

A Strategic Approach to the Implementation of the 2013 AACSB International Standards

Barry H Williams, King's College, Pennsylvania, United States
Amy L. Parsons, King's College, Pennsylvania, United States
Christopher Alexander, King's College, Pennsylvania, United States

ABSTRACT

Colleges and universities have taken many approaches to handling the 2013 AACSB International standards and the update to the standards in 2017. Smaller colleges and universities are challenged by the limited faculty resources that are available to meet the expectations of the standards as well as the other responsibilities they have in their organizations. The strategic approach that was taken by King's College was to group innovation, engagement, and impact with the stakeholder groups of the College to utilize micro tasks amongst multiple groups within the stakeholder groups to meet the expectations.

Key Words: strategic management, 2013 AACSB international, standards, assurance of learning, student development, accreditation

INTRODUCTION

The process of designing and implementing a strategic approach to the management of a School of Business is a central tenant to the 2013 Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation ("2013 Standards"). The focus on strategic planning is a requirement that must be demonstrated for the continued maintenance of accreditation or to secure initial accreditation by AACSB International - The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) and is also a best practice of colleges and universities as they chart the waters of uncertain economic times surrounding higher education. (AACSB 2017)

Strategic management for a School of Business is more than a checklist of requirements or set of rules provided by the 2013 Standards and requires an intersection of themes, standards, mission, values, and vision with a strategic plan. Academic leadership of the School of Business should think strategically in organizing the processes to be followed in the design and operational implementation of the 2013 Standards through curriculum design, faculty and staffing considerations, students, administration, and other stakeholders. It is the intersection of the strategy and operational design of programs where a school sets forth the relationship of the Colleges and School of Business missions, visions, and values to goals, objectives, and outcome expectations. This approach is consistent with the themes and requirements of the 2013 Standards requirements. (Miles, Franklin, Grimmer, and Heriot, 2015)

The 2013 Standards are organized around a preamble with three vital areas of continuous quality improvement and two sections which incorporate core values, guiding principles and fifteen standards. It is expected that a School of Business will show compliance with these areas and provide an atmosphere of sustainability in meeting the expectations of accreditation. The guiding principles proceed from the changing climate in which higher education finds itself including financial challenges and stakeholder expectations (Abdelsamad, Farmer, McNeil, and Stevens, 2015). The continuous quality improvement in the preamble consists of three areas:

- Engagement;
- Innovation; and
- Impact.

The first section of the 2013 Standards includes the expectations for the eligibility criteria of a School of Business for accreditation. Included in these expectations are:

- Encourage ethical behavior by students, faculty, administrators, and professional staff;
- Maintain a collegial environment where stakeholders interact and collaborate;
- Demonstrate a commitment to corporate social responsibility; and
- Establish accreditation scope within the overall College or University.

The second section of the 2013 Standards deals with the specific fifteen standards that a School of Business must demonstrate compliance with. These standards are divided into four categories:

- Strategic Management and Innovation;
- Students, Faculty, and Professional Staff;
- Learning and Teaching; and
- Academic and Professional Engagement. (AACSB 2017)

The elements of the preamble and both sections of the standards cannot be achieved by the School of Business addressing one in isolation from the others. The intersection of these three areas of the 2013 Standards is where the strategic planning process and the operationalization of the strategic plan meet. The success occurs when multiple elements from each group are designed to accomplish a combination of tasks in the operational plans to demonstrate fulfillment of the 2013 Standards.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

This paper explores the approach to and the implementation of the 2013 Standards in the William G. McGowan School of Business (“McGowan”) at King’s College. It further explores the literature that has been written on the implementation of the 2013 Standards to Schools of Business and compares the approach taken by McGowan. The principles of strategic management and the literature on applying these processes to not for profit organizations will be examined to determine comparisons to the 2013 Standards and the planning and operationalization of the strategic management approach to McGowan. With the 2013 standards and the revision in 2017 there are expanded expectations for scholarship in the area of quality and impact. There is also an enhanced focus on the mission driven impact that McGowan must show in impact upon the outcomes of students and Assurance of Learning (AoL). To ask a small faculty to do this in addition to everything else that is expected in a small school may not be realistic but nevertheless is expected. The way to do achieve it is through the strategic management of the stakeholder groups and the use of single tasks to accomplish multiple purposes.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A review of the literature in the field of strategic management and the application to the 2013 Standards implementation in schools of business was conducted to provide insights and strategies of in-practice implementation. The literature is also consistent with the general scope of strategic management processes for the broader community of organizations as well as other schools of business. This research also provides a theoretical base to the application of the 2013 Standards to practice which provides insight into the sustainability of the process as AACSB International adapts to the ever-changing landscape of higher education.

Given the requirements of ensuring that a School of Business adheres to the new 2013 standards, there has been an attempt in the business and higher education literature to further explain the new standards and to demonstrate how Schools of Business can meet the demands to become or remain AACSB accredited. The standards were developed in response to a changing business environment and a desire for business schools to remain relevant and accountable by demonstrating continuous improvement related to innovation, impact and engagement (Abdelsamad et. al., 2015). The implications of the 2013 Standards pose many challenges for deans who need to work with students, faculty, alumni and other stakeholders to create a mission that is linked with society, their region and their university and then acquire and deploy resources to support the mission (Miles. et. al., 2014).

In the business education literature, there are a few examples of how to address various specific aspects of the 2013 Standards. Zhu and Fleming (2017) focus on how to align assurance of learning activities with the 2013 standards and share a three-stage process that requires Schools of Business “to identify program learning goals, learning objectives for each program learning goal and to map program learning goals and objectives into the business curricula” (p. 51). Following these three stages will help Schools of Business effectively address the assurance of learning requirements. Marques and Garret (2012) also provide insights to the assurance of learning aspect of the 2013 Standards and describe a five-step process that involves defining outcomes at the program level, developing a shared progressive curriculum for the program, identifying and gathering work in key courses using standardized rubrics, creating a few externally validated assessments and creating an Assessment Committee to monitor and assess the assessment program.

In addressing issues related to the Participants component of the Standards which includes students, faculty and professional staff, Kindu and Bairi (2016a) describe how to develop a process model using a systematic approach to address the standards. In assessing the relationship between a School's mission and its faculty, Geaney (2017) discusses the importance of understanding the circular relationship between the portfolio of a faculty's intellectual contributions, the impact of that portfolio, management and support processes, teaching and learning and academic and professional engagement.

On a broader level, strategic management has been adapted from the business world to the higher education context. Strategic management for higher education is longer term in focus and relies more on shared governance and consensus than top down approaches often utilized in business (Hunter, 2013). Schools that have successfully utilized strategic management tools have a vision developed in consultation with relevant constituencies, make decisions informed by data and involve planning that is both aspirational and feasible (Pierce, 2017). One approach to strategic management involves using focus groups to develop a checklist of extensive questions that are then used to help the School of Business assess the key dimensions of the 2013 Standards (Kundu and Bairi (2016b). Alstete (2013) discusses the development of business core curricula using strategic management tools such as strategic group maps and weighted competitive growth assessment and suggests that these tools can help institutions to identify opportunities for improvement and provide theoretical frameworks for making decisions.

Key to the strategic management approach is the model of strategic management utilized in this paper. Although strategies are altered for an institution of higher learning, the premises of the model remain the same. As with for-profit organizations, a non-profit must start with an informed definition of its mission and vision. From there, both utilize the industrial-organizational and resource-based models to analyze the external and internal environments in which they conduct business. Based on this analysis, both types of organizations formulate their strategies (business-level, corporate level, international and cooperative). It is here where the application of several of the strategies differs. For higher education, the business-level strategies remain the same (cost leadership, differentiation, and integrated cost leadership/differentiation). However, the corporate, international, and cooperative strategies are applied in a somewhat different manner. For the corporate level, adding new programs rather than businesses would account for the level of diversification. For the international strategy, offering programs internationally would substitute for global, multi-domestic or transnational strategies. Lastly, cooperative strategies might include partnering with other institutions to offer programs rather than vertical or horizontal strategic alliances to share value chain activities. It is in the strategy implementation phase of the process that the process varies very little between for-profit and educational institutions. Governance, structure and control, strategic leadership and entrepreneurship are as relevant for colleges and universities as they are for corporations.

It is important to emphasize that primarily because they are related to how a firm interacts with its stakeholders (students, faculty, staff, administration, alumni, and the local community to name a few); most strategic management process decisions have ethical implications. (Luo, 2008; Reynolds, Schultz and Hekman, 2006; Trevino and Weaver, 2003). As the goal of strategic management is to identify capabilities, core competencies, and competitive advantages, decision makers failing to recognize that the implications of failing to meet the needs of the salient stakeholder groups (including accrediting bodies) during the process runs the risk of placing their organization at a competitive disadvantage (Heineman, 2007).

DISCUSSION

Integration of 2013 Standards and Strategic Initiatives

McGowan was first accredited by AACSB International in 2004 and has undergone successful maintenance of accreditation in 2009 and 2014. Throughout these accreditation efforts McGowan has utilized a strategic management approach to the accreditation and the management of McGowan, its programs and academic majors. The McGowan enrollment has been approximately five hundred (500) undergraduate students in its Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA) degree program and sixty (60) graduate students in its Master of Science in Health Care Administration (HCA) degree program. The organizational structure consists of a Dean, Director of the HCA program and two department chairs. The processes which inform, guide, and management the strategic planning processes, the curriculum continuous improvement, and structural changes begin with the Deans leadership group that consists of the Director and Chairs with input from faculty, administration, a business advisory council, and a student advisory group (stakeholders).

The challenges facing many small schools of business come from a relatively flat administrative structure, small faculty size and the demands placed upon these groups for achieving the requirements set forth by the College, School of Business, and the 2013 Standards. The successful implementation of continuous improvements activities in a small school of business can be achieved by the fundamental concept of mission centric strategies that recognize who the school of business is and adapting the strategic management approaches to achieving the mission through the delivery of quality programs. Ultimately, achieving measurable mission alignment impact under the 2013 Standards will proceed from a mission alignment and developing strategic initiatives and alliances with stakeholders that further that purpose. McGowan's mission (See Figure 2) proceeds from the College's mission (See Figure 1 and the fundamental educational tenants of the Congregation of Holy Cross which is the sponsor of the College.

Figure 1 - King's College Mission Statement

King's College is a Catholic institution of higher education animated and guided by the Congregation of Holy Cross. King's pursues excellence in teaching, learning, and scholarship through a rigorous core curriculum, major programs across the liberal arts and sciences, nationally-accredited professional programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels, and personal attention to student formation in a nurturing community.

Figure 2 - William G. McGowan School of Business Mission Statement

The William G. McGowan School of Business seeks to develop in its students the professional knowledge and skills needed to function successfully in the dynamic environments of business with a commitment to exercising their professional responsibilities in an ethical and socially responsible manner in a global marketplace.

To achieve its Mission, the William G. McGowan School of Business:

- Draws primarily traditional undergraduate students from the Mid-Atlantic region and students for the specialized certificate and master's degree in Health Care Administration regionally, nationally and globally and supports the educational tradition of the Congregation of Holy Cross in educating both the hearts and mind of students.
- Faculty provides a vital component in achieving our career focused and lifelong learning oriented student-centered learning goals through mentorship, teaching, scholarship, and service activities.
- Faculty maintains proficiency in their fields and teaching through pedagogical and applied research and by sharing their business expertise in private, public, and philanthropic endeavors.

Impact Measures and Mission Alignment

The Congregation of Holy Cross sponsorship and the Catholic intellectual tradition are important components of and inform the King's College and McGowan School of Business education. Blessed Fr. Basil Moreau, C. S. C., founder of the Congregation of Holy Cross, expressed his vision of educating the whole person, both mind and heart, as the essential philosophy of all Holy Cross schools. As a school of business within a Catholic College sponsored by the Congregation of Holy Cross, McGowan's Vision Statement, Values Statement, Mission Statement, Learning Goals, Curriculum, and Strategic Planning are guided by and informed by the educational vision of Blessed Fr. Basil Moreau. In the development of engagement of students, faculty and stakeholders; the determination of impact of scholarship, learning outcomes, and student success; and, innovation in program development, evaluation, and revision, the pillars of success are built upon the educational traditions of the Congregation of Holy Cross and the vision of the Blessed Fr. Basil Moreau. McGowan is committed to the fulfilling Blessed Fr. Moreau's vision in achieving successful outcomes for students through the educational tenants of Holy Cross and recognizing these elements as determining the alignment of mission and impact. Blessed Fr. Moreau's educational vision included: 1. Academic excellence; 2. Creative pedagogy; 3. Engaged mentorship; 4. Co-curricular participation; 5. A collaborative spirit; and 6. Intellectual, moral, spiritual, and personal growth in each student.

Proceeding from the alignment of the College and McGowan mission statements with Blessed Fr. Moreau's educational vision is the task of identifying impact in the areas of scholarship, academics, instruction, education, and community and making certain all areas are in alignment. In making these decisions the involvement of stakeholders in the process is central to the selection of the factors and in determining the success in achieving them,

and in providing continuous improvement recommendations. The measures of impact that McGowan has determined proceed from the mission and vision alignment are the following elements: 1. Academic excellence; 2. Creative pedagogy, 3. Engaged mentorship, 4. Co-curricular participation, 5. A collaborative spirit, 6. Intellectual, moral, spiritual, and personal growth in each student, 7. Professionalism, integrity, civility, and service; 8. Global spirit and understanding; 9. Professional knowledge for career readiness; 10. Communication skills; 11. Lifelong learning preparation; and 12. Intellectual curiosity.

The following measures of impact can then be aligned with the specific areas addressed in the 2013 Standards areas of mission alignment impact, academic impact, teaching impact and educational level impact. Mission related impact measures related to research, scholarship, presentations, etc. was identified by McGowan as: 1. Pedagogical scholarship; 2. Applied scholarship; 3. Ethics, spiritual and/or moral development scholarship; 4. Philanthropic organization and service learning scholarship; 5. Student-faculty joint scholarship; 6. Global business scholarship; 7. Engaged mentorship; 8. Co-curricular participation; and 9. Lifelong learning preparation.

Strategic Initiatives

McGowan has undertaken a number of initiatives designed to maintain a quality business education for the students which are meant to further the mission driven areas of impact. The initiatives that are undertaken follow the strategic planning process as it relates to engagement, innovation, and impact follows: 1. Engagement of Stakeholders to Foster/Review Innovation; 2. Innovation of curriculum and/or Programs; 3. Engagement of Stakeholders to Review Innovations; 4. Implementation of Innovations; 5. Impact Analysis of Innovations; and 6. Return to Beginning of Cycle.

Engagement of stakeholders occurs at more than one point in the process including development of innovative programs, engagement in the implementation of initiatives, and evaluation of initiatives. Utilizing this strategic approach to the themes of the 2013 Standards can best be displayed through examples of implemented programs that have been through one or more accreditation cycles. While innovation in education in education is encouraged in the 2013 Standards, it is critical to the success of the school of business that it occur in the same time frame as industry to avoid falling behind the pace of change needed to meet the expectations of all stakeholders. Creating sustainable models for innovation, engagement, and implementation creates what can be associated with a new paradigm in business education. The discussion that follows will demonstrate how the achievement of the 2013 Standards can be done while committing resources to student success and the pace of change needed for maintaining currency in business education. (Maxfield, 2014). An example of one important strategic initiative related to student success is described below.

Student Professional Development Program

The original innovation for what is now the Student Professional Development Program (the “SPDP”) had its beginnings with the Office of Career Planning and Placements “Career Development Across the Curriculum Project” and the Department of Accounting in 2001. This linkage was the culmination of the McGowan faculty, Career Planning office, business advisory council, students, and recruiters to increase career awareness and preparation and led to the inclusion of a course titled CARP 412 – Career Planning II being included as a required course across the undergraduate majors in the McGowan (Williams, 2002). This innovation was the beginning of a mission centric approach to the strategic planning for long term student career development that evolved over time and to becoming sustainable in scope and financially.

The SPDP that was created included the application of the strategic vision aligned with the 2013 Standards that could be adapted rapidly through the process previously discussed to improve curriculum through a mission driven assurance of learning process. To achieve a continuous quality improvement culture, there must be an understanding that the process has a value and that the efforts have a meaningful impact on the curriculum. Central to developing this culture of lasting and sustainable quality improvement processes is meeting the expectations of stakeholders, meeting strategic plan objectives, adhering to the 2013 Standards, and being financially sustainable. With a small faculty the expectations for teaching, scholarship, service, and assurance of learning expectations demand the building of faculty involvement and buy-in to the system and success will not be achieved without them.

In doing such one must be mindful of opportunities for cross campus collaborations as well as single tasks fulfilling multiple requirements for success.

In designing the SPDP, the strategic plan called for the meeting of the objectives through the involvement of two areas that many times are kept in separate silos: Academic courses and Professional Development activities. To accomplish the objectives that needed to be achieved to bring about a culture of continuous quality improvements were as follows:

- Stakeholder involvement activities,
- Impact that draws upon the mission, vision, and values of the College and McGowan,
- Strategic Plan initiatives,
- 2013 Standards Achievement, and
- Financial sustainability.

The strategy was to utilize required academic courses for the program and to involve the College Career Planning Office, alumni, employers, faculty, and administration in tasks related to achieving the overall plan. By involving many stakeholders in a strategic initiative, no one group was asked to do so much that they would resist involvement and jeopardize the overall strategic initiative (Marques and Garret, 2013). Table I demonstrates how the parts of the plan work together for the singular goal of “Student Success”. Table 2 is the portions of the McGowan strategic plan that are partially or fully accomplished through the SPDP.

An element of the plan that describes how the elements came together and works together toward a common goal is the William G. McGowan School of Business Forum (the “Forum”). Started in 2005 as a means of engaged mentorship for the students by alumni and friends of the College in a professional setting in New York City. The Forum has become an annual event rotating between Wilkes-Barre, PA (King’s location), New York City, and Philadelphia, PA. The success of this partnership of stakeholders and objectives was demonstrated by the suggestion from data collection and analysis that the mission driven elements of business ethics, ethical decision making, values based education and self-efficacy were enhanced by this event. This then demonstrates the improvement in quality outcomes for the students, achievement in areas of the McGowan strategic plan, and attainment of AACSB International Standards (Blewitt, Blewitt, and Ryan, 2016).

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The implications of the 2013 Standards upon schools of business can be concerning for schools looking for a means to meet the requirements as outlined. The application of the strategic approach of combining stakeholders and expectations to create what could be called micro tasks leading to strategic success in the long term are based upon continued application of the engagement – innovation – impact cycle. To manage this cycle, deans will have to become more versed in strategic alignment of financial and human resources along task lines and away from silos. It will be these linkages that create a system that adapts to change at or close to the pace demanded by employers, donors, students, and all stakeholder groups.

Future research may examine different ways in which deans and their faculty can utilize the fullness of the strategic management approach to not only maintain their scope of educational offerings but also expand to include new capabilities, core competencies, and competitive advantages. A college or university may choose to redefine its business-level strategy to hone its differentiating features, or look for ways to cut costs without sacrificing quality. They may seek ways to develop new programs which enhance their current programs. They may seek to transfer their competencies to programs abroad. They may seek ways to partner with other institutions to explore programs that neither could offer alone. Most importantly, using AACSB guidelines and standards, future research may focus on ways to strengthen an institution’s governance mechanisms, streamline its structure, utilize more appropriate controls, and strengthen its strategic leadership.

Table 1 – Student Professional Development Program Undergraduate Areas of Innovation, Impact, and Engagement						
Innovation Elements/Stages	Stakeholder Engagement	Impact	Strategic Plan Objective (Table 2)	Assurance of Learning Goal	AACSB 2013 Standard	Financial Sustainability
Academic Courses						
MSB 100 – Introduction to Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CP • EIR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Career Orientation • Mission Awareness • Self-Efficacy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1d • 4c 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DM - ET - BEN • DM - IL – BEN • DM - OR – BEN 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 • 7 • 8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EIR Endowment
MSB 250 – Business Communications and Mentoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EIR • FA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant Measurable Increases in WR skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1d • 4c 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DM - OR – DEV • DM - WR – ASM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSB Budget
CARP 412 – Career Planning II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Career Development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1d • 4c 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DM - OR - ASM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 • 8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College Budget
MSB 400 – Professional Seminar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CP • FA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Career Development • Lifelong Learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1d • 4c 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DM - PK - ASM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 • 8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSB Budget
Developmental Activities						
William G. McGowan School of Business Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AD • BAC • BU • DV • EIR • ST 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engaged Mentorship • Self-Efficacy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2b • 4c • 5c • 5d 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CV-B • 3 • 7 • 10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted Fund Raising
Business Advisory Council Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AD • BAC • EIR • FA • ST 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Review and Revision • Engaged Mentorship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4c • 5a • 5c 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CV-B • 1 • 8 • 10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSB Budget
Business Competitions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BU • CP • EIR • FA • ST 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engaged Mentorship • PwC Top 5 Finish Nationally 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1d • 5a 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CV-B • 7 • 10 • 13 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSB Budget • Business Support
Internships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BU • CP • FA • ST 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Career Readiness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1d • 5b 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IM – SUPERVISOR ASM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 • 8 • 13 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College Budget
Interview Opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BU • CP • FA • ST 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing Opportunity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1d • 5b 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College Budget

Table 2 – Student Professional Development Program	
Undergraduate	
Legend	
ADM – Administration;	ASM – Capstone Assessment;
BAC – Business Advisory Council;	BEN – Benchmark;
BU – Business community members;	CP _ Career Planning Staff;
DM – Direct measure;	DV – Development Office;
EIR – Angelo P. DeCesaris Executive in Residence;	ET – Ethics and Socially Responsible Behavior;
FA – MSB Faculty;	IL – Information Literacy;
IM – Indirect measure;	MSB – McGowan School of Business
OC – Oral Communications	PK – Professional Knowledge;
ST – Students;	WR – Written Communications

Table 3
William G. McGowan School of Business
Strategic Plan – Student Professional Development Plan Initiatives
<p>Strategic Goal 1: <u>Academic Excellence.</u> The William G. McGowan School of Business strives for excellence in its Bachelor of Science in Business Administration</p> <p><i>Objective 1d.</i> To encourage the students, many undergraduates whom are first generation college students, to grow personally and professionally through internships, service learning and study abroad experiences.</p>
<p>Strategic Goal 2: <u>Business Ethics and Social Responsibility.</u> The William G. McGowan School of Business strives to become a regional leader in best practices for the development and assessment of moral leadership and social responsibility in its students.</p> <p><i>Objective 2b.</i> To promote lecture and conference themes in areas related to business ethics and social responsibility.</p>
<p>Strategic Goal 4: <u>Student Centeredness.</u> The William G. McGowan School of Business strives to provide students with personal and professional development in a diverse and changing society while educating the whole person in the tradition of the Congregation of Holy Cross.</p> <p><i>Objective 4c.</i> To provide individual academic and career advisement, including building upon the Executive in Residence initiative through career development and mentoring across the Business curriculum.</p>
<p>Strategic Goal 5: <u>External Relationships.</u> The William G. McGowan School of Business strives to strengthen its external relations, recognition and supporting resources from alumni, recruiters and the regional community.</p> <p><i>Objective 5a.</i> To strengthen and enhance Business Advisory Council activities and its relationship with the students and faculty of the School of Business.</p> <p><i>Objective 5b.</i> To strengthen and enhance the working relationship with the Office of Career Planning in building internship and placement opportunities for students.</p> <p><i>Objective 5c.</i> To maintain and enhance student mentoring opportunities including the William G. McGowan School of Business Forum and King’s Washington Alumni Connection.</p> <p><i>Objective 5d.</i> To maintain and enhance the infrastructure and financial resources that supports the strategic goals of the Business School.</p>

REFERENCES

- AACSB International (2017). *Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation*.
- Abdelsamad, M. H., Farmer, B., McNeil, R., & Stevens, G. E. (2015). Major changes in AACSB standards (2003 compared to 2013). *SAM Advanced Management Journal*. Vol. 80 Iss 3 pp. 4-11.
- Alstete, J.W. (2013). Essential distinctiveness: strategic alternatives in updating the business core curriculum. *Quality Assurance in Education*. Vol. 21 Iss 2 pp. 199-210.
- Blewitt, J. C., Blewitt, J. M., & Ryan, J. (2013). Business Forums Pave the Way to Ethical Decision Making. *Academy of Management Proceedings*. Vol. 2013, Iss 1, p. 11952.
- Douma, M. (2016). Hands-On Ethics Education. *BizEd*, 54-56.
- Geaney, M.M. (2017). Transition to AACSB 2013 Standards: A Dean's Perspective. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*. Vol. 82 Iss 1 pp. 15-25.
- Heineman, B.W. (2007). Avoiding integrity land mines, *Harvard Business Review*, 85(4) 100-108
- Hunter, F. (2013). The importance of strategic planning in higher education. European Association for International Education Blog – <http://www.eaie.org/blog/the-importance-of-strategic-planning-in-higher-education>. Accessed 11/13/17.
- Kundu, G.K. & Bairi (2016a). A process model of framework for Participants area of AACSB standard. *Business Process Management Journal*. Vol. 22 Iss 6 pp. 1044-1068.
- Kundku, G.K. & Bairi (2016b). Strategic management and innovation: A checklist for readiness evaluation of AACSB standards. *Quality Assurance in Education*. Vol. 24 Iss 2 pp. 259-277.
- Luo, Y. (2008). Procedural fairness and interfirm cooperation in strategic alliances. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29, 27-46.
- Marques, J., & Garrett, N. (2012). Implementing mission-driven assurance of learning: Improving performance through constructive collaboration. *Journal of Education for Business* Vol. 87 Iss 4, pp 214 - 222.
- Maxfield, S. (2014), "Does Accreditation Spur Innovation?" *BizEd* Vol. 13, Issue 6, pp. 66-67.
- Miles, M. P., Franklin, G. M., Heriot, K., Hadley, L., and Hazeldine, M., (2014), "AACSB International's 2013 accreditation standards: Speculative implications for faculty and deans", *Journal of International Education in Business*, Vol 7 Iss 2 pp. 86 – 107.
- Miles, M. P., Franklin, G. M., Grimmer, M., & Heriot, K. C. (2015). An exploratory study of the perceptions of AACSB International's 2013 Accreditation Standards. *Journal of International Education in Business*. Vol. 8 Iss 1 pp. 2 – 17.
- Miles, M. P., Franklin, G. M., Heriot, K., Hadley, L., & Hazeldine, M. (2014). AACSB International's 2013 accreditation standards: Speculative implications for faculty and deans. *Journal of International Education in Business*. Vol. 7 Iss 2, pp. 86-107.
- Pierce, S.R. (2017) How colleges should rethink their strategic planning processes (essay) <http://insidehighered.com/views/2017/01/31/how-colleges-should-rethink-their-strategic-planning-processes-essay>. Accessed 11/13/17.
- Reynolds, S.J., Schultz, F.C. & Hekman, D. R. (2006). Stakeholder theory and managerial decision making: Constraints and implications of balancing stakeholder interests, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 64 285-301.
- Trevino, L.K. & Weaver, G.R. (2003). *Managing Ethics in Business Organizations*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press
- Williams, B., (2002), "Adding in the Value of Career Planning", *BizEd* July/August 2002, pp. 38-39.
- Zhu, F.X & Fleming, R.S. (2017) Aligning Assurance of Learning Activities with the 2013 AACSB Standards. *Business Education Innovation Journal*. Vol. 9 Iss 1 49-56.

Barry H. Williams, JD, CPA, is the Dean of the William G. McGowan School of Business and a Professor of Accounting. Dean Williams is active as an active volunteer with AACSB International having served on site visit teams. Dean Williams' research interests are in the area of taxation, assessment, and program development.

Amy L. Parsons, Ph.D., is a professor of marketing and the Chairperson of the Business and Management Department and holds the honor of being the PNC Bank Distinguished Service Professor. Dr. Parsons's research interest is in the area of social media, pedagogy, advertising, and consumer behavior. She is a member of the Deans leadership team responsible for oversight of AACSB International accreditation.

Christopher S. Alexander, Ph.D., is a professor of business and management. Dr. Alexander's research interest is in the area of strategic management and his teaching is in the areas of management, leadership, and strategic management.

The authors wish to acknowledge the assistance of student assistant Danielle Ortolani who read numerous copies of the paper and provided clerical support.