

## **Introduction and Rationale Statement for Omnibus Package: Carson College of Business Undergraduate Curriculum Revision**

The Carson College of Business is submitting a major revision of its core curriculum, while also adding a required co-curriculum. Because this revision requires the submission of nearly two dozen related, inter-connected WSU Faculty Senate forms, this document provides the overarching rationale, and a feasibility statement, including the impacts to the other campuses.

### Overall Rationale

Two years ago, the Carson College of Business set the new strategic goal that *WSU is the first choice for students seeking a business education in the Pacific Northwest*. After examining much assessment data of current students and seeking significant feedback from employers of our graduates, we determined that the current curriculum, which has not been holistically revised in over 25 years, emphasizes too few of the major learning outcomes students and employers seek, and our current curriculum is not sufficiently effective at advancing students towards its current learning goals due to many students being disengaged. Therefore, we know we have to revise our curriculum. We believe the new curriculum submitted here will get us to this strategic goal by 2026.

### Major Features of Revision

The primary features of the new curriculum and co-curriculum are designed to fundamentally change the culture and quality of the learning experience for our students. They will do so by increasing the emphasis on soft-skills that employers demand and by driving more engaging, interactive pedagogy both inside and outside the classroom. The primary structural features of the proposed, revised curriculum are:

- Moving certification from end of sophomore year to end of freshman year
- Adding nine new courses (11 credits) freshman and sophomore years, specifically:
  - Freshman Year: Five credits of courses that focus on helping students understand what a business career and education are all about, including HBM 101 and two new BA courses (BA 100 and BA 102).
  - Sophomore Year: Six credits of courses that provide the first instruction of each of the six, new learning goals, which are:
    - Act ethically and professionally
    - Make theory-based and data-driven decisions
    - Identify, assess and initiate opportunities to create value
    - Gain a global business perspective and be sensitive to and respectful of cultural differences
    - Communicate clearly and persuasively, both orally and in writing

- Lead a team and act as an effective team member

Note: These sophomore courses will be taken either as: a) six, one-credit, five-week modules (i.e., BA 201 to BA 206) at the Pullman campus; or b) two, three-credit courses (i.e., BA 211 and BA 212) at the other campuses. Thus, credit will not be granted for both sets of courses: i.e., credit will not be granted for both BA 211 and BA 201-203, and credit will not be granted for both BA 212 and BA 204-206. Also, where BA 201-203 is required, BA 211 satisfies that requirement, and vice-versa; where BA 204-206 is required, BA 212 satisfies that requirement, and vice-versa.

- Dropping Mgmt 301 from the core, because most of its key content is now the focus of the new, sophomore year courses
- Expanding the six credits of PoliSci and Psych/Soc requirements to include six credits of *any* social science or humanities course.
- Dropping the requirement that 60 credits be taken outside of business.
- Requiring for graduation that students participate in co-curricular activities (i.e., outside of courses they take), and creating a milestone system to provide a menu of such activities and to track these activities.
- All these new requirements would take effect for any WSU Freshman entering Fall 2019; for any WSU student starting at WSU before Fall 2019, they would be held to current requirements. Regarding transfer students, only those transfer students entering WSU Fall 2021 or later would be held to the new requirements.

There are a couple additional major features, worth mentioning to provide context, but not something that the Faculty Senate would vote on:

- Capping all core courses at 70 students per face-to-face section (online sections are not capped this way; they will continue to cap discussion sections at 45 students). Note that this is a feature that can be modified as the resources do or do not materialize. Carson College intends to raise funds privately to cover most of these additional costs.
- Creating a course-design team for each new core course to implement these recommendations, and to help each new core course effectively advance students toward the learning goals assigned to that core course. The purpose of these teams is to find pedagogies that are more interactive than just lecture and thus that better engage students.

### Feasibility of Curriculum Changes

We've considered the feasibility of this revision using seven feasibility test criteria: political feasibility, operational feasibility, technical feasibility, ethical feasibility, contract feasibility,

legal feasibility, and economic/budgetary feasibility. Below we summarize how the changes are feasible by each criterion.

Political feasibility: We have worked with as many affected stakeholders as possible before submitting this proposal. Within the college of business, we have had all faculty and staff review two drafts of the learning goals, followed by a unanimous vote of the CCB's Undergraduate Program and Policy Committee (UPPC), and then had faculty review three drafts of the full proposal of a curriculum to meet the new learning goals. We also held focus groups with students, including students from other campuses. Each CCB department and campus business programs have held their own meetings to discuss this proposal. After all that, this proposal passed the UPPC unanimously. We also worked with CAS and CAHNRS to ensure that our proposal, which has elements that affect those colleges (i.e., expanding the six credit hours of Psych/Soc/PoliSci to any Social Science or Humanities courses; revising the dedicated sections of English 402; revising Math 201 and 202) did not negatively impact those colleges or their students.

In terms of cross-campus voice, know that this proposal has been co-developed with and vetted at all campuses. The task force's eleven Carson College faculty and staff who developed this proposal include two members from the Vancouver campus (including the chair of the task force), one member from Tri-Cities, and one member from Everett (who also serves as its vice-chancellor of academic affairs). Several members of the taskforce have also taught on the Global Campus, and one member coordinates the CCB's Global Campus offerings. Moreover, earlier drafts of this proposal were presented to business faculty and staff at all campuses, who held campus-based discussions of it, as well as participating in their respective home-department discussions. Finally, an earlier draft was sent to the vice-chancellors of the Tri-Cities and Vancouver campuses. Through the process of multiple revisions of the proposal, seeking feedback with each revision, all campuses' interests and concerns have been incorporated and balanced.

Operational feasibility: We have mapped out how the addition of new courses affects the offering of continuing courses, at all campuses. Although we propose adding 11 credits of new courses, we also propose dropping three credits of the current business core (i.e., Mgmt 301), and removing the requirement that business students must take 60 credits outside of business (which we calculate to have insignificant impact on any other one college or department). This prevents us from pushing any business major over 120 credits, though note that Wine Business Management was already over 120 credits, and this proposal does not change that. We also have identified the staff who are needed to manage the co-curriculum, known as the Carson Career Amplifier Program. Finally, we have analyzed the scheduling of classrooms in Todd Hall and nearby buildings, and there are enough classrooms to accommodate the increased number of sections we'd have to offer if all core courses are capped at 70, if we schedule some sections outside of the "rush hour" times of mid-day.

Technical feasibility: Nothing in this proposal requires new technical systems at WSU, except perhaps software that would track co-curricular activities, which is affordable and which the Carson College would purchase. Nothing in this proposal will overwhelm or cause glitches in any WSU information systems.

Ethical feasibility: Nothing in this proposal creates injustices, violates rights, or makes any stakeholder worse off. For instance, no “negative impact” on transfer students (i.e., a statewide transfer agreement term meaning that students who transfer to WSU with an AA degree and Direct Transfer Agreement would not have to take additional courses at WSU before certifying in business) will be created because transfer students who have the DTA will not have to take any additional courses at WSU before certifying in business. Because this is so, we do not have to notify other schools in the state, but out of courtesy we will.

Contract feasibility: Nothing in this proposal violates any contracts the CCB or WSU holds with any other parties. In particular, it does not violate the Direct Transfer Agreement in Business that we have with other institution in Washington State.

Legal feasibility: Nothing in the proposal violates any state or federal laws.

Economic/budgetary feasibility: This proposal will cost more funds to implement. We have calculated the resource requirements for it at all campuses. In its minimal configuration/implementation it will cost only what is required to offer eight more credit hours. In its full configuration/implementation including its most expensive component to cap all business core courses at 70 students, it will require:

- In Pullman, about 13-14 faculty more lines and one staff line (this includes covering Global Campus needs) are forecast to be added if we are to staff the entire proposal complete with the smaller sections envisioned. Additional faculty will be a mix of tenure-track research faculty and instructional faculty, as the college intends to continue develop its research program, and because accreditation standards for the college require a substantial proportion of the program to be delivered by research faculty. The college has run a budget surplus in each of the last several years, and can, without additional funding, add several additional faculty while maintaining a balanced budget. The ability to add further faculty to staff the program fully will depend on the success of private fund-raising (building the college endowment) and on the sustained success of online graduate education.
- The Vancouver campus needs to add only one full-time instructor and one advisor to offer all the new courses, co-curriculum, and other requirements proposed in the omnibus proposal.
- The Tri-Cities campus needs only to get back one of its open lines in business, after which it can fully offer everything in this omnibus proposal, except for one course, MIS 250, which is already part of the business curriculum. The reason Tri-Cities needs so few

resources is because the Tri-Cities campus just closed its MBA program, thereby freeing up faculty schedules. Note that this resource estimate does not include resources needed to start up its planned Wine & Beverage Business Masters.

- The Everett campus needs only to move a half-time advisor to full-time, but if it also were able to hire one more full-time faculty, it could offer the new courses, as well as some current courses, face-to-face and rely on AMS and Global Campus less. A greater proportion of face-to-face courses is important given that one of the main goals in the omnibus proposal is to create greater engagement and community among business students at/within each campus.

Note that estimated costs at the other campuses are so low because they currently have no course sections greater than 70 students that need to be reduced. Also note that these costs were calculated in meetings among the taskforce chair (Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Tom Tripp) and the business program directors at the other campuses, where they created mock schedules of courses to model the resources needed.

Moreover, the Carson College is working with the other campuses to find and grow the resources needed.

### Impacts to Other Campuses

Every care was taken to include faculty, staff and business program directors from the other campuses, and obtain their approval, as described above in the sub-section on political feasibility. Thus, we know that the creation of new requirements does not interfere with the offerings of business courses at other campuses. One reason it does not interfere is that the proposal was designed not to impact transfer students negatively. Also, every campus is able to offer the new courses along with existing courses, with the addition of minimal resources, as described above. Finally, the Dean of the Carson College of Business is working with the program directors, chancellors, and vice-chancellors of the other campuses to grow resources in such a way that does not require diverting resources from these campuses' other strategic priorities.