**OUTLINE FOR REVIEW OF**

**APPLICANT’S INITIAL SELF EVALUATION REPORT (iSER) - BUSINESS**

|  |
| --- |
| Institution :  |
| Name of Business School: |
| Dean/Head of business school: | Mentor:  |
| Date of this report: |  |
| Projected Final Self Evaluation Year: | Projected Visit Year: |

1. **APPLICANT PROFILE** (time period: \_\_ )

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Headcount** | **Business** |
| Undergraduate Students |  |
| Graduate Students  |  |
|  |  |
| Doctoral students |  |
| **Total** |  |
| **Headcount** | **Business** |
| Participating Faculty |  |
| Supporting Faculty |  |
| **Total** |  |
|  |  |

**Accreditation Sought**: Business  [ ]  Baccalaureate

 [ ]  Masters

 [ ]  Doctoral

 Accounting [ ]  Baccalaureate

 [ ]  Masters

 [ ]  Doctoral

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Degree Programs and Majors** | **Degrees Conferred Per Year (prior five years)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **APPLICANT MISSION**

What is the Mission of the school?

What is the Vision of the school?

Is the mission translated into?

1. Educational objectives for degree programs? If no, please explain.
2. Commitment to continuous improvement in teaching and management of the curriculum? If no explain
3. Faculty staffing priorities? If no, please explain.
4. The intellectual contributions? If no, please explain.
5. Priorities for service activities? If no, please explain.
6. Is the mission consistent with the institutional mission?
7. **MENTOR INVOLVEMENT**

How did Mentor participate in the process?

Is the iSER acceptable? Yes [ ]  No [ ]

If no, please elaborate your concerns.

1. **SUMMARY OF STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES** (Standard by standard ---

Related to the applicant’s unique identity, character and mission)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strategic Management and Innovation Standards | Alignment with Standard Yes/no | If no, is plan in place to address the deficiency | Comments – as appropriate, cite relevant page numbers in iSER |
| 1. Mission, Impact, and Innovation  |  |  |  |
| 2. Intellectual Contributions, Impact, and Alignment With Mission |  |  |  |
| 3. Financial Strategies and Allocation Of Resources |  |  |  |
| Participants – Students, Faculty, and Professional Staff Standards | Alignment with Standard Yes/no | If no, is plan in place to address the deficiency | Comments – as appropriate, cite relevant page numbers in iSER. |
| 4. Student Admissions, Progression, and Career Development |  |  |  |
| 5. Faculty Sufficiency and Deployment  |  |  |  |
| 6. Faculty Management and Support |  |  |  |
| 7. Professional Staff Sufficiency and Deployment |  |  |  |
| Learning and Teaching Standards | Alignment with Standard Yes/no | If no, is plan in place to address the deficiency | Comments – as appropriate, cite relevant page numbers in iSER. |
| 8. Curricula Management and Assurance Of Learning  |  |  |  |
| 9. Curriculum Content  |  |  |  |
| 10. Student-Faculty Interactions |  |  |  |
| 11. Degree Program Educational Level, Structure, and Equivalence |  |  |  |
| 12. Teaching Effectiveness |  |  |  |
| Academic and Professional Engagement Standards | Alignment with Standard Yes/no | If no, is plan in place to address the deficiency | Comments – as appropriate, cite relevant page numbers in iSER. |
| 13. Student Academic and Professional Engagement  |  |  |  |
| 14. Executive Education |  |  |  |
| 15. Faculty Qualifications and Engagement |  |  |  |

**E. THE INITIAL SELF EVALUATION REPORT (iSER)**

Has the iSER been approved by the President and Provost (or equivalent) signifying their buy-in and understanding?

Is report specific, quantifiable, realistic, and comprehensive?

Does the report include the improvement implementation table? And does that table identify: improvement steps, resources needed, timetable, responsible individuals, and measures for performance?

Are you confident that – if the report is implemented as written – the school has a high probability of being in compliance with all standards before the final self-evaluation year? If not, why not?

Summary of Mentor recommendation(s):