CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT REVIEW – BUSINESS
PEER REVIEW TEAM REPORT

University of San Francisco
School of Management

Section I: Peer Review Team Recommendation

The peer review team recommends *Extension of Accreditation* of the degree programs included in the scope of accreditation offered by the School of Management at the University of San Francisco. This recommendation reflects the opinion of the peer review team only and will be reviewed by the Continuous Improvement Review Committee during the next scheduled meeting on March 31, 2021. The primary role of the Continuous Improvement Review Committee is to ensure consistent application of the AACSB International accreditation standards and processes across peer review teams.

Concurrence by the Continuous Improvement Review Committee and ratification by the Board of Directors are required prior to the confirmation of the accreditation extension. Following ratification by the Board of Directors, the Official Representative of the school will be notified initially via email and subsequently by letter from AACSB. The applicant must wait until the Board of Directors ratifies the recommendation before making any public announcement.

Within ten days following the visit, the team provides the peer review team report to the school and the Continuous Improvement Review Committee. Prior to issuing the final report to the school and the Continuous Improvement Review Committee, the school should be provided a review of the report in order to offer any clarifying comments and corrections related to factual information noted in the report. The school may also submit a response to the Continuous Improvement Review Committee (circ@aacsb.edu) within ten business days of receipt of the final peer review team report.

Section II: Accreditation Standards Issues Identified by the Prior Peer Review Team

At the conclusion of the last AACSB review in 2016-2017, the Peer Review Team identified four issues to monitor.

Standard 1: Mission, Impact and Innovation. *It was not clear how other stakeholders besides School of Management (SOM) faculty and staff members were included in the strategic planning process. The school should consider the appropriate role for students, alumni, the professional community, and other stakeholder groups in the strategic planning process.*

Based on feedback from the previous PRT visit, a strategic planning process was developed and employed that involves the Dean's Circle (the school's advisory board composed of key alumni) and other advisory boards for some of their key programs (i.e., MSOD, MSFA, and MSEI). The School now holds an annual State of the School event that stimulates interaction among the advisory boards and collects input on the strategic planning goals. The Strategic Planning Committee is now inclusive and has sought input from stakeholders, including the advisory boards – with plans to create two student advisory boards. The School has policies in place to ensure that the strategic planning process will carry forward and will continue to drive decisions about mission attainment, resource allocation, and the

teaching, research and service portfolio for the School. The School expects the 2020 Strategic Plan to receive formal approval from faculty and staff soon. Going forward, the SPC will provide bi-annual updates to all relevant stakeholders.

Assessment: The School has responded to this concern.

Standard 8: Curricular Management and Assurance of Learning. *Continue to implement the planned Assurance of Learning assessment activities as scheduled. It is important that the school be able to show evidence of curricular changes that were implemented to address learning outcomes deficiencies.*

The School has developed a consistent process across programs. The School created an AoL Committee that works with the Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC) and the Graduate Program Committee (GPC), and the office of the associate dean for academic affairs. It has created curriculum maps and learning outcome assessment schedules for all programs, with AOL Committee approval of learning outcomes and assessment plans.

Better documented information has been regularly collected resulting in tangible examples of continuous improvement. Direct and indirect measures have led to curriculum changes in five programs, and next steps have been clearly articulated for discussion at the school, department, and committee levels. The University recently implemented Curriculog, a documentation and approval platform for programmatic changes that captures key information (e.g., the rationale for the program change; curriculum requirements; and program learning outcome changes) about curricular changes electronically.

During this 5-year review period, full assessment cycles have been completed for most, but not all, programs. The School has adequately explained why some cycles were not completed.

Assessment: The School has responded to this concern in part, but some work remains to be done (see sections III and IV).

Standard 8: Curricular Management and Assurance of Learning. *Along with item two, the SOM should continue to foster faculty involvement in the management of the curriculum through appropriate governance of the AoL process.*

Faculty support and engagement are present in the new AoL Committee, which includes faculty representatives from every teaching area outlined across the learning outcomes. The Committee meets at least twice per year and works in collaboration with the School's undergraduate and graduate curriculum committees. Both curriculum committees are represented on the AOL Committee.

Assessment: The School has responded to this concern.

Standard 4: Student, Admissions, Progression and Career Development. *Post student achievement information on your school's web site. In addition, it is advisable to make this information available to the public through other means, such as brochures and promotional literature. Examples of student performance information include but are not limited to: attrition and retention rates; graduation rates; job placement outcomes; certification or licensure exam results; and employment advancement.*

The School's website includes some outcomes data, but information on attrition and retention rates; graduation rates; job placement outcomes; certification or licensure exam results; employment advancement, rankings and so on is not easily accessible. The website includes student success stories and information pertinent to understanding degree options.

Assessment: The School has begun to respond to this concern, but insufficient data are provided, and data are difficult to find as they are buried fairly deep on the website.

Section III: Accreditation Standards Issues Identified During <u>this</u> Peer Review Team Visit that Must Be Addressed Prior to the Next Peer Review Team Visit

2013 Standard	2020 Standard	Concern
1	1	Increased competition has resulted in a dramatic decline in enrollment from 2015 -2019. The School should develop a strategy to deal with the impact of this lower enrollment on revenue and reputation, identifying - which programs are distinctive and can set them apart from their competitors - what is the appropriate, sustainable size of the student body - what is the sustainable size of infrastructure (faculty, staff, and operating budget) to support the student body - why has the overall MBA enrollment been dropping when it is rising for most other institutions (since FT MBA has been dropping, and PT MBA has been growing, perhaps resources should shift?) - how to grow endowment to support programs - how to limit growth of discount rates
2 & 15	8 & 3	Guidelines for faculty qualifications are not distinctively mission-driven, based on either the 2016 or 2020 versions of the mission statement. The School should review and revise the guidelines to support faculty ICs or PCs in areas related to promoting a just and sustainable society, consistent with its mission.
3	3	The operational definitions for participating and supporting faculty appear to be primarily driven by the collective bargaining agreement. The School should examine these definitions and provide greater clarity and specificity around them.
3	3	The proportion of participating faculty in the BSM has been very low. The School should develop and execute a plan to improve this ratio.
4	6	As part of the previous CIR, the School was advised to post student success data on its web site. In addition, it was advised to make this information available to the public through other means, such as brochures and promotional literature. Examples of student success data include but are not limited to: attrition and retention rates; graduation rates; job placement outcomes; certification or licensure exam results; and employment advancement. The School has partially responded to this concern, but there is room for improvement. The School should be more systematic in making a broad range of student outcomes data easily available.

8	5	The School's AOL process is unnecessarily burdensome because there are too many learning goals across undergraduate and graduate programs. The School should reduce the number of goals to be assessed. In keeping with the 2020 Standards, the School should be sure that goals are competency-based.
8	5	The AOL process for the BSM has been inadequate. The School should develop a full AOL process and execute a full AOL cycle prior to the next CIR.
8	5	The AOL cycles for the MBA and EMBA were not completed during the review period. Some of this deficiency is attributable to the pandemic; some is based on program revisions. The School should accelerate its efforts to assure that a full AOL cycle for each program is completed in the next 5-year period and clarify its AOL processes to assure that the cycle can be repeated every five years.

Section IV: Peer Review Team Observations and Feedback that Form the Basis for Judgement for the Recommendation

STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT AND INNOVATION

Strategic Planning Process:

Based on feedback from the previous PRT visit, a strategic planning process was developed and employed that involves the Dean's Circle (the school's advisory board composed of key alumni) and other advisory boards for some of their key programs (i.e., MSOD, MSFA, and MBEI). The School now holds an annual State of the School event that stimulates interaction among the advisory boards and collects input on the strategic planning goals. The Strategic Planning Committee is now inclusive and has sought input from stakeholders, including the advisory boards – with plans to create two student advisory boards. The School has policies in place to ensure that the strategic planning process will carry forward and will continue to drive decisions about mission attainment, resource allocation, and the teaching, research and service portfolio for the School.

Impact of the faculty intellectual portfolio and alignment with the school's mission:

As can be seen from Tables 2-1 and 2-2, the faculty are engaged, and their scholarship reflects the mission of the school closely. Given their teaching load and general expectations of the faculty, their level of engagement and research is more than adequate. As we know, it can be challenging for a mission-driven school of this size to balance the teaching, engagement, and research of its faculty. The School of Management has done a good job with this balance by motivating faculty appropriately with their reward and evaluation structure.

Financial strategies, financial model and sustainability and alignment with the school's mission:

As pointed out by SOM, the competitive environment facing the university is challenging; there are numerous private and public business schools in the metropolitan area of San Francisco – including another Jesuit institution that is highly ranked. This competitive environment is not unique to USF – but does present serious strategic and financial challenges.

First, SOM correctly recognizes its need to develop and implement distinctive programs. However, these programs cannot only be distinctive in their delivery, but must also be distinctive in their discipline. An in-depth study of their competitors and student prospects will need to be conducted to understand the niche programs they should invest in and grow – and which programs to sunset.

This increased competition has resulted in a dramatic decline in enrollment from 2015 -2019: over 20% in the BSBA program and over 11% in all graduate programs combined, resulting in a total drop in overall enrollment of 22.5%. The School's enrollment dropped another 14% from 2019 to 2020 due to COVID. While this is understandable, and SOM is not alone in this impact of COVID, they will need to develop a strategy to deal with the impact of this lower enrollment on revenue and reputation.

The School will need to identify: 1) which programs are distinctive that can set them apart from their competitors?; 2) what is the appropriate and sustainable size of their student body?; 3) what is the sustainable size of their infrastructure (faculty, staff, and operating budget) to support their student body?; 4) why has their overall MBA enrollment been dropping when it is rising for most other institutions, which typically happens when employment is down? (Note, that while PT MBA grew slightly, FT MBA enrollment decreased.); 5) how to limit growth of discount rates?; and 6) how can they grow their endowment to support their programs?

PARTICIPANTS

Students

The University of San Francisco (USF) serves a diverse student population. Both the undergraduate and graduate student populations in the School of Management (SOM) are very diverse. This reflects USF's overall student body. The School's student (undergraduate and graduate) population is approximately 70% ethnic minority. While overall enrollment in the SOM has decreased over the review period, the percentage of SOM students classified as ethnic minority has increased. The above numbers do not include international students who account for roughly 33% of SOM's enrollment. SOM enrollment is split evenly between men and women with a slight increase (relatively) in male enrollment over the review period.

The number of first-year students in the SOM has dropped significantly over the review period. Some of this is no doubt related to COVID-19. This is especially apparent when examining the first to second year retention rate for freshman who entered in fall 2019; it is 12 to 15% lower than the previous three years. Graduate enrollment also appears to be impacted. In fall 2020, there were approximately 425 graduate students across all their (AACSB) graduate program offerings. This is down from the past, where in four of the previous five years enrollment ranged between 466 and 491 students.

Graduation rates for SOM undergraduate students mirror those of the university (high 60s-low 70s). Data for graduate degrees show very high success rates. The SOM chooses to use a two-year window with which to measure their graduate student graduation rate. Students in the one program with a low graduation rate, MBA Part-Time, typically take up to three years to complete their degree.

Faculty

Relevant to this review, SOM faculty are organized into seven departments: (1) Accounting, (2) Business Analytics & Information Systems, (3) Entrepreneurship, Innovation, Strategy, and International Business,

(4) Finance, (5) Hospitality Management, (6) Marketing, and (7) Organization, Leadership & Communication. A staff of 42 provide support to the Dean's office and the departments. As of fall 2020, the SOM has 64 full-time faculty (down from a high of 82 in fall 2015) with approximately one-half of the faculty being of ethnically diverse/international backgrounds and approximately one-third of the faculty identifying as female. These percentages have been relatively stable over the past few years.

Faculty recruitment and selection follows a well-established process. The numbers shown above reflect the commitment of both USF and the SOM to diversity. For example, the SOM is a long-time member of the "Ph.D. Project", an initiative begun by KPMG to help diversify business school faculties. While the number of full-time faculty have decreased, the SOM has added fourteen new full-time faculty since its last review. The SOM considers these new faculty to be "critical" to its accreditation efforts.

There is a mentoring system in place to support tenure-track faculty members. It is coordinated and run by department chairs. Each mentoring relationship is unique to the situation; sometimes a more senior, tenured faculty member will act as the mentor. At other times, it may be the department chair.

Also, SOM faculty receive an appropriate level of support, including technology, research assistants (although this practice is currently suspended), and development funds up to $3,365/year (also currently suspended). Faculty may apply for additional funds if available. Databases (e.g., S&P Global) are available as is access to USF resources such as the Center for Teaching Excellence. New faculty receive two years of guaranteed summer funding as well as the possibility of a one semester sabbatical in their fourth year.

During the spring 2020 semester, all USF courses transitioned to remote delivery methods. The university provided training and assistance through its Educational Technology Services (ETS) area while area deans provided other forms of assistance. Beginning this past January, the SOM introduced two new initiatives designed to help ensure high quality teaching outcomes in a remote environment. Early reviews of these two programs (TeachTalk and Slack) are positive. The first TeachTalk was held February 18, with 13 faculty (20% of full-time faculty) participating. Five more TeachTalks are planned this semester. Eight faculty have begun to build out a set of resources on Slack.

Faculty evaluation occurs annually and is governed by USF's collective bargaining agreement. It is usually conducted by the dean and/or associate deans and it includes a review of past performance as well as goal setting for the future. Teaching, research, and service are typically covered. While annual pay increases are not merit-based, and thus not directly connected to faculty evaluations, there are other awards for exceptional service.

A consequence of USF's collective bargaining agreement is that all full-time SOM faculty are classified as participating. This classification assumes that full-time faculty contribute to the life of the SOM beyond teaching (e.g., student advising; committee work). Part-time faculty are assumed to be supporting unless they "spend substantive time and effort" in different activities (e.g., student advising; committee work). While respecting the sanctity of a collective bargaining agreement, the Peer Review Team (PRT) agrees with the advice the SOM received from its consultants and would recommend greater clarity and specificity around these two definitions.

In general, the SOM has an adequate number of participating faculty to support its mission. For the 2020-2021 academic year they hit the benchmarks in most areas including the overall target of 75% as well as department targets of at least 60% participating faculty. The notable exception is the Bachelor of

Science in Management (BSM) program. It has not met the 60% guideline for either of the last two years and for 2020-2021 the percentage of participating faculty is reported to be 35.1%. While the PRT is understanding of the current challenges all business schools face and appreciative of the situation the SOM finds itself in with this particular program, it recommends that a definitive plan of action be developed to increase the percentage of participating faculty teaching in the BSM. While this metric is not a required part of the 2020 standards, future PRTs may request a program-by-program sufficiency analysis. In any event, it is critical that the SOM be able to explain the relatively high use of supporting faculty in the BSM program and why such use is in the best interests of BSM students.

There are a limited number of department-level exceptions to the faculty qualifications guidelines. All were addressed in the CIR. These are noted on pages 47-48 of the main CIR report. Three of the four exceptions occur within the Economics, Law, & International Business department, which has been eliminated effective fall 2020. The fourth is in Hospitality Management, which may be merged with another department. The other metrics are, for the most part, strong, and sustaining activities, again for the most part, are appropriately classified. SOM's definitions for its faculty qualifications are consistent with a business school of its type. The definitions address both the quality and the quantity of activities and in the case of Scholarly Academic (SA) status, they place a premium on peer-reviewed journals (PRJs) but not to the exclusion of other activities. It does stand out that SOM's definitions and guidelines do not specifically call out mission-related activities. It was encouraging to read that this is an area of focus moving forward.

Staff

Currently, there are 42 professional staff in the SOM. This is down from a high of 66 a few years ago. While this is down from a high of 66 a few years ago, the ratio of staff/full-time faculty (42/64) seems high to the PRT. Most similar schools the PRT are familiar with have ratios well less than 50%. The current staff work in such areas as graduate admissions and recruiting, alumni relations, fundraising, and graduate student career advising. Staff are set up for success in many ways like their faculty colleagues. Hiring practices, including job descriptions, are clear and positions are advertised in a way to gather a high-quality pool of diverse applicants. USF believes they offer competitive and sustainable compensation and benefits, and all staff are provided with technology and career-related support. SOM staff have access to internal development activities (e.g., facilitating effective meetings) and are evaluated on a regular basis formally and informally.

LEARNING AND TEACHING

Curricula Management and Improvement – Undergraduate

The School offers two undergraduate degrees – BS in Business Administration (BSBA) and BS in Management (BSM). The BSBA has eight majors, one of which, Business Analytics, was added in Fall 2020 and is therefore not part of the current review. Four minors are also offered. The breadth of the program is consistent with that of their peers' and aspirants' programs. The core curriculum of the BSBA, and the range of majors, are similar to what most business schools offer, though Hospitality Management might not be considered as common. The BSM program, which is targeted to working professionals, and which does not offer a selection of majors, is also similar to what other business schools offer for students in this demographic group.

Since the previous CIR, the School has systematized the assurance of learning (AOL) process, with clear and appropriate learning outcomes (though, with 13 multidimensional learning goals for both the BSBA and the BSM, there are far too many) and clear targets for achievement. Over the past five years, the AOL process was more effective for the BSBA than for the BSM, largely due to the low enrollment in the BSM. The AOL data collected include both direct and indirect measures; the timing and process for collecting data is well-defined. However, the School has not identified the courses in which a learning outcome or competency is introduced or taught. For the BSBA, most measures have been collected twice in the 5-year period, however, the same is not true of the BSM. Some BSBA curricular changes have been made as a result of the learning from the AOL process. For example, subject-matter coverage in several courses was expanded or refined and a decision was made to eliminate two majors – Business Administration and Organizational Behavior and Leadership – replacing them with a single Management major. In addition, some learning objectives were changed, and changes were made to some rubrics. In contrast, the difficulty with AOL for the BSM led the School to begin to redesign the curriculum to focus on management, rather than business administration. The draft proposal focuses on management in three sectors – business, non-profit, and other – because these are the sectors from which prospective and actual students come. The proposed redesign includes five competency-based learning outcomes. The School will need to develop a full AOL process for the BSM immediately in order to complete a full cycle (assess; implement changes; reassess) prior to the next CIR.

As observed elsewhere in this report, undergraduate enrollments have been declining. The School has considered ways to increase enrollments, including upgrades to the curriculum and additions of new high-potential programs. The faculty seem reluctant to consider trade-offs across different programs. In a resource-constrained environment, faculty will have to understand that resources must be deployed in the areas that hold the most promise for success. Although evaluating the potential elimination of a program or course is difficult to do, the School must do so to assure that its resources are deployed in the most effective ways.

Curricula Management and Improvement – Graduate

The School offers five graduate degrees – MBA (with five dual-degree options) , EMBA, MS in Entrepreneurship and Innovation (MSEI), MS in Financial Analysis (MSFA), and MS in Organization Development (MSOD). The MSEI was launched since the previous CIR, but it had been planned at that time. The curriculum in each of these programs is similar to what other business schools offer.

Since the previous CIR, the School has systematized the assurance of learning (AOL) process, with clear and appropriate learning outcomes (though, as with the undergraduate degrees, the School should consider reducing and simplifying the learning objectives) and clear targets for achievement. The AOL data collected include both direct and indirect measures and the process for collecting direct measures is generally well-defined. As well, the School has not identified the courses in which a learning goal or competency is introduced or taught. Importantly, the School has not completed the assessment cycle for all programs:
- MBA: A redesigned curriculum launched in Fall 2017 and assessments began in AY18-19. Each learning outcome has been assessed once, resulting in several curricular changes, such as adding a required capstone project based on indirect assessments. The School needs to reassess to determine the effectiveness of the changes made.
- EMBA: Five learning outcomes were assessed and reassessed; four were assessed with the reassessment delayed, primarily due to the pandemic; and one was not assessed. The assessments process resulted in a number of curricular changes. The School needs to complete

two assessment processes in each five-year period, with curricular changes implemented between the first and second assessment.

- MSEI: The program was launched in Fall 2017. To date, only two of seven learning goals have been assessed, both in Summer 2019. One other was scheduled to be assessed in Fall 2020 and the others are scheduled further out. One of the assessments completed in summer 2019 resulted in curricular changes. The School should reconsider the timing of assessments to assure that a full assessment cycle can take place within five years.
- MSFA: The School has done a fine job with AOL for this program, including assessing, responding to the assessment, and reassessing. Several curricular changes have been made that have led to substantial improvements in student learning.
- MSOD: The School has done a fine job with AOL for this program, including assessing, responding to the assessment, and reassessing. Several curricular changes have been made that have led to substantial improvements in student learning.

Overall, with respect to the School's AOL processes, the system as mapped out on paper is strong. However, the School has had difficulty completing full assessment cycles for all programs within a five-year period. One likely reason for this is that there are simply too many learning goals to assess. The School needs to review learning goals for all programs. In light of AACSB's 2020 Standards, the School should develop competency-based goals. For the most part, the School has already identified these needs (based on the "next steps" section of each program's AOL report).

Teaching and Faculty Engagement with Students

As described in the Participants section, the University and School both focus on the importance of teaching effectiveness. The School offers opportunities, such as a monthly "Teach Talk" for faculty to share teaching techniques and challenges with one another. In addition, faculty have a Slack site where they share resources with one another. The process to assure continuous improvement in teaching includes student evaluation of teaching for all faculty and all courses and, for faculty who need to improve, individualized consultations with the dean and associate deans, which includes accountability for mutually-agreed upon goals for performance. In light of the move to full distance-learning precipitated by the pandemic, the deans and others in the University have focused teaching development activities on both technology and engagement in online course delivery.

Prior to the pandemic, the School had done very little online course delivery. When it became clear that learning would be done remotely for the second half of the Spring 2020 semester, the University undertook a full week of emergency training to prepare both faculty and students to use Zoom. In late spring and over the summer, more extensive training was provided to help faculty develop fully online summer and fall courses. Full- and part-time faculty were required to participate in the training. The Center for Teaching Excellence reviewed each course syllabus to assure that it met minimum standards for effective online delivery. In addition, the office of Educational Technology offers supplemental resources to help faculty focus on student engagement in their online courses.

Students' evaluations of online courses have been used to assess faculty teaching effectiveness. However, in order to support faculty efforts to quickly ramp up to online teaching during spring 2020, the results of those student evaluations were not used for promotion and tenure decisions. Members of the School's leadership team have reviewed the evaluations and determined that, for the most part, faculty have done a good job in the transition to online teaching.

Across all disciplines and programs, faculty qualifications ratios are generally aligned with AACSB standard 15. There are some exceptions, as described in the Participants section. The Peer Review Team does not think that these exceptions negatively impact students' learning experiences.

In addition to classroom teaching, faculty engage with students in numerous ways. For example, the School has had 50 student-faculty research collaborations over the past five years. MSOD students work with four MSOD faculty in an ongoing research project, "the State of OD." The MBA program's Career Accelerator Platform provides another engagement opportunity for students and faculty. Faculty report that they actively conduct research with students and that the students have published in the case journal for students published by Baylor. Student clubs (e.g., Business Analytics Club) and competitions are another way that faculty and students interact outside the classroom.

Student Success

The School is doing a good job assuring that students achieve technology agility. All undergraduate students take 2-credit Applied Business Technology course. The course was added when employers recommended that students learn Python. The course now focuses on SQL. Students also learn Excel and have the opportunity to earn Sales Force certification. At the graduate level, different technologies are taught in different programs, ranging from Amazon Cloud and AWS Cloud in the MS Entrepreneurship and Innovation (note that these students must start an online business) to SQL, Python, Tableau, and AWS Cloud in the MBA.

Undergraduate students' 4-year graduation rates are in the high 60s (comparable to the rest of the University) while the 2-year graduation rate for graduate students is in the high 80s. Students in the part-time MBA typically take up to three years to complete their degree. The School reports outcomes data for students by major (undergraduate) or program (graduate). Some of these data are incomplete. For example, the MSOD page shows average salary and industries, but does not report promotion rates. The pages for undergraduate programs report in the same way. Indeed, the employment rate is given only for the full-time MBA.

ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL ENGAGEMENT

Both faculty and students engage deeply with the business community. Examples include:
- Business leaders judge various competitions, such as the Strategy & New Venture Competition that is part of undergraduate students' capstone course.
- In the MBA Magis Project, students compete in a cross-disciplinary business simulation, engage in structured reflection, interact with guest speakers, and perform a community service project.
- Graduate students participate in the Malloy Group for Organizational Science Consulting, in which they complete consulting projects in the Bay Area. Clients have included Bank of America, Adobe, , the San Francisco Giants, and Uber.
- Students and faculty in MSOD have an ongoing research project, "the State of OD," in which they conduct research interviews with Bay Area OD leaders.
- Through the alumni mentoring program, students have extensive engagement with alumni who are leaders in the local area.
- Many undergraduate curricular and co-curricular activities include participation from family business leaders affiliated with the Gellert Family Business Resource Center.
- Graduate program directors each engage extensively with advisory boards comprised of industry-specific business leaders.

- Through the Gellert Family Business Center, the China Business Studies Initiative and other programs, faculty leaders interact extensively with the businesses that their programs serve.

The School's guidelines for its faculty qualifications are appropriate, given faculty teaching and service workloads and available research support. However, the guidelines are not distinctively mission-driven, based on either the 2016 or 2020 versions of the mission statement. The School might consider amending the qualifications guidelines to support faculty ICs or PCs in areas related to promoting a just and sustainable society.

Section V: Commendations and Best Practices

The School has many initiatives associated with high quality outcomes, but the PRT has identified the following as especially noteworthy.
- Created Dean's Circle, new advisory boards, and annual State of the School strategic planning event
- Created tracking mechanism for SOM High Impact Practices
- Successfully updated their vision and mission statements
- Increased strong faculty record of scholarship in peer-reviewed journals
- Considering new 3.5 + 1 graduate programs to stimulate enrollment
- Maintained diversity of their student body
- Successfully raised their retention and graduation rates
- The China Business Studies Initiative is strong and unique
- Collectively, faculty have a strong pipeline of DEI and mission-based scholarship

The School has adopted curricular projects in keeping with its mission and market needs. For example,
- All undergraduate students must complete a community engaged learning (CEL) project embedded within the curriculum of a given course. Community engagement activities are shaped in collaboration with community partners and students, addressing some issue of the public good as an essential expectation of the course.
- Support for student research is provided.
- MBA students engage in significant project-based learning and a Magis Capstone. Projects are built into the curriculum in three courses, including the Capstone, allowing students to learn "by doing" and applying the concepts taught in the classroom. The *magis* approach allows students to go beyond the skills and knowledge taught in the program by applying them to have an impact in the community and thus contribute to the greater good.
- The new MS in Market Intelligence program is innovative and timely.

Faculty report that they are well supported:
- Ample travel/conference funds are available.
- A sabbatical research fund is available for faculty to apply for extra funding.
- A Research Weekend provides time for intensive work on the development of scholarly projects. For the most part, faculty spend the time focused on writing. These retreats have been suspended during the pandemic.
- The environment is collegial and interdisciplinary research is supported.

The School's depository for documents related to this CIR is easily accessed and well-organized.

Section VI: Consultative Feedback

The Peer Review Team has several observations about the School's staffing. First, compared to other business schools, the ratio of staff to faculty is fairly high. The number of program/administrative assistant is quite high for a School of this size. A specific recommendation is that staff resources be reorganized to better support School-level marketing and communications and undergraduate student advising.

The School requested consultative advice on three questions. The Peer Review Team is happy to offer some thoughts but does not claim to know best practices in these areas – indeed, with respect to the first and third questions, we too are undertaking the hard work of transitioning our practices in light of AACSB's 2020 Standards.

1. How best to transition our existing programmatic learning outcomes to competency outcomes? Which of our programs' learning goals are currently framed (or presented) as competency outcomes?

AACSB's guidance for the new standards includes a sample Table 5-1 for an undergraduate program that lists three competencies that are similar to some of the learning goals currently listed for the School's BSBA: communication skills-oral, communication skills-written, and technical business knowledge. Another sample Table 5-1 for a graduate program in cybersecurity lists one broad competency: technical knowledge in cybersecurity, including demonstrated success in post-graduate employment. The School's current learning goals for the MS programs might be revised to be similar. For example, in the MSEI program, the School might include a goal that encompasses both business skills and entrepreneurial mindset and might consider such things as number of start-ups or the investments they receive as indicators of success.

2. Are there examples as to how to effectively and efficiently survey alumni, especially with respect to learning, teaching impact, engagement, and societal impact? In our recently concluded 10-year reaccreditation by WSCUC, the Commission recommended that USF "improve methods of systematically surveying alumni in order to create a fuller picture of the impact of a USF education."

The PRT recommends that the School consult with other members of the Association of Jesuits Colleges and Universities (AJCU) to learn about the alumni surveys they might conduct. The School might also consider surveying employers to better understand the issues.

3. Specific to the new standards and the requirement to report faculty sufficiency based on discipline (and not department), what disciplines would be best for the SOM given its portfolio of programs?

The PRT recommends that the School report each basic business discipline (accounting, finance, etc.) as well as each discipline in which it has a specialized MS degree or undergraduate major/concentration.

Section VII: Attachments

Peer Review Team roster (provided in advance by AACSB staff)

Team Members

Kathleen A. Getz (Chair)
Dean
Loyola University Maryland
Sellinger School of Business and Management
4501 North Charles Street
Baltimore, MD 21210-2699
United States
Tel: +1 410 617 2301
Fax: +1 410 617 2829
Eml: kgetz@loyola.edu

Kenneth S. Anderson (Business Member)
Dean and Professor, Management
Gonzaga University
School of Business Administration
502 East Boone Avenue
Jepson Center
Spokane, WA 99258-0009
United States
Tel: +1 509 313 5502
Fax: +1 509 313 5811
Eml: anderson@gonzaga.edu

Norean R. Sharpe (Business Member)
Dean
St. John's University
The Peter J. Tobin College of Business
8000 Utopia Parkway
St. Augustine Hall, 2nd Floor, Room 2-135
Queens, NY 11439
United States
Tel: +1 718 990 3443
Fax:
Eml: sharpen@stjohns.edu

kgetz@loyola.edu; anderson@gonzaga.edu;
sharpen@stjohns.edu

Peer Review Team visit schedule

Session #	Time	Event	Focus	Zoom Address	PRT Participants	SOM/USF Participants	SOM Moderator
				SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 21			
1	TBD	PRT Team Meeting	Review of Materials and Questions	<None>	Anderson, Sharpe, Getz	<None>	
2	1 PDT 4p EDT	Launch Meeting	Introductions, School Overview, Review Visit Schedule, Set Expectations	USFAACSB1	Anderson, Sharpe, Getz	Moses, Henderson, Stackman, Takahashi, Zafra, Camara, Panter	Charles Moses
				MONDAY, FEBRUARY 22			
3	9a PDT 12p EDT	Strategic Planning	Mission, Strategic Planning Process, Resource Allocation	USFAACSB1	Anderson, Sharpe, Getz	Moses, Henderson, Stackman, Takahashi, Zafra, Fedyk, SPC Members	Peggy Takahashi, Tatiana Fedyk
<Break>	9:45a PDT 12:45p EDT						
4	10a PDT 1p EDT	Dean's Circle	External Engagement	USFAACSB1	Anderson, Sharpe, Getz	Johnston, Levine, Dean's Circle Members	Diana Johnston
<Break>	10:45a PDT						

	1:45p EDT						
5a	11a PDT 2p EDT	Faculty Development	Research Productivity and Quality	USFAACSB2	Anderson	Faculty Development Committee, Stackman	Billy Riggs
5b	11a PDT 2p EDT	Faculty Development	Teaching Effectiveness and Quality	USFAACSB1	Getz	Henderson, Takahashi	Linda Henderson
<Break>	11:45a PDT 2:45p EDT						
6a	12p PDT 3p EDT	Faculty Involvement	Faculty Governance, Development, Evaluation	USFAACSB2	Anderson	Tenure-Track Faculty	Johnathan Cromwell
6b	12p PDT 3p EDT	Faculty Involvement	Faculty Governance, Development, Evaluation	USFAACSB3	Sharpe	Term and Tenured Faculty	Carol Graham
6c	12p PDT 3p EDT	Faculty Involvement	Adjunct Faculty	USFAACSB1	Getz	Adjunct Faculty	Brad Morrison
<Break>	12:45p PDT 3:45p EDT						
7a	1p PDT 4p PDT	Undergraduate Curriculum	Undergraduate Curriculum Development and AoL	USFAACSB1	Getz	AoL Committee, UPC Co-Chairs, and UPC Members	Peggy Takahashi
7b	1p PDT 4p PDT	Undergraduate Students	Undergraduate Student Experience	USFAACSB3	Sharpe	Undergraduate Students	[TBD]
<Break> <End of Day>	1:45p PDT 4:45p EDT						
8	2p PDT 5p PDT	HOLD	Contingency for Rescheduled Monday Sessions		Anderson, Sharpe, Getz		
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23							
9	9a PDT 12p EDT	Advisory Boards	Overview of School and Programs' Positions in Community	USFAACSB1	Anderson, Sharpe, Getz	Faculty Board Liaisons, Board Chairs, Alumni Board Members	Courtney Masterson
<Break>	9:45a PDT 12:45p EDT						
10a	10a PDT 1p EDT	Graduate Curriculum	Graduate Curriculum Development and AoL	USFAACSB1	Getz	AoL Committee, GPC Co-Chairs, and GPC Members	Richard Stackman
10b	10a PDT 1p EDT	Graduate Students	Graduate Student Experience	USFAACSB2	Anderson	Graduate Students	Kate Milroy
<Break>	10:45a PDT 1:45p EDT						

11a	11a PDT 2p EDT	USF Staff	Centralized Staff Responsibilities and Engagement	USFAACSB1	Getz	Career Services, CASA, Development, ETS, ITS, OMC, SEM	Diana Johnston
11b	11a PDT 2p EDT	SOM Staff	SOM Staff Responsibilities and Engagement	USFAACSB3	Sharpe	Malloy Hall Staff	April McKay
11c	11a PDT 2p EDT	SOM Staff	SOM Staff Responsibilities and Engagement	USFAACSB2	Anderson	101 Howard Staff	Laura Camara
<Break>	11:45a PDT 2:45p EDT						
12	12p PDT 3p PDT	Wrap-Up	Additional Information and Address Remaining Questions	USFAACSB1	Anderson, Sharpe, Getz	Moses, Henderson, Stackman, Takahashi, Zafra, Camara, Panter	Richard Stackman
<Break> <End of Day>	1:45p PDT 4:45p EDT						
13	1p PDT 4p PDT	HOLD	Contingency for Rescheduled Tuesday Sessions		Anderson, Sharpe, Getz		
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 24							
14	8a PDT 11p EDT	Exit Meeting: SOM	Review Draft Report and Recommendations	USFAACSB1	Anderson, Sharpe, Getz	Moses, Henderson, Stackman	Charles Moses
<Break>	8:45a PDT 11:45a EDT						
15	9a PDT 12p EDT	Exit Meeting: USF	Review Draft Report and Recommendations	USFAACSBPrivate	Anderson, Sharpe, Getz	Moses, Fitzgerald, Cannon	Deborah Panter
<End of Day>							

List of peer, aspirant and competitive schools (provided in advance by AACSB staff)
See myAccreditation dashboard.

List of included and excluded programs (provided in advance by AACSB staff)
See myAccreditation dashboard.

Additional information the team received outside of the Continuous Improvement Review Report that would benefit the committee in their review process.

None