboard Indicators**

<i>Undergraduate Enrollment</i>		
<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Strategies for 2015-2016</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support recruitment with distinctive, visible, and quality programs</li> <li>• Faculty/staff support of recruiting, including presentations at SCHC and Scholars events</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of Freshmen               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>2001:</b> 742;</li> <li>○ <b>2011:</b> 1094;</li> <li>○ <b>2012:</b> 1148;</li> <li>○ <b>2013:</b> 1278;</li> <li>○ <b>2014:</b> 1472</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Total # of UGs               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>2001:</b> 2608;</li> <li>○ <b>2011:</b> 4036;</li> <li>○ <b>2012:</b> 4202;</li> <li>○ <b>2013:</b> 4544;</li> <li>○ <b>2014:</b> 5107</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refine existing strategies, with attention to distinctive programming and initiatives focused on enhancing employability</li> </ul>
<i>Average SAT</i>		
<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Strategies for 2015-2016</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhance appeal to top students via study abroad &amp; cohort programs, case &amp; business plan initiatives, consulting projects, curriculum for high-demand fields, world class facilities, and outreach to prospective students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>SAT growth:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>2001:</b> 1097</li> <li>○ <b>2011:</b> 1210</li> <li>○ <b>2012:</b> 1222</li> <li>○ <b>2013:</b> 1222</li> <li>○ <b>2014:</b> 1224</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refine execution of existing strategies, with attention to initiatives that focus on a) employability; b) distinctive &amp; impactful experiences; and c) academic rigor.</li> </ul>
<i>Freshman/Sophomore Retention</i>		
<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Strategies for 2015-2016</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact by attracting strong students and engaging in and out of class</li> <li>• Early at-risk identification and SI and Student Success Center referral and promotion</li> <li>• Increase early engagement via social media</li> <li>• Pilot student success software</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retention rate is 88.5% for 2013, compared to 89.2% in 2012, 89.8% in 2011, and 84.8% in 2010</li> <li>• Consistent with target for USC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refine execution of existing strategies</li> <li>• Utilize peer leaders to meet demands created by new orientation model</li> <li>• Expand and focus DMSB only U-101 sections</li> <li>• Business Major Forums to facilitate early engagement and understanding of career paths</li> <li>• DMSB communities of learning</li> </ul>

**Dashboard Indicators**

<i>Six-Year Graduation Rate</i>		
<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Strategies 2015-2016</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring availability of key courses, addressing demand and schedule requirements</li> <li>• Promote engagement, via USC Connect, DMSB organizations, and residential communities</li> <li>• Tracking and meeting with at-risk students regarding graduation plans</li> <li>• Engage at-risk students via social media</li> <li>• Enhance advisement process via SARS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Six-year graduation rate was 76.8% in 2013, compared to 80% in 2012 and 73% in 2011</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refine execution of existing strategies</li> <li>• Develop staffing and budget models to ensure capacity to address increased enrollment</li> <li>• Addressing failure rates in gateway courses</li> <li>• Ensure appropriate staffing in key student services areas</li> <li>• Develop resources to address deficiencies in academic preparation</li> </ul>
<i>Student Faculty Ratio</i>		
<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Strategies 2015-2016</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replacement and FRI hires</li> <li>• Clinical additions</li> <li>• Retention efforts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FT faculty has grown from 116 in 2010-11 to 146 in current year, with growth in NTT and TT faculty</li> <li>• Student-faculty ratio (incorporating PT faculty) grew from 33.3 to 36 during this same period, with the lowest ratio observed in 2013-14 (32.3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop cost-effective faculty staffing model for hiring initiatives</li> <li>• Retention initiatives</li> <li>• Enhance capacity to attract qualified adjunct faculty</li> </ul>
<i>Research Expenditures</i>		
<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Strategies 2015-2016</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grant course buy-outs at 15% of base</li> <li>• Incorporate grant activity within summer support policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FY 2014 external funding: \$2,528,310 (includes SBDC funding)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain buyout and summer support policies designed to encourage grant activity</li> </ul>
<i>Research Awards</i>		
<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Strategies 2015-2016</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offer research resources to enable the development of an international reputation</li> <li>• Encourage pursuit of recognized awards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discipline-specific awards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain existing strategies</li> </ul>

<i>Doctoral Degrees</i>		
<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Strategies 2015-2016</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initiatives designed to encourage timely completion</li> <li>• Partial funding of fifth year students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of doctorates awarded               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>2010:</b> 9</li> <li>○ <b>2011:</b> 10</li> <li>○ <b>2012:</b> 7</li> <li>○ <b>2013:</b> 16</li> <li>○ <b>2014:</b> 8</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explore alternative funding models</li> <li>• Investments in research climate</li> </ul>
<i>Master's Enrollment and Student Quality</i>		
<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Strategies 2015-2016</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop MBA focus areas</li> <li>• Modify model for fee reductions, expanding potential applicant pool</li> <li>• International/national MBA fairs</li> <li>• Develop feeder institutions</li> <li>• Print/digital marketing</li> <li>• Improve processes for recruiting funnel</li> <li>• Enhance student experience via services and program structure</li> <li>• Leverage enhanced corporate relationships and enhanced career support</li> <li>• Sponsorship initiatives</li> <li>• MACC scholars initiative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program, # Matriculated, GMAT, Experience               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ IMBA: 34, 666, 60</li> <li>○ MBA: 17, 653, 60</li> <li>○ PMBA: 197, 627, 105</li> <li>○ MHR: 42, 527, 19</li> <li>○ MACC: 39, 582, 19</li> <li>○ MAECON: 6, 317, 14</li> <li>○ MIB: 24, 636, 19 (plus partner school students)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explore Army/DOD partnership opportunities</li> <li>• Facility changes to support PMBA growth</li> <li>• Enhance quality of course delivery in PMBA and size of core courses</li> <li>• Streamline program design to expand applicant pool in key areas</li> <li>• Revise select UG majors to encourage flow into 5<sup>th</sup> year programs</li> <li>• Add strong partners for MIB double degree</li> <li>• Continuous improvement in current strategies</li> </ul>
<i>Master's Placement</i>		
<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Strategies 2015-2016</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refine process and structure for IMBA internship procurement</li> <li>• Adjust IMBA structure to facilitating placement</li> <li>• Solidify relationships initiated with new OCM resourcing</li> <li>• Leverage Centers</li> <li>• Leverage alumni &amp; advancement outreach</li> <li>• Enhance student career preparation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IMBA: 88K (71% placed)</li> <li>• MHR: 76K (86% placed)</li> <li>• MACC: 50K (92% placed)</li> <li>• MIB: 49K (92% placed)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop new centers to enhance placement/target firms with global leadership needs</li> <li>• Leverage 40<sup>th</sup> MIBS/IMBA reunion</li> <li>• Emphasize employability in admission decisions</li> <li>• Develop and refine metrics and measurement</li> <li>• Continuous improvement in current strategies</li> </ul>

**Dashboard Indicators**

<i>High Impact Publications</i>		
<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Strategies 2015-2016</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summer support</li> <li>• Internal research funds</li> <li>• Doctoral program funding</li> <li>• Critical mass hiring strategies</li> <li>• New BPF fellows/fixed term chairs to recognize research productivity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 32<sup>th</sup> in North American: UTD research ranking</li> <li>• 54<sup>th</sup> in global <i>Financial Times</i> research ranking</li> <li>• 37 publications with 5 year impact&gt;1.5</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refinement of existing strategies</li> <li>• Select pursuit of associate/full hires</li> <li>• Advancement efforts for chairs and fellows</li> <li>• Corporate engagement with linkages to data access</li> <li>• Retention efforts</li> </ul>
<i>Non-Traditional Revenue</i>		
<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Strategies 2015-2016</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relationship development</li> <li>• Brand enhancement</li> <li>• Innovation in programs and initiatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leadership team established for corporate solutions</li> <li>• Strategy established with a SC focus &amp; a national focus in niche areas</li> <li>• ExecEd Revenue doubled; investments kept us near break-even for FY</li> <li>• Increased faculty engagement in ExecEd</li> <li>• Giving: \$7,165,492</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build on regional ties for general executive programming</li> <li>• Increase enrollment for existing executive niche products, with current and new customers</li> <li>• Center development</li> <li>• Relationship development &amp; leveraging of new facility and leadership</li> </ul>

**Goals**

<i>Enhance Status as a World-Class Research Institution</i>		
<b>5-Year Goals &amp; Key Parameters</b>	<b>1-Year Progress</b>	<b>1-Year Goals</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scholarly activity affecting academic disciplines, business practices, economic development, and policy</li> <li>• Development of reputation for thought-leadership that affects engagement of external constituents with USC and its students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 32<sup>th</sup> in North American: UTD research ranking</li> <li>• 54<sup>th</sup> in global <i>Financial Times</i> research ranking</li> <li>• 37 publications with 5 year impact&gt;1.5</li> <li>• Continued development of productive faculty clusters</li> <li>• Recruited excellent faculty</li> <li>• 11 BPF Fellows awarded</li> <li>• Sponsorship of research seminars and mini-conferences</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leverage private sources for research support and recognition</li> <li>• Maintain recruiting and retention efforts</li> <li>• Select pursuit of associate/full hires</li> <li>• Corporate engagement with linkages to data access</li> </ul>

## Goals

### *Enhance Status: Core Programs*

<b>5-Year Goals &amp; Key Parameters</b>	<b>1-Year Progress</b>	<b>1-Year Goals</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilitating instructional innovation, curriculum development, and enhanced pedagogical techniques in order to affect learning outcomes, the student experience, and the capacity of our graduates to impact organizations and society</li> <li>Develop processes to satisfy the needs of students with some academic deficiencies as well as those who would benefit from opportunities to pursue a more advanced curriculum</li> <li>Enhance employability and student motivation by enhancing career education and expanding experiential education</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modest growth in GRAD enrollment, with increases in 5 of 7 programs</li> <li>MBA: Areas of focus developed with supporting OCM efforts</li> <li>PMBA: Tracking process for elective planning; strategy for reductions in core class size in 2015-2016; enhanced on-campus experiences</li> <li>Enhanced co-curricular experiences for specialized Masters</li> <li>Implementation of modified award and fee structure process</li> <li>Modest increase in student engagement initiatives</li> <li>Increases in UG student engagement initiatives</li> <li>New online UG classes</li> <li>For UG, plans developed to increase quantitative rigor; incorporate analytics; manage enrollment; address the needs of those arriving with academic deficiencies and those needing a more rigorous curriculum</li> <li>Expanded UG engagement in employability initiatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PMBA: Refine synchronous and asynchronous delivery; execute core class reduction strategy; curriculum refinements</li> <li>IMBA/MBA: Enhance availability of experiential learning &amp; enhance career linkages; curriculum refinements</li> <li>Expand grad enrollment via attention to recruiting, product, careers, &amp; new fee structure; secure Army/DOD program</li> <li>UG: finalize strategy and develop execution plan for a) quality enhancement, including quantitative rigor; b) the analytics curriculum; c) enrollment challenges</li> <li>Expand employability initiatives: a) consulting projects; b) co-curricular initiatives; c) major-specific career forums; d) expanded outreach</li> <li>Continuous improvement in student services area</li> <li>Refine &amp; expand blended learning, UG &amp; Grad</li> </ul>

**Goals**

<i>Enhance Status: International Programs</i>		
<b>5-Year Goals &amp; Key Parameters</b>	<b>1-Year Progress</b>	<b>1-Year Goals</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expand opportunities for international education and research via partnerships, cohort programs, exchange agreements, and short-term study abroad. Expanded opportunities both for internationally focused academic programs and other undergraduate and graduate programs</li> <li>Enhance DMSB status with regard to internationally focused undergraduate and graduate business programs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expanded participation in short-term study abroad programs</li> <li>Launched new UG cohort programs</li> <li>Enhanced IMBA student experience, with improved internship/OCM processes, refinement of program structure, and enhanced student services</li> <li>Expansion of dual-degree options for MIB</li> <li>Refined IMBA student recruiting processes, with modest enrollment increases</li> <li>Re-structured IBCE agreement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Launch of new UG cohort program</li> <li>Launch of new MIB double degree</li> <li>Sign new articulation agreements for MIB (Higher School of Economics)</li> <li>Enhance IMBA student experience with a focus on student services, internship processes, and career outcomes</li> <li>Enhance marketing for IMBA, emphasizing new data for internship and career outcomes</li> <li>Develop functionally-focused STSA programs</li> </ul>
<i>Strengthening of Corporate Relationships</i>		
<b>5-Year Goals &amp; Key Parameters</b>	<b>1-Year Progress</b>	<b>1-Year Goals</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developing strong relationships with corporations, governmental agencies, and non-profit organizations, expanding network size and quality</li> <li>Utilization of corporate and organizational partnerships to enhance career opportunities and revenue from services and philanthropy</li> <li>Enhance reputation and visibility of school among stakeholders, opinion-leaders, and potential students and clients</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased job postings by 25%, students interviewed by 90%, expo participation by 30%, and walk-in advisement by 250%</li> <li>Expanded corporate outreach for placement</li> <li>UG: avg. salary: \$47,900; 3 mo placement rate: 82%</li> <li>Restructured corporate solutions; maintained critical programs while restructuring; added new clients for executive education</li> <li>Support from firms for student fellowships</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In executive education, develop programs and models to ensure financial viability; expand number of teaching days; expand number of programs offered</li> <li>Expand number and status of firms recruiting at DMSB</li> <li>Refine metrics, data collection, and processes for placement activities</li> <li>Expand client base for custom and consultative services</li> <li>Marketing strategy and content for supporting outreach initiatives</li> </ul>

## Goals

<i>Enabling Environment: Resources, Infrastructure, and Organizational Capabilities</i>		
<b>5-Year Goals &amp; Key Parameters</b>	<b>1-Year Progress</b>	<b>1-Year Goals</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand discretionary resource base via relationship development and philanthropic initiatives</li> <li>• Development of facilities and technology capable of supporting business education best practices</li> <li>• Development of processes and capabilities to support execution and innovation</li> <li>• Development of incentive and budgetary mechanisms to support critical priorities and revenue growth</li> <li>• Enhanced IT resourcing to support new instructional models and business processes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Solicitations of 34 individuals for gifts of \$50,000 - \$2M</li> <li>• Young Alumni Giving Council created to encourage engagement and annual giving from 2003-2013 graduates</li> <li>• Over \$7,000,000 in gifts (major, annual, corporate, &amp; planned)</li> <li>• Successful building opening with over 500 people in attendance</li> <li>• Progress in development and creation of centers and advisory boards</li> <li>• Building move accomplished with appropriate trade-offs</li> <li>• Communication via senior staff and budget sessions</li> <li>• Budget realigned for building related issues</li> <li>• Some refinement of learning technology</li> <li>• Partial implementation of thin-cloud client computing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Center Advisory Boards created/supported</li> <li>• Key corporate relationship structure put into place, including use of Salesforce database by Executive Education, Office of Career Management and Advancement Staff</li> <li>• Individualized stewardship plan for key campaign donors</li> <li>• Engagement with high level advisors in key cities</li> <li>• Address challenges with classroom technology, room utilization and scheduling</li> <li>• Improve mechanisms for internal communication</li> <li>• Strategy for faculty/staff development and retention</li> <li>• Refine systems for asynchronous instruction</li> <li>• Improve communication via instant “chat” system</li> <li>• Continue progress toward LEED certification</li> <li>• Formalize KPI process with metric analysis</li> <li>• Manage transition to Peoplesoft</li> </ul>

**Appendix A  
Resource Requirements**

<b>Resources</b>	<b>Goals Targeted</b>	<b>Strategy</b>
<p>Provost allocations for faculty hiring to address DMSB enrollment growth. If freshman enrollment stabilizes at 1400 (with no transfer growth), an acceptable student-faculty ratio will require at least 30 faculty slots within the next 3 years. Enrollment patterns call for hiring at least 5 NTT for 15-16, 11 TT and 9 NTT for 16-17, and 4 TT and 1 TT for 17-18 (at an estimated cost of \$6,833,000 per annum when full deployment is achieved).</p>	<p>Student-faculty ratio, graduation and retention rates, status as world-class research institution.</p>	<p>Recognizing cost pressures and the need for an appropriate balance between, TT and NTT faculty, we propose that allocations be split between TT and NTT.</p>
<p>Enrollment growth is straining student services capabilities. NACADA specifies a 285:1 student to advisor ratio. We are at 564:1. Similar gaps exist in OCM. To address, we recommend funding 10 student personal staff for 15-16.</p>	<p>Employability of UG population and retention and six-year graduation rates. Student service quality may also affect capacity to attract top students.</p>	<p>Ensure student services staffing sufficient to allow appropriate attention to at-risk students and for the student population at large, as well as substantive exchanges regarding educational and career opportunities.</p>
<p>The design of the DMSB facility did not anticipate our current enrollment, creating challenges for classrooms and offices. Relevant resources include more local control over space, the ability to use nearby office locations, and support for adding office areas within DMSB.</p>	<p>Six year graduation rates. Research productivity would also be affected given office availability's impact on faculty recruiting.</p>	<p>If there was greater local control over classroom space, efforts would commence to establish viable schedules to maximize space utilization using program specific information. Additional office availability would be used to maintain standard offerings for new faculty.</p>
<p>Resourcing to expand size of IB major by 50 students.</p>	<p>Ability to attract additional students with high SAT scores.</p>	<p>Increase access to a visible major, enhancing USC's efforts to attract top students.</p>
<p>Resources to sustain and grow PMBA program. Needs include facility expansion for Charlotte market, reducing size of core classes (from 180 to 60), and IT upgrades.</p>	<p>Increased revenue for USC and increased visibility in an important market.</p>	<p>Enhance and expand existing NC facility, enhance student experience, and increase visibility.</p>

<b>Resources</b>	<b>Goals Targeted</b>	<b>Strategy</b>
Resources to support Centers focused on corporate engagement, with attention to the linkage between academic programs and corporate needs.	Employability and career outcomes, which will translate into enrollment and student quality outcomes at GRAD and UG level.	Expand capability to build corporate relationships via faculty led projects, experiential education, and center programming.
Resources to enhance the doctoral program impact, with a focus on providing competitive packages and adding slots	Doctoral production and status as world-class research institution	Incremental slots allocated across units on competitive basis and emphasis on 5 <sup>th</sup> year funding.
Faculty and instructional support resources for blended delivery models. Internal, university, and partner institution resources are all critical.	Six year graduation rates are affected by enhancing course availability and instructional design. Graduate enrollment is affected by enhancing instructional quality and program flexibility.	Enhance competencies relating to instructional innovation and streamline processes for development of blended learning models.
Resources to enhance adjunct compensation	Enhanced instructional quality	Attract and retain high quality adjuncts and providing compensation sufficient to ensure focus on critical learning outcomes

## Appendix B

### Peer and Top 10 Institutions

Department	Top 10	Five Peer Schools
<b>Accounting</b>	University of Illinois	Florida State University
	University of Texas	University of Alabama
	Indiana University	University of Missouri
	Arizona State University	University of Tennessee
	University of Washington	Virginia Tech University
	University of Florida	
	University of Wisconsin	
	Michigan State University	
	Ohio State University	
	Texas A&M University	
Department	Top 10	Five Peer Schools
<b>Economics</b>	UC Berkeley	University of Kentucky
	University of Michigan	University of Georgia
	UC San Diego	Florida State University
	UCLA	North Carolina State University
	University of Wisconsin	Clemson
	University of Maryland	
	UC Davis	
	UC Santa Barbara	
	University of Virginia	
	Michigan State University	

<b>Department</b>	<b>Top 10</b>	<b>Five Peer Schools</b>
<b>Finance</b>	University of Texas	University of Georgia
	University of Michigan	University of Pittsburgh
	UCLA	Texas A&M University
	University of North Carolina	Penn State University
	UC Berkeley	University of Oklahoma
	Ohio State University	
	University of Washington	
	Indiana University	
	University of Illinois	
	University of Virginia	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Top 10</b>	<b>Five Peer Schools</b>
<b>International Business</b>	University of Illinois	University of Illinois
	Indiana University	Indiana University
	Michigan State University	Michigan State University
	University of Minnesota	University of Minnesota
	Duke University	George Washington University
	New York University	
	George Washington University	
	London Business School	
	University of Michigan	
	University of Pennsylvania	

<b>Department</b>	<b>Top 10</b>	<b>Five Peer Schools</b>
<b>Management</b>	University of Maryland	Rutgers University
	UNC	University of Colorado
	Indiana University	University of Tennessee
	University of Michigan	Georgia Tech
	Michigan State University	University of Georgia
	Penn State University	
	University of Texas	
	UC Berkeley	
	UCLA	
	University of Illinois	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Top 10</b>	<b>Five Peer Schools</b>
<b>Management Science</b>	Penn State University	University of Minnesota
	University of Michigan	Michigan State University
	Purdue University	Indiana University
	Arizona State University	Ohio State University
	University of Arizona	Georgia Tech
	UC Berkeley	
	University of Texas	
	University of Maryland	
	University of North Carolina	
	University of Tennessee	

Department	Top 10	Five Peer Schools
<b>Marketing</b>	UC Berkeley	University of Connecticut
	University of Florida	Virginia Tech University
	UCLA	University of Georgia
	University of Texas	University of Missouri
	University of Wisconsin	University of Arizona
	Penn State University	
	University of Minnesota	
	University of Michigan	
	University of Maryland	
	Arizona State University	

## Appendix C

### Strengths and Accomplishments

- Research productivity within the DMSB remains strong. A ranking of business school research conducted by UT-Dallas (based on publication in 24 prominent journals) shows that DMSB is ranked 32<sup>th</sup> among North American schools and 54<sup>th</sup> in the global *Financial Times* research ranking. In the most recent year, DMSB faculty had 37 publications in journals with a 5 year impact >1.5. On the *Financial Times* ranking, the schools ranked just above us include Carnegie Mellon, Virginia, University of Illinois, Boston University, University of Pittsburg, and Michigan State University. There are also a number of very prominent schools ranked below us, including Purdue University, University of Wisconsin, University of Iowa, SMU, Oxford, and University of Hong Kong. Research productivity is very much linked to doctoral education and the ability to successfully place doctoral students. In the last year, 50% of our graduates were placed at either peer institutions within the US or very prominent international institutions. This provides another indication of research productivity within DMSB.
- Efforts to further develop international programs and activities continued in the most recent year. In 2014, 109 IB majors were placed for the spring semester with Global Exchange Partners and 92 exchange students from these partners studied at DMSB in the fall. Development of cohort programs continues, with a recently signed agreement allowing a cohort to proceed through their program with semesters at USC, University of Mannheim, ESSEC in Singapore, and Fundaco Getulio Vargas-EBAPE. Another significant UG initiative in the IB space is the IB-Oxford Scholars Program, affording unique opportunities for top students. Significant progress has also been made in terms of expanding international partnerships for the Double-Degree MIB. The Double-Degree MIB with Bocconi University was launched and significant progress was made with an articulation agreement with Higher Economics University in Moscow. Significant expansion has also occurred in short-term study abroad experiences, with 210 participants in the past year. Research and programmatic initiatives will also be made possible by the renewal of the CIBER grant and also funding provided by the Wang China Initiative and the Freeman Institute. Efforts in these areas were recognized by the #1 ranking in *US New and World Report* for undergraduate and graduate programs in International Business.
- While significant challenges remain with regard to the graduate programs, we are seeing tangible signs of progress. In key programs, improvements in student services and administrative processes have been introduced, factors critical to ensuring both career success and alumni ratings (both of which are heavily weighted in MBA rankings). In key programs, structure and offerings have been enhanced and re-configured with a focus on developing functional expertise and enhancing employability. Similarly, offerings are also being developed to allow for the acquisition of skills in areas of emerging importance (e.g., data analytics and Enterprise Resource Planning). Improved career outcomes are being

observed following increased investment in career services. Recruiting processes continue to be refined, with initiatives to enhance the impact of CRM software and digital marketing. Growth patterns highlight where there is potential for significant revenue expansion with some investment in programming, technology, and facilities. Traction with regard to enrollment has not been observed across all programs. In response to this lack of traction, curriculum and programmatic changes have been developed.

- We are observing traction from increased investment in the OCM area. When comparing fall, 2012 to fall, 2014, there were increases in the number of jobs posted (from 586 to 877), students interviewed (from 1106 to 2103), walk-in advisement sessions (from 113 to 394), and students participating in the career expo (from 635 to 900).
- Construction of and transition to the new DMSB facility was completed. The opening of the new facility was effectively used to facilitate donor and alumni relationships as well as to enhance DMSB positioning within the business community. While challenges exist with regard to space constraints, the facility offers the potential to enhance efforts with regard to student recruitment, the attraction and retention of faculty, and outreach among key constituents. Examples include holding the Career Expo on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor classroom space, affecting recruiting perceptions of USC and student engagement in the careers process.
- DMSB overcame significant challenges to ensure that the availability of required coursework to encourage timely graduation and student retention. We prioritized contingency funding to ensure the capacity to add classes when we experience unexpected demand. Unexpected growth in transfer students, strained faculty resources due to on-going growth, and constraints on room availability all made it challenging for DMSB to ensure course availability. Significant efforts to address these challenges were required by department chairs, faculty, and staff. Chairs were required to locate qualified adjuncts with little notice, faculty were asked to teach overload sections, and staff were required to overcome scheduling constraints associated with facility utilization issues. We also made available critical required courses in summer terms to further facilitate student progress.
- Advancement goals continue to focus on alumni engagement and development with the addition of a more active role in college-wide corporate partnerships. During the final year of the Carolinas Promise campaign, 34 specific solicitations were a priority in addition to fundraising efforts focused on the school's major areas of emphasis and the dean's overall vision. Incorporating connectivity tools and opportunities for the 43,000+ alumni was also a focus, including career services, a web-based alumni finder, and better networking opportunities with alumni and students.

- Negative trends observed over the last few years in executive education have been reversed, moving from a money-losing operation to one on track to generate revenue for the college. New program offerings for the military and private sector partners have the potential to yield significant revenue. Distinctive offerings are being designed and offered and resources are being focused on activities with short and medium term potential for revenue generation.
- The ability to attract top undergraduate students (with high SATs and other impressive credentials) depends on our ability to provide distinctive opportunities, highly ranked programs, successful placement outcomes, and opportunities for student engagement. The *US News* ranking for IB and Insurance offer value in this regard as does the supply chain ranking and employment outcomes. Opportunities for engagement in corporate consulting projects, case competitions, the Yield Book initiative, the IMA student chapter, the Proving Ground Competition, short-term study abroad experiences, and service learning combine to offer meaningful opportunities for skill development and engagement. We continue to increase our investment in these and similar activities even within the context of budget constraints.
- Curriculum plans for increasing the rigor of our UG program while also providing tools for student success even where there are deficiencies in prior preparation are moving forward. Associated with this, we are also moving forward with curriculum plans to enhance employability, both in terms of increasing skill acquisition, encouraging a focus on potential career pathways, and encouraging experiential learning.

## **Appendix D**

### **Weaknesses, Challenges, and Opportunities**

- In light of enrollment growth, staffing levels remain a critical concern, both with regard to faculty and critical student service positions. Per instructions from the Provost provided during the 2014-2105 blueprint meeting, we submitted a request in the fall of 2014 for funding to support faculty hires, with emphasis given to clinical hires. Funding concerns precluded immediate action. Follow-up discussions included consideration of enrollment caps as an alternative to increased staffing. Subsequent discussions focused on ensuring an appropriate student-faculty ratio, allowing for such a ratio to be achieved by either increased allocation of slots or controlling enrollment and/or progression. Intense enrollment pressures will be observed for 200-level classes in the coming year, and significant (but less intense) pressures observed for 300-level classes. In the coming year, our plan is to manage these pressures through class size changes, adjunct hiring, and increased dual compensation. This approach will likely not be feasible in the subsequent year in that (if trends continue) we will experience intense pressure for both 200- and 300-level classes and then significant (but less intense) pressures at the 400-level. The significance of the challenge that we will experience in 2016-2017 stems both from the fact that we will observe increased demand at more stages within the UG major and also from the fact that pressures would increasingly be observed in upper division classes where we are less able to find solutions focused on adjunct utilization or class size. The challenges we face have spurred (and will continue to spur) innovation and creativity in order to gain efficiencies while maintaining or even enhancing rigor and quality. However, innovation and creativity with regard to pedagogy are unlikely to offer a complete solution to the challenges posed by recent enrollment surges. Efforts to move forward will depend on both innovation and a viable plan for ensuring a reasonable student-faculty ratio. Given cost pressures, any such plan would likely require a balanced approach to faculty hiring, one that achieves efficiencies via NTT hires and also ensures an appropriate balance between NTT and TT faculty. Efforts to move forward will also depend on a plan for ensuring an appropriate ratio between students and student services personnel.
- The design of the DMSB facility did not anticipate the recent enrollment growth, creating challenges for classrooms and offices. If faculty expansion were to occur, we face significant challenges with regard to locating satisfactory faculty offices. Similarly, if enrollment trends persist, it will be challenging to find space within the DMSB facility for all DMSB classes in light of existing constraints and priorities.
- Faculty retention remains a critical issue for us. A number of faculty have been targeted by competing institutions and we are at risk of losing significant human capital investments. While personal reasons are often a key factor in determining retention, a number of faculty question whether we are offering packages that are competitive with what would be

available at other institutions. While we are sometimes in a position to respond to outside offers, resources often constrain our capacity to act. Further, resources constrain our ability to be pro-active. Within the context of escalating costs for business school faculty and relatively flat college budgets, consideration may have to be given to finding other ways to retain faculty (philanthropic support to fund additional chairs and faculty fellows or eliminating slots in order to fund retention efforts).

- Given the competitive environment for doctoral students in business, our ability to attract top students depends on whether we are competitive with regard to stipends, the number of years funded, and teaching load. Each additional student costs the DMSB over \$30,000 per year, making maintaining and/or growing the program a costly proposition. Partnerships with international institutions may offer opportunities for expansion as might other programmatic strategies for expanding funding availability. While strategies for alternative mechanisms for funding doctoral education deserve attention with regard to potential new initiatives, financial constraints are likely to remain significant in the near-term.
- Business schools face difficult challenges with regard to many of their graduate business programs. At DMSB, we face intense competition for students, with many more prestigious and better funded institutions aggressively competing for top students. Our competitors are able to both offer attractive packages to the best students and also offer an impressive array of services and experiences. We are also seeing growth in the number of well-funded competitors in Asia and Europe, a development with the potential to significantly alter the landscape for business school education. While we have devoted significant resources to many of our graduate programs, many competitors are able to more fully resource student services, instructional support, and faculty staffing levels. It should further be noted that the resourcing provided by other institutions affects expectations of our students, which requires us to respond if we are to ensure student and alumni satisfaction, which is critical for business school rankings, enrollment growth, and relationship development. There are critical areas across a number of our programs where improvements will be needed if we are to thrive. Examples include: a) reducing the size of core classes in the PMBA program; b) improving the quality of asynchronous PMBA program delivery; c) standardizing the quality of our synchronous delivery of PMBA programming; d) improving the quality and availability of global internships and career experiences for the IMBA program; e) expanding opportunities for experiential learning for the MBA and IMBA program; f) ensuring the availability of qualified faculty to teach critical electives and core classes for the IMBA, MBA, and PMBA programs.

The challenging environment for graduate programs in business has led some of our competitors to evaluate their program portfolio and take bold action. Wake Forest and Virginia Tech both eliminated their full-time MBA program in order to focus on part-time professional MBA programming. Other schools are assessing the sustainability of

specialized master's programs largely dependent on large cohorts of international applicants from just a few countries. Within this environment, consideration will need to be given to focusing support on programs where we have resources necessary to compete, where we have the capacity to deliver quality programming, and where it is possible to accrue reputational advantages and/or corporate connections.

- We offer distinctive, visible, and highly engaging programs, programs with the potential to attract highly talented students to USC. Too few students, however, have access to this programming. Further, concerns exist regarding whether we are able to offer programs for our entire UG population that, on a consistent basis, demand analytical thinking and communication skills. Concerns also exist regarding whether we are able to offer programs for our entire UG population that provide skills (whether they be specialized technical skills or general business skills) that lead to labor market success. This situation exists for a complex set of reasons, including program size, variation in student aptitude and motivation, faculty resourcing, and competing institutional priorities. While many options exist for making progress in this area, we must focus on identifying cost-effective alternatives that would increase rigor, develop a range of valued skills, and enhance employability.
- The college has experienced significant change in recent years. These changes include a move to a new facility with a very different work environment. These changes also include programmatic, structural and staffing changes. These changes have strained human capital resources and created coordination issues that DMSB will need to address via continued efforts at process improvement, prioritization of activities, communication, and structural modifications.

## Appendix E. Unit Statistical Profile

### A. Instructional

1. Number of entering freshmen for Fall 2011, Fall 2012, Fall 2013 and Fall 2014, and their average SAT and ACT scores.

	FALL 2011	FALL 2012	FALL 2013	FALL 2014
# Fresh/ACT Avg.	1094/27	1148/27	1278/27	1476/27
# Fresh/SAT Avg.	1094/1210	1148/1222	1278/1222	1476/1223

2. Freshman retention rate for classes entering Fall 2010, Fall 2011, and Fall 2012.

	FALL 2010	FALL 2011	FALL 2012
Same school	74.6%	75.2%	79.8%
Other school	15.2%	14.0%	8.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>89.8%</b>	<b>89.2%</b>	<b>88.5%</b>

3. Sophomore retention rate for classes entering Fall 2009, Fall 2010, and Fall 2011.

	FALL 2009	FALL 2010	FALL 2011
Same school	83.6%	82.4%	84.6%
Other school	10.0%	10.3%	9.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>93.6%</b>	<b>92.7%</b>	<b>93.8%</b>

4. Number of majors enrolled in Fall 2011, Fall 2012, Fall 2013 and Fall 2014 by level: undergraduate, certificate, first professional, masters, or doctoral (headcount).

	FALL 2011	FALL 2012	FALL 2013	FALL 2014
Level	Headcount	Headcount	Headcount	Headcount
Undergraduate	4,036	4,202	4,544	5,064
Masters	803	802	791	756
Certificate	0	0	0	0
First Professional	0	0	0	0
Doctoral	64	74	68	79
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,903</b>	<b>5,078</b>	<b>5,403</b>	<b>5,899</b>

5. Number of entering first professional and graduate students, Fall 2011, Fall 2012, Fall 2013 and Fall 2014, and their average entrance exam scores.

2011										
Program	EIMBA	IMBA	MACC	MAEC	MHR	MIB	PMBA	PhD	TOTAL	
Number Enrolled	18	92	60	12	38	13	163	9	405	
Average GMAT	NA	633	590	665	562	625	597	696		
Average GRE (q+v)	NA	1182	NONE	1264	1044	1040	1128	NA		
Average PAEP	575	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
2012										
Program	EIMBA	IMBA	MACC	MAEC	MHR	MIB	PMBA	PhD	TOTAL	
Number Enrolled	16	71	32	8	38	15	100	17	297	
Average GMAT	NA	624	592	617	599	643	606	698		
Average GRE (q+v)	NA	315	NA	316	304	NA	304	1360		
Average PAEP	627	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
2013										
Program	AMBA	EIMBA*	IMBA	MACC	MAEC	MHR	MIB	PMBA	PhD	TOTAL
Number Enrolled	9	45	28	35	4	39	16	120	11	298
Average GMAT	645	NA	664	595	NA	530	633	582	678	
Average GRE (q+v)	307	NA	312	NA	313	301	NA	307	322	
Average PAEP	NA	616	NA							
2014										
Program	1-Year MBA	IMBA	MACC	MAEC	MHR	MIB	PMBA	PhD	TOTAL	
Number Enrolled	17	34	24	6	42	30	112	22	287	
Average GMAT	653	666	590	NA	527	643	619	695		
Average GRE (q+v)	307	311	NA	317	301	312	307	313		
Average PAEP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		

**NOTE: Score averages are not calculated across programs as admission criteria are different for each degree program.**

**\*EIMBA 2013 numbers include GMBA program.**

6. Numbers of graduates in Fall 2013, Spring 2014 and Summer 2014 by level (undergraduate, certificate, first professional, masters, doctoral).

LEVEL	FALL 2013	SPRING 2014	SUMMER 2014
Undergraduate	203	659	71
Masters	123	182	48
Certificate	0	0	0
First Professional	0	0	0
Doctoral	5	4	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>845</b>	<b>121</b>

7. Four-, Five-, and Six-Year Graduation rates for the three most recent applicable classes (undergraduate only).

2007 COHORT			
	4-Year	5-Year	6-Year
Same school	48.1%	59.9%	60.5%
Other school	9.7%	14.8%	16.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>57.8%</b>	<b>74.7%</b>	<b>76.8%</b>

8. Total credit hours generated by our unit (regardless of major) for Fall 2013, Spring 2014 and Summer 2014.

TERM	COUNT
Fall 2013	51,913
Spring 2014	52,301
Summer 2014	7,953

9. Percent of credit hours by undergraduate major taught by faculty with a highest terminal degree.

FALL 2014	
Major	% of UG Credit Hours - Highest Terminal Degree
Accounting	40.44%
Business Economics	32.13%
Economics/B.A. or B.S.	45.64%
Finance	51.51%
International Business	41.78%
International Business/ Chinese Track	41.71%
Management Science/ Business Information Management	42.4%
Management Science/ Business Information Systems	42.34%
Management Science/ Global Supply Chain	43.88%
Management/ Entrepreneurship	41.71%
Management/ Human Resources	40.52%
Marketing	41.09%
Real Estate	43%
Risk Management and Insurance	43.16%

10. Percent of credit hours by undergraduate major taught by full-time faculty.

FALL 2014	
Major	% of UG Credit Hours - Full-Time Faculty
Accounting	79.76%
Business Economics	77.62%
Economics/B.A. or B.S.	72.06%
Finance	84.47%
International Business	77.01%
International Business/ Chinese Track	78.19%
Management Science/ Business Information Management	77.87%
Management Science/ Business Information Systems	77.75%
Management Science/ Global Supply Chain	78.9%
Management/ Entrepreneurship	100%
Management/ Human Resources	75.19%
Marketing	77.82%
Real Estate	79.13%
Risk Management and Insurance	77.9%

11. Number of faculty by title (tenure-track by rank, non-tenure track (research or clinical) by rank) for Fall 2012, Fall 2013 and Fall 2014 (by department where applicable).

<b>RANK</b>	<b>FALL 2012</b>	<b>FALL 2013</b>	<b>FALL 2014</b>
<b>Tenure Track</b>			
Professor	35	33	32
Associate Professor	25	30	24
Assistant Professor	25	30	23
Research Faculty	0	0	1
<b>Total Tenure Track</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>Visiting Faculty</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Clinical Faculty</b>			
Professor	1	2	2
Associate Professor	0	0	1
Assistant Professor	6	10	10
<b>Total Clinical Faculty</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Instructors</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Lecturers</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Adjunct Faculty</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>171</b>

12. Current number and change in the number of tenure-track and tenured faculty from underrepresented minority groups from FY 2013.

	FALL 2013	FALL 2014	PERCENT CHANGE
<b>PROFESSOR</b>			
Hispanic	0	0	-
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0	-
Asian	5	3	40% decrease
Black or African American	0	0	-
White	28	28	-
Two or More Races	0	0	-
N/R Alien	0	0	-
Unknown	0	0	-
Not Available		1	N/A
<b>ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR</b>			
Hispanic	0	0	-
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0	-
Asian	6	3	50% decrease
Black or African American	1	1	-
White	20	16	20% decrease
Two or More Races	1	1	-
N/R Alien	2	1	50% decrease
Unknown	0	0	-
Not Available		2	N/A
<b>ASSISTANT PROFESSOR</b>			
Hispanic	0	0	-
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0	-
Asian	5	2	60% decrease
Black or African American	0	0	-
White	14	7	50% decrease
Two or More Races	0	0	-
N/R Alien	5	2	60% decrease
Unknown	2	1	50% decrease
Not Available		11	N/A

## B. Scholarship, Research and Creative Accomplishments

1. The total number and amount of external sponsored research proposal submissions by funding source for FY 2014.

DEPARTMENT	APPLICATIONS BY FUNDING SOURCE								DOLLARS REQUESTED
	Fed	State	Local	Comm	Priv	Other	Agency (Z Accts)	Total	
Dean's Office	2				1	1		4	271,351
Division of Research		3		4	3			10	227,000
Small Business Development Center	4						1	5	3,492,320
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>3,990,671</b>

2. Summary of external sponsored research awards by funding source for FY 2014. Total extramural funding processed through Sponsored Awards Management (SAM) in FY 2014, and Federal extramural funding processed through SAM in FY 2014. Amount of sponsored research funding per faculty member in FY 2014 (by rank, type of funding; e.g., federal, state, etc., and by department if applicable).

DEPARTMENT	PRIMARY INDIVIDUAL	RANK/TITLE	FED	STATE	PRIV	COMM	TOTAL
Dean's Office	Kress, Dean	Assoc. Dir., Faber Center	12,932				<b>12,932</b>
	Roth, Kendall	Senior Assoc. Dean	154,790				<b>154,790</b>
	Thatcher, Sherry	Professor	81,225				<b>81,225</b>
Division of Research	Ferguson, Mark	Professor				90,000	<b>90,000</b>
	Von Nessen, Joseph	Research Economist, DoR	24,940	84,000	56,000	45,000	<b>209,940</b>
	Woodward, Douglas	Professor & Director, DoR				50,000	<b>50,000</b>
Small Business Development Center	Abraham, Michele	State Director, SBDC	1,127,336				<b>1,127,336</b>
	Lenti, John	Adjunct	802,087				<b>802,087</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>2,203,310</b>	<b>84,000</b>	<b>56,000</b>	<b>185,000</b>	<b>2,528,310</b>

3. Total sponsored research expenditures per tenured/tenure-track faculty for FY 2014, by rank and by department, if applicable.

DEPARTMENT	PRIMARY INDIVIDUAL	RANK/TITLE	TOTAL EXPENDITURES
Dean's Office	Finger, Stephen	Assistant Professor	619
	Kress, Dean	Assoc. Dir., Faber	3,625
	Thatcher, Sherry	Professor	14,141
Division of Research	Nartey, Lite	Assistant Professor	13,354
	Ployhart, Robert	Professor	34,984
	Roth, Kendall	Professor	166,113
	Von Nessen, Joseph	Research Economist, DoR	212,793
	Woodward, Douglas	Professor	8,279
Small Business Development Center	Abraham, Michele	State Director, SBDC	1,089,397
	Lenti, John	Adjunct	22,419
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>1,565,724</b>

4. Number of patents, disclosures, and licensing agreements in fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014.

None reported.

## DMSB 5% Budget Cut/Increase

**Options for 5% Budget Reduction.** A 5% cut would require approximately \$1.7 million in annual savings.

Potential cuts could include:

- a. 25% cut in Academic Unit budgets nets \$183,000.
- b. 25% cut in MARCOM state budget nets \$170,000.
- c. 25% cut in MARCOM salary/fringes saves \$125,000.
- d. 25% cut in OCM state budget yields \$56,000.
- e. 25% cut in international services operational/FTE budget yields \$222,000.
- f. 25% cut in research incentive budget yields \$65,750.

Combining all cuts above produce savings of \$821,750, and underscores that most DMSB expenses are personnel/academic related.

To reach \$1.7 million, it would likely also be necessary to make cuts in academic programs, where efforts would be made to minimize the impact on students and stakeholders. To illustrate the magnitude of cuts that would be necessary, if we were to cut the number of funded doctoral slots by 50% (combined with reallocation of faculty teaching resources), we would reduce the DMSB budget by \$900,000 per annum. Eliminating the IMBA program would allow for savings of a similar magnitude, depending on how such a cut were to be implemented. Combining the cuts described in points a to f with a significant academic program cut (such as one of those described above) would generate \$1,700,000 in cuts.

**Options for 5% Budget Increase.** Achieving an adequate student-faculty ratio to deal with increased undergraduate enrollment requires 30 FT TT and NTT faculty. Additional 10 staff are also needed. These needs are included in the blueprint, and were modeled in the DMSB 5 yr. budget plan. The total recurring cost of these additions once fully in place are estimated at \$6,833,000 per annum. As addressing these requirements is top priority, a 5% increase would first be devoted to meeting these faculty/staff costs. If not these, resources are needed to re-invest in PMBA (both faculty resources to teach some core courses that now have class sizes in the 100s, as well as resources to upgrade the IT backbone of teaching materials/presentation formats, as well as around \$100,000 p.a. for rental of a new site in Charlotte). Further, while we will be using DMSB resources to increase adjunct compensation to \$5000 for undergraduate courses (at a per annum cost of \$200,000), this level remains below what is offered by a number of peer schools and may still be insufficient to attract and retain qualified adjuncts. There is a need to raise compensation to \$7500 per undergraduate course. Adjuncts cannot be expected to upgrade UG program rigor while being so poorly paid; this will cost around \$325,000 per annum on a recurring basis.