

CURRICULUM ADVICE FROM YOUR ADVISORY BOARD: A SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Kevin L. Hammond, The University of Tennessee at Martin
Ernest Moser, The University of Tennessee at Martin

ABSTRACT

A number of forces (rapid changes in the global business climate, accreditation requirements, and expectations by external governing bodies) have combined to force business schools and their faculty to assess on a regular basis the strengths and weaknesses of their curricula. In order to have an effective curriculum faculty must seek information from a variety of stakeholders—current and former students, employers, graduate schools, etc. The advice of external stakeholders is especially important since, as employers of our students, they know firsthand the strengths and weaknesses of a school's graduates.

This manuscript reports the development of a survey instrument designed to solicit feedback from advisory board members regarding curriculum requirements. Though developed toward a particular case, the authors anticipate that the survey could be used by any other university (with minor modifications) to survey its own advisory board members regarding curriculum issues. Seven specific research questions to be addressed by the survey are provided along with some possible implications of the responses. The complete (five-page) survey is included as Attachment A.

INTRODUCTION

One of the most important aspects of a business program is its curriculum. Traditionally, however, the curriculum has been one of the most challenging items for a business school to change. Faculty members are often content to teach what they have always taught in their courses. Moreover, when a curriculum has been changed, too often the impetus for change was the arrival of a new faculty member who wanted his or her pet course included in the curriculum. Indeed, one of the authors of this paper remembers a period of eight years at a school during which not a single part of the undergraduate business curriculum was changed. While a business school in the past might have been able to survive with an outmoded curriculum, that is no longer the case. Indeed, rapid changes in the global business climate over the past ten years and corresponding changes in the skills and attributes demanded by employers of business graduates have forced business schools to establish processes that ensure periodic curriculum review.

Simultaneously, many external governing boards across the country have recently mandated that universities hold the semester hours needed for graduation in a four-year degree program to 120. Over the years, many universities have allowed the hours needed for graduation to creep upward beyond the traditional 120 as a way of placing additional courses in the curriculum without eliminating any courses that were previously included. Reducing a current curriculum from 126 – 132 hours down to 120 hours fosters a lively discussion among faculty concerning what is truly necessary for a bachelor's degree in business.

Further, AACSB International, the major accrediting organization for collegiate schools of business, has embraced periodic curriculum review as one of the processes necessary for a school to show continuous improvement in its efforts to achieve the school's mission ("Achieving Quality and Continuous Improvement Through Self Evaluation and Peer Review: Standards for Accreditation – Business Administration and Accounting," 2007). Thus, a number of forces have combined to force business schools and their faculty to assess on a regular basis the strengths and weaknesses of their curricula.

In order to have an effective curriculum faculty must seek information from a variety of stakeholders—current and former students, employers, graduate schools, etc. The advice of external stakeholders is especially important since, as employers of our students, they know firsthand the strengths and weaknesses of a school's graduates. Thus, in an effort to provide information needed by faculty to make curricular choices, business schools have sought the advice of external stakeholders, such as employers of business school graduates and members of external advisory boards (Ireland, Ramsower, Raegan, and Carini 1994). Since a school's external advisory board normally consists of representatives of local/regional firms with a vested interest in the success of the business school, the advisory board is an excellent starting point for input concerning the school's curriculum.

THE SITUATION

A curriculum review was initiated for the AACSB-accredited bachelor of science in business administration at this medium sized university. The common core of general education classes to be taken by all undergraduate students within the university had recently been established (to be effective in one year - the following academic year) and adjustments were made and implemented regarding other general education requirements for business majors. However, an additional decision was made to convert from a 127 hour business administration degree to 120 hours (effective in two years). A part of that decision was a commitment by the College to continue the curriculum review, adjusting the general education requirement to 60 hours, the business administration core curriculum to 30 hours, and the courses specified for the major to 30 hours.

Several questions surfaced in the curriculum review process, some due to the new constraints outlined above and some as a natural part of the review process; the business core and other portions of the curriculum had not been changed significantly in the recent past. Coursework not previously required (contract law, business communications, research methodology, international business) were discussed for possible inclusion. Certain courses currently required, alternatively, were considered for possible elimination from the business core requirements. Also, with the oncoming reduction of credit hours in the degree and several of the general education courses specifically required for all students, many alternatives were considered regarding requirements for the math/statistics component of the general education courses for business majors. With several questions identified, the decision was made to gather input from members of the College of Business and Public Affairs Advisory Board.

OBJECTIVES

The primary objective of this manuscript is to report the development of a survey instrument designed to solicit feedback from advisory board members regarding curriculum requirements for the Bachelor of

Science in Business Administration. The survey developed within the study is geared toward a particular case. The authors, however, anticipate that the survey is generic enough that other universities could use it with minor modifications to survey advisory board members regarding curriculum issues.

In the process of curriculum review and survey development, we identified several research questions to be addressed by the respondents and attempted to design the survey in such a way as to gather separate, objective responses from each advisory board member. In an effort to assure face validity, early versions of the questions were shared with selected faculty and advisory board members. Their feedback was considered in preparing the final version of the survey instrument. In conducting the survey, we attached a cover letter to each survey thanking the member for their time and attention and assuring them that we are interested in their opinion concerning the general business knowledge and skills that each business graduate (regardless of major) should bring to his or her job. Though we provided a brief review of our curriculum constraints, we did not indicate current requirements or any particular preferences that faculty or administration might have for future requirements.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The completed survey instrument appears as Appendix A. The specific research questions identified and mentioned below are listed below along with references to the sections of the survey addressing them.

Within the given constraints, . . .

Should business calculus and/or an advanced statistics class be required (in addition to college algebra and statistics) for all business majors? See Section 1 of the survey instrument.

If not required for all business majors, for which specific business majors and concentrations should business calculus and/or an advanced statistics class be required? See Sections 2 and 3 of the survey instrument.

Should business electives be restricted to business courses outside the major (thus forcing more breadth), or have no restrictions (allowing more depth if the student chooses). See Section 4, Question 1 of the survey instrument.

What percentage of the business core should each curricular area (accounting, business communication, business information systems, business law, business / marketing research methodology, advanced economics, finance, international business, management, marketing, interdisciplinary capstone course(s), business elective(s), other) account for? See Section 5 of the survey instrument.

What relative weight should be placed on the subject matter within each major discipline (accounting, business law, advanced economics, finance, management, marketing)

represented in the business core? See Section 4, Questions 2 through 7 of the survey instrument.

How important is the inclusion in the business core of each of the areas indicated in questions 4 and 5 above? In other words, how strongly do the respondents feel that the curricular areas and the subject matter within each discipline should be included in the business core? See Section 6 of the survey instrument.

Generally, how much breadth should be included in the business core? Though there may be some disagreement as to the exact courses to be included, does the advisory board generally feel that the subject matter should be spread between relatively few (five to seven) curricular areas, a broad set (ten or more) of curricular areas, or somewhere in between? Indicated by the number of responses (above zero) to Section 5.

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Tabulated responses to the survey can provide the college with considerable information indicating, individually and collectively, how the advisory board feels about the required curriculum for the undergraduate business administration degree. Obviously, the gaps between current practices and the collective advisory board recommendations could be easily calculated. The suggestions / recommendations could prove invaluable in helping to shape future actions regarding the curriculum. A concern, or “risk,” of course, would be that the mix of required coursework recommended by the advisory board would vary from the current format, would contradict certain beliefs of at least some faculty, or would guide curriculum development in a direction that the college had previously been unprepared for. However, these are not necessarily bad things. Advisory boards are familiar with the mission and potential capabilities of the colleges that they help guide, and they are familiar with the breadth and depth of general business knowledge and skills that each graduate should bring to his or her job. Feedback from the advisory board could end concerns as to the most appropriate inclusion or exclusion of certain courses and could provide a wake-up call if the college does need to change its curriculum requirements in order to better prepare its graduates. Several authors (Heinfeldt and Wolf 1998; Dudley, Dudley, Clark and Payne 1995; Ryan 1999; Walker and Black 2000; Walker and Ainsworth 2001) have addressed these and other issues surrounding changing or integrating undergraduate core curriculum.

Mean responses to the five scenarios outlined in Section 1 of the survey would indicate the “favorite” approach to the math requirement by the advisory board. Any solution above the midpoint (4) would be at least generally agreeable; any scenario with a mean response below the midpoint would indicate general disagreement as to the appropriateness of the approach.

Mean responses to Sections 2 and 3 indicate whether or not advisory board members collectively feel that calculus or advanced statistics, respectively, should be required for certain majors and concentrations, assuming no requirement for all business majors. Coding positive responses as “1” and blanks as “0,” mean responses above .5 would indicate at least generally that the course should be required for that major / concentration and mean responses below .5 would indicate that the course should not be required. Obviously,

a closer mean response to “1” or “0” indicates more unanimous agreement as to inclusion or exclusion of the requirement.

Mean responses to the two alternatives outlined in the first question of Section 4 indicate the collective preference of advisory members for either restricting or not restricting business electives to courses outside the major. With “Yes” coded as “1” and “No” coded as “0,” collective responses closer to “1” would indicate preference for that particular policy.

The remainder of Section 4 requests feedback as to the relative weight (percentages) that should be placed on subject matter within several of the disciplines. Mean responses reflect the collective opinions of the advisory board members.

Similarly, responses to Section 5 indicate the percentage of the business core that the respondents feel each particular area of study should account for. The assumption given was that course format is completely flexible and the business core could be designed to match their suggestions (classes not necessarily forced into the “three-credit-hour” format).

Section 6 asks how strongly the respondents feel as to the inclusion of the curricular areas that they commented on in Sections 4 and 5. Mean responses could be used to rank the subject matter. Also, this ranking could be combined with the responses to Sections 4 and 5 to determine the amount of coursework within each area (subject, discipline, etc.) that the advisory board collectively feels should most appropriately be included in the business core as a requirement for all business majors.

Reactions by the college to this portion of the survey results might take several forms. One possibility is that the results might be used to confirm which of the existing core courses should continue to be included in the core, which ones should be dropped, and/or to suggest courses to be added from existing noncore courses. Alternatively, or in addition to the first possibility, information provided by the results could be used to match core coursework more closely to the breadth and depth of subject matter suggested by the advisory board (addressing first the areas judged most important by the respondents). Depending on format flexibility and resources of the college, several options might exist for accomplishing this. For example, courses could be developed or reformatted into 1, 2, or 4 credit hour formats, subject matter could be shifted somewhat within existing courses, and/or a new interdisciplinary course (or courses) addressing a mix of subjects could be developed, adding breadth or depth as needed to existing core courses.

One reaction of the college might be to place certain additional constraints on the final decision as to curriculum format, prior to or during the process of making the recommended changes. In fact, colleges might react by rejecting the recommendations of the advisory board entirely. To completely ignore or reject the suggestions / recommendations of the advisory board would seem to be a very bad reaction, since the college has chosen to have an advisory board and has chosen to ask the questions.

APPLICATION OF THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT: ONE CASE

The survey instrument described in this manuscript was used to gather input regarding the curriculum from 14 members of our College of Business and Public Affairs advisory board. Survey results were presented to the advisory board and were discussed with them. Results were also shared with the faculty. We now share with readers the results of this one particular application of the survey.

In Section 1 of the survey (Appendix A), which dealt with math requirements, respondents were in most agreement (2.29 mean response on the “1” to “7” scale) with the second scenario. They indicated that

nine credit hours of math should be required, with specific requirements for the third math course determined within the major. Mean responses indicated slight disagreement with a six-hour math requirement, a twelve-hour math requirement, or a nine-hour requirement that includes calculus. Though not preferred over the second scenario, as noted above, respondents indicated slight agreement with the nine-hour requirement that includes advanced statistics.

Results from Section 2 indicate that half of the respondents felt that calculus should be required for finance majors and international business majors. None of the respondents felt that calculus should be required for marketing majors, for general management majors, or for human resource management majors. A few respondents (less than half) indicated that calculus should be required for the other majors.

Section 3 results indicated that more than half of the respondents felt that advanced statistics should be required for economics, finance, international business, and operations management. Half of the respondents indicated appropriateness of the requirement for accounting and entrepreneurship, and a few respondents suggested that advanced statistics should be required for the other majors.

Responses to the first question of Section 4 revealed no clear insight regarding breadth or depth within the business core. Responses to other questions within Section 4 suggested that equal weight should be given to financial and managerial accounting within the required accounting coursework, and equal weight should be given to microeconomics and macroeconomics within the required economics coursework. Somewhat surprisingly (to the authors), responses suggested 40% weight to contract law versus legal environment of business (Question 3). Other responses included 46%, 21%, 18%, and 13% weights, respectively, to financial analysis, investments, banking, and real estate (Question 5); 28%, 27%, 24%, and 19%, respectively, to general management theory, human relations, production/operations, and entrepreneurship (Question 6); and 38%, 22%, 21%, and 16% to marketing strategy, business to business marketing, consumer marketing, and logistics (Question 7).

The mean number of entries in the responses to Section 5 was 10.14 (indicating that ten is the suggested number of curricular areas that should be included in the 30-hour core?). Responses to Section 5 suggested relatively heavy (greater than 10%, indicating about four credit hours of coursework), approximately equal coverage of four disciplines: accounting, finance, management, and marketing. The responses yielded some surprises. The highest percentage (12.50%) was for finance; our current core includes only three credit hours for finance, compared to six hours of accounting and six hours of management. The lowest percentage (2.86%) was for the interdisciplinary capstone course which we include as the three hour policy class in the current core. Further, the results suggested that we give serious consideration to the addition of business communication, international business, and research methodology to the core.

Responses to Section 6, which indicated level of importance of the curricular areas to be included in the business core, served to emphasize some of the above findings. Respondents indicated, for example, that business communications and international business should be included in the core, and that human resources management is perhaps the most important component within the required management course(s).

Responses to the survey were considered by the faculty, along with recent changes to the general education core and other factors, as a part of the subsequent curriculum review process at our university. We made a few changes, adding a business communications class to the business core, allowing a contract law class as an option to the legal environment class, and eliminating the requirement for a calculus class. Due to changes in the university core that eliminated a global requirement and a social sciences requirement, we added a global course requirement (providing a list of business and non-business courses that provide a global

perspective) for business majors and changed one of the required management courses to add more of a social sciences (psychology, sociology) perspective.

CONCLUSION

Colleges of business are challenged to conduct meaningful, continuous reviews of their curriculum. As mentioned earlier, the authors anticipate that this survey, with slight modifications, could be used by any college of business to communicate with its advisory board, soliciting objective responses as to the most appropriate coursework for all business students, regardless of major. The complete survey (other than the cover letter and the review of curriculum constraints) appears as Appendix A of this manuscript.

Input from the advisory board, obviously, provides only one component of the information that must be considered by faculty within a curriculum review. However, this advisory board input could be a very important component of the review, signaling changes in the external environment that some faculty may be otherwise slow to realize. As noted earlier, faculty may be tempted to take the more comfortable route by keeping the curriculum the same. Relative importance within business of various knowledge or skill sets change over time, creating a need for adjusting the curriculum requirements within the business core and also, possibly, within specific majors. These adjustments might involve simple “tweaking” of existing classes, the creation of new classes, elimination of classes, or major restructuring of the core for curriculum coverage that does not fit easily into the traditional three-credit-hour framework. Though (or maybe because) an ongoing curriculum review could suggest changes that are a challenge to adopt and implement, the review is important, helping to insure that the curriculum remains current and strong, providing students with valuable knowledge and skills.

LIMITATIONS

Some limitations exist for the use of this survey of advisory board members. One limitation is that reliability and validity of the results may be reduced by a limited number of advisory board respondents. Though the responses may provide valuable information, the number providing input overall and especially from within a particular industry may be low.

One remedy for the problem could be to work with other universities, gathering and sharing input from several advisory boards. Another solution could be to extend the survey beyond the advisory board to other employers of the university’s business graduates.

An additional limitation could be the level of knowledge or biases of specific advisory board members regarding the current workplace. The advisory boards should, as a whole, have considerable knowledge of the general workplace that current graduates are hired into. However, steps should be taken to identify the demographics of the respondents and then apply the demographics in interpreting the results. Some advisory board members, for example, may be further from the current workplace (retired business persons, retired faculty), or may have opinions that are biased by their particular industry. Due to possible industry biases, efforts should be made to insure that specific industries are not underrepresented or overrepresented. Care should be taken to gather responses from a variety of industries. Many of the responses (from a variety of industries) should be similar, though, since the survey elicits opinions regarding general

business knowledge and skills required for all graduates, going into any industry. Efforts to take these factors into consideration, again, should help to assure the results are valid and reliable.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Future application of the survey could address the limitations noted above, seeking input perhaps from a variety of sources. Additionally, the survey could be repeated periodically. This effort would provide an update to original responses along with first-time responses from new board members. Any results that remain consistent over time, with repeated applications of the survey, should be given greater attention by faculty during the curriculum review.

Curriculum adjustments that may be “suggested” by the survey results could be compared to curriculum at other universities. Peer institutions and benchmark institutions could be identified, and the curriculum at those universities could be reviewed. Flagship universities and others may be “ahead of the curve,” and (if the survey results are indeed correct) may have already identified and reacted to changes indicated by the survey, if any, in workplace requirements. The review might contradict the survey results. Alternatively, however, affirmative results of the review could provide faculty and administrators with an additional level of validation that may be necessary if changes are to be made to a curriculum that, perhaps, faculty and administrators are very comfortable with.

REFERENCES

- Achieving Quality and Continuous Improvement Through Self Evaluation and Peer Review: Standards for Accreditation – Business Administration and Accounting (2007). AACSB International, Tampa, FL.
- Dudley, Sid C., Dudley, Lola W., Clark, Frank L., and Stephen Payne (1995). New directions for business curriculum. *Journal of Education for Business*, 70 (5), 305-310.
- Heinfeldt, Jeff and Fran Wolf (1998). Re-engineering the business curriculum: a stakeholder paradigm. *Journal of Education for Business*, 73 (2), 198-201.
- Ireland, R. Duane, Ramsower, Raegan M., and Gary R. Carini (1994). Critical business trends: views from a business school’s advisory board. *Journal of Education for Business*, 69(4), 190-193.
- Ryan, Cathy (1999). Trends in business curricula: The view from AACSB. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 62(1), 91-95.
- Walker, Kenton B. and Penne L. Ainsworth (2001). Developing a process approach in the business core curriculum. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 16 (1), 41-66.
- Walker, Kenton B. and Ervin L. Black (2000). Reengineering the undergraduate business core curriculum: aligning business schools with business for improved performance. *Business Process Management Journal*, 6 (3), 194-211.

APPENDIX A
Section 1:

INSTRUCTIONS: Assume that, staying within our constraints, a math requirement of six hours allows 13 hours of nonbusiness electives. Nine hours of math, then, would allow ten hours of nonbusiness electives and twelve hours of math requirement would allow seven hours of nonbusiness electives. The following five scenarios describe alternatives that we are considering regarding math requirements and the corresponding tradeoff with nonbusiness electives. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement as to the appropriateness of each alternative. In answering, use the following response scale and place the most appropriate number in the blank space to the left of each scenario. Please read all five alternative scenarios before beginning and respond to each statement.

- | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 = Strongly Agree | 5 = Somewhat Disagree |
| 2 = Agree | 6 = Disagree |
| 3 = Somewhat Agree | 7 = Strongly Disagree |
| 4 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree | |

- ___ 1. College algebra and introductory statistics are sufficient for business graduates in general. Other than specific requirements for certain major(s), business students should only be required to take these two 3-hour math courses.
(Total math requirement six hours; nonbusiness electives 13 hours)
- ___ 2. In addition to college algebra and introductory statistics, business students should also be required to take an additional math course (probably a second statistics course or introductory calculus). The choice for the third math course could be made by the student and/or faculty within the major.
(Total math requirement nine hours; nonbusiness electives ten hours)
- ___ 3. In addition to college algebra and introductory statistics, business students should also take an introductory 3-hour calculus course. Other than specific requirements for certain major(s), business students should, however, not be required to take a second, more advanced statistics course.
(Total math requirement nine hours; nonbusiness electives ten hours)
- ___ 4. In addition to college algebra and introductory statistics, business students should also take a second, more advanced statistics course. Other than specific requirements for certain major(s), business students should, however, not be required to take a calculus class.
(Total math requirement nine hours; nonbusiness electives ten hours)
- ___ 5. In addition to college algebra and introductory statistics, business students should also take a second, more advanced statistics course and an introductory 3-hour calculus course.
(Total math requirement twelve hours; nonbusiness electives seven hours)

Section 2:

INSTRUCTIONS: Assuming that we go with one of the above options that does not require the introductory calculus class, please indicate with a check mark in the blank space to the left of any of the majors listed below that you feel should include the calculus class as a requirement specifically for that major.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Accounting	<input type="checkbox"/>	Information Systems
<input type="checkbox"/>	Economics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Management - General
<input type="checkbox"/>	Economics - Finance Concentration	<input type="checkbox"/>	Management-Human Resource Concentration
<input type="checkbox"/>	Economics - International Business Concentration	<input type="checkbox"/>	Management - Production Operations Mgmt. Concentration.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Marketing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Management-Entrepreneurship Concentration

Section 3:

INSTRUCTIONS: Assuming that we go with one of the above options that does not require the second statistics class, please indicate with a check mark in the blank space to the left of any of the majors listed below that you feel should include the second statistics class as a requirement specifically for that major.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Accounting	<input type="checkbox"/>	Information Systems
<input type="checkbox"/>	Economics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Management - General
<input type="checkbox"/>	Economics-Finance Concentration	<input type="checkbox"/>	Management-Human Resource Concentration
<input type="checkbox"/>	Economics - International Business Concentration	<input type="checkbox"/>	Management - Production Operations Mgmt. Concentration.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Marketing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Management-Entrepreneurship Concentration

Section 4:

INSTRUCTIONS: As stated earlier, the required "business core" courses would apply to all business majors and, of course, would be in addition to nonbusiness courses and course requirements specified for the major.

- If we were to include three to six credit hours of business electives in the business core, would you prefer . . .
 - . . . that the business elective(s) be restricted to courses outside the major discipline, thus encouraging more general business breadth? YES NO
 - OR
 - . . . that the business elective(s) have no restrictions, thus allowing students to add further depth within their major if they choose? YES NO
- For business core courses in accounting, please indicate the relative weight you would put on the following subject matter.

Financial Accounting	<input type="text"/>	%
Managerial/Cost Accounting	<input type="text"/>	%
Other <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	%
		100%

3. For business core courses in business law, please indicate the relative weight you would put on the following subject matter.
- | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|---|
| Legal Environment of Business | _____ | % |
| Contract Law | _____ | % |
| Other _____ | _____ | % |
| | 100% | |
4. For business core courses in advanced economics, please indicate the relative weight you would put on the following subject matter.
- | | | |
|----------------|-------|---|
| Macroeconomics | _____ | % |
| Microeconomics | _____ | % |
| Other _____ | _____ | % |
| | 100% | |
5. For business core courses in finance, please indicate the relative weight you would put on the following subject matter.
- | | | |
|--------------------|-------|---|
| Banking | _____ | % |
| Financial Analysis | _____ | % |
| Investments | _____ | % |
| Real Estate | _____ | % |
| Other _____ | _____ | % |
| | 100% | |
6. For business core courses in management, please indicate the relative weight you would put on the following subject matter.
- | | | |
|------------------------------|-------|---|
| General Theory / Strategy | _____ | % |
| Human Relations | _____ | % |
| Production / Operations Mgmt | _____ | % |
| Entrepreneurship | _____ | % |
| Other _____ | _____ | % |
| | 100% | |
7. For business core courses in marketing, please indicate the relative weight you would put on the following subject matter.
- | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------|---|
| General Marketing Strategy | _____ | % |
| Consumer Marketing | _____ | % |
| Business to Business Marketing | _____ | % |
| Logistics | _____ | % |
| Other _____ | _____ | % |
| | 100% | |

Section 5:

INSTRUCTIONS: The business core should consist of a cross-section of courses from many areas within business. The exact mix of courses is flexible, though, and we are requesting your input in determining the best combination that would benefit our graduates and their employers. Note that the first two economics courses (microeconomics and macroeconomics) are required but, per AACSB, can be considered in the nonbusiness group of courses and are not a part of the business core.

Following is a list of curricular areas that might be included as a part of the 30-hour business core. Assume for now that course format (one hour, two hour, three hour, four hour, etc.) is completely flexible and we could design the business core to match your suggestions. Keeping in mind the subject matter you indicated in Section 4 above, please indicate in the blank space to the left of each of the following areas the percentage of the business core that you feel that particular area of study should account for. If you feel any area should not be included in the core as a distinct course or major part of a course, enter 0% for that area. This, of course, would place more emphasis on the remaining subjects. Please read the entire list before completing this section and please be sure that the percentages total to 100%.

- ___ % Accounting
- ___ % Business Communications (In addition to six hours of English and three hours of Speech Communications nonbusiness course requirements)
- ___ % Business Information Systems (In addition to three hours of Computer Science nonbusiness course requirements)
- ___ % Business Law
- ___ % Business/Marketing Research Methodology
- ___ % Advanced Economics (beyond the first two courses)
- ___ % Finance
- ___ % International Business (Could be selected from General Business, Economics, Finance, or Marketing)
- ___ % Management
- ___ % Marketing
- ___ % Interdisciplinary Capstone Course(s)
- ___ % Business Elective(s)
- ___ % Other _____
- 100 %

Section 6:

INSTRUCTIONS: Finally, we are interested in knowing how strongly you feel about each of the areas you indicated should be included in the core. Please indicate your feelings about the inclusion of the subject matter in the business core. In answering, use the following response scale and place the most appropriate number in the blank space to the left of each item.

- 1 = Definitely Include
 2 = Include If Possible
 3 = Good, But Not Necessary for Inclusion

ACCOUNTING
 _____ Financial Accounting
 _____ Managerial/Cost Accounting
 _____ Other _____

_____ BUSINESS COMMUNICATIONS

_____ BUSINESS INFORMATION SYSTEMS

BUSINESS LAW
 _____ Legal Environment of Business
 _____ Contract Law
 _____ Other _____

_____ BUSINESS/MARKETING RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

ADVANCED ECONOMICS
 _____ Macroeconomics
 _____ Microeconomics
 _____ Other _____

FINANCE
 _____ Banking
 _____ Financial Analysis
 _____ Investments
 _____ Real Estate
 _____ Other _____

_____ INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS

MANAGEMENT

_____ General Theory / Strategy

_____ Human Relations

_____ Production / Operations Mgmt

_____ Entrepreneurship

_____ Other _____

MARKETING

_____ General Marketing Strategy

_____ Consumer Marketing

_____ Business to Business Marketing

_____ Logistics

_____ Other _____

_____ INTERDISCIPLINARY CAPSTONE COURSE(S)

_____ BUSINESS ELECTIVE(S)

_____ OTHER _____

Your Name: _____

Your Undergraduate / Graduate Degree(s): _____

Please use the back of this page if you have any further comments.

THANK YOU

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.