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Cries for change have been heard by the nation’s colleges and universities and their business schools, and reform is underway. Yet many continue to challenge the academy’s readiness to meet modern challenges. How responsive are America’s business schools to changing social needs? What lessons can they learn from the broader academic community of which they are apart? To answer these questions, we looked at the growing body of literature in these areas and queried six of this country’s premiere public business schools directly. We found evidence to suggest that this nation’s business schools are engaging with society and are doing so in ways that reflect their unique missions. The tactics used by this small subset of public business schools to enact their social compacts provide fodder for larger scale studies on this subject and serve as resources for other schools looking to expand their engagement efforts.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"The idea that colleges and universities...are stewards of the common good, and that they are vital to the preservation of a free and democratic society is deeply rooted in American higher education. More than two centuries ago, Thomas Jefferson declared that the purpose of a liberal education is to promote and safeguard the 'public happiness' and to 'guard the sacred deposit of the rights and liberties' of the people" (London, 2002, p.5).

Background

Policy makers, educators, students, and the public have much to say about the purpose of higher education and about how well public institutions fulfill their social and civic missions. Most recently, business schools and their flagship MBA programs have come under considerable scrutiny. Driven in part by the recent spate of business scandals, some of which were orchestrated by corporate leaders with MBAs from this country’s most respected business schools, critics complain that our nation’s business schools are not producing ethical leaders, capable of managing increasingly complex institutions operating in a dramatically changing world (Khurana, 2007; Ghoshal, 2005; Pfeffer, 2005, Pfeffer & Fong, 2002, Hahs, 1999, Paton, 2001, Kretovich, 1999). No-one
as yet has attempted to prove a causal connection between these scandals and business education, yet the evidence of corporate greed and malfeasance and geo-political and environmental instability suggest that business leaders may lack the knowledge and skills needed to demonstrate socially responsible decision making and action.

A primary driver of any national disposition toward civic and social conduct derives from its economy, which is forged by business. This nation’s business schools were specifically designed to educate and culturally inculcate our future business leaders, while introducing new and innovative ways to manage organizations and resources in order to generate economic returns. Public business schools and the programs and services they deliver play a crucially dynamic social and civic role in the United States. Yet their capacity to produce capable, values driven leaders, and civic-minded individuals, as well as their ability and willingness to provide meaningful service to society is a matter of growing concern (Walsh, Weber, and Margolis, 2003).

If we were to evaluate public business schools, not by examining placement rates of graduates, but instead by looking at the ways in which they contribute to the public good, how would they fair? This study was our attempt to answer this question while expanding upon the efforts of others who have examined specific aspects of social responsibility in the nation’s business schools (Atcha, Bunch, Layke, Gentile, McGaw & Samuelson, 2001; Chapple, Powers, Bunch, McGaw, Lefkowitz & Samuelson, 2003; World Resources Institute & The Aspen Institute, 2005; Aspen Institute, 2007; Khurana, 2007). As a result, this study is the first of its kind to broadly evaluate how business schools are enacting their social contracts.
Drawing upon the writings of educational philosophers, scholars, and policy makers, from Ancient Rome forward, we examined the changing contract with public higher education and the role that business schools play in society. We also explored the literature on social responsibility in higher education in order to uncover the strategies business schools and academies use to fulfill their social contracts. Using these sources, we built a theoretical and analytical framework that identified four broad categories, comprised of a variety of diverse activities used by business schools and institutes of higher education alike to serve and advance society and create ethical, socially aware, and engaged citizens and business leaders.

A preliminary study was used to test our framework. Through this effort we attempted to examine the existence and extent of activities designed to fulfill higher education’s contract with society in the nation’s public business schools (Stott & Wolverton, 2006). We applied this construct to secondary data derived from the Wolverton and Penley (2004) study of 12 prominent public business schools. In this work, Wolverton and Penley analyzed how each institution achieved its level of quality graduate business education over the last decade and where the school’s vision and strategic choices will lead it over the next ten years. Data in the Stott and Wolverton (2006) study were analyzed and coded using Yin’s (1994) comparative case study method. Cross-case analysis ensured that all relevant data were taken into consideration in the analysis (Manning and Cullumn-Swan, 1994; Miles and Huberman, 1984). To make sure that the analysis in the study was accurate and complete, one researcher looked for patterns and themes across the data; the other researcher validated data coding and
modified it where necessary. This process provided definitional clarity and contextual agreement on themes (Miles and Huberman, 1984; Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

Although the schools included in the Wolverton and Penley (2004) and the Stott and Wolverton (2006) studies were not directly queried about their efforts to engage with society, a remarkable picture emerged. Preliminary evidence surfaced in both these works that these 12 schools are actively using curriculum, infrastructure, a diverse learning environment, and community outreach efforts in service to society. Despite this discovery, it was clear that further investigation was needed to determine the breadth and extent of the schools’ engagement efforts.

Problem Statement

This study represents our attempt to ascertain more precisely what a subset of these 12 premiere American business schools are doing to fulfill their social contract and produce ethical, socially aware, and civically active business leaders and citizens. Because the study was exploratory in nature, we used the comparative case study methodology advanced by Yin (1994). The purpose of this case study was to observe, describe, and analyze the policies and practices used by top-tier public business schools in the United States to demonstrate social responsibility and fulfill their compact with society.

Research Question

This investigation sought to answer one primary research question: What are elite public business schools doing to fulfill their contracts with society – to demonstrate
social responsibility themselves and to create socially responsible, civically engaged
business leaders and private citizens? We were particularly curious to learn how business
schools define social responsibility, envision their role in society, characterize and serve
their primary stakeholders, and use curriculum and instruction; community engagement
and economic development; infrastructure to support these efforts (e.g., mission, strategy,
budget/finding, staffing, compensation, fund-raising, etc.); and other strategies to enact
their social compact.

Method

Interviews and analysis of archival data were used to answer our research
questions. All 12 schools included in the Wolverton and Penley (2004) study were asked
to participate in this project, and nine agreed to do so. The University of Washington
declined to join the study, and Georgia State University and the University of Pittsburgh
did not respond to repeated requests to contribute. Data for this project were derived
from the University of Maryland, Indiana University, Purdue University, Georgia
Institute of Technology, the University of Florida, the University of Georgia, the
University of South Carolina, Arizona State University, and Texas A& M University.

Over a three month period, interviews were conducted with the deans, or their
designees, of these nine business schools. Participants received an overview of the study
and a copy of the interview questions prior to the interviews. Interviews took place over
the telephone and were recorded and transcribed. The researcher also took notes during
each meeting, recording participant responses and her own observations. While the
interviewer used pre-prepared questions to guide each interview, the discussions that
ensued were fairly unstructured. The unstructured nature of the interviews allowed
participants the opportunity to focus on the issues they believed to be most salient.

Each school was also asked to provide the researcher with documents, including
memos, newsletters, course descriptions, course curricula, mission statements, strategic
plans, demographic data about student enrollment and faculty makeup by gender and
ethnicity, marketing materials, press briefings, videos, and other official and popular
culture documents (Bogden & Biklen, 2003) to illustrate their engagement efforts more
fully. Requests for data were made prior to scheduled interviews. When archival data
were not received before these discussions occurred, a request for documents was
reiterated during and following the interviews. Supporting documents were received
from six of the nine schools. Georgia Tech, the University of South Carolina, and
Indiana University did not provide the researcher with any supplemental data. When
schools did not share supporting materials with the researcher, she used information
derived from school websites to supplement interviews.

Interview notes were typed up by the researcher immediately after the discussions
concluded. Recorded conversations were transcribed by a third party. Interview
transcripts, notes, and collected documents were reviewed, coded, and analyzed using the
framework developed in the Stott and Wolverton (2006) study. Despite our expectation
that new major categories would emerge through this process to expand our framework,
this did not occur. Findings did, however, result in deletions and other modifications to
the schema.
Significance of the Study

Through the use of a wider frame to view and analyze the socially directed activities used by business schools, this study creates a more complete portrait of social responsibility in public business schools than existed in the past and offers other schools interested in more fully engaging with society a variety of strategies and models to guide them to this end. Because of their scope and unique focus, our findings add to the scant but growing body of research in this area. Further, discoveries unearthed through this inquiry provide additional support for previous studies on and criticism of business education in America, particularly those focused on how business schools address ethics, social responsibility, sustainability, and stakeholder theory their MBA programs.

Limitations

While guided by sound reasoning, the decision to look only at public business schools in the United States and to restrict this examination to only those included in the 2004 Wolverton & Penley and the Stott and Wolverton (2006) studies results in several key limitations. First, none of the schools included in this project have been identified by other researchers, including the World Resource Institute and The Aspen Institute (2001, 2003, 2005, 2007), as exemplars in the area of social responsibility or sustainability. While many of our schools have been recognized as being among the best of their kind in the nation by ranking bodies such as Business Week, The Financial Times, US News and World Reports and others (Careerdynamo, 2006), none have been acknowledged for excellence in the area of social responsibility or sustainability by any entity.
We argue that this limitation can be overcome by considering that the criteria used to analyze institutional accomplishments related to social responsibility by other agencies have been limited in their scope. For example, the World Resources Institute and Aspen Institute only look at what business schools are doing to promote social and environmental impact management in MBA programs. While we include these criteria in our analytic framework, a school’s attention to sustainability and social responsibility in their curriculum and research are two of many elements we considered when evaluating a school’s contributions to the public good. By asking more broadly about what schools are doing in to realize their social compact and using an analytic framework derived from research on academic and civic engagement in higher education, we make a case that we were able to significantly minimize this limitation. Additionally, evidence derived from our 2006 study involving these 12 schools suggests that when such a frame is applied to business schools, it appears that they are fulfilling their social contract more substantially than other studies have inferred.

This study also looked at how business schools enact their social contracts broadly through policies and practices like research, faculty and institutional service, continuing education offerings, access to facilities and resources, and relationship building with community and business leaders. These activities cross all programs and disciplines within a school. We used a narrower lens to examine student diversity, activities to promote an appreciation of diversity, student service activities, and all elements under the category, curricular content and delivery (including, curricular and co-curricular activities to promote an understanding of social responsibility and sustainability, build a global mindset, and cultivate ethical, leadership, and civic
competencies). Our focus in these categories was only on those activities used in a school’s MBA programs. The choice to evaluate only MBA programs using specific criteria in the framework was deliberately made in order to allow us to compare our results with the outcomes of past studies focused on these different issues. The ability to judge our outcomes against others diminishes the difficulty that this limitation might impose. Using this frame to examine how business schools enact their social contracts in their undergraduate programs in future studies will further minimize limitations imposed by this decision while illuminating differences between how schools address demonstrate their compact with society in different programs.

By choosing to only look at the schools previously examined by Wolverton and Penley (2004) and Stott and Wolverton (2006), we excluded the ability to compare these schools with others which have been previously recognized for their social engagement, including private and international business schools. It is our hope that future researchers will choose to do so, and will attempt such an analysis using the broader criteria we are articulating here.

An additional limitation related to subject selection emerged as we attempted to engage all 12 of the schools examined by Wolverton and Penley (2004) in the present study. Three of the schools included in both the Wolverton and Penley (2004) and Stott and Wolverton (2006) studies directly or indirectly declined to participate in this investigation. Our assessment of the schools in 2006 using the framework we deployed here and the patterns that emerged through the present study suggest that these schools are remarkably similar to those we did examine. This data helps reduce concerns about this limitation.
One final limitation emerged as the result of our decision to exclude data collected from three of the nine schools as analysis progressed. The decision to do so was made because we were finding a great deal of similarity between participating schools in many of the elements included in our framework. We will attempt to overcome this limitation by analyzing data from the business schools at Purdue, Texas A & M University, and the University of Georgia and comparing these results to the findings reported here in a subsequent study to be completed in 2008.

We suggest that these limitations do not diminish the important contributions the present study brings to this area of inquiry. Because this investigation is exploratory in nature, we expect to add significantly to the literature on academic engagement and social responsibility in business schools by using the data collected to create a more comprehensive set of policies and practices to promote greater engagement by business schools and a larger framework by which to evaluate how business schools demonstrate social responsibility.

Conceptual Base

As we sought to determine just how America’s premiere public business schools fulfill their social contracts, we used a broad and encompassing framework to help define and capture the wide array of activities we expected to find. This analytic tool was informed by the writings of academicians, philosophers, and policy makers, researchers and activists, and critics of higher education and business education. In order to clarify the elements of this analytic tool, we begin by providing the reader with an understanding of key concepts derived from these works, and we lay bare our biases, which both
informed our interest in this issue and shaped the way we interpreted the data collected. We then review the educational theory, history, and literature that form the theoretical base of this framework in the next several chapters

Key Definitions

Through this study we used several terms to describe what we mean when we ask: What are public business schools doing to demonstrate social responsibility and graduate MBA students who are capable, ethical, engaged leaders and citizens? We see social responsibility in public business schools as a function of that entity’s ability to fulfill its contract, compact, or charter with society, serve the public good, demonstrate social/civic engagement, or act in social responsibility ways.

Barbara Holland (2001) notes that although many of these terms “are fairly new to our vocabulary in higher education... the ideas beyond these terms often go back into the history of our institutions in a variety of forms and under a number of different names” (p.28). As key terms are clarified here, the underpinnings of this study will begin to emerge. The historical, philosophical, and theoretical basis of this study is developed more fully in the next three chapters as the relevant literature is discussed.

Higher Education’s Contract with Society

In discussions about the academy’s responsibilities to society, the terms contract, compact, covenant, and charter are frequently used interchangeably to describe these obligations. Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary (1977) describes a contract as “a binding agreement between two or more persons or parties” (p. 246); a covenant as “a formal, solemn, and binding agreement (p. 262);” and a compact as “a written agreement or promise... between two or more parties especially for the performance of some action”
Jean Jacques Rousseau (1762) described the social contract as "the underpinnings that bind us to the social body" which are obligatory through their mutuality. When considering the term charter in relation to higher education, another dictionary definition provides further clarity. *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (1982, in Chambers, 2005, p. 7) defines a charter as "a document issued by a sovereign, legislature, or other authority, creating a public or private corporation, as a city, college, or bank, and defining its privileges and purposes." The first charter granted to an institution of higher education in America was issued by England to Harvard College in 1636 (Kezar, 2005). Since that time, each subsequent academy entered into a similar agreement with the government.

Each of these concepts, "though holding distinct qualities, reflect a complex relationship between higher education and society" (Chambers, 2005, p. 6). This affiliation is replete with specific expectations and responsibilities, which change over time, resulting in the continuous renegotiation of the agreement between the two.

Chairman of the National Economic and Social Development Board for Thailand, Sippanondha Ketudat (2000) portrays a university as an ever evolving and adapting living organism that derives its sustenance from the environment, yet is not passively dependent upon it. Ketudat asserts that universities and society are engaged in interactions that "are coupled in dynamic, multi-dimensional directions" (p. 37). Harold T. Shapiro, past president of Princeton and the University of Michigan, notes that the form, function, and social role played by the university have been and continue to be in a constant state of flux as higher education attempts to respond to society's transforming view of itself (2005).
Serving the Public Good/Fulfilling the Social Charter

Higher education’s contract with society is often described as a social charter (Holland, 2005; Kezar, 2005; Chambers, 2005). Implicit in this phrase is the expectation that colleges and universities will act in ways that serve the public good. Rousseau offers an early effort to delineate between individual desires and the good of society when he advanced the idea that the “will of all” is the sum of individual desires and the “general will” is the good of society taken as a whole (Barash, 2004). Rousseau emphasized that the social contract is a means of assuring that individual desires do not win out over the general good (Barash, 2004).

Universities arguably serve the public good by providing the government and taxpayers who support them with a return on their financial and resource investments through their efforts to meet the needs of the public at large and the communities in which they operate. Exactly what constitutes the public good is defined by policy makers, citizens, academicians, and business leaders and is based on the social, political, and economic needs of the time. It is also reflected in the missions and activities undertaken by academies (Holland, 2005; Kezar, 2005). While the public good and social charter have evolved and changed over time, the fulfillment of these ends can best be summarized by the “etymological” (Calme, 2000, p. 77) meaning of the word university – universality and community.

Social/Civic Engagement

From the halls of academia and policy institutions, individuals, like Barbara Holland, Adrianna Kezar, and Tony Chambers, have written extensively on civic engagement and provide colleges and universities with guidance as they seek to revitalize
their missions and activities in alignment with social needs in the 21st century. Barbara Holland, one of the most prolific writers and researchers in this area, defines a civically engaged academy as one that is:

committed to direct interaction with external constituencies and communities through the mutually-beneficial exchange, exploration, and application of knowledge, expertise, resources, and information. These interactions enrich and expand the learning and discovery functions of the academic institution while also enhancing community capacity. The work of the engaged campus is responsive to (and respectful of) community-identified needs, opportunities, and goals in ways that are appropriate to the campus’ mission and academic strengths. The interaction also builds greater public understanding of the role of the campus as a knowledge asset and resource” (2001, p. 24).

This definition, she asserts, reflects the contributions and benefits conferred and received by higher education and society and allows colleges and universities to respond to community needs through uniquely crafted missions and activities reflecting their individual contexts (Holland, 2001).

Social Responsibility

While the term civic engagement is most often used to describe academic efforts to support and contribute to society, social responsibility is a phrase most readily associated with corporate efforts to respond to societal needs. Colleges and universities play similar roles in society: each entity receives charters from the government detailing their responsibilities to and role in society; both are economic engines, providing outputs
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demanded by individuals, organizations and governments; and each must define its place in the market in unique ways that differentiate them from their competitors). Because of these similarities, social responsibility can be appropriately applied to the two institutions (Maira, 2004).

The societal expectations placed on universities reflect the larger social, political, and economic systems in which they operate and the demands placed on them by the consumers of their outputs. Pressures on universities today to demonstrate social responsibility are being generated by both students and business alike. Operating in an increasingly global, complex, and fragile geo-political environment, these groups are progressively more concerned with their ability to operate successfully in this new world. Consumer demands and a desire to differentiate themselves from competitors are moving businesses and universities to adopt missions and practices that reflect principles of social responsibility.

Social responsibility “embraces three concerns:…improving the physical environment,…community development,…[and improving] public policy and governance” (Maira, 2004). It is characterized by an organization’s ability to demonstrate “triple bottom line” accountability, which incorporates traditional financial returns as well as social engagement and environmental stewardship (Aga, 2004; Chapple, Powers, Bunch, McGaw, Lefkowitz & Samuelson, 2003). Social responsibility is also reflected in a growing concern with sustainable development that has been fueled by a decrease in global trade barriers, an increase in economic and educational engagement with developing nations, and worries about global warming.
An organization’s commitment to sustainable development reflects a desire for economic growth while attending to the social and environmental needs of the communities that support this expansion. Sustainable development is demonstrated through the generation of meaningful jobs, accessibility to affordable and healthy food, reductions in income inequality, and “modernization, distributive justice, and international relations” (Omotola, 2000, p. 117)). Vice Chancellor of the University of Lagos, Nigeria, Jelili Omotola (2000), describes sustainable development as “a situation in which everyone cares not to injure or harm others, is each other’s brother’s keeper, holds life as sacred, and extols the virtues of live-and-let live...[It] does not permit exploitation of the weak but rather encourages and enhances accessibility of essential public goods and services to the different social classes” (p. 118). Sustainable development is also concerned with individual freedom and liberty, political stability, healthy citizens, and affordable goods and services (Omotola, 2000), and the protection of the environment through re-use of materials, remanufacturing, use of alternative fuels, recycling, and eco-friendly building practices.

Organizations committed to social responsibility and sustainability are concerned with protecting the environment, employment and development of historically disadvantaged members of society, and helping to improve the quality of governance, the economy, and the society as a whole (Khandwalla, 2004). Such actions require an enhanced knowledge of law, ethics, economics, divergent cultures, languages and people, philanthropy, politics, and the natural and social sciences (Khandwalla, 2004). They also demand the ability to plan, allocate resources, and monitor, review and evaluate these activities (Khandwalla). Social responsibility also dictates a new definition of
stakeholders that extends beyond shareholders and includes employees and members of
the local, national, and global communities in which an organization operates
(Khandwalla, 2004).

This enlarged “social consciousness” is reflected by “leaders [who] recognize that
they cannot ensure long term-growth for their [organizations] without generating
sufficient social capital or goodwill. [Social capital is] generated through trust,
reciprocity, and tolerance of third party actions” (Gupta, 2004, p. 113). It also
demonstrates a rejection of Adam Smith’s popular and prolific profit maximization
theory, which Khandwalla (2004) describes as being driven by greed and self
centeredness and a lack of concern for “ethics, corporate social responsibility, [or]
stakeholders other than promoters” (p. 113-114). Replacing Smith’s theory, which has
driven commercial and policy decisions for decades, is a new economic theory of
responsibility which is “subject to ethical restraints, appropriate discharge of the
company’s social responsibility, and a balanced concern for the needs of all stakeholders,
not just the [shareholders]” (Khandwalla, 2004, p. 113-114).

Growing interest in social responsibility and sustainability in business today is
propelling firms to ask business schools to provide them with leaders with an
understanding of the theories and practices that lead to socially responsible management
and help prepare students to become global citizens (Winn, 2005). This includes
teaching students new economic and shareholder theories; providing them with a deeper
comprehension of environmental, legal and regulatory issues at home and abroad;
cultivating the ability to make sound, ethical decisions that take into account multiple
constituents – both human and ecological; and developing students’ ability to work with
multiple technologies and interact with peoples and governments who are culturally, ethnically, and religiously quite different from themselves. Students, too, particularly those enrolled in MBA programs, are expressing an interest in social responsibility. Studies have shown that MBA students want to work for socially responsible businesses and have a desire to gain the skills needed to lead in socially conscious ways (Kretovich, 1999; The Aspen Institute, 2003; Barlas, Thompson, Williams, & Verschoor, 2003).

Researcher Bias

Each of us comes to a given situation with a unique perspective and set of beliefs that shape what we look for and how we interpret what we find. We began and ended this study believing that the public nature of the business schools studied requires them to give back to the stakeholders that support them by creating a culture that supports diversity and ethical behavior; through curricular and co-curricular activities that provide students with the opportunity to learn and practice skills that will help them become effective, concerned, and engaged leaders and citizens, capable of succeeding personally and professionally as members of increasingly divergent, complex, and inter-connected organizations and communities; and through research and service to the local, regional, national, and international communities that addresses pressing social, environmental, and business issues and contribute to the health, prosperity, and well-being of their constituents.

This bias was surfaced and confronted by one study participant from the Carey School of Business at Arizona State University who does not share the same belief system. The researcher’s bias was also raised by the former dean of the College of
Management at Georgia Tech who shares a similar world view. In each case, the researcher clearly articulated her position, claiming it only as her own. In conversations with the associate dean of MBA programs at Carey, she acknowledged and welcomed his perspective, and invited him to share more about his views with her by directing her to additional writings he produced that she had not yet examined.

Efforts were made to contain this bias, particularly through the extensive analysis that was conducted on the data collected. This was done by having a second researcher review cases and analyses as they were written, and by providing each of the study participants with the chance to review and provide commentary and feedback on the researcher’s understanding of their institutions. Several times during this process, the second investigator challenged the researcher on her interpretations when she felt that subjectivity was coloring her summation or analysis of a school’s activities. In each of these instances, the researcher reviewed and modified her work accordingly. In one situation, Carey’s associate dean took issue with the evaluative tone used in the original draft of a case summary for that school. Here too, the researcher made changes to the document, and reworded portions that reflected personal views, making them more objective.

A Look Ahead

In the chapters that follow, we reveal the sources that informed our framework, explore the social expectations placed on higher education and business schools over time; present the literature that examines how well business schools have met these obligations, and illuminate strategies to promote great engagement between public
universities and business schools and the communities that support them. In Chapter 5, we will detail the methods used to collect and analyze our data. The reader will learn, in detail, how each business school we studied enacts their social contracts in Chapters 6 through 11. We analyze these efforts against our framework in Chapters 12 and present and discuss the collective results of our study in the final three chapters.
CHAPTER 2

HISTORICAL BASE: SOCIETAL EXPECTATIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE CHANGING SOCIAL CONTRACT

Introduction

Since their founding, institutions of higher learning were designed to meet specific social needs, including the education of professionals like teachers, clergy, civic leaders, physicians, and lawyers; promoting economic development; and the preparation of individuals for active engagement in civic life. The social, economic, and political circumstances that characterize the local and national regions that support individual academies helped shape and refine their distinct missions over time as colleges and universities are called upon to help their communities meet their changing demands. A look at higher education from its inception to modern times will illustrate the interconnectedness between higher education and society and will highlight the changeable nature of the social compact and the integral role responsive universities play in the social order.

Historical Retrospective

*The Purpose of Higher Education: Ancient Greece through the Renaissance Period*

Expectations regarding the social contributions of higher education today have their roots in the Greco-Roman Empire. In ancient Greece Socrates saw education as
necessary for the preservation of and participation in a democratic society (Knox, 1998). Such an outcome required a broad-based education consisting of a full exploration of history, literature, and the arts, a broad understanding of “man and his world” (Mitchell, 1999, p. 17), and opportunities to develop the ability to “investigate and question logical principles and beliefs and to be critical thinkers” (Knox, 1998, p. 117). As a means of developing critical thinking, Socrates introduced the practice of active teaching. This method avoids lecture and passive dependence on the teacher and replaces them with problem-based learning, which requires students to challenge assumptions in search of “unshakeable conclusions” (Mitchell, 1999, p. 18). The Socratic Method is reflected in the scientific method used in research today and has been proven to be among the most effective pedagogical tools in the development of reasoning and in the retention of learning (Sivan, A., Leung, R. W., Woon & Kember., 2000; McCarthy. & Anderson, 2000; King, 1993).

In the fifth century Sophists revolutionized higher education by shifting its focus away from vocational preparation and toward the goal of producing “citizens equipped to succeed in the circumstances of their society” (Mitchell, 1999, p. 17). Among them was Plato, who founded the first university (Mitchell, 1999). Plato envisioned higher education as the vehicle for teaching rational thinking as a “means to truth...[that] serves the true interest of human beings and promotes their true happiness” (Mitchell, 1999, p. 17). This was accomplished through a rigorous program of intellectual activity and the application of “reason to the search for knowledge and answers” (Mitchell, 1999, p. 17).

The preeminent educators of ancient Greece greatly influenced the Romans and their educational efforts. Perhaps most shaped by their works was Cicero, a Roman
Senator in 63 B.C.. Cicero introduced several concepts that continue to shape higher education today, like the importance of a liberal education that includes the study of law, history, literature, society, and philosophy, in an effort to develop the person to his/her fullest potential (the concept of humanism) and provide him/her with the communication and reasoning abilities, and the morals or ethics needed to be a “good citizen” (Mitchell, 2000, p. 18).

Through the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, great universities were established across Europe and new traditions related to the organization of academies and the role of scholars in the institutions emerged with no major changes in the educational philosophy (Mitchell, 1999). Through these periods, higher education was expected to continue to teach the classics and to produce thinking and engaged citizens. Along side these traditions, a new emphasis on natural and moral philosophy and metaphysics was introduced by Thomas Aquinas. This included the teaching of prudence or the process of choosing moral actions to achieve desired ends, which affect oneself and one’s community. (Morgan, 2003).

**Higher Education in America**

The history of institutions of higher learning in the United States, from the colonial period on, provides an outstanding example of the social charter and the evolving nature of this contract in response to the needs of an emerging nation. Although changing social, political, and economic forces have worked to alter the focus and work of American institutions of higher education over time, their primary responsibilities to society have remained relatively unchanged. From the time that the first college was established in the Massachusetts colony over 300 years ago, our institutions of higher...
learning have been tasked with preparing individuals for the various vocations, including leadership roles, needed by government and business alike, and for active participation in a pluralistic and democratically governed society. Boyer and Hechinger (1981), in their classic essay *Higher Learning in the Nation’s Service*, explain that although the goals of the nation’s earliest institutions may not have been fully articulated, it is clear that they were tasked with “training clergy, teachers, and educational leaders; combating the restlessness of youth...; instilling in their students...responsible citizenship; and transmitting knowledge that would be useful, not merely in the classical sense of preparing gentlemen, but for the practical demands of a changing world” (p. 9).

One can see from this description that higher learning in America has been intertwined since its inception with the larger purposes of society (Boyer & Hechinger, 1981). A brief look at the history of higher learning over the past three centuries deepens one’s understanding of the interdependence between an evolving democratic society and its institutions of higher learning.

Following the conclusion of the Revolutionary War, patriotic leaders, like Benjamin Rush and Thomas Jefferson, saw the academy as a vehicle for the preparation of leaders for the new government and citizens who were capable of actively engaging in the democratic process (Boyer & Hechinger, 1981). A clearer picture of the founders’ expectations of higher education can be found in Jefferson’s 1818 address to the Commissioners of the University of Virginia. In this speech, he asserts that higher education is designed to:

- produce statesmen, legislators, and judges; [teach the] principles and structure [and laws] of government; harmonize and promote the interests
of agriculture, manufacturing and commerce, and by well informed views of political economy to give a free scope to the public industry; develop the reasoning faculties of... youth, enlarge their minds, cultivate their morals, and instill into them the precepts of virtue and order; enlighten them with the mathematical and physical sciences, which advance the arts, and administer to the health, the subsistence, and comforts of human life; and generally, to form them to habits of reflection and correct action, rendering them examples of virtue to others, and of happiness within themselves.

His concluding comments in *The Rockfish Gap Report* (1818) capture the essence of the social compact in the early 19th century. He surmises that “these...objects of higher grade of education...provide for the good and ornament of their country [and] the gratification and happiness of their fellow-citizens.”

Jefferson’s vision of the academy was expanded during the Antebellum period with the passage of the Morrill Acts, which established federally supported land grant universities designed to provide both a liberal education and training in the skills needed to grow the economy by supporting the nation’s expanding agricultural and industrial engines. One could argue that this national investment helped spawn the agricultural and industrial revolutions that soon followed. The second of these acts opened the door to the education of and meaningful employment for Blacks by providing Congressional assurance that equal funding would be provided for land grant colleges serving Negros. They also linked college campuses to the national expansion (Boyer & Hechinger, 1981).
The economic engine, fueled by the Industrial Revolution, put pressure on universities to expand their educational offerings to meet the growing need for professional specialists and provide innovative technologies and organizational management practices to use to support the expanding economy and workforce. This spurred the establishment of professional schools and research universities, based on the German university model (Cohen, 1998; Mitchell, 1999). Both the Morrill Acts and the introduction of professional schools focusing on vocational preparation and skill development challenged higher education’s focus on classical or liberal education and sparked a new debate about the purpose of higher education (Mitchell, 1999). From this dialogue emerged a new model of higher learning, which required professional education to occur alongside the liberal arts or be preceded by it. This move was reflective of the changing social needs and the writings of Cardinal Newman who insisted that “liberal education...provides the individual with the intellectual capacity and body of theoretical knowledge that can link his professional training to the broader world of learning and bridge the gap between craftsman and intellectual” (Mitchell, 1999, p. 19).

In the following century, higher learning joined with the government to address some of the most serious and challenging problems the United States encountered including the collapse of the national economy, war and its aftermath, and civil inequality. During the Great Depression, as this country’s economy faltered, President Franklin Roosevelt turned to and found help from the academy in devising solutions to address the nation’s ills, thus establishing the concept of a national “brain trust” (Boyer & Hechinger, 1981, p. 14) housed in higher education. As the nation moved from the Depression into war, the government again turned to the academy as a resource for
scientific assistance in the development of military weaponry and strategy. In 1940 the National Defense Research Academy (later named the Office of Scientific Research and Development) was established to continue to harness the scientific power of universities for research in times of peace (Boyer & Hechinger, 1981, p. 14). Vannevar Bush, head of the Carnegie Institution at the time, spearheaded the establishment of this government agency citing the need for continued collaboration between the government and higher education in an effort to effectively address individual, social, and economic problems and insure the "health, prosperity, and security as a nation in the modern world" (In Boyer & Hechinger, 1981, p. 15).

As the nation attempted to absorb over 12 million returning veterans at the close of World War II, Congress, seeking a means of rewarding military personnel for their service, a strategy to delay their re-absorption into the economy, and a means of preparing them for employment, enacted the G.I. Bill of Rights (Boyer & Hechinger, 1981). This Bill afforded every veteran desiring an education with one paid for entirely by the federal government. Like the Morrill Act of the previous century, this legislation opened the door to higher education to millions of Americans who never before had the opportunity or means of entering. The establishment of community colleges, which provided no or low cost educational opportunities, helped to educate returning veterans and further expanded the reach of higher education to working adults and others who had previously been excluded from academic pursuits (Boyer & Hechinger, 1981). Community colleges helped prepare individuals for a variety of employment opportunities, including many in the ever growing service industry, and provided a vehicle of introduction to four year colleges for numerous others.
Efforts to establish democratic governments in Germany and Japan and provide assistance with the growth and development of the economies of emerging nations created further opportunities for the government to collaborate with higher learning through the 1950s and early 1960s (Boyer & Hechinger, 1981). At the close of the Second World War, government leaders tapped higher education for help with the implementation of the Marshall Plan in Europe and with the execution of President Truman's "Point Four" foreign policy initiative in nations in the Third World (Boyer & Hutchins, 1981). During the Cold War period, President Eisenhower introduced the Defense Education Act to utilize higher education to advance science and math education as a means of addressing issues of national defense.

As the 1950s came to a close, civil unrest was spreading throughout the South, threatening this nation's safety and security at home and reputation around the world. Almost one hundred years after the end of the Civil War, Blacks in America, particularly in the southern states, continued to be excluded from full and equal participation in education, politics, transportation, and employment. Violent and sometimes deadly struggles emerged on college campuses as the federal government clashed with local political leaders in an effort to permit Black student enrollment in public, historically white colleges and universities. Facing a national crisis, President Johnson persuaded Congress to pass a number of key pieces of legislation designed to make discrimination illegal and open the doors to full participation in society to Blacks. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 were two of the most far reaching and important pieces of legislation he sponsored.
A year after the passage of the Civil Rights Act, Johnson realized that more muscle was needed to overcome the barriers imposed by hundreds of years of discrimination, placed into law Executive Order 11246 requiring organizations receiving federal funding to take affirmative action in the areas of education, training, and employment as a remedy for past injustices and as a means of preventing discriminatory practices in the future (Kovach, Kravitz & Hughes, 2004). Recognizing that opening the doors to higher education to Blacks was not enough to get them into the halls of academia, President Johnson and Congress turned their attention to the issue of financial aid.

On the heels of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and EO 11246, Congress passed the Higher Education Act of 1965, which “provided the framework for federal financial aid today: grants, work study, and loans” (Green, 2005, p. 3). In 1972, Congress reauthorized the Higher Education Act and established the Basic Education Opportunity Grant (known today as the Pell Grant), “which targets grants on a sliding scale to the poorest college students in the United States” (Green, 2005, p. 3) and mandates needs-testing for aid. The reauthorization of the act also included “State Student Incentive Grants (SSIG’s) as an encouragement for states to begin need-based grant programs for their citizens” (Green, 2005, p. 4). This legislation made financial aid portable for the first time, allowing students to shop for schools. The availability of movable, need based aid, an expanded community college system, and state support of four year public colleges and universities broadened opportunities for students of color.

In the decades following the passage of these bills, minority and female enrolment in institutions of higher learning increased dramatically. Gains for Blacks were among
the most notable. Over the five years following the passage of both of these pieces of legislation, “total Black student enrollment at predominantly White colleges and universities increased 308%” (Williams, 1988, p. 3). It increased again in the following six years by 148% (Williams, 1988, p. 3). The impact of this legislation on Black socio-economic well being is immense. Over the last 50 years, Blacks have advanced faster than Whites in their rate of high school graduation and have significantly closed the gap with Whites in terms of overall educational attainment and in the median earnings ratio (Donahue, 1991; Willie & Willie, 2005).

The 1960s saw the passage of a number of pieces of legislation, which opened the doors to the academy further to students who were not previously served by higher education. Legislation, including the Higher Education Acts (HEA) of 1963 and 1965, The National Defense Education Act, and The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 authorized federally funded grants, aids, and loans to students, providing them with relief from the high cost of college attendance (Place, 2003). The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the American’s with Disabilities Act of 1990 prohibited discrimination against the admission of disabled individuals who are otherwise qualified for academic enrollment. The Age Discrimination Act of 1975 barred institutions from discriminating against students on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving public funding. All of these laws greatly enhanced access to higher education over the past 40 years, creating a more open system of education and greater socio-economic mobility for millions of Americans (Cohen, 1998).

Over the last 30 years, higher education expanded its involvement with the broader community in a variety of ways (Cohen, 1998). Research agendas became more
closely tied to economic development and industrial ventures, and professional schools expanded their direct community service through such professional ventures as offering community health care and legal aid and through active engagement in policy debates on broad social issues, including the environment and the economy (Cohen, 1998). Student engagement with the community was enhanced through the passage of The National and Community Service Trust in 1993, which established “a corporation to coordinate programs through which students receive minimum wage stipends and tuition benefits in return for community service” (Place, 2003, p. 4). During this same period, higher learning positively impacted the national economy through contributions to individual mobility, production of wage premiums, as well as greater protection from unemployment and higher standards of living for college graduates (including those with associates degrees) (Cohen, 1998).

This historical retrospective provides a look at the significant role the academy has played in addressing a number of critical societal needs at home and abroad over time. Ernest Boyer, former president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, argues that higher education is at its best at the moments in history when it is serving larger purposes like helping to “build a more just society” and making the nation “more civil and secure” (1996, p. 13). Boyer (1996) envisioned the primary work of the university as engagement in scholarship with relevance to the nation’s most pressing civic, social, economic, and moral problems, and not as a vehicle for the credentialing of students and the creation of tenure for faculty. Boyer found support for his positions in Derek Bok (1982), president of Harvard University, who suggested that the academy has a significant role to play in society by working to directly solve basic social problems,
engaging in the moral development of students, preparing students for careers in a global marketplace, educating more and better teachers, and working to reduce poverty, homelessness, and chronic unemployment. William Bowen, former President of Harvard, sees the role of universities in society slightly differently. Bowen (2000) asserts that the academy serves society over the long term through research and via education that instills democratic and civic values in students, preparing them to serve others through their own vocations and citizenship.

In 1963, Robert Hutchins captured the pivotal role of the academy in society when he wrote: [The university’s role is] “to formulate, to clarify, to vitalize ideals which should animate mankind – this it the incredibly heavy burden which rests, even in total war, upon the universities. If they cannot carry it, nobody else will; for nobody else can. If it cannot be carried, civilization cannot be saved. The task is stupendous” (p. 105). Over 40 years after Hutchins penned these words in his essay Education for Freedom, our nation stands at a remarkably similar point in history. Our homeland was attacked. We are engaged in multiple military conflicts abroad. Trouble is brewing in the nation’s economy. Poverty is on the rise, and the country’s abundant wealth disproportionately rests in the hands of a few. At the dawn of the 21st century, we face new and troubling challenges, including ever expanding diversity in our population; an increasingly disengaged electorate; shrinking public funding for social programs and higher education; unprecedented advances in technology; disappearing trade and national barriers as commerce becomes increasingly global; and a world characterized by political instability and environmental degeneration. All of these factors have converged to create a loud and growing call for a return of the academy to its rightful and necessary place in
the national landscape as both a critic of society and its institutions, and as a major
critic, providing civic education in service to democracy, education of public
leaders, and service to society in the form of basic and applied research to address
important social issues.

Both Boyer (1996) and Bok (1982) argued that society needs and is demanding
more from higher education than it is getting. Cohen (1998) conceded that changes in the
pattern of higher education funding and internal and external competition for status and
students have taken colleges down a path that leads away from society and toward
scholarship in service to the private interests now providing a greater portion of the
academy’s revenue. As we enter a new millennium, higher education clearly sits at a
crossroads. Faced with shrinking federal and state funding, a nation struggling to address
ever increasing deficits, and states seeking to balance their budgets, public colleges and
universities compete for public monies with other high cost social priorities, like prisons,
Medicaid, and K-12 education. To make up for funding shortfalls from the government,
so long a strong, consistent, and powerful strategic and financial partner, the academy has
increased tuition and fees and turned increasingly to wealthy donors and businesses for
money to support operating expenses and research efforts. At the same time, local, state,
and federal lawmakers are calling for increasing accountability from institutions of higher
learning, asking them to demonstrate their utility and the value of the public’s investment
in them (Cohen, 1998). These changes have significantly challenged the missions of
colleges and universities and have caused shifts in functional priorities away from public
service and more and more toward service of its other constituents – students and the
business community.
In their 1981 essay, *In Higher Learning in the Nation's Service*, Boyer and Hechinger argued that these forces make it more imperative than ever that higher learning focus its efforts on educating citizens for life in an increasingly complex world; meeting the needs of those who have been underserved by higher education in the past; adjusting their curriculum to educate those displaced by the changing economic engine, recommitting to basic research necessary for the generation of new knowledge needed to advance society; while "systematically engage[ing] in the civic education of adults" (p. 50); and "transmitting to the next generation, intact, society’s moral, cultural, and political values and traditions" (p. 56). Speaking to the crises of the day, Boyer and Hechinger asserted:

At a time when society’s values are shaped and revised by the fashion of the marketplace, higher education’s influence must grow outward from a core of integrity and confidence rooted in human goals that are currently lacking in most other institutions.....In the end, education’s primary mission is to develop within each student the capacity to judge wisely in matters of life and conduct. This imperative does not replace the need for rigorous study in the disciplines but neither must specialization become an excuse to suspend judgment or interfere with the search for worthwhile goals (1981, p. 58).

Boyer and Hechinger (1981) argued that the purpose of higher education is “not only to prepare [individuals] for productive careers, but to enable them to live lives of dignity and purpose; not only to generate new knowledge, but to channel that knowledge to human ends; not merely to increase participation at the polls, but to help shape a citizenry
that can weigh decisions wisely and more effectively promote the public good” (Boyer & Hechinger, 1981, p. 60).

Higher Education Today

The end of the 20th century saw a resurgent interest in higher education for the public good. Spurred by economic, political, social, environmental, technological, and demographic changes, policy makers, students, community leaders, and businesses demanded accountability from their colleges and universities and a demonstration of their ability to serve the people and the communities which support and sustain them.

Among the first to heed the calls for change were the presidents of Brown, Georgetown, and Stanford Universities, who, along with the president of the Education Commission of the States, formed the Campus Compact in 1985. Originally created to disprove the media’s portrayal of college graduates as a group of disengaged, self-absorbed, and materialistic individuals, this group grew to a coalition of over 950 college and university presidents, representing public and private, two- and four-year colleges and universities “committed to fulfilling the public purposes of higher education” (Campus Compact, 2006). From its inception, Campus Compact provides member organizations the “training, resources, and advocacy...[needed] to build strong surrounding communities and teach students the skills and values of democracy” (Campus Compact, 2006). Among the resources provided are tools to help disciplines within the academy develop and realize engagement agendas is a series of volumes on service learning for individual academic areas (now published by the American Association for Higher Education) and a multi-media publication called The Engaged
Department Toolkit (Zlotkowski, 2005). Campus Compact members demonstrate civic engagement by:

- Sharing knowledge and resources with their communities,
- Creating economic development initiatives, and
- Supporting service and service learning efforts in key areas of importance to their communities and society as a whole, including literacy, health care, hunger, homelessness, the environment, and senior services (Campus Compact, 2006).

The New Millennium Project on Higher Education Costs, Pricing, and Productivity, sponsored by The Institution for Higher Education Policy, The Ford Foundation, and The Education Research Institute, represents a second notable response to concerns regarding higher education’s disconnect from society. In 1999, the New Millennium project published the findings and recommendations of a multi-year project to “improve understanding and facilitate reform of the complex system for financing higher education” (Wellman, 1999, p. 5). Presented as a working paper, the report examines how higher education serves the public good and assesses and accounts for service to society.

Jane Wellman, author of the paper, writes that, unlike private colleges, public and non-profit universities have broad civic purposes at the core of their missions that requires them to fulfill two primary roles in service to society. First, they must provide students with a broad-based “civic education” designed to them to be effective, engaged citizens in a democratic society” (Wellman, 1999, p. 8). Second, public academies are tasked with providing “institutional service” which “is the combination of individual faculty, student, and staff efforts, as well as organized institutional activities that serve
the community” (Wellman, 1999, p. 8). Achieving these two substantial objectives, Wellman (1999) argues, requires a rethinking of strongly held ideas and practices, including those related to pedagogy, faculty reward systems, student body and faculty demographic composition, relationships with the community, research agendas, academic leadership, and others, and focused efforts that support a mission of service to society.

Summary

In order to realize these competing objectives, colleges and universities, and the programs that exist within them, need new models of organization, teaching, and research based on theory and practical experience. A number of innovative paradigms and tools have emerged to help academies engage more fully with society. We will review these models in Chapter Four.
CHAPTER 3

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN GRADUATE BUSINESS EDUCATION:
A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview

This chapter details the purpose and functions of business schools in society, reviews significant criticisms of business education and of MBA programs, and examines key studies that expose weaknesses in business schools related to the vehicles they use to prepare students for leadership roles and civic engagement. Through these discussions, we also detail expectations of business schools put forth by business leaders, academicians, and students, and examine past research that suggests business schools are not living up to these ideals.

Great Expectations

From the establishment of one of this country’s first and most enduring business schools at the University of Pennsylvania in 1881, the mission of these institutions has been broader than providing practical education in service to business and industry. The sentiments of Joseph Wharton, a prominent steelmaker from Philadelphia who provided the seed money to found the Wharton School of Finance and Economy reflects this broader social and moral purpose in society. With his substantial financial contribution to the school, Wharton “wanted the university to teach business subjects and to ‘inculcate
and impress upon the students...the immorality and expediency of seeking to acquire wealth by winning it from another rather than by earning it through some sort of service to one’s fellow man” (Wharton in Van Fleet & Wren, 2005, p. 2). A growing body of evidence suggests that service to society remains an integral expectation of American business schools today. The accreditation standards for business schools detailed by the International Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) make clear that engagement with society remains a primary goal of these schools. The Association describes the work of business schools as “providing management and accounting education, which will prepare students to meet the complex demands placed on organizations and managers by such social, economic, political, demographic, and technological forces as a strong and growing global economy; culturally diverse employees and customers; a plurality of cultural and organizational values; and rapidly changing technology in products and processes (2005, p. 1).

In light of these environmental pressures, the AACSB asserts that “management education must prepare students to contribute to their organizations and the larger society and to grow personally and professionally throughout their careers” (2005, p. 1). It further declares that all accredited members must share a common purpose, which is “the preparation of students to enter useful professional, societal, and personal lives” (2005, p. 1). This purpose sounds remarkably similar to that which has been expressed for all public higher education institutions in this nation by Jefferson, Bok, Hutchins, Boyer, Hechinger and others.

While some effort has been made to rank business school social engagement by organizations like World Resources Institute & The Aspen Institute (2001, 2003, 2005,
2007), neither they nor the AACSB offer academicians the guidance needed to fully realize these aims. In its accreditation manual, the Association simply asserts business schools can achieve this broad mission most directly “through interaction among students and faculty members” (AACSB, 2005, p. 1). Since 1999, the World Resources Institute (WRI) and the Aspen Institute (AI) have partnered to conduct a biennial survey and report of business schools designed to highlight the schools’ curricular and research efforts directed towards the promotion of social and environmental stewardship (WRI & AI, 2006). Their collaborative report, Beyond Grey Pinstripes, published every other year since 1999, provides a relative ranking of the schools representing how well a school has done in each of three categories: MBA coursework (this measure includes “the total number of [required and elective] courses with social and environmental content available at a school…, the proportion of coursework dedicated to …social and environmental issues compared to the total number of hours in the MBA program…., and the degree to which each course emphasizes the role of business as a force for positive, social, environmental, and economic change”), faculty research (accounts for “…the number of articles that examine business in a social and environmental context… published in…leading peer-reviewed management journals”); and institutional support (which includes non-curricular programs and activities that address issues of social impact and environmental management) (WRI & AI, 2006). The Beyond Grey Pinstripes project also offers business school faculty and administrators resources to connect them with communities of scholars engaged in this work and curriculum tools to aid in the development of new or enhancement of existing courses addressing social or environmental issues.
Although the introduction of a new ranking system based on curricular, co-curricular, and research activities related to sustainability and the availability of resources to help promote a more sustainable agenda represents a significant movement toward a more socially responsible graduate business education, it is merely a beginning. The *Beyond Grey Pinstripes* initiative provides initial evidence of precisely how far business schools have to go to become fully engaged, socially responsible institutions, but offers schools interested in pursuing a broader engagement agenda limited help to do so. A look at the literature, which offers a deeper exploration of the limitations of business education today and an examination of the work done in the broader academy to create educational opportunities that promote the public good, provides business schools with a fuller understanding of the initiatives, structures, and activities that promote academic-community engagement, and serves as an excellent starting place for this study.

**New Requirements for Business Education**

Historically, corporate recruiters looking to fill leadership positions sought the most experienced candidates for these crucial roles. Increasingly, however, recruiting efforts have shifted away from candidates with stellar credentials gained through on-the-job training towards those with MBA degrees from the nation’s growing pool of business schools. This change in focus coupled with a significant increase in the number of MBA graduates each year (up over 23% since 1971) (Friga, Bettis & Sullivan, 2003), many of whom are commanding six figure starting salaries, has heightened awareness of the primal role business schools command in the marketplace.
As a primary supplier of business leaders, American business schools are expected to produce graduates with the “analytical skills, strategies, and decision-making frameworks” (Atcha, Bunch, Layke, Gentile, McGaw, & Samuelson, 2001, p. 4) needed to fill key positions in organizations operating in an increasingly complex and global context, many of which are concerned with issues of social and environmental stewardship. Today, the traditional graduate curriculum focused almost exclusively on accounting, finance, marketing, strategy, and organizational behavior, fails to provide the cognitive, ethical, social, or behavioral competencies needed to lead the modern firm (Khurana, 2007; Pfeffer, 2005; Ghoshal, 2005; Atcha, Bunch, Layke, Gentile, McGaw, & Samuelson, 2001). Recent studies, surveys, and focus groups have found a growing disconnect between the needs and requirements of businesses and students alike and the curricular and co-curricular opportunities offered by many graduate business programs.

**Leadership Skills for the 21st Century**

In a world in which business success depends on the ability to compete in the global marketplace through the development of partnerships that extend across national boundaries, use of foreign labor, and operations in other countries with different laws, customs and practices, enterprise leaders must possess a new and unique set of competencies. These capabilities must inform business school agendas.

Peter Lorange (2003), President of the International Institute for Management Development (IMD) in Lausanne, details the capabilities needed to lead the modern firm. Lorange argues that these leadership qualities are derived from the need to possess a global mindset. The ability to think globally includes an appreciation of diversity and the ability to “bring people together with different perspectives, backgrounds, different
cultures, different consumer understandings, different geopolitical viewpoints, etc., in a way in which they will benefit from one another” (Lorange, 2003, p. 128). This requires an understanding and appreciation of different cultures, practices, customs, religions, and geo-political issues. It also necessitates the capacity to think strategically about global issues and a knack for identifying and analyzing new opportunities in the global marketplace.

Leaders of the 21st century must also be able to form partnerships, build alliances with business and governmental leaders and customers, and manage mergers and acquisitions in order to facilitate growth and expansion. They also need a thorough grounding in human resources, organizational development, human rights, labor law, environmental law, and other related issues in order to rapidly staff operations “through expatriation and localization...so that the best talents, the best qualified people – irrespective of nationality – are always assigned to the task, wherever it may be” (Lorange, 2003, p. 129). The capacity to form and sustain relationships is another critical competency. Relationship building requires tolerance of differences, the ability to listen for understanding, and to demonstrate a genuine interest in the positions and needs of others. Leaders must also possess the capacity for lifelong learning and the adeptness to experiment and learn from both successes and failures – quickly. Those at the helm of modern firms must also possess flexibility and ethical and moral standards (The Princeton Review, 2005).

Global Competencies

To compound matters further, organizations today operate in a world in which “centers of commerce [have become] more differentiated, distinctions between public
and private leadership [are increasingly]...blurred, and business is being pressured to solve complex social and environmental problems in countries around the world” (Atcha, Bunch, Layke, Gentile, McGaw, & Samuelson, 2001, p. 7). This new “global marketplace [is] dictating a need for stewardship skills” (Atcha et al, 2001, p. 7). In such an environment, organizations need leaders with a firm understanding of issues related to social and environmental impact management and sustainability (The Princeton Review, 2005; Atcha, Bunch, Layke, Gentile, McGaw & Samuelson, 2001). This includes the capacity to: “understand diverse cultural, social, and political systems; to cope with vastly different infrastructure and resource issues; and to work with organizations such as the UN, the World Bank, and NGOs that provide significant funding for projects in developing countries” (Atcha et al, 2001, p. 7).

Business schools are in a unique position to shape future leaders and to help them develop the skill set needed to succeed in the global landscape. They can help build these new competencies by exposing students to different peoples and cultures through an international mix of students and faculty members; via case studies that address globalization issues and challenges; through small and large-group learning opportunities that allow cross-cultural discussions to occur; by creating global learning opportunities through internship and projects with global firms; via international linkages forged with companies and business schools outside the U.S.; through exchange programs with international business schools; and through the development of global meeting places, which includes conferences, the formation of international networks, and Web casts that reach and connect with students and others around the world (Lorange, 2003; Webb, Mayer, Pioche & Allen, 1999).
Faculty with extensive knowledge about the global dimensions of business drawn from their own experience working with international firms, from researching issues relevant to the needs of international businesses, or from teaching, living or studying abroad are critical to student acquisition of the requisite qualities needed to lead modern organizations “since students rely on faculty as their primary source of information” (Webb et al, 1999). The demands of a new economy require research agendas focused on social and environmental responsibility and sustainability issues and on the generation of new theories of leadership that reflect the realities of business in the new millennia. They also call for increased opportunities for students to engage with and learn about cutting edge business practices necessary for the survival of the modern firm, and experiences that will help students to develop the skills needed to think critically about complex issues and innovate rapidly. Coursework and co-curricular activities that build skills needed to communicate, negotiate with, and manage diverse work groups, facilitate the development and enhancement of leadership skills needed today (Webb, Mayer, Pioche & Allen, 1999). By providing MBA students with an interdisciplinary and diverse educational experience that demonstrates the interconnectedness of courses and issues faced by businesses and integrates critical topics like ethics, social responsibility, and sustainability into core coursework, graduates will be better prepared to think about and respond to issues broadly, systemically, and with a greater concern for all involved parts and parties (Webb, Mayer, Pioche & Allen, 1999).

Recommendations by Business Leaders

Corporate leaders offer business schools a variety of additional recommendations designed to strengthen MBA programs and build essential leadership skills. In a 2000
focus group conducted by members of the World Resources Institute’s Sustainable Enterprise Program and the Aspen Institute for Social Innovation through Business, officials from seven of the nation’s largest private enterprises put forth the following suggestions to enhance MBA programs:

- Develop business school cases with measurable examples of success through sustainability.
- Look to international development banks and financial institutions for globalization programs, seminars, cases, and course content.
- Accelerate integration of stewardship training into the core curriculum through modules within required courses.
- Bring consumer activists, institutional shareholders, socially responsible investors, and industry and NGO representatives into the classroom to work on projects with MBA teams.
- Provide role-playing opportunities and consulting experiences that require students to make decisions in scenarios where the population is impoverished, the government is corrupt, and there is no electricity or clean water.
- Help students learn how to manage human and environmental disasters.
- Conduct research on different cultures and customs (Atcha, et al, 2001, p. 8).

Lack of Alignment

This discussion of 21st century leadership qualifications suggests that traditional, stand-alone courses in accounting, finance, marketing, strategy and organizational behavior may no longer suffice as vehicles for the effective development of future leaders. Business schools operating without connections to local and international
communities, with faculty focused on research agendas out of alignment with modern business needs, and traditional methods of teaching and learning do not serve the needs of many 21st century organizations, and raise questions about the return on the estimated $885 billion annual investment made in MBA programs by stakeholders (Friga, Bettis, & Sullivan, 2003). Without a clear and distinct redirections of strategies and educational tactics the relevancy and necessity of business schools may be challenged, and their position of dominance in leadership development might falter. A cursory look at the recent literature on business education suggests that these things may already be occurring.

Perceived Short-Comings of MBA Programs

Calls for reform in business education began in the 1950s with the Ford Foundation’s efforts to reshape the historically vocationally driven curriculum and faculty into a model reflective of other programs within the academy (Friga et al, 2003). Business schools responded to this initiative by professionalizing the faculty and enhancing their focus on research (Friga et al, 2003). The Carnegie Commission initiated additional pressures for change in the 1970s when it argued that business school research and teaching were divorced from the needs of industry and society (Friga et al, 2003). In response, business schools introduced curriculum that addressed some of the issues of the day, including organizational effectiveness and teamwork, but did little to change the structure of their programs or their research focus, which remained largely directed toward basic research (Friga et al, 2003).
Since the 1980s cries for change have reached a cacophony as the divergence between the needs of industry and the curriculum of business schools expanded. This disconnect was highlighted by a large scale study conducted by Porter and McKibbin (1988), which raised concerns about the level of cooperation between these schools and businesses, evidenced by a disengaged and increasingly irrelevant curriculum and research, and a lack of attention paid to soft-skill development (Friga et al, 2003). The author's conclusions underscored the seriousness of the matter, "Perhaps our most disturbing finding was the general absence of concern for, or even expressions of, looming changes in the environment in which business schools will be operating in the next 10-20 years (Porter & McKibbin, 1988, p. 311, in Friga et al, 2003, p. 236).

Increasing globalization and the rapid social, geo-political, economic, demographic, and technological changes that occurred within the last two decades, and the difficulty large and entrenched institutions like colleges and universities encounter when rapid change is needed may explain some of this detachment. In their 2001 report on social responsibility in MBA programs, Atcha, Bunch, Layke, Gentile, McGaw & Samuelson (2001) identify a "triple disconnect" between what businesses say they want from MBA programs, what the schools are providing, and the qualities identified by MBA recruiters as most needed in today's business environment.

The detachment of business schools from other core constituents may also be due in part to the changes in higher educational funding that occurred during the same period. Over the past 20 years, this country's public business schools have faced increasing pressure to fill the fiscal void left by the government's slow and steady decline in funding. To address this financial gap, schools have expended a great deal of effort to
cultivate relationships with and provide service to businesses and private donors. This intensified focus on fundraising has arguably helped move these schools away from their social and civic mission and has opened them up to increasing criticism from students, scholars, and policy makers.

Censure of business schools escalated over the past several years as a recession produced a shrinking market for newly minted MBAs (Hahs, 1999) and allegations of corporate malfeasance blossomed. Diminishing demand for MBA graduates and a tarnished image in the public marketplace has led many to target business schools not only for their failure to produce capable, ethical business leaders who are able to manage modern firms, but also for their failure to provide meaningful service to society and educate civically minded individuals. In response, business schools introduced instruction focused on interpersonal leadership skills and ethics and increased their focus on internationalism (Economist.com, 2006).

Sumantra Ghoshal (2005) of the London School of Business attributes the recent spate of corporate scandals in large part to the theories and ideas that have emerged from business schools over the past 30 years, theories that have affected not only MBA students and undergraduates in business, but executives attending business courses offered on and off campus. In his article Bad Management Theories are Destroying Good Management Practices, Ghoshal called these dominant ideas about business deeply flawed and described how they have led to “many of the worst excesses of recent management practices” (2005, p. 75).

Jeffrey Pfeffer (2005) argued that the situation is even worse than Ghoshal inferred. He wrote, “There is evidence that both economics, a subject that forms the
foundation for most business schools and a majority of business school courses and education, and business school training, and business school environments themselves, can have deleterious effects [on students]” (2004, p. 2). To support his position, Pfeffer (2005) pointed to the 2001 Aspen Institute study of MBA student values and behavior, which found that as students progressed through their graduate degree their belief in the importance of their role in enhancing shareholder value increased and their focus on the valence of customers and employees decreased. He also drew attention to studies of cheating and student values to underscore the deleterious effects of business education. Pfeffer (2005) noted that in a large empirical study conducted by McCabe and Tevino, business school students were found to place “the least importance on knowledge and understanding, economic and racial justice, and the significance of developing a meaningful philosophy of life” (1995, p. 211 in Pfeffer, 2005). Their research also revealed that business majors report 50% more cheating violations than their peers and almost twice as many such violations as the average student participating in this study.

Ghoshal (2005) suggested that the business schools have a very significant negative impact on management practices because they have propagated “ideologically inspired amoral theories [that] have actively freed their students from any sense of moral responsibility” (2005, p. 76). Adopting and applying the scientific method to management practices, he argued, teaches managers that they are not responsible for their actions and that they are not active decision makers and agents in their environments. Instead, it teaches managers that they are subject to the dominion of patterns and laws (economic, social, and psychological) which creates the notion of causal determinism as an explanation of all aspects of corporate performance (Ghoshal, 2005). Ghoshal wrote:
Management theories at present are overwhelmingly causal or functional in their modes of explanation. Ethics, or morality, however, are mental phenomena. As a result, they have had to be excluded from our theory, and from the practices that such theories have shaped. In other words, a precondition for making business studies a science as well as a consequence of the resulting belief in determinism has been the explicit denial of any role of moral or ethical considerations in the practice of management (2005, p. 79).

Ghoshal argued that the “false premise of determinism” (2005, p. 79) dehumanizes practice and frees managers from any sense of moral or ethical responsibility for their actions.

Ghoshal (2005) also suggested that business schools erroneously teach students the importance of their role in maximizing shareholder value, and drew a connection between this practice and the corporate scandals that are plaguing businesses globally. He used observations by Thomas Kochan to trace the root cause of corporate wrongdoing to this overemphasis on returns to shareholders without concern for the effects of their actions on stakeholders. Ghoshal argued that the theory and practice of maximizing shareholder value is misguided at best and completely devoid of evidence to support it. Instead of perpetuating an intensive focus on providing returns to shareholders, Ghoshal (2005) urged business schools to teach students to recognize the investments made and value of all of a business’ stakeholders, particularly those of employees, who contribute more to firms and carry greater risks than do financial investors. Removing from business curriculum the emphasis on maximizing returns for those who provide a firm
with financial capital, and replacing this concept with one that re-conceptualizes investors as individuals entitled to residual cash flow, will help managers to attend to the "enormously complex economic, social, and moral issues related to leading public corporations, which have enormous influence on the lives of thousands, often millions of people" (Ghoshal, 2005, p. 80).

Pfeffer (2005) offered support for Ghoshal's argument that the negative effects of business education extends beyond the halls of academia. He provided evidence for this assertion in the 2000 study conducted by Williams, Barrett and Brabston, which looked at citations for violations of occupational safety and health regulations. Here, the researchers found a positive correlation between firm size, the number of MBAs in top management positions, and the number of violations. Pfeffer (2005) also referred to the findings of other studies that reveal a link between economics training and unethical, illegal, self-centered, and avoidant behavior. He noted that these results raise ethical concerns about the next generation of business leaders. Pfeffer (2005) suggested that the crisis in values and ethics in business education is the function of the failure of business schools to sufficiently professionalize management. He explained that professionalism of a discipline requires it to be concerned with professional values, and "the why and what of behavior, not just the how" (2005, p. 4).

Trank and Rynes (2003) trace problems in business schools to their increasing focus on market rhetoric, changes to curriculum and practices in response to pressure from students and the business community, and a drive for rankings (in Pfeffer, 2005, p. 4). Pfeffer and Fong (2004) and Goiia and Corly (2002) concur, suggesting that a quest of status and resources have driven business schools away from their original missions.
Ghoshal (2005) contended that "bad theories" have persisted and multiplied in business schools because of academia's desire to make management a science. He suggested that over the last 30 years, business schools have erroneously moved away from the pluralistic view of scholarship Boyer describes in his 1990 work *Scholarship Reconsidered* to the scholarship of discovery in their desire to introduce research into the agenda (Ghoshal, 2005). This shift in focus, Ghoshal argues, has led to a number of problems in business schools, including a decrease in "common sense and morality" and "poor public policy decisions" (2005, p. 79).

Support for Ghoshal's criticism of business research predates his arguments. In 2003, Walsh, Weber and Margolis suggested that the public interest "holds a tenuous place in management scholarship" (p. 860). Their analysis of business research found that since the late 1970s few studies have focused on anything other than the effects of management action in economic terms. Before that time, research considered a broad array of outcomes. Hinings & Greenwood (2002) argued that scholars in business schools have stopped asking "big, important questions [and have instead focused on] technical precision and manageable research projects" (Pfeffer, 2005, p. 4).

Pfeffer (2005) offered further support for Ghoshal's arguments when he noted that "the theories that came to be believed and accepted [in business schools] affect both public and organizational policies and practices (2004, p. 1). He cited Bernstein, who in 2001 noted that "the field of [economics] has more and more tended to dominate the

---

1 Boyer's balanced scholarship model emphasizes equality and balance between the scholarship of discovery (research), the scholarship of integration (synthesis), scholarship of practice (application), and scholarship of teaching (pedagogy).
formulation of curricula and research agendas in all of the social and policy sciences, and in some cases, even in the humanities” (in Pfeffer, 2005, p. 1). In his commentary on Ghoshal, Pfeffer (2005) suggested that the choices that business schools make regarding research models and approaches, theories, and teaching strategies are directly tied to the “sources of business school funding and the dynamics of the interaction between the schools and those external groups and organizations on which they depend” (2005, p. 4). He noted that the growth of these flawed theories about economy and society “was helped along by foundations and research institutes that received funding from conservative sources [that hold classical liberal ideals]” (2005, p. 4).

Rosabeth Moss-Kanter (2005) of Harvard University acknowledged that business schools are not solely responsible for the dominance of what Ghoshal calls “bad theories.” Moss-Kanter suggested that they could not have taken hold without a demand for and adaptation of them by business leaders who provide business schools with a receptive audience, even when voices articulating alternative theories have been present (Moss-Kanter, 2005). Additionally, she provided readers with a historical context for a demand side explanation of “bad theories,” which illustrates the fact that external forces, including the fall of communism, the decline of trade unions, growth of institutional investors, and greed created a demand for theories that supported and legitimized a worldview dominated by the quest for more money. Moss-Kanter (2005) also suggested that the more enduring reason these theories have taken hold is that they are easier to teach and do than do less neat, more comprehensive theories of action and behavior.

With more students than ever before entering and graduating from business schools, MBA programs are clearly responding to consumer demand for seats in their
coveted programs (Hahs, 1999). Although they are satisfying student demand for their product at this primary level and are continuing to provide graduates with a handsome financial return on their investment, evidence is emerging that both students and businesses are finding the schools unwilling or unable to provide students with the knowledge and skills needed to effectively manage people in all of their complexities and large and multifarious firms operating in a global environment. Surveys of Harvard MBAs five years post graduation found many former students struggling to manage people and wishing their graduate education better prepared them to do so (Moss-Kanter, 2005). Studies of employer satisfaction with business schools and their students have identified employer concerns about graduates and their ability to apply what they learn to real situations they will encounter in today’s global work place (Hahs, 1999).

Business schools may be the target of criticism, in part, for their over emphasis on satisfying students at the expense of the needs of their other constituents, including society and even the businesses who hire them (Paton, 2001). Paton argued that this intensive attention to students is not surprising because it is the students who attend, frequently pay for their education, and ultimately assess the quality of their education. In America, ratings matter. And in our business schools they matter a great deal. Ratings enhance a school’s visibility, reach, and reputation. This translates into financial returns brought about through enhanced enrollments, private donations, and other sources. In this great nation, our individualism and competitiveness lead us to “rank everything – soft drinks, sports teams, students, and business schools” (Wolverton & Penley, 2004, p.vii).

Wolverton and Penley (2004) explained that each year, internationally recognized journals rank business schools based primarily on a singular factor – money – how much
graduates earn. Other factors considered include the degree to which programs prepare graduates for employment, and a school’s reputation among deans or recruiters (Wolverton & Penley, 2004, p. viii). Yet this race for rankings obscures their true effectiveness in areas of real significance including the quality of “the faculty they employ, the research that gets conducted, the doctoral programs they offer, the way they deal with diversity, their interactions and partnerships with industry, their contributions to their local communities [and to society as a whole], and the strategic leadership that drives their creativity” (Wolverton & Penley, 2004, p. viii).

While it can be argued that ratings have merit, such valuations do little more than help students benchmark and choose schools, but “will never be more than a snapshot of past performance” (Paton, 2001, p. 4). In a ratings driven environment “the ‘true’ clients, the sponsors, economy, and society can often be little more than an afterthought” (Paton, 2001, p. 1). To deliver their full mission requires business schools to develop real learning partnerships with all of their constituents. In order to be successful, these relationships must focus on collaboratively developing a learning contract and processes to ensure that the product delivered meets the requirements of every partner (Paton, 2001).

In the late 1990s, the World Resources Institute (WRI) partnered with the Aspen Institute (AI) to introduce a revolutionary new way of ranking business schools by examining the extent to which they incorporate environmental and social impact management issues into their curriculum, co- and extra-curricular activities, and research efforts. In their annual report, Beyond Grey Pinstripes, WRI & AI recognize schools worldwide who are engaged in creating learning opportunities for students which
promote social and environmental stewardship. Rankings are based on surveys sent to AACSB accredited and top ranked business schools around the world and the written summaries the schools submit, which demonstrate efforts to address social and environmental impact management in programs and initiatives. Responses are then reviewed by a panel of judges drawn from business, academia, government, and institutes dedicated to social responsibility, and analyzed using the framework presented in Table 1. Participating schools are then ranked relative to one another, and 30 schools (representing approximately one-third of all respondents) are recognized for their efforts to produce MBA graduates with an appreciation of and skills relative to social and environmental impact management and sustainability.

Although rankings may reflect student overall satisfaction with their schools and the education they receive, a growing body of research highlights the fact that behind the ratings glow lie concerns that this educational experience is not adequately equipping students for successful careers as business leaders or engaged citizens. The somewhat disappointing reports that accompany the WRI and AI rankings of business schools suggest “the majority of future business leaders will be denied the tools they need to consider and react to the full range of issues affecting their companies” (Atcha, Bunch, Layke, Gentile, McGaw & Samuelson, 2001, p. 5).

In a study of MBA graduates at Colorado State University, Kretovics (1999) found that although participation in a graduate business program positively impacted the learning skills of students compared with a control group of students who did not participate in an MBA program, the business school experience did not produce significant learning in two key areas - interpersonal and communication skills. Other
Table 1: Analytical Framework Used in the Beyond Grey Pinstripes Biennial Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum/Classroom Based Activities</td>
<td>Measures the number of courses, both required and elective, with social and environmental content, availability of dual-degree programs and concentrations, and the “percentage of course time dedicated to considering social and environmental issues” (World Resources Institute &amp; the Aspen Institute, 2005, p. 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support/Activities Outside the Classroom</td>
<td>Examines extracurricular activities which promote learning related to sustainability issues including orientation activities and programs, student competitions, conferences, speakers, and seminars; student involvement in clubs and groups like Net Impact; philanthropic and community service activities undertaken by students and faculty; informal faculty networks; career fairs designed to connect students with opportunities in businesses, non-profits and government; and Centers and Institutes dedicated to social and environmental topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Research</td>
<td>Indicates the number of articles written by faculty on issues related to social and environmental impact management and sustainability and published in peer-reviewed management journals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

skills that were not found to be positively affected by participation in an MBA program included information analysis, sense making, action, initiative, and relationship (Kretovics, 1999). These competencies are not only highly desired by employers and necessary for leadership within the modern firm, but are essential for effective participation in a democratic society. Kretovics (1999) concluded that the findings “may indicate that the current curriculum may not be placing enough emphasis on these areas [or that] these areas may not be deemed as valuable [as others]” (p. 6).
Kretovics' (1999) findings are reflected in a more recent and larger study conducted by the Aspen Institute which surveyed over 2,000 MBA students from 13 different schools in the United States and abroad. Students were queried at three different points in their graduate programs – upon entry, at the end of their first year, and at graduation. This study found that the attitudes of students about the roles and responsibilities of business are shaped by what they learn over the course of an MBA degree, and many of attitudes, particularly those related to social responsibility in business and of their own desire and ability to successfully address values and ethical conflicts, declined over the course of the MBA program.

The Aspen Institute reported that “MBA students are unsure as to whether and how social responsibility contributes to business success [yet they expressed a desire to learn more about this relationship and] want business schools to provide concrete examples and integrate it into the curriculum” (2002, p. 3). When asked how they think companies benefit from fulfilling their social responsibilities, over 75% of students responded that such actions would result in a better public image and reputation. Far fewer MBAs linked social responsibility with such factors as stronger, healthier communities, or with enhanced revenues and profits.

Paradoxically, students consistently identified companies with a reputation for social responsibility as ones they would like to work for, yet the majority of graduates accepted positions in other companies – predominantly banks and consulting firms. All three waves of students surveyed expressed the belief that companies entering foreign markets have the responsibility to go “above and beyond business success to the development of the local community” (Aspen Institute, 2002, p. 9). Respondents also
reported that, given the chance, they would pay more attention to social and environmental issues than current business leaders do.

The responsibility of business for society does not appear to be clearly emphasized in the MBA curriculum or in co-curricular experiences of students. This situation is reflected in results that suggest that students in the Aspen Institute study in 2002 identified shareholder return as being of primary importance for companies, while corporate responsibility to the community and the environment were viewed as being less critical. Liz, a respondent to the survey, offered insight about this finding when she said, “In their hearts, people are concerned. But they have no context to talk about these issues (social, environmental) in business school. Here we are so caught up in the next problem set that is due. That’s what you talk about” (Aspen Institute, 2002, p. 5).

When students were asked where social responsibility belongs in the MBA curriculum, most responded that it belongs in a course on business ethics, which, not surprisingly, is the course in which these issues are most frequently addressed (Aspen Institute, 2002). Students also expressed the desire to see the issue of corporate responsibility integrated into core courses in the MBA program. The Aspen Institute reported that “students believe that topics related to social responsibility would be most effectively introduced with a direct and ‘hands on’ approach, through guest speakers and case studies” (2002, p. 10). MBA students would also like their programs to teach them how social responsibility can be profitable for organizations (Aspen Institute, 2002).

Students also reported that they expect to encounter situations over the course of their careers, which conflict with their values. It appears, however, that their experience in an MBA program does not arm them with the knowledge and skills needed to confront
and resolve these challenges. Notably, as students progressed in an MBA program they were found to become less willing to take any action to change things "either by advocating alternative values or getting others to join them in expressing their concerns" (Aspen Institute, 2002, p. 7). The Aspen Institute concludes, "Today's MBAs do not believe that they can change the values/culture of a company. If it comes to a conflict of values, they are likely to leave rather than to try to change the organization" (2002, p. 3). One business school professor who reviewed the results of the survey offered these comments about the seriousness of this finding,

There is a flaw in business education if students say they will leave a company when faced with a values conflict. Business schools are supposed to be in the business of training leaders. They should be teaching them to raise the issues - not bail out. That is the only way we are going to see change happen – if people actually ask the tough questions in their organizations (Aspen Institute, 2002, p. 7).

In their summary of the Aspen Institute survey, Barlas, Thompson, Williams and Verschoor (2003) said the report provided both good and bad news for business schools. "The good news [was] that today's business students have a growing interest in ethics and the importance of corporations in the well-being of society. The negative news [was] that they believe their university preparation [in these areas] may not be adequate" (Barlas et al, 2002, p. 2).

Although the results of biennial surveys of business schools by the World Resources Institute and the Aspen Institute provide evidence that a growing number of MBA's, particularly those from top ranked programs receive much of the preparation
needed to lead organizations in the 21st century, outcomes also intimate that many continue to be left behind. Amidst the progress noted in their 2003 and 2005 reports, authors from the WRI and AI provide commentary on the shortcomings of today’s MBA programs. They note that in the five year period during which business schools were surveyed, they found a broadening of schools’ “coverage of social and environmental stewardship” (Chappie, Powers, Bunch, McGaw, Lefkowitz & Samuelson, 2003, p. 1) within curricular offerings, extracurricular activities, and research. Disappointingly, however, a collective look at the survey data showed that “depth of coverage of these topics in MBA programs is severely limited in the core courses...that most powerfully shape the MBA experience. Also, only the most innovative schools [George Washington, Michigan, North Carolina, Stanford, Yale, and York] have elevated the study of social impact management and environmental management from separate disciplines to the level of sustainability” (Chappie et al, 2003, p. 1). These schools, and others moving in this direction, provide students with opportunities to explore the interrelationship between social, environmental, and financial factors and the importance of them for businesses today and into the future (Chappie et al, 2003).

Beyond these model programs, integration “remains limited” and the availability of courses in environmental or social management, either required or elective, continue to be disappointingly restricted at most schools (Chappie et al, 2003, p. 3). The result is that “students at the top 30 schools are exposed to social and environmental issues in roughly 25% of their core coursework, versus only 8% for students in the remaining schools” (Atcha, Bunch, Layke, Gentile, McGaw, & Samuelson, 2005). The Beyond Grey Pinstripes 2003 report indicated that half of the schools surveyed offer five or fewer
electives of this sort and noted that most students looking to study sustainability must do so through specialized dual degree programs, concentrations, or a customized course of study (Chappie et al, 2003). The 2005 Beyond Grey Pinstripes report also concluded that sustainability and related issues continue to be greatly under-researched areas, with just “4% of faculty at the [90] surveyed schools published research on these topics in leading peer-reviewed management journals between 2003 and 2004.” The report’s authors asserted, the “significance of these numbers warrants deep concern about social responsibility in business education when one considers how frequently faculty research informs teaching agendas” (Atcha, Bunch, Layke, Gentile, McGaw, & Samuelson, 2005).

Business Schools Respond to the Call for Change

Harsh criticism and disappointing research results have pushed many schools to pause, re-evaluate, and revise their MBA programs. Addressing the ethical and moral dilemmas inherent in business and using ethics classes as “the predominant vehicle for teaching social stewardship skills” (Atcha et al, 2001, p. 15) appear to be actions taken most frequently by the nation’s business schools, perhaps because they are among the easiest of the strategies to implement. Indeed, the Beyond Grey Pinstripes 2003 report noted an increase in the percentage of schools requiring “one or more courses in ethics, social responsibility, sustainability, or business and society” (Chappie et al, 2003, p. 1). Even with this increase, a danger exists when issues of social responsibility and stewardship are “consigned to ethics classes” (Atcha et al, 2001, p. 15). If this trend continues, “students will experience these issues as distinct and separate from the core
business decision-making process" (Atcha et al, 2001, p. 15). Students will also fail to
gain the skills needed for socially responsible action inside and outside the walls of the
firm.

Beyond the addition of cases and courses involving ethics, innovative efforts
designed to extend coverage of this and other issues critical to the development of the
engaged leader are underway. Harvard Business School recently introduced a new
course for first-year students, which affords them the opportunity to explore the interplay
between leadership, ethics, and values (Pfeffer, 2005). MBA students at the Tuck School
of Business at Dartmouth College are led through case studies of moral dilemmas by
faculty from seven different departments including marketing, strategy, and finance
(Jensen, Porter & Ghoshal, 2005). The Mays School of Business at Texas A&M brings
the school's honor code to life in their MBA program by addressing ethics in core
courses in accounting, marketing, economics, organizational behavior, international
business, and business negotiations (Robertson, 2004). Even the standards-setting body
for American business schools has responded to the ethical crisis. In 2003, the
Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) introduced guidelines
for those member institutions interested in teaching of ethics as part of their curriculum
(Jensen, Porter, & Ghoshal, 2005). It did, however, fall short of requiring accredited
institutions to include education on ethics in their programs (Jensen, Porter & Ghoshal,
2005).

Other schools are seeking ways to create a more integrated curriculum and afford
students greater opportunities to develop their problems solving, team building, and other
leadership skills, including “triple bottom line” accountability and stewardship, needed to
function in an increasingly global and diverse world. In the late 1990s the Keller Graduate School of Management in northern Illinois worked to integrate communications, quality, computerization, internationalization, and ethics into all its courses (Hahs, 1999). The University of Maryland’s College of Business holds an intensive one-week series of meetings and seminars annually, which focus on the link between business and government and requires second year students to “participate in group field projects designed to sensitize them to business problems in Maryland” (Hahs, 1999, p.3).

Team-based learning is widely deployed across graduate programs in business. At the International Institute for Management Development in Lausanne, students are placed in small teams to conduct projects and consulting assignments for companies under the supervision of faculty or experienced business leaders as a means of creating interaction between students of different nationalities (Hahs, 1999). At Texas A&M, teamwork is cultivated over the course of the MBA’s academic experience (Robertson, 2004). During a two-week orientation, A & M students participate in a number of teambuilding activities and then are assigned to a cohort and a team within that cohort (Robertson, 2004). Teams are balanced in terms of experience, academic performance, and student demographics in order to facilitate student learning and promote an appreciation for diversity (Robertson, 2004). Mays’ faculty capitalize on the team concept and further facilitate the development of teamwork through assignments and project work which requires group effort (Robertson, 2004).

A variety of efforts by business schools to develop students’ analytical and critical skills, which have been identified as both leadership and civic competencies, can also be
found in the literature. Schools, like the University of Western Ontario, Manchester Business School, and the Kelley School of Business at Indiana University, address these competencies through the use of case studies drawn from recent business situations as well as through in-company projects (Hahs, 1999). Efforts to create a greater balance between the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and learning described by Ghoshal (2005) are also in evidence. To this end, Keller is hiring working professionals from business to serve as faculty members in its programs (Hahs, 1999).

Increasingly, MBA programs introduce students to social responsibility and sustainability during student orientation programs and activities. Atcha (et al, 2001) notes, “This is now a common practice perceived to have a variety of benefits that include a broadening of student perspectives, team building, reinforcing the value of volunteerism, teaching valuable lessons about leadership in diverse settings, and showing how non-profit managers accomplish objectives with very limited resources” (p.15). The Beyond Grey Pinstripes 2001 report highlights several innovative orientation programs that link social impact management skills to business management. These include: World Games workshops sponsored by the University of Texas at Austin, which works to expose students to international business efforts; UNC’s collaboration with the Point of View Theater to introduce students to diversity issues; and the University of Minnesota’s simulation exercise to train students in ethics (Atcha et al, 2001).

Student competitions, consulting projects, including capstone experiences, which engage students with businesses, non-profits, and government agencies to solve real problems and address pressing issues, are other vehicles used by business schools to connect classroom learning with real world issues and enhance the development of
socially responsive leadership skills. The Mays MBA program requires all students to complete a capstone experience called The Business Consulting Project (Robertson, 2004). Under a faculty mentor, teams of four or five students work together for 15-weeks to address a company-identified issue and present their findings and recommendations to the business at the conclusion (Robertson, 2004). Other examples include York University’s annual case competition on sustainability and business and Berkeley’s Haas Social Venture Competition (Atcha et al, 2001).

Individual faculty members and groups of faculty are coalescing in networks dedicated to issues of social responsibility and sustainability and are helping move business schools toward changes in teaching, research, and institutional support needed to align their missions more fully with service to society. Institutional support to enable faculty to more fully attend to the development of social and environmental impact management competencies is also occurring in the form of endowed chairs and faculty positions dedicated to these issues; changes in faculty assignments that allow some faculty to be completely devoted to teaching and others to research or a combination of the two; and modifying rewards systems to incorporate recognition for teaching, research, and service that addresses pressing issues in society (Atcha et al, 2001; Gupta, 2004).

A variety of innovative strategies to build competence in environmental and social impact management and sustainability can be found among the five top-ranked schools in the Beyond Grey Pinstripes 2003 report. Programs in these cutting edge schools offer more courses in social responsibility, social and environmental impact management, and sustainability than their peers and have infused social and environmental content into their core courses. Among the most noteworthy examples of
these efforts is the *Development of Enterprise* course offered by the Asian Institute of Management that “encourages students to consider their role in society at large, not just within the firm” (Chapple et al, 2003, p. 3), and Stanford’s *Financial Accounting* course which allows students to explore the social impact of accounting practices and methods (Chapple et al, 2003). The World Resources Institute and the Aspen Institute also found all business schools in their 2005 study to be experimenting more and more with elective courses with social and environmental content (an increase of over 70% since 2001). The authors note, “This trend bodes well for the future content of core courses; experience suggest that if electives are well received, their content can migrate into the core” (Chapple et al, 2003, p. 4).

Programs identified as exemplary in *Beyond Grey Pinstripes* have more faculty engaged in research in social and environmental impact management, with publications in peer-reviewed journals ranging from issues like “diversity in the workplace, sustainable development, stakeholder theory, globalization, and environmental management strategies” (Chapple et al, 2003, p. 5). They also have more extracurricular and student initiated activities, including “student clubs and groups,...conferences, seminars, and speakers, that broaden understanding of social and environmental stewardship” (Chapple et al, 2003, p. 2). Almost all of the top-ranked schools in the *Beyond Grey Pinstripes 2003* report have institutes or centers “dedicated to social and environmental topics [-] a key factor in the depth of teaching and research on these issues at business schools” (Chapple et al, p. 4). Examples include Dartmouth’s *Allwin Initiative for Corporate Citizenship* and Berkeley’s *Center for Responsible Business* (Chapple et al, 2003).
In order to encourage MBA graduate employment in public service organizations, schools, like Harvard, Stanford, Yale, and Michigan have built relationships with employers from the public and non-profit sectors and offer loan forgiveness or assistance programs for students securing nonprofit jobs (The Princeton Review, 2005; Aaron, 2005). Student engagement with organizations that serve society is also promoted by some schools, Harvard and Columbia for example, which supplement the income of students who elect to do internships in not-for-profit organizations (Aaron, 2005). Other unique efforts include Columbia University’s MBA-Nonprofit Connection, which matches jobs and internships for MBA students and graduates with national and international nonprofit organizations (The Princeton Review, 2005). MBA students at the Graziadio School for Business at Pepperdine can participate in semester-long consulting projects with nonprofits and charities through a Service Leadership Project (The Princeton Review, 2005). Haas MBA students at Berkeley have the opportunity to participate in fellowships that allow them to learn first hand about non-profit board management by working directly with executive directors and board members, serving on board committees, and “acting as non-voting members of the board” (The Princeton Review, 2005, p. 2) over the course of an academic year.

Summary

While mounting evidence suggests that business schools are heeding the calls to re-engage with society by becoming more responsive to the needs of all of their constituents, reports like Beyond Grey Pinstripes (The World Resources Institute & the Aspen Institute, 2001, 2003, 2005) highlight the fact that they are adapting slowly, if at
all. With survey response rates hovering at around 20-30% for the World Resources & Aspen Institutes' studies, one wonders what the other 300-400 accredited MBA programs are doing in this area. Because studies of social responsibility in business schools are limited primarily to the narrow examination of the issue through queries about course offerings in ethics, social responsibility, and sustainability, extracurricular activities for students, which enhance awareness of these issues, and faculty research on the value of these issues for business – and not for business schools, it is clear that this is an emerging matter for these institutions.

A paucity of examples of socially engaged MBA programs and a lack of a broad-based interest in the issue among business school faculty and administrators may be the result of a number of factors including faculty compensation, evaluation and reward systems that do not support this commitment, a lack of funding for research in these areas, and the continuing flow of students and dollars into existing programs. Among these change inhibitors may be the aforementioned lack of model MBA programs to emulate. For such examples, it may be necessary to turn to the larger academic community where a breadth of research and writing in this area has already occurred. It is from this literature that we received our inspiration to study this issue and formulated a framework to use when doing so.
CHAPTER 4

STRATEGIES FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN BUSINESS EDUCATION:
LESSONS FROM HIGHER EDUCATION

A New Mission for Higher Education

The competing priorities of multiple constituents are requiring institutes of higher learning to rethink their missions and identify new strategic objectives to meet shifting social needs. These changes also require colleges and universities, and the programs that exist within them, to adopt new models of organization, teaching, and research based on theory and practical experience. Ramaley (2005) provides academicians with a starting point for these changes by offering a definition of the engaged campus and a new set of goals designed to reshape the "classic functions of research, teaching, and service" (p. 169).

Institutions that take on the mantle of engagement are committed to direct interaction with external constituencies and communities through mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, and application of knowledge, expertise, resources, and information. These interactions enrich and expand the learning and discovery functions of the academic institution while also enhancing community capacity. The work of the engaged institution is responsive to (and respectful of) community-identified needs,
opportunities, and goals in ways that are appropriate to the campus’ mission and academic strengths” (Ramaley, 2005, p. 173).

In order to more fully engage with the communities they serve, Ramaley (2005) encouraged academies to commit to a number of following aspirations, which advance the needs of higher education’s many constituents. These goals include:

1. Preparing students for engaged citizenship by acting as a good citizen.
2. “...Fostering and renewing bonds of trust in the community...and...using the neutrality of the campus to provide a common ground where differences of opinion and advocacy for particular points of view can be addressed in an open and constructive way and where people with similar goals can come together and create ways to work together” (p. 169).
3. Fostering a commitment to civic and social responsibility and provide students with opportunities to develop leadership skills.
4. Enhancing the future employability of students by providing them with career guidance and real-world experience.
5. Promoting learning for students and community members.
6. Partnering with the community to address complex social problems and enhance the community’s ability to resolve these issues in the future.
7. Contributing to economic and community development.
8. “…Building support for public investment in higher education, to provide both access and opportunity for students of all backgrounds to pursue an education and...generate knowledge that will address critical societal needs” (p. 169).
9. Committing to a mission of service.
We examine precisely how academic institutions can achieve these objectives in the pages that follow.

Activities in Support of Service to Society – A New Framework of Engagement

Colleges and universities deploy their resources in a variety of ways to achieve their civic mission and fulfill their three primary functions – teaching, research, and service (Holland, 2005). Holland (2000) referred to the most frequently cited “historical and contemporary activities” (2005, p. 65) as the characteristics of an engaged campus (See Table 2). These qualities and their associated actions, derived from the work of Holland (2005; 2000) and Ramaley (2000; 2005) form the basis of our analytic framework which is further refined and expanded by the literature and presented later in the paper.

A Responsive Curriculum

The sustenance of a democratic society requires citizens who possess ethical standards, a sense of social responsibility, as well as civic competence (Cheekoway, 2001). “Courses and programs provide the primary forums for enhancing students’ understanding of and commitment to the principles of democracy and engaged citizenship” (Ramaley, 2005, p.66). Demonstration of a commitment to society, therefore, begins with a broad based curriculum designed to cultivate these values and competencies in students and help translate them into civic behavior (Checkoway, 2001; Wellman, 1999). This requires the academy to provide students with space and opportunities to examine their own assumptions and learn about those of their peers (Checkoway, 2001). It also demands “sustained attention to how curricula help to
develop civic competencies and habits” (Boyte & Hollander, 1999, p. 11). This type of curriculum incorporates “the arts of public argument, civic imagination, the ability to critically evaluate arguments and information, the capacities and curiosity to listen constantly, interest in and knowledge of public affairs, capacities for inter-group dialogue, and the ability to work with others different from themselves on common projects and problem solving in ways that deepen appreciation of others’ talents” (Boyte & Hollander, 1999, p. 10).

Table 2: Characteristics of an Engaged Campus

1. MISSION: “Civic engagement is articulated in the institutional mission and strategies” (Ramaley, 2005, p. 174) and is informed by public perspectives and needs.
2. PARTNERSHIPS: “The campus involves the community in continuous, purposeful, and authentic ways…” (Ramaley, 2005, p. 174).
3. RESPONSIVE CURRICULA: “The curriculum contains a variety of ways for students to learn in ways that engage them in community concerns” (Ramaley, 2005, p. 174).
4. MULTI-DIMENSIONAL ENGAGEMENT: The institution “links engagement to every dimension of campus life and decisions” (Holland, 2000, p. 25) including those affecting and made by and about departments, disciplines, programs, buildings and expansion, the environment, [and] budgeting/finances/fundraising.
5. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT: “The institution has a policy environment and appropriate infrastructure and investment to promote, support, and reward engagement” (Ramaley, 2005, p. 174; Holland, 2000).
6. SHARED LEADERSHIP: “Individuals throughout the campus community play leadership roles in fostering engagement. This...[ensures] that a commitment to engagement will survive the leadership transitions at presidential, provost, and deccanal levels” (Ramaley, 2005, p. 174).
8. EVALUATION: “Engagement activities are held to high standards of excellence and are rigorously evaluated” (Ramaley, 2005, p. 174).
Specific tactics for the development of civic and social competencies include team-based learning, recruitment of a diverse student body and faculty, and coursework focused on communication, teamwork, diversity, problem solving, public affairs, and others. Additional tactics to prepare students for citizenship are detailed in Table 3.

Table 3: Educational Strategies that Promote Active Citizenship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic themes and issues – that prepare students to live and work in a culturally diverse society – across the curriculum;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses and programs – often interdisciplinary – on ethics, moral reasoning, and professional responsibility that stress practical application and problem solving;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-credit programs during spring breaks, winter recesses, and summer vacations that send students abroad, to developing countries, or to poor American communities where students can simultaneously learn and serve;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year programs that link academic and residential life to studies on pressing civic, societal, and moral issues;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone courses and senior seminars, often requiring teamwork, that include civic projects or themes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary majors or minors in environmental studies, urban studies, women’s studies, cultural or ethnic studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-learning, community-based learning, and experiential learning that link traditional learning experiences with service to a non-profit or community-based organization or initiative;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning communities, curricular clusters that link two or more disciplines in the exploration of common – often civic – themes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative learning across the curriculum; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio projects through which students demonstrate their civic skills and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In their study of civically engaged universities, Stephens, Colby, Ehrlich, and Beaumont (2000) found that incorporation of moral, ethical, civic or political issues into coursework and providing students with opportunities to learn and practice critical thinking and effective communication skills promotes civil discourse and social responsibility. Thomas (1999) suggested that the cultivation of personal ethics can be
accomplished by providing students with opportunities to engage in conversations and action, which allow them to explore how they can take ownership and responsibility for community based problems. Curriculum that teaches students the skills needed to frame, analyze, and collectively resolve problems and conflict, advocate for a position, negotiate and mediate solutions also facilitates civic engagement (Thomas, 1999; Stephens et al, 2000). Thomas (1999) encouraged the use of interdisciplinary approaches to teaching and learning in order to help students think broadly and systemically about issues. These skills prepare students to become active, informed, and responsible citizens.

Using multiple teaching approaches and interdisciplinary collaboration helps strengthen the coherence of the student’s experience and promotes a deeper and more integrated understanding of issues (Stephens, Colby, Ehrlich, and Beaumont, 2000). Providing students with a contextual framework for topics and issues being studied also promotes students’ civic understanding and commitment. To that end, Thomas recommended that universities “teach the public relevance of each discipline” (p. 9) and of each professional program and afford students the opportunity, as part of the subject they are studying, to spend at the minimum a quarter or semester in a government or nonprofit setting practicing that particular field of interest.

Higher learning in service to society must do more than provide students with academically based knowledge, however. Additional opportunities outside the classroom are needed to cultivate sufficient learning, practice, and motivation for civic engagement. Involving students in research projects that address important issues in society develops a deeper understanding of the community and strengthens civic competence (Checkoway, 2001). Providing students with opportunities to do the work of citizens through for-credit
learning experiences in the community, including field-based learning, internships with community organizations, and service learning are other avenues universities can explore (Cheekoway, 2001; Boyte & Hollander, 1999). Through these activities, students are engaged in real projects of impact and relevance with government or non-profit organizations (Cheekoway, 2001; Boyte & Hollander, 1999).

Opportunities of this nature impact the cognitive and affective development of students, help students learn and retain subject matter, and enhance their ability to synthesize information and to reason analytically (Wellman, 1999). Through service learning students develop the skills, habits, and identities, and acquire the knowledge necessary to “contribute to the general welfare” (Boyte & Hollander, 1999, p. 9).

Community based learning has been found to be most effective in developing civic competencies when students are adequately prepared for and oriented to their placement sites; when they are afforded the chance to critically reflect on their experiences; when these experiences are linked to the student’s present and future roles as members of a community; and when they are designed to focus on an issue rather than on a single project or place (Cheekoway, 2001; Thomas, 1999).

Colleges can also involve students in co-curricular activities with a strong civic purpose including volunteering in the community on their own initiative or with the assistance of professional staff; participating in political activities; mentoring peers or disadvantaged children in the community; or in Alternative Spring Breaks (Checkoway, 2001). These activities expose students to critical “moral challenges,” expand “the range of people for whom one feels empathy and responsibility...” and builds an appreciation for different perspectives (Stephens et al, 2000, p. 14).
Cultivation of a Diverse Learning Environment

As America becomes increasingly diverse and as the nation’s economy and businesses moves toward greater global inter-dependence, higher education is called upon to provide students with the skills needed to live and work in these new and dynamic environments. The multicultural nature of our society today creates unique challenges for democracy, and for those who wish to engage in the democratic process. Checkoway (2001) noted, “For democracy to function successfully in the future, students must be prepared to understand their own identity, communicate with people who are different from themselves, and build bridges across cultural differences in the transition to a more diverse society” (p. 127). Wellman (1999) argued that colleges can address these issues by creating an inclusive and collaborative learning community characterized by a diverse student body and faculty, which is necessary to reflect the changing social and economic fabric of society. Creating a diverse campus environment includes not only recruiting and retaining faculty, staff, and students, but providing students with opportunities to work collaboratively in ethnically and culturally diverse environments (Wellman, 1999).

Developing a diverse campus is necessary to reflect the changing social and economic fabric of society, “which will require students to be able to work collaboratively in ethnically and culturally diverse environments” (Wellman, 1999, p. 12) and “build and sustain genuinely public cultures full of conversation, argument, and discussion about the meaning of their learning, their work and their institutions as a whole” (Boyte & Hollander, 1999, p. 10). Living, learning, and working with others who are culturally, racially, ethnically, religiously, and socio-economically different from
themselves allows students to develop respect and sensitivity toward others’ values, and learn and practice problem solving, team building, and collaborative skills (Wellman, 1999, p. 12).

Thomas (1998) offered additional strategies for faculty seeking to develop these competencies in students. Drawing upon recommendations gathered from community leaders in the Listening to Communities project, she recommended the integration of “themes of social justice, particularly racial diversity and civics, across the curriculum,” and advised faculty to “model and teach collective problem solving skills [using innovative teaching methods to] enhance the way students learn to frame, analyze, and resolve problems” (1998, p. 10). These tactics provide students with the ability to “discuss, facilitate, or moderate a dialogue by asking the right questions, listening with empathy and understanding, think critically and constructively, resolve conflict, advocate for a position, and negotiate or mediate toward solutions” (Thomas, 1998, p. 11).

Thomas (1998) also encouraged faculty to make explicit linkages between living in a diverse society and the strength of American civic and democratic ideals, and argues for the creation of opportunities for students to develop a global perspective on social issues. Table 4 summarizes the strategies colleges and universities use to create a diverse learning environment.

*An Engaged Campus*

Through pedagogy, research, and community outreach, faculty can expand the academy’s service to the community. Via the deployment of interdisciplinary and stand alone courses faculty members can teach students to think and behave ethically, question assumptions and think critically about issues, analyze problems, explore alternative
solutions, and collaborate in the resolution of conflict and problems – all necessary skills for civic engagement. Teaching students the history of institutions and societies grounds them in truth and helps them to better understand the nature of organizations and to recognize and avoid problems of the past (VanFleet & Wren, 2005). Using problem centered instead of discipline centered learning as the backbone of curricular and co-curricular activities further supports the development of students’ civic competencies (Cheekoway, 2001). Faculty can also build service to the community into their courses by structuring community based learning experiences that link course content to these experiences and integrates them into dialogue in the classroom (Checkoway, 2001). Through the cultivation of relationships with governmental and community non-profit organizations, faculty members can identify meaningful placement sites for students, create a pool of guest lecturers who can be invited into the classroom, and develop partners for community based research projects (Wellman, 1999).

Table 4: Tactics to Cultivate a Diverse Learning Environment

- Diverse faculty and student body (Wellman, 1999)
- Integration of themes of social justice, racial diversity, and civics, across the curriculum (Thomas, 1998).
- Faculty model and teach collective problem solving, critical thinking, communication, influence, negotiation, and conflict resolution skills using innovative pedagogical approaches (Thomas, 1998).

A commitment to society can also be demonstrated through faculty who provide consultation and technical assistance to public organizations, communities, and private not-for-profit institutions (Checkoway, 2001). Through these relationships, faculty
members can collaborate with members of the community to research, analyze, develop and assess public policy proposals, generate alternative problem solving strategies, and challenge or support legislation (Thomas, 1998). They can also conduct civically focused research designed to improve the conditions of society using research methods that treat communities as partners and participants rather than as human subjects (Checkoway, 2001). By engaging in social research, faculty members serve as role models and mentors for students, “inspiring students through their own commitment to socially responsible work and…involving students in their work” (Stephens, et al, 2000, p. 10). Tactics to demonstrate faculty service to the community are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5: Demonstration of Faculty Involvement in Community Service

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community outreach (volunteerism, consulting, socially directed research)</strong> (Checkoway, 2001; Stephens, et al, 2000).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem centered and interdisciplinary teaching, learning, and research</strong> (Checkoway, 2001).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coursework to build an appreciation of history and cultivate the capacity to behave ethically, think critically, analyze problems, question assumptions, and collaborate to solve problems</strong> (Checkoway, 2001; VanFleet &amp; Wren, 2005).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community-based learning experiences (practicums, internships, service learning)</strong> (Checkoway, 2001).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship building with government and community organizations to identify placement sites for students, create a pool of guest lecturers, and develop partners for community based research projects</strong> (Wellman, 1999).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborate with community members to develop and assess public policy proposals, solve social problems, and challenge of support legislation</strong> (Thomas, 1998).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Increasing Institutional Capacity*

Commitment to higher learning’s contract with society is an on-going, dynamic process, which requires the commitment of the academy’s leaders to provide the vision,
funding, and resources necessary to realize these ends. By establishing a mission statement and strategic plan that demonstrate an institution’s commitment to society and civic engagement (Thomas, 1998), leaders articulate the university’s values, intentions, and tactics to all of its stakeholders and create a framework for future evaluation of the academy’s efforts to fulfill these objectives. Stephens et al (2000) recommend that these public statements of institutional purpose stress the importance of character, social responsibility, civic and political engagement, and leadership. To more fully align these efforts with social and community needs and avoid duplication and disconnected but parallel initiatives, administrators can collaborate with community members and the leaders of other colleges and universities to generate a vision and strategic objectives (Thomas, 1998).

Leaders of higher learning are in a primary position to develop needed relationships with members of the community, including government officials and key individuals from non-profits, business, schools, and other community organizations (Thomas, 1998). Through these connections, administrators can identify persons and entities interested in working with students and collaborating on key issues, and can pinpoint pressing social issues that can help shape the institution’s research agenda. Administrators can involve government, civic and business leaders on campus by inviting them to participate in professional development offerings, to teach courses, to act as guest lecturers, and to serve as mentors for students (Thomas, 1998). College administrators can also take a lead in the organization and hosting of “public forums, roundtables, and private meetings [organized] around pressing social issues, activities that bring together like-minded people to solve problems collectively....” (Thomas, 1998, p.7).
Service to society is also demonstrated through the creation of an image of a "college town," which involves providing the public with "valued access to campus facilities, such as athletic buildings, museums, theaters, spaces for meetings and access to sophisticated technology" (Thomas, 1998, p. 7) and offering incentives to faculty and staff to live in the surrounding community. It entails the establishment of structures which make knowledge more accessible to the public as well (Cheekoway, 2001). This requires moving away from the traditional one-way flow of information from campus to community towards a concerted two-way strategy for information exchange which would reach people in a language they understand and promote public understanding in society (Cheekoway, 2001). Cheekoway (2001) argued for administrators to increase institutional capacity in order to promote an on-going process of civic renewal. This can be accomplished through the establishment of a centralized office tasked with monitoring and promoting the institution’s civic mission, via a combination of decentralized academic departments and professional schools, or by infusing the civic mission throughout all units (Cheekoway, 2001).

Beyond establishing a mission, vision, strategy, and tactics in support of service to society, it is critical that college administrators provide the funding, staffing, support, and oversight needed to facilitate the development and maintenance of initiatives that demonstrate the institution’s commitment to civic and social engagement (Stephens, Colby, Ehrlich & Beaumont, 2000). Through the establishment of processes to routinely evaluate an institution’s efforts to foster increased civic engagement, college administrators can provide the oversight needed to inventory, replicate, and celebrate initiatives, and modify them as needed (Stephens et al, 2000; Thomas, 1998). Two
recognized tools are available for such use. The Princeton Review Survey provides an
assessment of student perceptions of college quality by looking at student perceptions of
such things as student service, student activism, campus spiritual life, and diversity
(Wellman, 1999). Surveys conducted by the Templeton Foundation are also useful in
assessing institutional commitment to character education (Wellman, 1999). Strategies to
expand an institution’s capacity for civic engagement are
summarized in Table 6.

Table 6: Strategies to Extend an Institution’s Capacity for Civic Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mission statement demonstrating a commitment to society and civic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strategic plan detailing tactics that supports the socially directed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mission (Thomas, 1998).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Infusing the civic mission and socially directed strategy across all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutional units (Checkoway, 2001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaboration with community members to create a vision and strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objectives (Thomas, 1998).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relationship building with members of the community to identify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individuals interested in working with students, to target areas for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaboration, and to pinpoint pressing social issues that shape the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institution’s research agenda (Thomas, 1998).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community access to campus and to its resources, including technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Checkoway, 2001; Thomas, 1998).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administrators provide the funding, staffing, support for and oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regularly measure and evaluate social engagement activities (Stephens,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Strategies

A variety of additional tactics to demonstrate institutional service to society can
be found in the literature and are summarized in Table 7. Other strategies include:

offering cooperative extension and continuing education programs and institutional
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initiatives like institutes and centers with an economic or political purpose (Wellman, 1999; Ramaley, 2005); providing university run hospitals and clinics (Thomas, 1998); developing theoretical models for problem solving and shared power (Thomas, 1998); building or expanding a mentoring program using faculty, staff, and students as mentors for area youth (Thomas, 1998); and providing students with curricular and co-curricular opportunities designed to foster personal ethics and build a sense of ownership and responsibility for the resolution of societal and community based problems (Thomas, 1998).

Table 7: Miscellaneous Strategies for Academic Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuing and cooperative education programs (Wellman, 1999; Ramaley,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional initiatives, institutes, and centers with an economic or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political purpose (Wellman, 1999; Ramaley, 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of theoretical models for shared power and effective problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solving (Thomas, 1998).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, staff, and student mentorship of area youth (Thomas, 1998).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular and co-curricular activities that promote ethics and build a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shared sense of ownership for the resolution of societal and community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>based problems (Thomas, 1998).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Fulfilling higher education’s civic and social mission is a daunting, and challenging task, particularly in light of the numerous pressures placed on universities by students, parents, business, industry, and even policy makers to deliver vocationally focused education, which will supply the nation with necessary and capable human capital and students with meaningful work, and contribute to the nation’s economic
growth. Yet today, as at many different points in the nation’s history, the call for higher education to address the country’s civic and social needs is critical. As Castagnera (2001) writes, if institutions of higher education fail to “differentiate [themselves] from business and government in order to serve as a counterweight to them, they run the risk of abrogating their claims] to being genuine educational institutions” (p. 3).

Each piece of literature reviewed helped create a clearer picture of the extensive array of behaviors and innovative strategies that exist in the academy’s efforts to demonstrate its commitment to society today and the possibilities that remain toward that end. The recommendations offered and activities detailed by Wellman (1999), Thomas (1998), Stephens et al (2000), Checkoway (2001), Ramaley (2005), and others, provide business schools with a set of tools to help them build and remodel their curriculum, programs, and processes to realize their full capabilities and meet the entirety of the mission established for them through their contract with society.

Although the literature highlights contemporary and classical strategies for social engagement, it underscores the significant void that exists in the study of social responsibility in MBA programs. To this point, research on social responsibility in business education has focused only on a few narrow issues in a much broader area of consideration. Our use of a more expansive lens with which to view and attempt to capture and understand the work of a half dozen premier public business schools in the U.S. helped us identify and clarify the number and types of strategies such schools – and the academic community as a whole - can use, as they work to build, strengthen, and enhance their own connections with the communities they serve. Informed by the literature just reviewed, we developed a vision of engaged business education, which is
summarized in the framework (see Appendix F). We then used this framework to evaluate business schools included in our study.
CHAPTER 5

METHODOLOGY

The General Perspective

Through a preliminary study of social responsibility in 12 public business schools in the United States, Stott and Wolverton (2006) discovered a promising level of activity using a secondary analysis of data collected and reported in an earlier work by Wolverton & Penley (2004). The outcomes, however clear, were still incomplete, suggesting that more direct inquiry was needed in order to truly capture what some of the nation’s preeminent schools are doing to fulfill their social contract. This study represents our effort to ascertain more precisely what six of these 12 business schools are doing to produce ethical and socially engaged business leaders and citizens, and how they are actively modeling these behaviors themselves.

Because the study was exploratory in nature, we used qualitative methodology. Our desire to more fully understand the issue by examining the policies and practices deployed by six different business schools led us to choose to employ a collective (Stake, 2000) or multi-site qualitative research approach (Herriot & Freston, 1983). This afforded us the opportunity to jointly study a number of cases in order to gain an understanding of both the phenomenon and the population we wanted to examine (Mulenga, 2001). Our choice of methodology and of the sites to include in this study was further guided by Mulenga’s assertion that because “since single cases may or may not be
known, in advance to manifest some common characteristic, cases are selected because of the belief that understanding them will lead to a better understanding or better theorizing about a larger collection of cases (Mulenga, 2001, p. 134). The emerging nature of theory and research in the area of inquiry drove us to use interviews and document analysis as our primary data collection tools (Cresswell, 1998). Data was analyzed using a comparative case study approach (Cresswell, 1998; Yin, 1994).

As anticipated, the results of this study provide a more complete portrait of social responsibility in public business schools than that which has been painted to date and offer other schools interested in expanding their engagement efforts with a variety of tactics to help them achieve this aim.

The Research Context

The six schools which were examined in this study are housed in public colleges and universities located in the West, Midwest, Southeast, and Mid-Atlantic regions of the United States. Due to the geographical and financial constraints inherent in an unfunded study of this nature, interviews were conducted remotely, via telephone. Although this methodological choice limited the ability for true data triangulation (Yin, 1994; Cresswell, 1998) to occur through the inclusion of direct observation of the schools, the larger institutions in which they are housed, and their communities, data collection included other methods to ensure that triangulation occurred. These methods included collection and analysis of documents and archival data (Yin, 1994; Cresswell, 1998) and a review of the case summaries by the participants prior to inclusion in the final report.
The Research Participants

In order to answer our research question, we conducted interviews with the deans, or their designees, from nine of the 12 public business schools included in the Wolverton and Penley (2004) and the Stott & Wolverton studies: University of Maryland, Indiana University, Purdue University, Georgia Institute of Technology, University of Florida, University of Georgia, University of South Carolina, Arizona State University, and Texas A& M University. Invitations to participate in the current study were sent to all 12 schools that were involved in the Wolverton & Penley (2004) investigation. The choice to examine these schools again, using a different lens, was partly directed by Stott and Wolverton’s (2006) study of these same schools, which produced some promising, yet preliminary findings regarding their level of social engagement. In order to determine more fully what they are doing to enact their social contract, we determined that it was necessary to go back to these same schools and query them directly. Additionally, because the business schools are housed at public institutions of higher education, they are part of organizations that arguably have a higher duty than private schools to demonstrate service to society. As Wolverton & Penley (2004) note:

...Programs housed at public universities function under certain constraints that do not befall those located at private institutions. Public universities carry a mandated fiduciary and social responsibility specific to the states in which they are located. Private institutions...may exercise similar charges as a matter of good practice but not under the same restrictions. This public responsibility continues despite the growing
privatization of large public institutions. Public universities and their programs are still expected to respond to the social and economic needs of the state. Many large public business schools have retained their business research centers with the production of critical research data for the state in the face of reduced state funding. While private institutions engage in these types of activities, they have the luxury of limiting their exposure to the expenses incurred in such endeavors should they find them too costly. In the end, business schools at public universities must not only provide the best value for the dollar but also contribute to the economic and social vibrancy of the states they serve (p. iv-v).

The driving force of the public missions of these schools dictated their inclusion in the Wolverton & Penley (2004) and Stott & Wolverton (2006) studies, and as a follow-up to each of these previous studies, informed their inclusion in this one. The criteria used in case selection fits with Mulenga’s requirement that cases included in a study demonstrate “relevance to the research objective” (2001, p. 138).

The 12 schools we targeted for inclusion in this study were also selected because they:

1. Are an AACSB International-accredited, public, U. S. school of business with highly visible graduate programs.
2. Have MBA programs ranked in the top 50 programs in the country.
3. Expressed a willingness to participate in the study (Wolverton & Penley, 2004).

Although the choice of participants in the present inquiry represents the type of purposeful sampling described as convenience sampling (Miles & Huberman, 1984;
Cresswell, 1998), we believe the differences between the schools in terms of geography, mission (e.g., research, land-grant, etc.), student and faculty composition, and size should reduce concerns about selection bias and external validity that can arise from a traditional convenience sample (Cresswell, 1998). Further, the divergent characteristics of the schools provides us with cases that demonstrate the “maximum variation” needed to gain multiple perspectives on this issue and help shape a fuller understanding of public business schools and social responsibility than would a different selection criteria (i.e., choosing a homogeneous set of cases) (Cresswell, 1998, p. 120).

Study participants were identified by “gatekeepers” at each of the schools (Cresswell, 1998, p. 117). Here, “gatekeepers” were the deans of the 12 business schools included in the 2004 Wolverton & Penley study. In order to target participants who are most knowledgeable about this topic, Dr. Wolverton contacted the deans via email. In this communication, she reintroduced herself and her tie to the 2004 project, informed the deans of the new study, provided them with a two-page description of the study, and invited them to participate or to identify someone from their team to do so. Two subsequent email invitations were sent to this group over a two month period in order to attain 100% participation from the targeted institutions. In some instances, participants identified as key informants were the deans themselves, assistant deans, or faculty members. In all situations, the informant was identified by the dean as being the person most able to provide a detailed description of the school’s work in this area.

Three schools, Washington State University, Georgia State University, and the University of Pittsburgh, either directly or indirectly declined to participate in this study, compromising our original sample size and selection methodology. In an effort to
minimize the effects of this change, we reviewed our initial assessment of these schools and their enactment of their social compact by revisiting the analysis that was conducted in our preliminary study (Stott & Wolverton, 2006). We then compared these outcomes against the cross case analysis conducted in this study, and found the omitted schools to be remarkably similar to those that were included across all measures. We used this same process when we decided not to include data from three additional schools in this study. The choice to eliminate the University of Georgia, Purdue University, and Texas A & M University from this investigation was made after individual and cross-case analyses were completed on six other schools. At this point in the analysis, significant themes were emerging across the schools, while minimal differences were surfacing. We recognize that this decision created new limitations for this study. We plan to further control for these through a subsequent study that will include individual and cross-case analysis of data for those three schools and a comparison of those findings with the ones reported here.

Data Collection Instruments and Procedures

Data Collection Tools

Because we were interested in contributing to the developing theory of social responsibility in business schools and were curious to learn what these schools are doing to engage with society, interviews were selected as the primary data collection tool. Interviews with key informants took place over the telephone at pre-arranged times, and lasted between twenty-five minutes and two hours. Participants received interview questions in the initial email invitation they were sent, and again, via email, when the
researcher confirmed the interview date and time. Interviews were semi-structured in nature. The interviewer used the prepared interview questions to guide her discussions with participants, but allowed them to speak about the things that were most important to them and to their schools; to share their views on issues ranging from social responsibility, the social compact schools have with society, and the common good; and to talk about themselves, their backgrounds, interests, and priorities. Interview questions used in this study are detailed in Table 8.

Table 8: Interview Questions

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What is the purpose of your school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Who are your school's major stakeholders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How do you serve the stakeholders you identified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>How do you define social responsibility at (School name)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>What do you believe your school's role is in or responsibility is to society?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I'm going to ask you next to describe the business school's efforts to demonstrate both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>social responsibility as a business school and to create socially responsible business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leaders and graduates who are engaged members of society by asking you about specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activities you are engaged in towards these ends. Specifically, would you please</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>describe your school's efforts to demonstrate social responsibility using strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>related to the following areas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Curriculum and instruction (ex: ethics education, social responsibility in business,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>social and/or environmental impact management, sustainability, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Extra- and co-curricular activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Community engagement and development (local, national, international)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Diversity (including efforts to create a diverse faculty and student body, and to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>develop an appreciation of differences and the ability to work with those who are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>culturally different from oneself)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Creating an infrastructure to support these efforts (e.g., mission, strategy,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>budget/funding, staffing, faculty evaluation and compensation strategies, fund raising,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>research institutes, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. Other strategies (including, &quot;green campuses&quot;, international outreach, and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please specify.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Is there anything else you would like to add to help us understand the business school's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>efforts related to social responsibility?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While this study was primarily concerned with how business schools demonstrate their social contracts through their MBA programs, deans often spoke more widely about activities and initiatives at the undergraduate level. When this occurred, the interviewer would ask follow up questions to ascertain what the school was doing for MBA students. Differences in the focus of responses to questions appeared to emerge as a function of the role the person participating in the interview played in his or her school. For example, deans provided the most comprehensive view of their business schools, offering information about undergraduate, MBA, and doctoral programs, and were able to readily share information about the school’s strategy and priorities. Individuals with leadership roles within MBA programs were able to offer a detailed look at how the tactics used within these programs and provided less information about activities beyond them. As such, the researcher recommends that others who might attempt to replicate this study interview both the deans of the business schools under investigation, and a key informant from the school’s MBA program in order to get a richer, more well-rounded picture of the school and its MBA programs.

In order to permit the triangulation necessary to address concerns about construct validity inherent in case study research (Cresswell, 1998), we instituted the following remedies suggested by Yin (1994) and Cresswell, (1998):

1. Use of multiple sources of data (Yin, 1994). These included interviews, documents, and archival data. Key informants from each school were asked, in advance of their interviews, to provide the researcher with the following:

   - college/university mission, business school mission statement, course catalogue for the school, demographic information on the business school’s students and
faculty, sample course syllabi, faculty vitas, or a list of faculty publications in peer-reviewed journals, marketing materials, newsletters, strategic plans, press briefings, memos, and other official and popular culture documents (Bogden & Biklen, 2003) that illustrated their efforts more fully. Six of nine participating schools provided some of these materials, and one school shared most of the requested documents with the researcher. In instances where supplemental documents were received and when they were not provided, the researcher also relied on information from a school’s website as an additional source of data.

2. Use of “member checks” (Cresswell, 1998, p. 140). Key informants were asked to review a draft of the findings (Yin, 1994). Before the results portion of this paper was finalized, a draft was sent to each participant, along with a note asking them to review the document to ensure that findings related to their school were represented accurately. Four of the six participants emailed, mailed, or called in comments and feedback to the researcher. In three of these four cases, participants requested factual changes. In the fourth instance, the interviewer offered clarification of his positions and asked for evaluative language to be removed from the case. All recommended changes were included in the final cases.

3. Use of peer consultation (Cresswell, 1998). Draft findings were reviewed by the dissertation chair before finalization in order “to establish validity through peer judgment” (Cresswell, 1998, p. 141).
Data Collection Procedures

Concerns about reliability related to data collection in case study research were addressed through the institution of a variety of procedures and protocols recommended by Yin (1994). Each of these is outlined below.

Procedure 1: Access (Creswell, 1998)

Key informants were provided with information about the study before being interviewed. During the first contact made with the schools by Dr. Wolverton via email (See Appendix A), deans were provided with a brief overview of the project including its purpose, an explanation of the relationship between this project and two prior studies (Wolverton & Penley, 2004 and Stott & Wolverton, 2006), and were given a two-page description of the project (See Appendix B). They were also asked to identify a key informant who would participate in the interview and provide supporting documents and archival data to the researcher.

One and one-half months prior to the interviews, key informants were contacted by telephone. The researcher introduced herself to the participant, reiterated the purpose of the study, thanked them for participating, reviewed the questions to be asked, and scheduled a time for the interview. She also requested that the participant submit supporting documents to her at least two weeks before the scheduled interview. A follow-up email was sent to the key informant immediately after the phone call. This communiqué reiterated the information discussed on the telephone, including the request for documents and their deadline for submission, and confirmed the interview date and time. Consent-for-participation in the study was attached to the email, and a written
request was made to return this form via email, fax or mail to the researcher prior to the scheduled interview (See Appendix C).


At the beginning of each interview, the researcher made a note of the date, time and person being interviewed on the interview protocol sheet (See Appendix D). She restated the focus of the study and thanked respondents for participating. She also asked participants if she could record their conversation. In all instances, interviewers agreed. She then asked the interviewee questions and recorded the participant’s responses directly on the protocol.

Before concluding the interview, the researcher acknowledged any secondary data received, reiterated a request for documents when they had not been provided, asked about any additional data that may be needed or helpful, and informed the interviewee that she might call or email again once a thorough review of the documents had occurred to ask any questions that arose through this evaluation. She also indicated that a draft of the findings would be sent to the respondent for review and evaluation for accuracy before inclusion in the final report. An approximate date for this review was provided along with a request for a two-week turn-around of the materials. Each interview concluded with an expression of gratitude for the respondent’s time.

Procedure 3: Data Management (Cresswell, 1998)

In order to manage the large amount of data collected in this study, an electronic and a paper filing system was established. All documents collected from and about participating schools, which are not delivered electronically, were scanned into the computer and a PDF file was created. These electronic documents were then stored
electronically in a file of the school's name. Paper versions of the documents also went into a physical file that was also identified by school name. Interview notes were typed immediately following discussions, and were filed on the computer and in physical form.

Field notes were kept throughout the study, providing the researcher with a vehicle to record her feelings, hunches, questions, and notes about the progress of the study. These were also typed, and a copy was placed in both electronic and physical files. An annotated bibliography, identifying each piece of data collected and the date it was collected was placed in each file as well (Mulenga, 2001).

Electronic storage of all data collected will allow for ease of review of the materials by others after the study is completed. These storage practices facilitate the "chain of evidence" that Yin (1994) advocates as means of managing concerns about construct validity.

Data Analysis

A cross-case analysis (Yin, 1994) was conducted on all data collected. This began with an in-case analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994). All data contained in an individual school's file (e.g., interview notes, case notes, and documents collected) was read once in order to gain an appreciation for the organization as a whole (Cresswell, 1998). During this review, the investigator recorded findings and impressions in memos or reflective notes (Cresswell, 1998). The data was then reread a second time, and data was coded and categorized using the framework created for this study (See Appendix F) (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Examples of behaviors demonstrated by the school were also recorded in the framework. This portion of the data analysis process concluded with
the creation of a brief case summary, which included themes that emerged for the school (Cresswell, 1998) and the creation of an individual, written analysis of each case.

After all individual cases were been reviewed and analyzed, a cross-case analysis was conducted (See Appendix F). The investigator read through all the data, cases, and individual case analyses again, and identified themes and divergent patterns across cases (Cresswell, 1998). Similarities and different cases were noted and the frequency of behaviors across cases was tabulated (Cresswell, 1998; Mulenga, 2001). A cross-case summary was then written (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The cross-case analysis also resulted in substantial revisions to our original framework (See Appendix G), as we encountered novel initiatives not predicted by the schema and failed to find behavior and activities that supported the frame.

Study findings are presented in a narrative report in the chapters that follow. Chapters Six through Eleven contain narratives summarizing how each school enacts its social compact. Chapter Twelve contains the cross-case analysis, while we discuss the results in the final three chapters. Chapters 13 through 15 detail critical themes that emerged through this study, describe the frequency of behaviors observed and reported, provide a connection back to the literature, and discuss the implications of the findings for future research (Cresswell, 1998).

Summary of the Methodology

Through the processes outlined above, we discovered an array of policies and practices deployed by public business schools to fulfill their social contract. In places, these activities aligned with those outlined in the literature on social responsibility in
higher education overall and in business education specifically, while in others they did not. Our discoveries also provided support for past research on and criticisms of business schools and their MBA programs, particularly related to ethics education; research, curricular and co-curricular activities that teach students about social responsibility and sustainability; and stakeholder theory. As a result, our findings provide a fuller and more complete understanding of how engaged our nation’s business schools are with their communities and constituents than that which has been provided by studies to date. Our findings also support our previous work, which showed that American public business schools are far more engaged with the communities in which they operate and are doing a much better job engaging students with society and preparing them for future roles as responsible leaders and citizens than critics or past research would suggest.
CHAPTER 6

CASE: W.P. CAREY SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

Background

The Associate Dean of MBA Programs at the W. P. Carey School of Business served as the interviewee for this study. The MBA associate program dean took over two years ago for Larry Penley, co-author of the 2004 Wolverton and Penley study on elite public business schools. The interviewee wrote his dissertation on the topic of corporate social responsibility and is the author of five peer-reviewed articles focusing on the issue. These articles were published over the past 20 years ago. The associate dean described himself as part of the academy of social scientists who look at the issue of corporate social responsibility.

ASU was the first school to be scheduled for and to participate in an interview for this study. This interview lasted 25 minutes. The interview was recorded and transcribed. The associate dean provided a number of documents to the interviewer after the discussion concluded. He shared detailed syllabi for many of the core courses in the fulltime MBA program and several marketing pieces for Carey’s MBA programs. At the conclusion of the interview, when the associate dean was asked to share a variety of different supporting documents with the interviewer, including a copy of Carey’s strategic plan, the associate dean declined to share the school’s strategic plan because this document is considered to contain proprietary information.
After reviewing a draft of this case, the associate dean called the researcher to share his feedback. During this 30 minute call, the associate dean clarified his beliefs about social responsibility and asked the researcher to modify some of the language he found to be evaluative in nature. He also offered to send the researcher excerpts from articles he has written in order to clarify his positions. Two weeks after this call, these materials had not been received by the researcher. Changes were made to this chapter to reflect the associate dean’s requests and more clearly capture his position on the issue. In this second conversation, the associate dean and the researcher agreed that they did not share the same thinking about social responsibility.

The interview began with the associate dean’s assertion that he did not agree with the premise of the study. Throughout our discussions, he made periodic references to the “political correctness” associated with the term social responsibility. He hesitated, at times, when responding to questions, and periodically appeared to want to defend his answers. In a subsequent conversation with the researcher, the associate dean (2007) explained that this pattern in his responses was due to his beliefs about the topic, which significantly differ from those held by the researcher. He explained that his background is in collective decision making. Through research in this area, he has found that when governments or organizations attempt to make decisions using majority rule, there is no policy that two out of three people will support on a consistent basis. He used this finding as the basis to reject the notion of the public interest, and to replace it with the aggregation of private interests.

The associate dean (2007) explained that his ideas about stakeholders is also derived from this work, and shared that his framework holds organizations have a
responsibility to groups of stakeholders and not to the "public good. He furthered that businesses are nested in social settings and are good at responding to the interests that exist in these settings because, if they don’t, they won’t be supported. He notes that stakeholder interests vary in different locations across the country and regions around the world, again making it impossible for organizations to address the common good because they cannot know what this is when such a wide variation in needs exist.

Institutional Context

The W. P. Carey School of Business is part of Arizona State University (ASU), the fourth largest university in the United States (Arizona State University, A New American University, 2007). ASU is a Carnegie classified doctoral research institution (AACSB, 2006), with annual enrollment topping 60,000 in 2006 (Arizona State University, A New American University, 2007). Over the next 13 years, the school’s enrollment is projected to grow to 90,000. The university’s main campus in Tempe is complimented by two additional campuses in Glendale and Mesa, Arizona. ASU is planning for the addition of a fourth campus in downtown Phoenix. The university’s vision, seen in Table 9, describes an institution that is both heavily engaged with and in service to society. Instead of focusing outward as it does in its vision, ASU’s mission is directed inward toward the students it serves (see Table 10).

Table 9: ASU’s Vision Statement

| To establish ASU as a model for a New American University, measured not by whom we exclude, but rather by whom we include; pursuing research that considers the public good; assuming major responsibility for the economic, social, and cultural vitality of our community (Arizona State University, A New American University, 2007). | 104 |

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Arizona State University is a community of scholars, a place where students and faculty work together to pursue knowledge and understanding. ASU combines the resources of a large diverse university with over 90 undergraduate programs, an enthusiastic and engaged faculty, and the beauty of the ASU campus and the Southwest, to provide a unique college experience. For each student, from the freshmen seeking guidance through the nationally recognized Freshmen Year Experience program, to the senior choosing interviews from among hundreds of employers, the focus is on the individual. To each student, ASU dedicates itself to superior instruction and excellent student performance (U.S. News & World Report, 2007, American’s Best Colleges 2007).

In its drive to distinguish itself as a leading American university that is both engaged with and a contributor to society, ASU president Michael Crow identifies eight strategic imperatives for the university. The first, “Leveraging Places,” calls for the university to embrace its “cultural, socioeconomic, and physical settings..., to address problems of [its] regions..., [and to learn] from local knowledge, [and to consider] the local relevance of research” (ASU, A New American University, 2007). “Transforming Society,” ASU’s second strategic imperative calls for the institution to: demonstrate “planetary stewardship, transform society, improve the human condition, and foster sustained social advancement and economic growth.” The university’s strategy also directs ASU to engage in research that both advances knowledge and transforms society, to consider the social implication of its research and “harness...knowledge for maximum societal benefit.” Arizona State’s strategy commits the university to public service, and to inter-, multi-, trans-, and post-disciplinary research and teaching.

ASU’s strategy also reflects the state’s divergent ethnic composition in its dedication to greater diversity in its student body. According to U.S. Census Bureau (2005) data, Arizona is the 13th most ethnically diverse state in the nation, with almost
40% of its population comprised of individuals from minority ethnic groups. With close to 40,000 of its students drawn from the state of Arizona, and its current graduation rate of just under 20% for ethnic minorities, ASU’s renewed attention to the diversity of its student body is significant (ASU Fact Book, 2005-2006). In terms of faculty diversity, ASU is fairly balanced in between males and females (40% female, 60% male) and closely mirrors student diversity, with 21% of faculty members identified as ethnic minorities (ASU Fact Book, 2005-2006). Perhaps because of this parity, ASU’s strategic objectives do not explicitly address the issue of faculty diversity.

Social Responsibility at the W. P. Carey School of Business

Mission

The school of business at Arizona State University is named after businessman William P. Carey, who gave the college not only a sizable donation, but its catchphrase, “Doing good while doing well.” The mission of the W. P. Carey School of Business reflects not only a commitment to excellence but a dedication to research, teaching, and service to the region and to the business community (See Table 11). The associate dean of MBA programs at ASU sees research on all aspects of business and using this research to “educate people who have aspirations to lead both private and public institutions” as Carey’s primary charge.

The W. P. Carey School of business offers bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral education to over 8,000 students a year. At the Master’s level, the business school offers five MBA degrees, all delivered over 22 months. Carey offers full-time, part-time, Executive, and on-line MBA programs as well as customized MBA programs tailored to
The W. P. Carey School of Business will continue our upward trajectory toward a top-of-mind business school known for positively impacting the practice, science and art of management on a national and international level while maintaining a strong and ongoing commitment to Arizona and the southwest. We seek to attract and develop top students and help them develop and advance their career aspirations.

We are in the knowledge creation and application business for the benefit of students, executives and other practitioners, and the global business and academic communities. Our ability to accomplish this is totally dependent upon the quality and capability of our faculty as thought leaders in research and teaching and the ability of our staff to support our initiatives and programs at the highest level of excellence. (AACSB, 2004).

individual business needs. The business school also offers a number of joint degree programs at the master’s level including: a MBA/Master of Accountancy and Information Systems, a MBA/Master of Architecture, a MBA/Master of Information Management, an MBA/Juris Doctorate, a MBA/Master of Health Sector Management, and a MBA/Master of Taxation (W. P. Carey, 2007, Fulltime MBA). The fulltime MBA at Carey is not recognized as a top tier program by Business Week, U.S. News and World Report, or Forbes Magazine. In 2007, U.S. News and World Report ranked the Carey MBA 41st, and in 2005, Forbes placed the Carey MBA in 52nd place in the rankings.

Stakeholders

The Carey School of Business has a variety of primary stakeholders. Its associate dean of MBA programs describes the school’s major stakeholders as the taxpayers of Arizona who partially fund the school and its programs, the local community in which the school operates, the faculty and staff who create the learning environment, the students the school serves, and the businesses and not-for-profit organizations that hire Carey graduates.
Service to the state and its taxpayers is delivered through the provision of “high quality business education,” which the associate dean describes as important to the state because it is important to businesses within the state. He sees businesses as interested in having “a high quality business school in the environment” that “helps them [acquire] new knowledge...[and provides] them...newly trained MBAs, and continuing education programs for executives and working professionals who may be their employees now or in the future.” Through its research mission, Carey produces and disseminates new information to the business community through publications, its courses, and its continuing education offerings, including conferences and seminars, and through commentary offered on business and policy issues in the media (W. P. Carey Associate Dean of MBA Programs, 2006). Carey’s seven research centers and institutes help the school achieve its research mission by developing and disseminating new knowledge and preparing students and practitioners to use that knowledge to improve the way organizations operate. The community in which Carey operates is further served by the business school through its graduation of students who “will be productive employees and managers,” says the associate dean (2006).

Carey serves its faculty and staff by providing them with a strong research environment (W. P. Carey Associate Dean of MBA Programs, 2006). Service to Carey students is enacted by providing MBA students with a return on their investment through successful placement of graduates in jobs. The associate dean (2006) asserted that Carey is proud of its 95% employment rate for MBA graduates, which puts the them “on par with the very top business schools in the United States.” He continued, “We are very focused on how the market responds to our students.”
Defining Social Responsibility and the School's Role in Society

The W. P. Carey School of Business does not have a shared definition of social responsibility. The associate dean shared that each faculty member has his or her own characterization of the concept. In his courses on strategy, government and business, and ethics, for example, the associate dean teaches students that organizations define social responsibility in terms of their own interests and stakeholders’ interests. The associate dean asserted that he “strongly rejects the notion of the concept of the public interest” (2006) because it is difficult to “aggregate the needs of large groups of people” (2007). Instead, he affirmed that he holds a philosophy that is shared by a lot of other political scientists that firms “are the best judges of what should be done to deal with their stakeholders” and that firms make investments in their communities on the basis of how such investments will benefit the organizations. As an example, he suggested that a firm might invest in a hospital in its community because it might be beneficial to its employees and their families. The associate dean further asserted that “the [social] responsibilities, if you want to use that term, are defined in a very heterogeneous way, depending on what the organization is, where it is located and who its stakeholders are.”

When asked about what the associate dean believes Carey’s role in or responsibility to society is the associate dean replied that the school needs to try to develop managers who understand that their individual behavior will affect “the broad success of our economy and our society” because “trust is a very important attribute of successful market economies.” The associate dean noted that Carey focuses on “issues like trust and ethical behavior by talking about the importance of that sort of behavior for the success of the overall market system, which is highly correlated with both wealth as
measured in economic terms and satisfaction as measured in terms of surveys of people across the world.” He said, “The countries that have people who...indicate that they are the most content with their lives, tend to be countries that have well functioning market economies. Those that don’t are at the bottom of the line...where corruption, theft, and coercion...are rampant.”

The associate dean avowed that he does not “think it is legitimate to suggest that [a business school should focus on social responsibility].” He asserted that no such emphasis existed at any of the seven other business schools in which he worked, when he was there (including Ivey, the International Management Institute; Texas A&M, Bonn University, and Stanford). He contended that some schools may make public relations statements that reflect that they have a commitment to social responsibility, yet he said, “This strikes me as another area where political correctness is an important consideration for many schools” and does not reflect the reality of what actually happens there.

In a 2007 conversation with the associate dean, he made a connection between what he has seen business schools do in relation to social responsibility and how businesses address this issue. Carey’s associate dean explained that business leaders are always affirmatively answering surveys that ask them if they are managing in a socially responsible way, when they are not really doing so. He said when he has pressed business leaders about their responses, they told him that they answer surveys they way they do because they’ll be criticized if they indicate that they are not acting in a socially responsible manner.
Ethics Education

The MBA curriculum exposes students to ethics through a course in the program’s core (Carey Associate Dean of MBA Programs; W.P. Carey MBA Program Core Curriculum, 2006). At the beginning of their second year, fulltime MBA students at Carey are required to take a Legal and Ethical Issues in Business course, taught by Marianne Jennings. The associate dean described Jennings as “one of the leading experts in the world on ethics.” Ethics too, is addressed in the MBA’s required course on strategy (Associate Dean, 2006).

Problem Centered & Interdisciplinary Learning

Within the full-time MBA program at Carey, first year MBA students tackle a ten-course core curriculum (see Table 12), participate in a one-credit, 20 week long course in career planning, and begin taking elective courses. First year students are assigned to teams and work collaboratively with their established cohort across courses to analyze cases, synthesize classroom-based learning, and apply what is learned across business functions. First year courses are delivered in ten-week sequential sessions in order to ground students in the fundamentals of business and to allow them the opportunity to build knowledge and skills sequentially (W. P. Carey, 2007, Fulltime MBA).

Course descriptions for core classes in the MBA program emphasized the use of experiential learning, case analysis, collaboration, and real-world application as pedagogical tools (W.P. Carey MBA, Full-time program trimester 1 & 2 curriculum topic outlines and complete syllabus, 2006). According to MBA program marketing materials, these teaching and learning techniques are used to build knowledge of key business and...
Table 12: Core Courses in the Carey Fulltime MBA Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year Core Courses</th>
<th>Second Year Core Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Accounting</td>
<td>Global Business Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Theory &amp; Behavior</td>
<td>Legal and Ethical Issues for Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Leadership</td>
<td>Strategic Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and Supply Chain Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Accounting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Information and Decision Support Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

management issues and skills needed in the workplace including decision making and problem solving; analysis and synthesis of information; working with technology; developing a global mindset; working in and managing diverse teams; conflict management; teamwork and collaboration; and ethics.

Fulltime MBA students at Carey may customize their degree by pursuing a complementary (dual) degree; taking any number of elective courses in areas of their choice; spending a year abroad in a global exchange program at a partner institution in France, Spain, Mexico, Peru, or Austria; or specializing in one of a number of core areas including: finance, strategic marketing, management, supply chain management, information management, health sector management, or sports business. An extensive array of additional courses, offered by faculty from departments across the business school or from other colleges across the university, is available to support student choices. Carey MBA students also have the opportunity to supplement classroom experiences with several co-curricular activities including a mid-term, “Understanding
Washington program; a short-term (one to three week) study abroad program in China or Central Europe; and summer internships. Each of these experiences is optional for Carey MBAs.

Service to Society: Institutional, Faculty, and Student Service Engagement

MBA students interested in service to the community can elect to participate in the W. P. Carey MBA Volunteer Council (Carey Associate Dean MBA Programs, 2006; W.P. Carey Student Life, 2006). The associate dean described this club as one that is organized by and very popular with students and as an organization that is very active in its outreach to non-profits within the community. The interview revealed that the Carey MBA program leader believes that students in the program learn a great deal about non-profits by interacting with peers in the classroom who work for not-for-profits and community organizations. He explained that engagement with fellow students with this type of work experience provides “a real service to the rest of the students in terms of broadening their perspectives and having them better understand the interests and the concerns of various stakeholders [and helps them learn] ways to work with them.”

The associate dean for the MBA program (2006) revealed that some Carey faculty are engaged with the local community despite a lack of requirement of them to do so. He did not elaborate about their efforts or offer specific examples of their activities. Information about faculty outreach efforts was found in their biographies and vitas. An examination of these documents for all Carey faculty, not just those associated with the MBA program, revealed that most faculty involved in consulting work were doing such work with for-profit firms (n=26). About the same number reported consulting for public, private, and non-profit organizations (n=25), and far fewer reported consulting
only for government agencies, non-governmental organizations, and non-profits (n=3). One faculty reported pro-bono consulting for a non-profit organization. Three faculty members indicated that they sat on corporate boards, and 13 shared that they served on the boards of non-profit organizations. When discussing service activities, most faculty members detailed service to the school, followed closely by service to professional associations or editorial boards. Six faculty members reported that they volunteered in the community in non-profits, schools, or community organizations.

Of note, a Carey marketing professor provided evidence of collaboration with community and non-profit organizations to help them solve pressing issues. In one reported project, the professor engaged with a blood services organization to help increase the number of blood versus financial donations it receives. Another revealed a partnership with a city to reduce littering in public areas, while a third example involved the faculty member collaborating with a minority run community organization to create an educational program for inner city residents to help them resist the requests from sales people, merchants, and fundraisers.

**Socially Directed Research**

The W. P. Carey School of Business does not have an established research agenda. Instead, faculty members focus on research in their own areas of interest. The associate dean (2006) explained that research is clearly the most important criteria against which Carey faculty are evaluated, with teaching receiving the next most importance, and service being the third component of faculty assessment. He shared, “Good research alone, in most of our departments, is not sufficient for someone to be promoted and tenured.” This requires effectiveness in the classroom as well. The associate dean (2006)
noted that the competitive research environment deters the school from recruiting faculty with research specialties in any one area. Instead, the school attempts to attract faculty with diverse research interests. The associate dean (2006) said that the school does, however, periodically pursue faculty members with distinct research interests. For example, the interviewee explained that Carey worked for several years to hire a top environmental economist, and they succeeded in their efforts in 2005. He shared that with 160 tenure track faculty, Carey produces research on widely diverse topics.

This divergence in research interests is evidenced in self reports of research interests and publications by Carey faculty. Despite the absence of an established research focus at W.P. Carey, or any collective emphasis on the importance of research to address social or environmental issues or to examine issues related to social responsibility, including ethics, a review of the biographies and vitas of Carey faculty (MBA and other) found many with interests in and published studies in related areas. Table 13 provides a summary of faculty research in areas with a social focus or impact.

Initiatives with an Economic Purpose

W. P. Carey engages with the community predominantly through work done by two centers within the L. William Seidman Research Institute, the Center for Competitiveness and Prosperity Research and the JP Morgan Chase Economic Outlook Center. Both centers conduct research on economic indicators and outlooks for the state and the region. The Center for Competitiveness and Prosperity Research specializes in “applied economic and demographic research with a geographic emphasis on Arizona and the metropolitan Phoenix area. The Center for Competitiveness and Prosperity Research “conducts research projects under sponsorship of private businesses, non-profit
organizations, government entities, and other ASU units...[and] the Center administers the Productivity and Prosperity Project: An Analysis of Economic Competitiveness and the Office of the University Economist. These ongoing initiatives began in 2005 and are sponsored by university president Michael M. Crow” (L. William Seidman Research Institute, 2007).

Table 13: Summary of Carey Faculty Research Interests and Activities with a Social Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Area</th>
<th>Number of Faculty with Interest/Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making/Analysis</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology in Business</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Issues (i.e., disabilities, senior housing)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Issues</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact/Sustainability</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Theory of Public Goods</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Theory of Voting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Diversity

The W. P. Carey School of Business operates in one of the most ethnically diverse states and in one of the most diverse regions in the United States. Almost 40% of Arizona’s population is identified as ethnic minorities (with over 28% of the population identified as Hispanic, almost 4% identified as African American, and over 5% of the population identified as Native American) (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005). Within Maricopa county, ethnic minorities make up 40% of the population, and 29% of the population is identified as Hispanic. When asked about the efforts Carey engages in to attract diverse
faculty and students and help students develop an appreciation of and ability to work with differences, Carey's associate dean of MBA programs shared that the school has not consciously engaged in any practices to recruit diverse faculty members. He explained that Carey has "more women faculty members who are stars in their field than any other business school I am aware of" and admitted, "I can't tell you that [this] is the result of any conscious policy [of] the business school." The associate dean continued, "I think it has just sort of evolved that way, but since I took over as MBA dean, I have been trying to use that capability to attract more and more women to our program. We are growing but not at the rate I would like to see."

While no statistics regarding the diversity of the faculty at Carey was readily accessible, a look at the faculty biographies on line provided support for the interviewee's assertion that gender diversity among the school's academics is strong. There, 51 female faculty members were identified, representing about 22% of the total full and part time academic team. In terms of ethnic diversity in the Carey faculty, the associate dean asserted that Carey has "a number of Hispanic faculty members as well...and far fewer folks of African-American descent." Faculty biographies supported these claims as well. A look at the Carey faculty on-line biographical descriptions found 12 Hispanic or Latin faculty members (approximately 5%), a number of whom are foreign born, two Black faculty members (about 1%), both from the West Indies, and 34 Asian faculty members (14%). Most of the ethnic diversity in the Carey faculty seems to be the result of the hiring of individuals who were born abroad.
Student Diversity

Student diversity at Carey is less evident. The associate dean disclosed that within the full-time MBA program, comprised of approximately 160 students, Carey currently has "several folks who are of Native American descent" and six African American students, representing less than 1% of Carey’s MBA students. In a second conversation with Carey’s Associate Dean of MBA programs (2007), he offered more detail regarding the demographic make up of the students in the incoming group of MBA’s. In 2007, the associate dean offered that ethnic minorities account for 15% of the incoming MBA cohort (this excludes international students). International students makeup 35% of the new MBA student body (Associate Dean MBA Programs, 2007). Carey’s associate dean of MBA programs said that the school offers most minority students "a complete full ride."

No additional data about Carey’s student body was provided or available electronically, and specific information about the student population of Arizona State University was also limited. The researcher did discover that the majority of ASU students come from Arizona and from Maricopa county, and that among ASU’s 3,000 graduate students, 15% are from minority groups within the United States (ASU Factbook, 2005). This data suggests that the demographic makeup of Carey’s 2007 MBA program is reflective of the ethnic composition of other graduate programs across the university.

The associate dean explained that Carey takes many of the actions “other good business schools do” to attract a diverse student body, including providing scholarship aid and expressing an interest in diverse students through their recruiting efforts. He
shared that diversity is “an area that we are constantly focused on, and I think we have to attract an increasingly more diverse population.” A desire to have a more extensive international population at the MBA level than the 35% they currently have was also expressed by the associate dean (2007). Growing student diversity within the MBA program is important at Carey, because the associate dean believes “the education that takes place in the classroom with a diverse student body is very, very important.” The international makeup of the school’s newest crop of MBA students suggests that Carey’s efforts to increase the number of foreign students are working.

Other Strategies to Demonstrate the Social Compact

When asked about other strategies that Carey uses to demonstrate its own social responsibility or to teach students to be socially responsible, the interviewee cited the motto of the school’s namesake, “Doing good while doing well,” and asserted that the school tries to operationalize this catchphrase in all it does. The associate dean (2006) clarified that he thinks that ethics is something that many faculty members talk about in the classroom and, as a result, is a concept that “permeates the business school.”

The associate dean described this theme as one that teaches students that “engaging in law abiding and, hopefully, ethical behavior is absolutely essential.” He contented that in the school’s recruiting efforts, they “signal” that they are looking for “people who find ethical considerations a very central part of their activities as a manager” and that they try to “signal in a way that people who don’t think that is important won’t come to our program.” Carey’s associate dean of MBA programs also affirmed that the Carey MBA program uses character and ethical behavior as a means of differentiating their graduates from their competitors when talking with recruiters about
their students. In order to highlight the importance of ethical behavior to MBA students, Carey has “very strict standards on ethical behavior while students are in the program, and [the school dismisses] students who behave unethically very quickly with very little tolerance or exception” (W. P. Carey Associate Dean of MBA Programs, 2006).

The MBA program associate dean believes that Carey students identify with the school’s value – integrity upon arrival, and those who don’t leave with this value or “think a lot more about” this value while at Carey “because [it] is a strong part of the culture and...is absolutely essential for the broader system to work effectively.” Ethics, he says, is focused on more extensively at Carey than social responsibility because he believes managers need to act ethically and make decisions that consider the impact the stakeholders and rather than adopting a “broader mantra...of social responsibility, which...has some heavy political connotations.” Carey’s associate dean concluded, “I don’t necessarily think [it is] appropriate for us to be teaching social responsibility in a business school.” In 2007, he qualified this statement by saying that he does believe that it is important to teach students to take stakeholder interests into account when making decisions.

Summary

Whether the absence of a focus on social responsibility in Carey’s MBA programs is a reflection of the thinking and vision of the school’s leaders or may simply be strategic choice made based on the expressed needs and desires of the businesses that hire Carey graduates, find the school’s research, or donate to Carey is not known. What appears to be true though is that the curricular and co-curricular choices made by school
faculty and administrators are honest ones. Carey does not hold itself out to potential students or to its constituents as a school that is interested in the issue of social responsibility. Its marketing materials do not mislead the public about what it is or what it believes in. So, while Carey may not demonstrate many of the civic engagement activities advanced by the literature, the school and its MBA programs are doing what they believe to be important. And, whether you agree with the school’s choices or not, their honest is to be respected.
CHAPTER 7

CASE: KELLEY SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Background

The dean of the Kelley School of Business served as the interviewee and key contact for this study. The dean has been with the business school for over ten years, and has served in a number of roles at Kelley, including marketing professor, chair of the marketing department, and MBA program chair. The interview took place on the telephone and lasted just over an hour. No secondary data was provided by the school, and all archival documents used to complete and analyze this case were obtained electronically by the researcher through the Kelley website. While the business school does have a strategic plan, a copy was not shared with the researcher and none was available electronically. The absence of this document makes it difficult to determine the basis for many of the school’s tactics. One additional challenge encountered in this case was the interviewee’s almost exclusive focus on actions taken at the undergraduate level. Follow-up questions and significant and extensive review of archival material was needed to attempt to paint a picture of social responsibility at the MBA level. The interview was recorded and transcribed in its entirety without incident.

A draft of this case summary was sent to the dean for review and comment on September 15, 2007 with a request for a two week turnaround for feedback. No reply was received. As such, this case was created without a fact check by the school.
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Institutional Context

The Kelley School of Business, located in Bloomington, Indiana, is part of the Indiana University (IU). Since its inception in 1822 as a small state seminary school with an enrollment of ten students, Indiana University has grown significantly and has undergone a transformation of its mission. Today IU is a Carnegie classified research institution, educating over 92,000 students through its eight campuses located throughout the state. The university employs 16,000 faculty and staff and offers 922 degree programs. The annual operating budget of the institution is $2.2 billion. IU has a healthy endowment of $1 billion. At this writing, the university does not have a strategic plan to guide its efforts (Saylers, 2005). It does, however, have a mission that outlines its purpose. The mission of Indiana University reflects its charter as a state institution and positions the university as a partner with the communities it serves to solve social problems (See Table 14). This partnership is expressed through the university’s establishment of a steering committee called Advancing Indiana, coordinated by the Office of the President.

Table 14: Mission of Indiana University

| Indiana University is a major multi-campus public research institution, grounded in the liberal arts and sciences, and a world leader in professional, medical and technological education. Indiana University’s mission is to provide broad access to undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education for students throughout Indiana, the United States, and the world, as well as outstanding academic and cultural programs and student services. Indiana University seeks to create dynamic partnerships with the state and local communities in economic, social, and cultural development and to offer leadership in creative solutions for 21st century problems. Indiana University strives to achieve full diversity, and to maintain friendly, collegial, and humane environments, with a strong commitment to academic freedom (Indiana University, Presidential Search, 2005) |
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Advancing Indiana was established in 2003 by the university’s president Adam W. Herbert to address the “anticipated slow growth” of the state’s economy by marshalling “the entire IU family” to serve the economic development needs of Indiana and creating a “central point of contact for economic and community engagement” (Saylers, 2005, p. 1). In response to feedback obtained from members of business associations, leaders of local and regional economic development organizations, elected officials, and faculty and staff from IU and other educational institutions, Advancing Indiana identified a number of strategic imperatives and metrics to assess success (Saylers, 2005). Advancing Indiana’s objectives include: creating a culture within the university that makes economic development a priority and establishes a central point of contact for economic development efforts within the university; advancing research investment and capabilities; prioritizing and funding technology transfer and licensing; proving policy leadership and direction that influences local and regional community decision making; promoting workforce development by educating Indiana citizens and serving business needs through internships, graduate placement, and continuing education; assisting with business formation; and extending cultural performances and art across the state.

Among the initiatives outlined in Advancing Indiana 2005-2006 Plan, a number align with the compact between society and institutions of higher learning. Among these is the commitment to revise the university’s promotion and tenure policies to provide faculty incentives to participate in community and economic development activities. Other initiatives that reflect the university’s social compact include the pledge to review policies to ensure community access to campus facilities; a vow to create collaborative,
multi-jurisdictional research and business partnerships; and dedication to conduct applied research and share research findings more effectively with those in the community who would benefit from this knowledge. Advancing Indiana calls on the university to consider subsidizing business internships that occur in non-profits, start-up businesses, and in key growth industries within the state; to use resources in the business school and research centers to support start-up ventures; and to use cooperative and service-learning opportunities as vehicles to enhance student retention.

Community outreach efforts across the university are evidenced in a number of key activities. Undergraduates at the business school can participate in the Civic Leadership Development program. Indiana University undergraduates pursuing any major can choose to pursue a multi-disciplinary minor, Leadership, Ethics, and Social Action, which teaches students that service is the cornerstone of leadership. Students with this minor complete service learning projects and coursework in leadership, service, and the community, and complete an individual assignment with a community focus (Indiana University, College of Arts and Sciences, 2004). Indiana University students interested in volunteering can find opportunities through the Volunteer Students Bureau (Indiana University, Community Outreach and Partnerships in Service Learning, 2007). Service learning courses are also available within a variety of disciplines across the institution. These courses connect students with hospitals, elementary, middle and high schools, community organizations, and non-profits where they participate in for-credit, community-based learning opportunities. IU students can also engage with the community by collaborating with faculty in community-focused research projects (Indiana University, Civic Engagement, 2007).
Research Centers across Indiana University further support the institution’s commitment to community engagement through economic development. Two such centers, Indiana University Research and Technology Corporation (IURTC) and the Johnson Center for Entrepreneurship and Innovation, are primarily focused on regional economic development. IURTC is a non-profit division of the university focused on collaboration between the university and businesses across Indiana to advance research on technology (About Indiana University, 2007). The Johnson Center is committed to connecting IU with the state’s business community while providing undergraduate and graduate students with entrepreneurial experiences (Johnson Center for Entrepreneurship and Innovation, 2007).

Indiana University is located in an ethnically homogeneous state in which 15.7% of the population is identified as belonging to an ethnic minority group (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005). Ethnic minorities make up 11.5% of the population in Monroe County, home of the main campus of IU (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005). On average, the ethnic composition of the Indiana University student body closely mirrors the communities in which it operates, ranging from 6% at the East and Kokomo campuses in 2005, to 10% at the Bloomington campus, to 37% at the Northwest campus (University Reporting and Research, 2006). The Office of Academic Support and Diversity at Indiana University reported that a substantial portion of the minority population (8.45%) at the main campus is attributed to enrollment of foreign students from Africa, Latin America, the Middle East, Canada, and Oceania (Office of Academic Support and Diversity, 2005).

The ethnic composition of Indiana University’s faculty also mirrors the diversity in the communities the school services. Ethnic diversity of fulltime faculty and
administrators at Indiana University averages 17% across all of its campuses. Faculty
diversity ranges from a low of 9% at the Fort Wayne location to a high of 19% at Purdue
University (University Reporting and Research, 2006).

In the absence of a strategic plan, it is hard to assess whether diversity within
Indiana University’s student population and faculty and administrators is an institutional
concern, or to determine what strategic tactics, if any, the university plans to deploy to
create a more divergent campus community. The website for the Office of Academic
Support and Diversity offers some clues regarding how the university approaches
diversity. Here one finds that the university is engaged in a variety of activities to attract
and retain underrepresented minorities, including K-12 outreach, student mentoring,
cultural celebrations, diversity education, and scholarships. In efforts to recruit and
engage women and minorities in the faculty ranks, the Office of Academic Support and
Diversity reported that the university is engaged in a strategic hiring initiative and
mentoring of female and minority faculty members. The limited information available
about either program makes it difficult to assess the extent or effectiveness of these
efforts.

Social Responsibility at the Kelley School of Business

Established in 1938 on the Bloomington campus of Indiana University, the
business school began as an undergraduate program only. In 1961, Indiana’s business
school started offering graduate degrees. Today, the Kelley School of Business offers a
variety of programs and grants bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral degrees. At the
master’s level, Kelley provides a fulltime MBA, an MBA in Accounting, an MS in
Information Systems, and an MS in Professional Accountancy at the Bloomington campus. In Indianapolis, Kelley delivers a part-time MBA program and a Master in Public Accountancy. Additionally, Indiana’s business school offers an on-line MBA for businesses and partners with a number of other universities including Michigan, Purdue, and Thunderbird to offer on-line, dual degrees at the master’s level including a Master of Engineering/MBA, a Master of Science in Engineering/MBA, a Master in Food and Agribusiness Management/MBA, and a Master of Information Management/MBA (Kelley Direct Programs, 2007).

When compared with other business schools in 2005, Kelley’s MBA program is ranked 23rd by U.S. News and World Report, 22nd by Forbes, 11th by the Wall Street Journal, and 18th by Business Week. Among public institutions, Kelley’s MBA scores even higher. In 2005, Kelley’s MBA program was ranked 6th by Business Week, 7th by Forbes, and 9th by U.S. News and World Report (Kelley School of Business, Quick Facts, 2006).

Mission

According to Kelley’s dean, the school exists to “transform lives, organizations, and society through business education and research.” An expanded version of the school’s mission appears in Table 15. The business school mission reflects and expands upon the mission of Indiana University. The dean explained that the mission is shared so frequently with Kelley staff, faculty, and students through a multitude of mediums that “everyone in the building should know it.”
Table 15: Mission of the Kelley School of Business

The mission of the Kelley School is to transform lives, organizations, and communities through education and research. We accomplish this by following ten guiding principles:

1. Maintaining the highest ethical standards with whomever we interact. This is a matter of respect, trust, and personal integrity and is the foundation of our individual performance and our professional excellence. We accept no less in ourselves and expect no less from others;

2. Providing a collaborative environment that emphasizes mutual respect, individual initiative, innovation and pursuit of excellence;

3. Enrolling women and men of great character, accomplishment and leadership ability, and hiring faculty who are not only thought leaders and outstanding scholars, but who are also committed to excellence in teaching;

4. Creating a culture that embraces diversity in all its many forms;

5. Providing innovative and relevant curricula that focuses on developing critical thinking skills, exploring complex problems, decision-making under uncertainty, taking responsibility for one's actions, and leadership;

6. Maintaining our leadership in the pervasive and effective use of technology in serving our students;

7. Embracing a global perspective that permeates the content of our courses and influences the topics and contexts of our research;

8. Maintaining strong ties and lifetime relationships with our alumni in ways that further their career ambitions and the School’s educational and research objectives;

9. Creating a culture that encourages outreach, service and rigorous research;

10. Creating and sustaining our national and international relationships with corporate and academic partners that provide opportunities for students, faculty and alumni of the Kelley School of Business.

Stakeholders

Kelley’s dean identified three groups as the school’s primary stakeholders:

prospective and current students, recruiters, and faculty and staff. He asserted that Kelley
has a secondary set of stakeholders that includes campus administration, alumni, the media, and parents. According to Kelley’s dean, the business school serves its students by providing them with transformative experiences – ones that fundamentally shift their way of thinking about issues and the world in general. Kelley transforms students through the relationships faculty build with them inside and outside the classroom and through the use of experiential teaching and learning activities. The dean noted that accessibility of faculty to students is stressed in the business school, yet this is sometimes a challenge in a research institution where they have a “fair number of faculty...who only want to do research.”

Experiential learning is a cornerstone of the Kelley experience and includes the use of live case projects in companies, team-based projects, and other assignments that “stress students” – taking them out of their comfort zones and into unfamiliar situations (Kelley School of Business, Dean, 2006). Travel to developing countries was offered as another example of a transformative experience available to Kelley’s students. The dean proffered a recent example of a student trip to India to illustrate the use of experiential learning to “jar” student’s into recognizing “that the world isn’t what they thought it was.” He shared that during this trip, the school took a “bunch of kids from middle to upper middle class families and drop[ped] them off in the middle of Delhi, and suddenly they are seeing chimpanzees and cows walking along the street and poverty like you have never imagined....This is life transforming.”

The dean described the recruiters that hire Kelley graduates as the school’s “ultimate customers.” The school serves this constituency by maintaining regular contact with them and making sure that they get “the right students for their needs” (Kelley...
School of Business, Dean, 2006). The dean explained that Kelley’s aim is to have the recruiters’ experience with the school a seamless one. In order to achieve this end, the school takes a page from Nordstrom’s book on customer service to ensure that the three to four hundred recruiters Kelley has on campus are “delighted with everything [from]...the quality of the students [to] the facilities, lunch, parking, and their room accommodations” (Kelley School of Business, Dean, 2006). Kelley tracks recruiter satisfaction with their entire experience at the business school including the quality of the students they interview and the service they receive from the school. This focus on recruiter satisfaction pays dividends for the school with recruiters ranking Kelley in a Business Week poll among the top five schools “in the nation in terms of overall quality of the experience” (Kelley School of Business, Dean, 2006).

Kelley’s dean sees his role in serving faculty as staff as one of ensuring the happiness of these groups. He asserted that he is committed to making sure that the business school has the best faculty and the resources they need to be successful. Because Kelley is part of a state institution, the dean works with faculty to understand the inherent resource constraints that exist, and he helps them negotiate needed tradeoffs to ensure their needs are met. The dean explained that he treats students and faculty as partners and sees himself as “the managing director of a large consulting group.” In this role, he does his “level best to make sure that [each faculty member has] a rich career—that they achieve their dreams as scholars, as teachers, and as academics....”

Service to university administrators involves regularly communicating to them that the business school is the university’s “cash cow,” according to Kelley’s dean. He described his role as one that requires continuous promotion of Kelley and its
accomplishments to campus leaders in order to get the resources the school needs. To illustrate, the dean shared, during the “past year, campus SAT scores for the incoming freshman class went up by about 14 points. The business school accounted for at least half of that increase. So, I remind administrators of this.” He avowed that one of his primary responsibilities is to act as a “very passionate marketer across campus.”

The dean affirmed that Kelley is interested in creating lifetime relationships with its students that extend well beyond graduation. In the school’s efforts to serve alumni, Kelly is developing continuing education programs for them and offers a “variety of outreach programs that are largely education and networking oriented” (Kelley School of Business, Dean, 2006). One such program is a newly launched alumni career coaching service that assists graduates looking for jobs with help doing so through access to the school’s placement office and Kelley’s alumni database. Maintaining a “cradle to grave” relationship with Kelley students has a definite value for the school, according to its dean. He shared that a business degree from Kelley provides graduates with a significant return on their investment in terms of earnings, and he “wants part of that back.” The dean explained that for many Kelley students, “philanthropy is not part of their background.” As a result, the school is “always looking for programs and ways to” encourage students to give to Kelley (Kelley School of Business, Dean, 2006). Kelley’s dean tells “student groups all the time...that we’re not IBM. You don’t just write us a check and get a computer, and then go on your way. We’re also not a church. We don’t depend solely on gifts....” The dean explained that he tells students that the business school is “somewhere in between a church and a corporation” – in need of donations and of revenue from its products and services in order to survive and thrive.
The dean explained that Kelley attends to the needs of the media by continuously sharing information about the business school with them. The dean’s office employs a fulltime public relations professional whose job is to generate weekly press releases about Kelley. The dean spends a significant amount of time each year in New York where he cultivates relationships with people at the Wall Street Journal and Business Week. On his quadrennial trips to New York City, the dean provides media outlets with briefing packets about Kelley. In between these visits, the media can access up-to-date information about Kelly through a recently established website. In response to the interviewer’s comments that these media relations activities aren’t surprising in light of the dean’s background in marketing, he commented that he doesn’t think a lot of universities or business schools have taken a similar approach. He explained that he thinks that schools “in the future that are going to do well will have to look a lot more like a private university, and they have to look a lot more like a private corporation in terms of the service they provide and their communication about what they do.”

The dean identified the parents of undergraduates as in increasingly critical group of stakeholders. This is true, not only because parents play an important role in the choice of a child’s school, he said, but because parents of the millennial generation are more engaged with their children while away at college than previous generations of parents have been. The dean noted that parents today recognize that in the age of outsourcing, a good education is a necessity and not a luxury. As a result, parents not only want their children to get into a good business school, but to do well while there. To serve the parents of Kelley’s undergraduate student population, the school launched an interactive webpage for parents that will allow them to learn the news of the week at
Kelley, hear from the dean, and access their child’s own homepage (with the student’s permission). The school encourages students to post items of interest to parents on their web pages, including grades, pictures, and information about their activities. The dean explained that students who participated in the recent trip to India created a blog for their parents and were required to post to that blog daily. He reported that this blog “was a big hit with the parents” and held the blog out as example of the partnership the school cultivates with parents.

Defining Social Responsibility

When asked about how the Kelley School of Business defines social responsibility, the dean replied that while the school does not have a shared definition of the concept, Kelley teaches its students that the success of a business depends upon its contributions to the social system in which it exists. He asserted that Kelley students are taught that, because businesses are sanctioned by society, these organizations and their leaders have a commitment to give back to it. Kelley students are also taught that “business should be an enterprise that makes the world a better place.” The dean shared that Kelley students learn that, as leaders, they can transform organizations, and organizations in turn, can transform society for the better.

Student Service

Kelley does not require students to volunteer in the community or to participate in any projects with a social impact (Kelley School of Business, Dean, 2006). Not mandating these activities is a conscious policy decision that comes from Kelley’s belief that students cannot be compelled to develop a “social compass,” but must develop it themselves (Kelley School of Business, Dean, 2006). The dean asserted that the school
strongly encourages student volunteerism and provides students with avenues and opportunities to engage with the community. As an example, the dean pointed to Kelley’s undergraduate Civic Leadership Development Program (CLDP). The CLDP website describes the program as a demonstration of Kelley’s “commitment to helping students become good corporate citizens as well as good citizens of society.” Kelley undergraduates who participate in the program volunteer or complete internships in area not-for-profits on their own time and without credit. Through these experiences, students learn about the nonprofit sector and about “challenges that face communities,” while gaining “valuable [work] experience that will prepare them for the workplace and distinguish them from other candidates in the marketplace (Kelley, Civic Leadership Development, 2007).

Volunteer and community service projects included in the CLDP program range from attendance of a civic series event or presentation, a one-day community service project, to semester-long volunteering – serving an agency directly or the clients it serves, participation in a one-week, intensive alternative spring break experience serving a community in need, serving as a volunteer “teacher” in the Monroe County School Corporation, or involvement in a two-semester, 15 hour a week internship (Kelley, Civic Leadership Development, 2007). The school offers undergraduates in the CLDP program a number of incentives to participate in the program. Kelley awards interns a stipend of $500 at the end of each semester (Kelley, Civic Leadership Development, 2007). Students can also compete for awards and prizes including the John H. Porter Community Service Award that includes a cash prize of $250, the Joseph M. Waldman CLD Outstanding Internship Award with the same financial award, or the Jeffrey Maiatico
Outstanding Volunteer of the Month Award, which confers a gift certificate to the winner (Kelley, Civic Leadership Development, 2007). Undergraduate clubs registered with the Civic Leadership Development program that engage in community service projects are eligible to receive the Kelley Club Award that recognizes the organization for its engagement activities and provides the winning club with a financial award of $250 (Kelley, Civic Leadership Development, 2007). According to the dean, the CLDP is staffed with one full-time employee who develops relationships with nonprofits and social/community organizations throughout Monroe county and arranges volunteer internships for Kelley students. The dean shares that the CLDP is “heavily supported” by Kelley alumni and through private donations that he works to raise.

Kelley’s dean promotes the value of student volunteerism by telling students that recruiters look for volunteer activities in the resumes they review. As a result of this encouragement, between 60 and 70% of Kelley’s 1,000 undergraduate students participate in “some sort of civic engagement during their time at the school” (Kelley School of Business, Dean, 2006). The dean estimated the financial impact of Kelley’s student work in the community to be almost $300,000 a year in free service to community organizations.

At the MBA level, Kelley’s dean explained that the school encourages students to take on year-long projects with non-profits and community based organizations that are larger in scale than those they might engage in through student-run groups like Net Impact. The dean shared that the business school at Indiana hosts a Net Impact chapter that is currently working on a project with the Gates Foundation to “figure out how to market safe sex practices in India to try to curb the AIDS epidemic.”

A review of
Kelley’s Net Impact website revealed a list of club activities that include a Social Venture Competition, Earth Day, non-profit and socially responsible business consulting, a Net Impact Annual Conference, and a Faculty Case Competition. The national Net Impact website indicates that Kelley’s chapter has 35 members.

When asked if Kelley offers other curricular or co-curricular activities that address social issues or build a socially responsible mindset, the dean replied, “Not really.” A subsequent examination of Kelley’s MBA program’s student associations found this to be true. Among the program’s 16 student clubs and associations, only Net Impact and the Kelley Association of Women MBAs report engagement with community organizations, examination of social responsibility or social issues, or concern with issues of sustainability. The Kelley Association of Women MBAs reports the following goals that focus the club’s activities on the community: “continue one-time community service activities that engage members; keep members up-to-date on educational and volunteer opportunities within Indiana University at-large; [and] partner with other MBA organizations in their community efforts.”

Faculty Service

Kelley’s dean maintained that business school faculty “don’t do a whole lot [of service to society] consciously.” While faculty evaluation contains a community service component at Kelley, the dean admitted that he does not “place a huge weight on it.” Instead, the dean described service to the community as part of what he expects faculty to do, and research and teaching as the two activities he really wants faculty to focus on. The dean said, “Quite honestly, if [community service] gets factored into their salaries in
any big way, they will do it....I don’t want to incent [sic] in that way. I try to encourage them to do the right thing on their own.”

Examination of Kelley faculty biographies found that a few are engaged in community service despite a lack of incentive to do so. One faculty member reported participating in community development work, three indicate that they worked with non-profit organizations, and two faculty members reported volunteering in community organizations. Kelley faculty appear to be devoting far more of their off-campus time to editorial boards, professional organizations, and consulting work than to volunteerism and community or economic development. Sixteen faculty members reported serving on editorial boards, three shared that they serve on corporate boards, and 11 noted that they are active in professional associations. Twenty Kelley faculty biographies showed individuals engaged in consulting work with corporations, while 10 faculty members detailed their involvement in consulting with corporations and public organizations, including government agencies.

*Institutional Service and Initiatives with an Economic or Political Purpose*

Service to society provided directly by the school occurs largely through the research centers associated with the business school, according to the dean. The Kelley School of Business has eleven active research centers and institutes: the Benecki Center for Real Estate Studies; the Center for Brand Leadership; the Center for Econometric Model Research; the Center for Education and Research in Retailing; the Center for Global Sales Leadership; the Center for International Business Education and Research; Indiana Business Research Center; the Institute for Corporate Governance; the Institute for Urban Transportation; the Johnson Center for Entrepreneurship and Innovation; and
the Tobias Center for Leadership Excellence. Many of these centers are engaged in research and outreach activities that serve the immediate community, including the county, state and region in which the school operates, and the larger national and global community as well.

At Kelley, The Benecki Center for Real Estate Studies partners with the Bloomington Housing and Neighborhood Development office to evaluate the existence of and develop policies that support the availability of affordable housing in the city (Kelley, 2007, Benecki Center for Real Estate Studies). This center also works with the Bloomington Urban Enterprise department to identify and create a database to track commercial and industrial properties in the city’s enterprise zone in an effort to promote economic development in the area. At a national level, the Benecki Center is involved in research to compare trends in property taxes at the local, state, and national level and inform policy decisions. Kelley’s Center for Econometric Model Research uses statistical modeling to analyze economic data for the state and uses this information to make long-range economic projections.

The business school at Indiana University is also home to a Center for International Business Education and Research (CIBER). In addition to providing faculty members at IU and other institutions and K-12 teachers with support in the development of curriculum to promote awareness of international issues, Kelley’s CIBER Center hosts conferences and workshops on international business issues and provides foreign language tutoring for the regional business community. The CIBER Center at Kelley also supports faculty and doctoral student research on international business issues.
through research grants and sponsors research that promotes regional economic integration.

The Kelley Business School sponsors the Indiana Business Research Center (IBRC). According to the Center’s website, the Indiana Business Research Center “provides and interprets economic information needed by the state’s business, government and nonprofit organizations...[and] maintains databases on...economic indicators for the nation, the state and local areas.” The IBRC conducts sponsored research and training for businesses and government agencies in such areas as business retention and expansion; economic impact; demographic analysis; efficiency analysis; population and workforce analytics; and school enrollment projections (Kelley School of Business, 2007, IBRC). The Indiana Business Research Center is engaged in a number of key initiatives that impact the state’s economic development as well, including activities to improve government efficiency, promote economic advancement in rural areas, and analysis of existing and projected skills needed for Indiana’s workforce.

Kelley’s Corporate Governance Institute conducts research on corporate governance and provides training to business leaders and board members from private and non-profit entities to promote optimal board functioning (Kelley, 2007, Corporate Governance Institute). The business school at Indiana University also hosts the Institute for Urban Transportation (IUT). The IUT at Kelly administers the Rural Transportation Assistance Program for “small city and rural transportation providers; the Urban Transportation Assistance for [larger] urbanized areas; administers the state transit trade association, the Indiana Transportation Association,” and works with Indiana University’s Transportation Services department to improve transportation for the
Bloomington campus (Kelley, 2007, Institute for Urban Transportation). Additionally, the IUT conducts research, training, and education, and provides technical assistance to professionals in the transportation industry.

The Johnson Center for Entrepreneurship at Kelley connects area businesses with interns from the business school and provides Indiana business leaders with conferences and networking opportunities. The Johnson Center also offers fulltime MBA students at Kelley the chance to pursue a Social Entrepreneurship Certificate. This interdisciplinary certificate, offered in collaboration with the School of Public and Environmental Affairs is designed for MBA students interested in learning to lead in the non-profit, government or public sector, or in businesses where the line between sectors is indistinct (Kelley School of Business, 2007, Social Entrepreneurship Certificate). Students in the Social Entrepreneurship program take 18 hours of coursework and are required to complete a summer internship with an approved business, non-profit, or public agency.

Kelley’s Randall L. Tobias Center for Leadership sponsors research and hosts public forums and lectures focused on the theory and practice of leadership in corporate, public service, educational, religious, medical, and non-profit organizations (Kelley, 2007, Tobias Center). The center’s Hazlett Forum is concerned with issues affecting female leaders including “the role of gender and work/life balance in the...workplace” (Kelley, 2007, Tobias Center). The Tobias Center hosts the Semler Lecture series that “encourages the concept of ‘giving in perpetuity’ and explores the inter-related areas of philanthropic and community leadership and commitment to stewardship” (Kelley, 2007, Tobias Center).
Responsibility to Society

When asked what the dean believes Kelley’s responsibility to society is, he responded, “I think...our principle product is not just a well educated student but a student who has a sense of a larger calling for business and... leadership....We want them to come out of here recognizing... that they should commit themselves to not just being a leader within their organization but being a leader within the community.” He shared that the school teaches students that their business education gives them a set of skills and “a gift of management talent... that is needed in organizations that can’t afford their services...[and that their] role is not just to be a business leader but to be a leader in the community as well.

Ethics and Social Responsibility Education

Ethics and social responsibility are addressed at the undergraduate level through the integrated core experience that takes place during a student’s sophomore year at Kelley. The dean explained that the 15 credit core is “taught by a core of four faculty members from various disciplines.” Through these classes students learn all of the “functional areas of business” (Kelley School of Business, Dean, 2006). While at the undergraduate level, the school offers an elective course on ethics, this issue and social responsibility are taught at “core junctures during that semester” as part of the core curriculum (Kelley School of Business, Dean, 2006). The dean offered an example of how this occurs: “Let’s say the marketing professor has...done a couple of lectures and [the students participate in a case]. [During] the next class session, an ethicist will...revisit the case from an ethics [perspective]” so that ethical issues are addressed in context allowing students to probe social and ethical issues “in real time.”
The dean shared that, at the undergraduate level, the school has taught ethics and social responsibility as separate, stand alone courses, but changed that approach because they believe that integrating these topics into the curriculum provides students with a “more holistic experience.” The change is also a result of the school’s conviction that when ethics and social responsibility are left as electives some of the students who take the courses “don’t believe they need to be there” and “you are preaching to the choir” with the rest (Kelley School of Business, Dean, 2006). The dean asserted, “The challenge of teaching ethics...is...getting students to recognize that they are actually facing an ethical dilemma. Many times people don’t willfully do unethical things. They just literally don’t realize they are standing on the abyss. They just don’t know. It’s foggy....Most ethical dilemmas are very gray and could be argued one way or another.”

Ethics is one component of a required course on Critical Thinking and Ethics for students enrolled in Kelley’s fulltime MBA program. This course is delivered as part of the Foundations Core in the first semester of an MBA student’s time at Kelley. It is not clear whether ethics is addressed in an integrated way across the MBA curriculum as it is at the undergraduate level. MBA students interested in learning more about ethics at Kelley will find no additional courses on the topic in either core or elective courses.

Faculty and Student Diversity

When describing diversity at Kelley and the school’s efforts to create a diverse faculty and student body, the dean declared, “It’s a headache - one of my biggest frustrations.” He continued, “I’m not willing to accept that you can’t have a diverse faculty or ...student body just because you’re located in Southern Indiana, but it doesn’t make it easy.” Demographic data about student diversity in Kelley’s fulltime MBA
program, however, paints a less grim picture. Marketing material from the school show that 15% of Kelley’s fulltime MBA students are ethnic minorities, 27% are women. Forty-one percent of the students in Kelley’s fulltime MBA program are international students.

The dean shared that the school is looking for innovative ways to attract minority students and has begun to develop relationships with historically black universities (HBCUs) that don’t have business schools. Kelley is looking at offering an exchange program with HBCUs that allow students from these institutions to attend the business school for a semester to take the integrated core and provide them access to the school’s placement facilities and resources. The business school at Indiana University is also part of a 13 institution collaboration called the Consortium for Graduate Study in Management that looks to expand diversity in business education and leadership by increasing the number of African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Native Americans in member school enrollments and in management ranks across organizations. The consortium recruits underrepresented minorities and other who demonstrate a commitment to the group’s mission, and provides them with a fellowship that covers the cost of full tuition and required fees for a two year, full time MBA (Kelley School of Business, Fulltime MBA, 2007). Kelley is also a member of the Forte Foundation, a consortium of business schools, corporations, and non-profits committed to increasing the number of women in MBA programs and in business. The Forte Foundation provides scholarships to women in MBA programs, sponsors networking events, research, opportunities for mentorship, a speaker series, and other events (Kelley School of Business, Fulltime MBA, 2007). At the undergraduate level, Kelley recruits
underrepresented minority students through outreach to high school students in using two key programs, the Kelley Junior Executive Institute and Kelley Emerging Leaders (Kelly School of Business Office of Diversity Initiatives, 2004).

Kelley's dean explained that the school is looking at similarly innovative tactics at the faculty level because "Diversity in our faculty is...absolutely miserable." To illustrate, he pointed out that Kelley has "just a couple of African American faculty...and maybe a couple of Latino or Hispanic faculty." When it comes to international faculty, the dean asserted that he feels that the school is "in pretty decent shape." He clarified that Kelley has "quite a few faculty from India, a few from China, a few from Latin America, and a few from Russia." Subsequent examination of faculty biographical statements posted on the Kelley website confirmed that faculty diversity at Kelley is an issue, not only in terms of ethnicity, but of gender as well. Only 11 of Kelley's faculty members are women. This represents about 10% of the entire full and part-time academic team. Two of Kelley's faculty members are of Hispanic origin, one is African American, and six are Asian. All six of the Asian faculty members are from India. Only about 3% of Kelley's faculty (excluding foreign nationals) can be identified as ethnic minorities.

The dean described faculty diversity as a "tough nut to crack" for them and shared that they are struggling at Kelley to find creative ways to attract minority teaching staff. The business school is actively recruiting minority doctoral students from other schools who are either looking for a place to do post-doctoral work or who are interested in teaching before completing their degrees. Kelley is also trying to bring in faculty of color as visiting lecturers or scholars "so that...students can see and be taught by folks other
than white males and females” (Kelley School of Business, Dean, 2006). These tactics have proved to be a challenge for them as well (Kelley School of Business, Dean, 2006).

Diversity Building Education

Kelley is using a number of tactics to help its students at the undergraduate and MBA level to gain an appreciation of differences. One such activity involves Kelley’s use of a theater group that promotes diversity awareness through performances that it holds “a couple of times a year” at the business school. A number of MBA student clubs and associations at Kelley are concerned with diversity issues. For example, Kelley’s International Business Society describes its focus as “providing a forum for members to learn from their diverse cultures and professional experiences” (Kelley, 2007, International Business Society). The International Business Society promotes cultural awareness through networking events, activities such as an international food festival, and through a speaker series focused on international business issues. Kelley also hosts an Asian MBA Association, a Black MBA Association, a Latin MBA Association, and the Kelley Association of Women MBAs. Three of these four clubs report goals and activities that are concerned not only with the recruitment of female or minority students to the Kelley MBA program but of helping to provide female or minority students with a sense of community on campus, help advancing their careers, and/or the promotion of awareness of minority issues within the business school itself.

Coursework at Kelley also helps MBA students learn how to work with those who are different from them through the use of team-based assignments, including case studies and challenges that begin during Orientation, continue through individual courses, and conclude with a capstone business simulation case competition during the MBA’s
final semester. Kelley undergraduates participate in I-Core Diversity Training, a performance based diversity awareness program sponsored by the State Farm Companies Foundation (Kelly School of Business Office of Diversity Initiatives, 2004).

Socially Directed Research

There is no established research agenda at Kelley and no distinct focus at the school of research that examines issues of social responsibility, sustainability, social or environmental impact, or related areas. The dean described efforts to set a research focus as “a non-starter.” He asserted that a couple of faculty are engaged in research in these areas, “but not a lot.” Examples of socially conscious research studies by Kelley faculty offered by the dean include fraud detection and scandal within the financial community. He noted that it was a Kelley faculty member who recently brought to light the options backdating scandal through a research project he was engaged in.

Kelley faculty biographies on-line provide additional insights into individual research interests and activities. As one might expect, Kelley faculty are engaged in a divergent array of research projects, however, two distinct clusters emerged. Eleven faculty report research on issues related to technology in business and 12 are engaged in studies focusing on international issues. When one looks for research with a social focus another two clusters surface. Seven Kelley faculty report studies on critical thinking or decision making and six indicate that they are engaging in research on ethics in business or business education. A further breakdown of Kelley faculty research with a social focus or impact is detailed in Table 16.
Table 16: Summary of Kelley Faculty Research Interests and Activities with a Social Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Area</th>
<th>Number of Faculty with Interest/Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global/International Issues</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking/Decision Making</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teams/Collaboration</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Environmentalism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict/Cooperation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Global Focus*

When asked about other strategies Kelley uses to demonstrate social responsibility or build this competence in students, the dean returned to the school’s expanding focus on providing students with global experiential learning opportunities. MBA students at Kelley who are interested in learning about international business issues can do so through elective coursework, choosing to major or minor in International Business, by completing a Certificate of Global Business Achievement, or by participating in a one and a half credit Kelley International Perspectives (KIPS) experience. The Certificate of Global Business Achievement can be pursued as part of a major or minor in International Business or in addition to any other choice of emphasis. The certificate requires the completion of two international business courses, one international business experience (either an internship, a KIPS, study abroad, or completion of an international research project, or through work done at the CIBER center), and completion of a foreign language course or a culture course. The elective KIPS experience is a seven-week course that includes selected readings, guest speakers,
and a 10-12 day field research trip to the country of study. Countries visited include Brazil, Japan, Cuba, South Africa, the Czech Republic, Poland, Australia, Ireland, China, Chili, and India.

Kelley’s dean shared that about 40% of the school’s students participate in some type of study abroad activity today. He also asserted that Kelley’s strategic plan calls for the school to have a sustainable and substantial presence in India and China. Relationships with countries like these, the dean says, provide students with the chance to experience first hand real poverty, the realities of doing business in emerging economies, and the opportunity to be “smacked in the face with the role of business in trying to improve society.”

The dean explained that a primary focus of the business school in the future is to continue to expand chances for students to experience life in developing countries first hand. He said, “I don’t want [students] going to Europe, Australia, or London….and calling it an international experience….They’re not different enough to change your life.” Instead, the dean wants Kelley students to have experiences that make them realize, like Dorothy when she reached Oz, that they “are ’not in Kansas anymore.’”

Summary

It is unclear after interviewing Kelley’s dean and studying the school’s MBA program materials directed toward prospective students whether the school’s expressed focus on producing civically engaged leaders is a resourced goal or a marketing strategy, or both. The dean’s background in marketing and his focus on promoting the school’s value to the university, prospective students, recruiters, and the media, may be a key
influence in the curricular and co-curricular tactics chosen by Kelley’s faculty. His identification of recruiters as a primary and most important of the school’s constituents reflects the dean’s background and makes sense in light of the fact that this stakeholder group ranks the school very highly in the business press. In fact, the dean’s choice of important stakeholders and the tactics used to serve these groups all seem to be directly related to what the school can get back from each of them. Service to students and alumni appears to be offered with an eye on future donations and rankings. Service to the media has an even more explicit aim of school promotion. Despite the university’s focus on economic development and community service and the business school’s own mission driven focus on service to community, is unclear why Kelley faculty, students and administrators are not more engaged with the state and local communities.

Potential MBA student looking to develop an ethical compass and learn about and experience first hand corporate social responsibility and civic engagement will be challenged to find these experiences at Kelley. Instead they will discover a traditional business degree and the chance to learn the fundamentals of business while pursuing in-depth study in an area of interest. The promise for a richer enactment of the social contract by Kelley lies in the strong social focus of its mission, its success in recruiting diverse students to a business school in the rural Midwest, and its intent focus on experiential learning and international study to transform student thinking about the world and their place in it. If the school capitalizes on these strengths while enhancing its focus on ethics, social responsibility and sustainability, and international business issues, Kelley could easily become what it wants to be – a transformative institution.
CHAPTER 8

CASE: ROBERT H. SMITH SCHOOL OF BUSINESS,
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

Background

The Dean of the Robert H. Smith School of Business served as the interviewee for this study and also acted as the author of the chapter in the 2004 Wolverton and Penley book on elite public business schools. The interview took place over the phone and lasted an hour and 50 minutes. The only difficulty encountered during this interview was technical in nature. The tape recorder used in this interview malfunctioned and, as a result, only 40 minutes of the discussion was recorded and transcribed. Data used to analyze this case therefore were derived from the abbreviated transcript, interviewer notes, the business school's strategic plan provided by the dean, and data obtained from the University of Maryland, the Smith School of Business, and the Beyond Grey Pinstripes websites. Despite the length of the interview, it was difficult to paint a portrait of social responsibility within the MBA programs because the Dean focused his answers most intently on undergraduate education at Smith. His attention was drawn toward the school’s bachelor’s programs because changes here are among the school’s most pressing priorities. The lack of supplemental material provided by the school directly and difficulty finding pertinent information on the school’s website also made the development of this case challenging.
A draft of this case was sent to Smith’s dean for factual review. Feedback from the dean was sent to the researcher and was incorporated into this chapter.

Institutional Context

The University of Maryland is home to the Robert H. Smith School of Business. Initially chartered as a land-grant institution in 1856, the university spent many years assisting the state with agricultural and technical education and the provision of a variety of services for the state including the management of the state’s weather bureau and conducting geological surveys (University of Maryland, History, 2007). Over 100 years after its inception, state leaders enacted legislation to refocus the university’s efforts toward research and graduate education (University of Maryland, Mission, 2000).

Today, the University of Maryland is a Carnegie classified Doctoral/Research institution providing undergraduate and graduate education to over 35,000 students a year (University of Maryland, Undergraduate Catalogue, 2006). Its flagship campus in College Park, located a short distance from the nation’s capital, houses the Smith School of Business.

The mission and strategy of the University of Maryland (UMD) are rich with references to service, while programs and activities found on the institute’s website demonstrate the institution’s commitment to the community, the environment, and the development of civic-minded graduates. Table 17 provides an excerpt from the university’s mission statement. UMD’s vision is focused on achieving national distinction as a public research institution (UMD, Mission Statement, 2000). A significant emphasis in both the University of Maryland’s mission and strategy is placed
Table 17: Excerpt from the University of Maryland's Mission Statement

In keeping with the legislative mandates of 1988 and 1999, the University of Maryland is committed to achieving excellence as the State's primary center of research and graduate education and the institution of choice for undergraduate students of exceptional ability and promise. While the University has already attained national distinction, it intends to rank among the very best public research universities in the United States. To realize its aspirations and fulfill its mandates, the University advances knowledge, provides outstanding and innovative instruction, and nourishes a climate of intellectual growth in a broad range of academic disciplines and interdisciplinary fields. It also creates and applies knowledge for the benefit of the economy and culture of the State, the region, the nation and beyond.

As the flagship of the University System of Maryland, the University shares its research, educational and technological strengths with other institutions and their constituencies in the USM and throughout the State. The University's academic programs and expanding computer and information technology infrastructure serve many audiences, and the entire State has access to and depends on the University's libraries. In conjunction with the University of Maryland Eastern Shore, the University serves the State's agricultural needs through the Maryland Cooperative Extension and the Agricultural Experiment Station. The University delivers continuing education programs that are consistent with its research mission and core competencies to an increasing number of degree-seeking and professional audiences. Using technology, the University provides selected quality programs to audiences worldwide to share its knowledge and extend and enhance educational opportunities....

The University values the Ph.D. and terminal professional degrees such as the M.B.A. as its signature degrees, but it also awards a wide range of bachelor's, master's and other doctoral degrees....Its faculty achieve national and international renown for their research and scholarship, serve society at a distinguished level, are innovative and creative teachers, and participate in the tradition of shared governance. The highly qualified academic, professional, and non-exempt members of the staff provide both support and leadership for the University's educational, research, and service activities.

The University counts among its greatest strengths and a major component of its excellence the diversity of its faculty, students, and staff. It is committed to equal educational opportunity. It strives to hire a diverse faculty and staff of exceptional achievement through affirmative action, to celebrate diversity in all of its programs and activities, and to recruit and retain qualified graduate and undergraduate minority students.

(University of Maryland, Mission Statement, 2000)
other educational institutions, and federal, state, and local governmental agencies is also stressed. The university describes itself to the public as the provider of education; preserver of history and culture; as a resource to shape public policy; and as a partner with the community and its agents in helping to study and solve pressing social issues.

The institution’s social compact is reflected in the University of Maryland’s 2000 strategic plan, *Building on Excellence: The Next Steps*. In this document, the institute’s president C. D. Mote, Jr. sets forth four key goals, including the use of research and enriched educational experiences to prepare students to be “productive members of society” (p. 2) and engagement in partnerships to promote economic development within the state and enhance the “well-being of the citizens of Maryland” (p. 2). To achieve these and other objectives, the strategy details such tactics as enhanced cooperation and collaboration across departments, institutes, centers and colleges within the university and with other universities; increased engagement with the larger community in which the university operates; interdisciplinary teaching and research; recruitment of a diverse faculty, staff, and student body; and the creation of a culture of inclusion to support diversity within the institution.

In seeking to continue efforts to “elevate the quality of undergraduate education” (UMD, 2000, p. 11), the University of Maryland’s strategic plan targets such activities as the use of innovative curriculum design using experiential and team-based learning, problem solving, and technology; an increase in academic internship and fellowship opportunities within the region as well as international experiences, including the enhancing chance for students to study abroad; ensuring undergraduates have a rich general education experience; an increased emphasis on ethics and academic integrity;
expansion of the student orientation period and the use of innovative orientation programs that highlight the value of diversity; community involvement; and increases in funding for student scholarships to promote student retention.

In the University's pursuit of academic and research excellence, UMD's strategic plan outlines steps that include research that concentrates the institution's efforts on shaping major social and public policy issues and expansion of the number and size of Graduate Fellowships to attract diverse graduate students. The University of Maryland's strategic tactics designed to enhance campus diversity are extensive. Next steps include the establishment of procedures to promote "opportunity hires" (UMD, 2000, p. 16) and retain diverse faculty and staff, and campus-wide equity reviews to "ensure parity across gender and ethnic groups" (UMD, Strategic Plan, 2000, p. 16). Efforts to attract and retain diverse students include faculty mentoring of students; outreach to local school systems, Historically Black Institutions (HBCU's), and "other institutions with high minority representation" including community colleges (UMD, Strategic Plan, 2000, p. 16); enhancement of scholarship and grant aid for graduate students; exit interviews with departing staff, faculty, and students; and encouragement of student involvement in the campus community and in service and volunteer opportunities.

The intensity of the University of Maryland's focus on diversity appears to be paying off when one considers the diversity of the academy's existing student body. Statistics presented in the 2006-2007 Undergraduate Catalog indicate that the 42.3% of the undergraduate student body are ethnic minorities (12.5% are African American, 13.7% are Asian American, 5.7% are Hispanic American, and .4% of students are Native American). Only 2.2% of undergraduates at the University of Maryland are international...
students. These statistics are particularly impressive in light of U.S. Census data for the state of Maryland. According to a 2000 population survey, ethnic minorities make up 36% of the state’s population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). Information regarding the ethnic and gender composition of the University of Maryland’s graduate population and of the institution’s faculty and staff was not readily accessible.

The University of Maryland’s strategic focus on community outreach and collaboration emphasizes engagement with other academic institutions, corporations, non-profits, community organizations, and government agencies. To enhance these relationships, the university plans to: build a technology park that will serve as a research center and a promoter of regional economic development; invite researchers from public and private organizations to campus to teach; engage in collaborative research projects; expand work with public and private agencies to address social problems; extend educational outreach throughout the region through the university’s cooperative extension, via the development of select on-line master’s degree programs, through customized education programs for public and private organizations, by increasing the number of professional and academic conferences, seminars, and workshops offered by the institution annually, and by increasing the scope of the university’s international programs and activities. Partnering with local government and private developers to enhance the economic status and aesthetics of the neighborhoods in which the university operates is another strategic tactic for UMD.
Social Responsibility at the R.H. Smith School of Business

The Smith School of Business provides business education to over 4,300 full- and part-time undergraduate, master’s, and doctoral students each year (AACSB, 2006). At the master’s level, Smith offers four MBA program options: a full-time MBA, a part-time MBA, an Executive MBA, and a joint MBA. The full-time MBA program is a 21 month degree. The part-time MBA is a 30 to 36 month program, and the Executive MBA is an 18 to 24 month program. Executive MBA programs are offered at the College Park location, in Beijing, China, and in Shanghai, China. Smith offers the following joint MBA degrees: an MBA/MS in Business Administration that allows students to focus on research and technology while pursuing an emphasis in Finance, Information Systems, Logistics and Transportation, Operations Research, or Statistics; an MBA/MSW degree preparing students for leadership roles in social service agencies; an MBA/MPP degree in collaboration with the School of Public Policy, providing students with preparation to lead public or private enterprises through education that emphasizes national security policy, public sector financial management, or public policy and private enterprise management; an MBA/JD degree that prepares students for “administrative or managerial positions in industry, commerce, or government, where an understanding of both business and law is necessary” (Smith School of Business, 2007, Joint MBA Program). The Smith MBA is ranked 25th by Business Week (2006) and U. S. News and World Report (2008), and 29th by Forbes magazine in 2007.

Mission

Smith’s dean asserted that the school’s “goal is to be one of the great research business schools in the country – in the world literally” and delineated the purpose of
Smith as educating students at the beginning of their careers and throughout their lives while providing them with a return on their investment. His description of Smith’s purpose closely mirrors the school’s written mission, which appears in Table 18. Despite being a state institution, the dean said that the school sees its mission and its stakeholders, not simply in terms of reflecting the state of Maryland’s needs, but in relation to the needs of the broader region the school serves. He asserted, “Our mission does not stop at the boundary of Washington, D.C. or the Potomac River.”

Table 18: Mission of the Robert H. Smith School of Business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mission of the Smith School of Business is to ascend to one of the top global business schools as measured by the school’s stature in research and teaching, and the quality and placement of its students. We will provide a superb research and teaching environment for our faculty and students as well as giving our students a first class return on investment for their time and expense (AACSB, 2006).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dean described the school’s stakeholders as anyone trying to start, build, or operate a business in the region and included among Smith’s stakeholders, students, faculty and staff, alumni, and citizens of the region. Smith serves students by helping them pay for their education through Research Assistantships and by raising money to help support the school’s goal of providing students with opportunities for international trips and global experiences. In an effort to continue to increase the quality of the student body while attending to its diversity, the dean described a program that involves undergraduate business students as mentors to high school students in low-income areas. The dean sees these initiatives as benefiting both the students and the school itself.
The dean detailed service to faculty as enacted through the provision of resources needed to develop as professionals throughout their careers. The Smith School of Business services its staff by providing them with “a decent environment and decent working conditions” (Smith School of Business, Dean, 2006) and by helping them to advance their education and careers. The dean also sees the business school as serving faculty and staff through regular “agenda-less” lunches with him that allow them to dialogue with him and with one another.

In describing how Smith serves its alumni, the dean noted that many of the school’s graduates don’t interact much with the school after they leave. Much of the dean’s description of the business school’s service to its alumni focused on Smith’s efforts to re-engage its graduates. The dean offered several examples of how Smith serves its alumni, including providing them with opportunities to mentor students, the establishment of alumni networks and an alumni portal, and executive education offerings (about 10 to 15 a year) including conferences, forums and other related activities that are also open to the business community.

Service to the citizens and the region occurs through a variety of different activities. The dean described the school’s Dingman Center for Entrepreneurship as a critical feature of the business school’s engagement with the region. For the past 20 years, the Dingman Center has been helping individuals establish businesses in surrounding areas through a variety of different activities. The center hosts a weekly “Pitch Dingman” competition for University of Maryland faculty, staff, and students designed to promote entrepreneurship and the launch of new businesses. Winning ideas receive a small amount of seed money along with advice and support needed to
implement business plans (Dingman Center, 2006). The business school also has a Private Investors Network that matches potential entrepreneurs with angel investors who help fund new business ideas.

According to Smith’s dean, the school also has the largest venture capital fund ever started at a business school. This for-profit venture fund affords students the opportunity to work as fund associates while taking a year-long course in venture investments taught by fund managers. The school hosts a number of business competitions in Maryland and in China and provides support to entrepreneurs following the events. Smith partners with the state on a number of different projects including some that promote economic development or improve transportation in the region and the state. The dean explained that some MBA students conduct consulting projects with not-for-profit and community based organizations at a “50% discount.” When describing this pricing structure the dean shared that he believed organizations need to pay something for these services “otherwise, they would have no vested interest in the outcomes.” The dean offered the joint sponsorship three years ago of an annual Net Impact meeting as another example of service to citizens and the region. When asked about the school’s focus on and efforts to place its graduates in jobs within the state or region, the dean responded that Smith doesn’t have a particular investment in or commitment to placing students in organizations within the community. We left our discussion about stakeholders with this summation by the dean, “Having a great institution is essential to the economic development of the region. Rising to greatness is a contribution to the region.”
Defining Social Responsibility

When asked about how Smith defines social responsibility, the dean responded that he doesn’t “really know if a business school has a role in curing poverty” and doesn’t believe the university could eliminate ignorance in Prince George County (the county in which Smith resides). Instead, he said that social responsibility at Smith is demonstrated by graduating individuals who play key roles in solving the world’s problems. The dean asserted that Smith graduates help transform society by bringing “advanced ideas into the marketplace.” As an example of social responsibility at Smith, the dean pointed to a partnership between the school and a non-profit organization to create and deliver a mini-MBA for accountants in the Palestinian area of the Gaza Strip. Graduates of the program now work as accountants in the Gaza Strip and surrounding region.

Ethics Education

The business school’s efforts to demonstrate social responsibility directly and to create socially responsible business leaders occur at Smith primarily through curriculum and instruction. The dean explained that ethical discussions take place in Smith in almost all courses but not through deliberate efforts by faculty to surface these issues. The dean described ethics education as not deeply structured or woven into the fabric of Smith’s curriculum. An examination of the MBA program curriculum and of the school’s profile on the Beyond Grey Pinstripes website reveals one core and no elective coursework on ethics in the master’s curriculum. Students participating in the undergraduate Freshman Fellows Program are, however, exposed to ethics through an introductory course on business and more directly through a required one credit course on ethics and social
responsibility (Smith School of Business, Dean, 2006; Smith School of Business, 2007, Freshman Fellows Program).

The dean noted that the school "makes a big deal about integrity and instruction." This focus is enacted in a number of ways across Smith. At the MBA level, students are required to participate in an Ethics Week as their last activity before graduating. For over ten years, 2nd year MBA’s visit a prison and meet with white collar criminals doing time for unethical and illegal behavior in the workplace. All incoming students receive a briefing on ethics and are required to sign an ethics pledge, according to the dean. The dean asserted that business school faculty members are vigilant in prohibiting ethics violations and pursue discipline for students who violate the university’s ethical code. The dean explained that he got the university to change its integrity code from one that used to allow students to remove a failing grade from their transcripts to a policy that expels students convicted of an integrity violation. Undergraduate and graduate programs within Smith have Integrity and Ethics Councils and faculty are encouraged to participate in the university’s Honors Court. The dean avowed that Smith has a culture which says that cheating and unethical behavior will not be tolerated.

Global Connections

When discussing the importance of understanding the international nature of business today, Smith’s dean asserted that he believes business students are not truly educated unless they can “interact globally, think globally, and understand culture.” When describing the school’s efforts in this area, the dean said, “We have come up with ways…in the part time MBA program [to accelerate] the actual time to degree while at the same time providing students…with a global experience. It’s not a requirement but it
is a facilitator. And we will have now anywhere between 10 and 15% of our part-time students going somewhere during the course of their tenure here.” The dean asserted that all Smith students, including those participating in the part-time MBA, have opportunities to participate in international trips and study-abroad programs. The dean said, however, that he does not see the school requiring these opportunities because “if you require them, then either you have to pay for it or expect that they are going to be able to pay for it. And until we are in the position where we can pay for it all, we can’t expect them to pay for it, because many of our students don’t have the financial resources to do that.”

Smith’s five year strategic plan (2006) focuses the school’s resources in the international arena largely on the development and expansion of relationships with corporations and educational institutions and the creation of programs and centers in an increasing number of locations around the world in Asia and Europe, and then in Latin and South America. The school’s expansion includes the addition of a joint degree program in India (Smith School of Business, 2006, From Excellence to Greatness). According to the business school’s strategic plan, the extension of programs and partnerships around the globe is intended to promote the free flow “of ideas, students, faculty, and corporate partners across international boundaries” (p. 5). The strategy calls for the inclusion of a three credit international study trip within the undergraduate Honors Program and the addition of two undergraduate programs with a global perspective: The Smith International Fellows Program provides undergraduates with a dual major in business and language, and the Global Opportunities Program offered with the College of Arts and Humanities allows students the chance to acquire education in global, cultural, business, and languages through coursework and study trips to other countries.
An examination of the core and elective courses in the Smith MBA program revealed that required coursework provides students with a foundation in fundamental business issues and introduces students to globalization and technology through three core courses that address global business issues and one that focuses on technology. In the MBA program electives, one finds the greatest emphasis on technology, a secondary emphasis on global business issues, and one elective that teaches students how to manage diverse, multicultural organizations. If a Smith MBA student is looking to develop a specialized understanding of global business issues, she would find nine electives addressing this area and would have the option to either study abroad for a semester in one of 10 schools in Europe, Australia, China, Korea, or India, or participate in a week long study trip. Study trips last between seven and 10 days and involve time in the classroom at a foreign university and field trips to businesses and the local community (Smith, Full Time MBA, Study Abroad, 2007).

Smith’s strategic plan identifies tactics to more fully integrate technology into the school’s curricular and co-curricular activities over the next several years. The plan articulates a desire to infuse technology into the school’s curriculum and develop the technical competence of the faculty, staff, and students, and to extend its own global outreach using technology.

**Balanced Scholarship and Problem-Centered Learning**

The MBA curriculum at Smith is complemented by opportunities for students to gain real world business experience. Smith MBA’s must complete a three credit consulting project in which they work as part of a team to address actual business issues in corporations, federal agencies, non-profit organizations, or non-governmental
organizations. MBA students are also required to participate in a one-credit case
competition at the conclusion of their program. As both a synthesis of learning and a test
of students’ analytical skills, students work in teams to analyze and generate
recommendations for actual strategy issues facing an organization. Smith MBA students
must also participate in Ethics Week at the end of their program. This event includes
presentations by guest speakers, role playing around topics such as workplace
discrimination, harassment, whistle-blowing, and product defects, and a visit with former
executives imprisoned in a federal penitentiary. MBA students at Smith may gain
additional real-world experience by participating in optional activities including the
Mayer Fund, a year long, six credit experience that blends classroom learning with
practice analyzing and managing investment portfolios; the Dingman Entrepreneurial
Internship Program, a small, select summer internship opportunity with technology firms
in the D.C. area; Experiential Learning Modules that promote leadership decision making
in a low-risk environment; or the Financial Trading Laboratory within the Netcentricity
Laboratory, affording students the chance to gain an understanding of financial
instruments through the analysis of real-time and historical data (Smith Fulltime MBA,
2007).

Continuing and Cooperative Education

Executive and continuing education programs are targeted for expansion in
Smith’s five year strategic plan (2006). A review of the school’s website revealed that
Smith currently offers a number of continuing and executive education programs, some
with a social focus. Smith’s recruitment focused series – Beyond the Classroom, brings
prospective minority students to campus for a series of events that introduce them to
campus life and allow them the chance to hear speakers like Kofi Anan and Nelson Mandela. The Dingman Center for Entrepreneurship sponsors regular Dingman Day Lunches for undergraduates, MBA’s, and business leaders featuring presentations by successful entrepreneurs; annual Chief Information Officer (CIO) Forums highlighting the latest advances in technology; a Business Ethics Lecture Series addressing ethical issues leaders may face; and a variety of other events featuring outside speakers addressing issues of interest to current and future leaders, including bio-fuels.

_Student Service_

Evidence of extra- and co-curricular activities at Smith with a focus on social responsibility or that promote socially responsible actions is limited. The dean explained that Smith had a Net Impact chapter that was active on campus for awhile. A subsequent examination of the club’s website shows no activities for the chapter since 2006. The dean noted “lots of student volunteerism” at Smith and indicated that student service is not required, directly encouraged, or reinforced with credits. Only one example of student volunteerism could be found on the school’s website. This involved a group of students who raised money and provided assistance to Tsunami survivors in 2005 (Mwangi, P., 2005).

_Faculty Service_

Faculty volunteerism is neither encouraged nor required at Smith. Smith’s dean shared that there is less faculty than student volunteerism at the school. He explained that some faculty are engaged in what others might describe as volunteerism like consulting for emerging societies in Africa, while others coach basketball teams or lead chapters of the Boy Scouts or Girl Scouts. Subsequent examination of faculty biographies and vitas
posted on the Smith website found Smith faculty to be largely involved in service to the university, with the majority of external service given to professional societies and editorial boards. Faculty biographical statements and vitas reveal that a number of academics are engaged in outside consulting work, with the majority of faculty providing consulting services to corporations, the second largest number reporting consulting with corporations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and/or government agencies. The fewest number of faculty (e.g., four) reported consulting with government agencies, NGOs and non-profits only. Six faculty members reported sitting on corporate boards. The dean noted that he is engaged in one outside volunteer project and sits on one outside board at any given time. At present, he sits on the board of a non-profit organization. Smith’s strategic plan (2006) identifies outreach as a strategic imperative: “By the year 2011, the Smith School, through its portfolio of programs (research, curricula, and outreach), will be viewed as one of the best business schools in the world” (p. 5). At the same time that the school recognizes outreach as a key differentiator from the competition, Smith acknowledges that it is currently a strategic weakness because of the school’s focus on faculty research.

**Student Diversity**

Diversity at Smith is a priority, as it is for the University of Maryland. The dean detailed that two-thirds of students at the undergraduate level are from minority groups, while between 14 and 22% of MBA students are identified as ethnic minorities (African American, Hispanic, Native American, and Asian). Evidence to support or challenge these numbers was not available. Forty percent of Smith’s graduate students are international, according to the dean. Despite these statistics, the dean asserts that in terms
of diversity, the school is “one step short of splendid.” He shared that the business school was concerned with the diversity of the freshman class in 2005, and as a result, they are focusing on outreach efforts to prepare high potential, minority high school students for college. Through Smith’s STARS program (Smith Talent Acquisition and Referral System), Smith faculty are training teachers from the Prince George County Finance Academies, and the school hosts two Finance Field Days a year for students and teachers from these academies designed to teach them about business, finance, and investment, and learn about careers in business and finance (Smith, STARS, 2007). The academies are largely comprised of minority students. Smith offers scholarships to support minority and international students. The dean shared that the business school is not “resting where they are” and will continue to examine ways to attract and retain minority students.

Smith’s MBA program also has an initiative to recruit minority students. The Volunteers in Business Education (viBE) program pairs prospective students with diverse MBA students who share information about the school and conduct tours for potential students. ViBE also hosts admissions events, including workshops and lectures by guest speakers, around the world (Smith, Full Time MBA, 2007). Smith’s strategic plan (2006) targets its minority student recruitment program for expansion.

Diversity Building Education

Teaching Smith students about diversity is also a concern for the dean. He noted that students learn about differences and how to work with students who are not like them through team-based learning assignments that begin “day one.” Further evidence of the use of learning teams was not found in descriptions of graduate or undergraduate programs or in course descriptions found on line. Smith’s Dean also shared that Asian
students hosted an Asian week in 2005 that included a fashion show and regional food. The dean indicated that the business school partially funded this event. The Dean’s Council is currently exploring ways to bring a university sponsored diversity program designed to promote an understanding of differences to Smith undergraduates as a one credit course. The dean clarified that because students will eventually be marketing to people who are ethnically and culturally different from them, understanding different cultures would help them do so more effectively.

*Faculty Diversity*

When asked about faculty diversity, the dean explained that Smith has a “wonderfully diverse faculty.” Just how diverse they are is less clear. The dean shared that he could not provide the researcher with statistics about faculty diversity because he doesn’t “think that way.” He did offer that about half of the Smith faculty are international, about 25% of the full-time faculty are women, and that they are “higher than average in the profession for the percent of Black and Hispanic faculty.” While the researcher was unable to find secondary data to support or challenge these assertions, a review of faculty biographies on-line at the Smith website suggests that these estimations are fairly accurate. This review found approximately 30% of Smith faculty are women, about 32% are from minority groups (including one African American male and one African American female). It appears that the majority of the minority faculty are foreign born.

*Infrastructure*

In discussions about infrastructure to support social responsibility and fulfill the school’s social contract, the dean pointed to the school’s seven institutes or centers and
their varied missions. Each center involves students and faculty in research and outreach efforts related to their specific purposes. Centers and institutes at Smith include: Excellence in Service; Electronic Markets and Enterprises; Human Capital, Innovation, and Technology; Health Information and Decision Systems; and Supply Chain Management. These centers create partnerships with and linkages to public, private, and non-profit organizations, the university, and with students and faculty within Smith. They provide integrated teaching and research opportunities that cross-disciplines and functional areas in organizations (Smith School of Business, 2006, *From Excellence to Greatness*).

The Strategic Plan for the Smith School of Business describes the school financially as resembling a private institution. According to this document, the business school receives just 10% of its revenue from the state of Maryland, and the remainder of its $56 million income from private donations, tuition, and fees charged for executive education and other services. The interview with Smith’s dean shines a great deal of light on how this budget is allocated and on the school’s strategic priorities.

The dean is using a substantial portion of the business school’s annual budget to invest heavily in enhancing Smith’s undergraduate programs in an effort to create the best, most recognized undergraduate business program. With the desire to create a variety of small schools within a much larger school (now comprised of 2,800 undergraduates), Smith is creating a multiplicity of specialty tracks that will allow undergraduates to live and study in groupings of between 12 and 15 students focused on specialty areas of study including research, technology, financial software, and numerous cross-disciplinary tracks including quantifiable marketing, sports management, and many
others. These specialty areas overlay a shared core undergraduate business curriculum and provide students with a more personalized, intensive, and specialized educational experience. The dean asserted that the school decided to implement this model because they realized that they have “spectacular” students in a program that wasn’t matching their abilities. Providing students with a “small school experience” was seen as a way to maximize their overall educational experience, offer students the widest variety of specialty tracks available, and differentiate the undergraduate business program from all others.

One of the tracks proposed in the school’s strategic plan is Philanthropy and Not-for-Profits, designed to prepare students for leadership in non-profit organizations. The school is currently considering whether it should add this program to the Undergraduate Fellows Program. The dean is making a significant financial and resource investment in a newly initiated joint Business and Language program and in hiring new full-time faculty in an effort to limit the school’s dependence on adjuncts. Smith’s strategic plan also notes that the business school intends to double its marketing and communication budget between 2006 and 2011.

**Socially Directed Research**

There is no set research agenda at Smith, according to the dean. This assertion runs counter to information on the school’s website, which, when describing leadership capabilities needed for the new economy notes that the school’s research agenda is focused on technology in business (Smith School of Business, Leaders, 2007). The dean noted that each department has a strategic plan that drives research and informs the overall direction of the business school. The dean also shared that the school has...
identified research areas that they want to expand in, including technology and
entrepreneurship, both of which permeate the school’s philosophy. Despite this shared
focus, the dean clarified that neither he nor the school define or dictate the focus of
faculty research. The Smith strategic plan (2006) addresses the need to extend research
across disciplines, departments, and colleges. Examination of faculty biographical
statements and vitas revealed the primary research interest at Smith to be in technology.
A further breakdown of faculty research interests and pursuits can be found in Table 19.

Table 19: Smith Faculty Research Interests with a Social Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Area</th>
<th>Number of Faculty with Interest/Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teams/teamwork</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity/cross-cultural issues</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Issues</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research to address social problems/with a social impact (ex., microfinance,</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternative fuels, stakeholder management, experiential learning in business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict/Negotiation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other Strategies*

The interview with Smith’s dean concluded with a question about other strategies
the school uses to enact its social compact. The dean’s responses provided a succinct
summary of where the Robert H. Smith School of business is today with social
responsibility and its plans for the future. The dean revealed that in the years before he
arrived at the school, people there spoke about being better, about getting great. When
the dean arrived, he began to ask, “How would we know if we were great?” The answers
he heard helped him to shape and then implement metrics to measure their improvement efforts. The dean explained that Smith’s metrics tend to be research and teaching oriented, and include service to the profession such as the number of editorial boards faculty serve on and faculty editorship of professional journals, faculty presentations given at major conferences. The dean asserted, “Measuring something reinforces the behavior.” He explained that Smith does not have any metric today that talks about social responsibility because it is not their primary focus. “Instead,” he said, “it is a result of their educational efforts.” The dean continued, “If we added a focus on this, we’d have to take something else away.” He asserted that to a great extent, social responsibility is a top-down leadership initiative. “If a different person was in my role,” he shared, “they may not have the focus I do.” He continued by saying that he chooses not to focus on social responsibility because the school is not where he wants it to be. “A school can’t go in many directions at once and get all things done,” asserted the dean. He believes that his strategic choices are right for the school today.

The dean asked, “Who should be focusing on social responsibility?” And he answered his question by sharing that Smith needs to focus its efforts on adding one or two things at a time to build the program the school needs in order to distinguish itself among its peers and within the region. While the dean does not believe that social responsibility should be a primary metric now, he does believe that it could become a top focus within the next three to five years.
Summary

Among Smith’s many strengths lies perhaps its greatest asset – the ability of the school to establish, commit to, and realize priorities. Led for the past ten years by a dean with an unrelenting vision, the discipline to measure outcomes and recalibrate accordingly, and a belief that the school cannot do all things simultaneously and well, the R. H. Smith School of business has transformed its mission and programs significantly. In its unwavering drive for excellence, Smith has achieved many of its strategic priorities. It has also extended its focus on the importance of ethics in business education and academia by toughening its own code of conduct and influencing the University of Maryland to do the same, and by providing MBA students with a number of curricular and co-curricular opportunities to learn and practice ethical thinking and decision making. Through its institutes and research centers and fee-for service consulting delivered by students to area businesses, Smith has contributed significantly to the economic development of the region in which it operates. The business school has also made inroads towards creating a diverse learning environment by increasing the number of minority and international students in its MBA programs, supporting student clubs and associations for women and minorities. Smith is also working to create global connections and build the international business acumen of its MBA students through coursework and international study and travel opportunities.

Beyond these efforts, however, Smith’s engagement with the community is limited, and its attention to issues of social responsibility and sustainability in its curricular and co-curricular activities is almost entirely absent. If the business school decides to focus on these issues in several years, as the dean asserts, one can expect to see
Smith ascending to excellence in a broader way – one that adds increased value to the community and extends its contributions to the greater good.
CASE: WARRINGTON COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

Background

The dean of the Warrington College of Business Administration at the University of Florida served as the interviewee for this study. The interview took place on the telephone on December 18, 2006 and lasted just under one hour. At the conclusion of the interview, the dean indicated that he would send supporting documents, including a copy of the school's strategic plan by the beginning of January. No supporting documents were received. Very little detail about Warrington or the University of Florida is available on their websites. This lack of supporting data made it difficult to create this case and to make comparisons between the business school and its institutional host or other business schools in this study. Specifically, the researcher was not able to obtain demographic information about faculty and staff diversity at the University or college level from official institutional sources, nor was she able to secure detailed information about the MBA program at Warrington. This limited her ability to fully validate the information shared by the dean during the interview.

The dean asked to review the case summary for accuracy prior to its inclusion in the study and a copy was sent to him on September 11, 2007. He sent factual corrections to the researcher a day later. These were incorporated into this chapter.
Institutional Context

The University of Florida is the home of the Warrington College of Business Administration. With its origins in 1853 as a seminary school, the University of Florida’s mission was transformed in 1905 when it merged with the Florida Agricultural College, St. Petersburg Normal and Industrial School, and South Florida Military College to become the state’s first university (University of Florida, 2007, History). While maintaining its identity as a land-grant institution, the university was recognized in 1985, as a research institution with programmatic strengths in agriculture, medicine, business, engineering, and law (University of Florida, 2007, History). Today, the institution offers 200 undergraduate programs, 100 master’s and doctoral programs, and over 30 dual-degree programs to over 46,000 students through its 2000 acre campus in Gainesville.

Florida’s extensive mission elucidates a three-fold purpose for the institution: teaching, research, and service and establishes the school as a catalyst for “strengthening the human condition and improving the quality of life” (See Table 20). Service is a significant focus of the university’s mission, with Florida acknowledging therein its obligation to serve the public good through research and knowledge sharing and the development of multicultural understanding and skills necessary for success.

The University of Florida’s strategic plan outlines a substantive array of objectives in support of the institution’s purpose, a number of which reflect the school’s status as a land-grant institution and its social compact. The strategy directs the institution’s resources toward solving problems and challenges facing the state and nation including an aging population, health issues, educational needs of children, adolescents, and adults, agricultural and economic development, globalization, and the search for
Table 20: The University of Florida Mission Statement

The University of Florida is a public-land-grant, sea-grant, and space-grant research university, one of the most comprehensive in the United States. The university encompasses virtually all academic and professional disciplines. It is the largest and oldest of Florida’s eleven universities, a member of the Association of American Universities, and has high national rankings by academic assessment institutions. Its faculty and staff are dedicated to the common pursuit of the university’s three-fold mission: teaching, research, and service.

The University of Florida belongs to a tradition of great universities. Together with its undergraduate and graduate students, University of Florida faculty participate in an educational process that links the history of Western Europe with the traditions and cultures of all societies, explores the physical and biological universes, and nurtures generations of young people from diverse backgrounds to address the needs of the world’s societies. The university welcomes full exploration of its intellectual boundaries and supports its faculty and students in the creation of new knowledge and the pursuit of new ideas.

Teaching is a fundamental purpose of this university at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Research and scholarship are integral to the educational process and to the expansion of our understanding of the natural world, the intellect, and the senses. Service reflects the university’s obligation to share the benefits of its research and knowledge for the public good. The university serves the nation and state’s critical needs by contributing to a well-qualified and broadly diverse citizenry, leadership, and workforce. The University of Florida must create the broadly diverse environment necessary to foster multi-cultural skills and perspectives in its teaching and research for its students to contribute and succeed in the world of the 21st century.

These three interlocking elements span all the university’s academic disciplines and represent the university’s commitment to lead and serve the State of Florida, the nation, and the world by pursuing and disseminating new knowledge while building upon the experiences of the past. The University aspires to advance by strengthening the human condition and improving the quality of life.

renewable energy. The Institution plans to address these needs through interdisciplinary research, strengthening of its academic programs, development of its faculty and staff, outreach to K-12 schools, internet-based education, continuing and cooperative education offerings, and enhancement of its professional degree programs. In its recognition of the increasingly global nature of life and work, Florida’s strategic plan targets teaching and
study abroad opportunities, exchange programs, collaborative research with scholars from other countries, and research on international issues for expansion, and acknowledges that these activities serve as vehicles to promote cultural understanding and competence. The strategy concedes that faculty and student diversity are requisite factors in the development of multi-cultural skills and awareness and maintains that the racial and gender diversity of these groups is “not yet adequate” (University of Florida, From Achievement to Recognition, p. 3). To address this deficit, Florida plans to deploy tactics to attract female and minority faculty with excellent teaching and research skills. Increasing student diversity is to be achieved by enhancing student support services and expanding co-curricular and extra-curricular activities. The university indicates that these activities were chosen because they are believed to be effective tools to foster creative thinking, develop multi-cultural competence, and engender responsible citizenship and leadership skills.

Social Responsibility at the Warrington College of Business Administration

With total enrollment exceeding 6,000, the Warrington College of Business offers bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral degrees. At the Master’s level, Warrington provides full and part-time MBA programs, a professional MBA program, an executive MBA program, and internet MBA program, and seven dual-master’s programs in law, engineering, exercise and sports science, medical sciences, and international management. Florida MBA students have the option of majoring in a variety of areas from Decision and Information Sciences and E-business, to Entrepreneurship, Finance, General Business, Human Resource Management, International Business, Management,

Mission

The purpose of the business school at the University of Florida is to prepare students to become decision makers who “attack problems and solve puzzles in the business world” (Warrington’s Dean, 2006). The school accomplishes this mission through research it shares with its students, alumni, and the business community. Table 21 contains a full accounting of Warrington’s Mission Statement.

Table 21: Mission Statement for the Warrington College of Business Administration

| The Warrington College of Business Administration, located at the University of Florida, serves students, businesses, alumni, and government agencies by providing educational and research programs that enhance leadership and competence among business people and provides solutions for important business problems. We accomplish this mission by generating new knowledge through our research and disseminating knowledge to our students and alumni as well as the academic and business communities of the world (AACSB, 2007). |

Stakeholders

The dean identified Warrington’s stakeholders as the state of Florida and its residents, students, recruiters, graduates, faculty and staff. He explained that the school serves Florida and its residents by preparing students for the workforce, predominantly
within the state. To illustrate, the dean noted that 98% of Warrington’s undergraduates are Florida residents, 85% of its specialized Master’s and Executive MBA students are state residents, and 15% of its MBA students are from Florida. The business school also serves its home state by offering programs to meet the needs of students, like its Internet MBA and its planned web-based PhD.

Students are served by Warrington in a number of ways. The dean explained that the business school allows students from other programs across the university access to all graduate courses. For over 30 years, Warrington has allowed undergraduate students, regardless of discipline, the opportunity to enroll in nine introductory level courses. Interdisciplinary minors in Real Estate, Entrepreneurship, Ethics, and Management Communication further extend the reach of the business school and provide additional opportunities for undergraduates majoring in another area the chance to access the school’s resources. All undergraduates within the business school have the option of obtaining a dual degree in business and another discipline. The undergraduate and graduate curriculum in the School of Business Administration at Florida share the same platform, allowing the school to offer over 220 different courses a year. This enables Warrington to offer a wider array of classes annually than many of its competitors. Weekend and internet course offerings expand students’ ability to “get the courses they want, when they want them” (Warrington College of Business Administration, Dean, 2006).

Warrington serves recruiters by providing them a wide range of students to choose from, from bachelor prepared graduates with a breadth of skills to graduates of specialized master’s students with narrowly defined expertise and skill set (Warrington
College of Business Administration, Dean, 2006). The dean noted that Warrington graduates with specialty MBA degrees are more polished and have a deeper knowledge base than undergraduates and “are priced in the market between an MBA and an undergraduate,” which recruiters find especially appealing.

Warrington’s commitment to its graduates is demonstrated by the school’s efforts to make them aware of its graduate programs in an effort to recruit them back (Warrington College of Business Administration, Dean, 2006). The school also looks for ways to engage its alumni with the school and its students by providing them with networking events, lecture series, and opportunities to mentor students. The school attends to the needs of its faculty by providing them with a supportive environment and the freedom to teach “anything they want to teach at times that meet their needs and allow them to do research” (Warrington College of Business Administration, Dean, 2006).

Perceived Responsibility to and Role in Society

Warrington’s dean sees the school’s responsibility to society as one that requires Warrington to give back to the state of Florida “because they are paying the bills.” The school does this by encouraging student volunteerism in the community and offering them opportunities to do so, encouraging entrepreneurship “in the context of society,” and by providing students with interdisciplinary coursework that addresses critical issues such as discrimination. The dean explained that the university established a number of key goals for the business school, including ensuring that 100% of business students are engaged with the community, demonstrating that the school’s faculty members are involved with the community and with the K-12 education system, and preparing
students for work in a global society by showing that at least 30% of its students are studying abroad.

Community Service – Students, Faculty, and Institutional Engagement

To ensure all Warrington students are engaged in service work Warrington “has a lot of organized activities to help students find volunteer and work opportunities in the community” (Warrington College of Business Administration, Dean, 2006). As an example, the dean offered that Warrington’s teaching and administrative personnel are engaged in projects to fight cancer in children, combat hunger, and assist the homeless.

Despite these instances of faculty and staff volunteerism, the dean noted that the college does not endorse any particular cause or initiative and does not participate in any community-based activity as a whole. He also shared that community service is a component of faculty’s evaluation but “in name only.” Faculty reports of community service found through examination of faculty biographies and vitas on-line reflect the absence of an expectation of engagement. Only one of 99 faculty members reported volunteering in community and civic organizations. Two detailed service on non-profit boards. Many more offered examples of university service, service to editorial boards and to professional associations, as well as consulting work for government and non-governmental organizations, non-profits, utilities, and corporations.

Most of the school’s community engagement appears to derive from its work with area entrepreneurs, start-up companies, and with research to promote local and regional economic development. Through Warrington’s Center for Entrepreneurship and Innovation students take courses in entrepreneurship, can learn about social entrepreneurship, participate in lectures led by entrepreneurs, and engage in case
competitions including those designed to create nonprofit or for-profit ventures directed
towards solving social problems locally or abroad (Center for Entrepreneurship &
Innovation, 2007). Students interested in learning more about social entrepreneurship
can participate in a club hosted by the center called Change the World. Change the
World is described as a student organization committed to educating “students to think
innovatively about social problems in the local community and around the world and
empower them to create positive social change” (Change the World, 2007). The Center
for Entrepreneurship provides undergraduate business students with opportunities to help
start-up businesses in depressed areas, provides a forum for faculty and staff to
participate in monthly business incubator meetings, and affords Warrington graduate
students with chances to engage with area non-profits and help local companies get off
the ground (Warrington Dean, 2006).

The Center also sponsors an Entrepreneurship Academy that pairs students with
business owners (Warrington Dean, 2006). A six week summer academy for high school
students is also available through the Center for Entrepreneurship. This service-based
program teaches high school sophomores, juniors, and seniors, leadership,
entrepreneurship, and civic engagement skills through 75 hours of community service
work, attendance of lectures and workshops, and mentoring by Warrington students.
Academy participants earn six college credits and qualify for the Bright Futures
Scholarship (Center for Entrepreneurship and Innovation, 2007). Individuals interested
in starting their own businesses can participate in a Master of Science in
Entrepreneurship program sponsored by Warrington’s Center for Entrepreneurship
(Warrington Dean, 2006).
**Initiatives with an Economic or Political Purpose**

Among Warrington’s 15 research centers and institutes, we found several with a social purpose, including the Bureau of Economic Business Research, the Public Utility Resource Center, and the Robert F. Lanzalotti Public Policy Research Center. With a focus on the collection and publication of data on state economic issues, Warrington’s Bureau of Business Research analyzes demographic and economic data used to inform state policy decisions and businesses and non-profits operating in the state. The Public Utility Resource Center engages in studies, training, and outreach directed towards the “efficient delivery of telecommunications, energy and water/wastewater services, including the achievement of environmental objectives” (Public Utility Resource Center, 2007). The Robert F. Lanzalotti Public Policy Research Center conducts independent research to inform public policy decisions in areas antitrust, education, the environment, health care, international trade, regulation, and tax policy (Robert F. Lanzalotti Public Policy Research Center, 2007).

**Global Connections**

The Center for International Education and Research (CIBER) at Warrington conducts applied and basic research in international business issues; collaborates with the business school and other disciplines across campus to enhance international business education; provides faculty and students with opportunities to study abroad; offers international business degree programs and foreign language training; and shares information about global business issues with the business community through academic publications, workshops, and conferences (Warrington Center for International Education and Research, 2007). Warrington’s CIBER Center sponsors study abroad programs for
undergraduates focused on language, culture, international relations, and European business courses at partner universities in England, France, and Spain, and on-line coursework done through Warrington. The CIBER Center reports that 17% of Warrington’s undergraduates have participated in study abroad programs to date and estimates that this will increase in the future.

Master’s students enrolled in MBA or other programs at Warrington can participate in short-term or summer study abroad programs in Latin America. This program features classroom sessions on international finance and a one-week tour of a financial market centers in Latin America (Warrington Center for International Business Education and Research, 2007). Other international learning options for master’s students include six-week long summer study abroad experiences at institutions in the Czech Republic or Russia featuring coursework in language and culture at a partner institution in the country of study and regional “cultural excursions” (Warrington Center for International Business Education and Research, 2007). Graduate students participating in the summer study program earn up to seven credits towards their degree.

The Executive MBA and the Master of Arts in International Business are the only degree programs at Warrington that require an international study experience. During the two-credit, international study tour, “students travel abroad in May for a week of experiential learning through lectures or discussions with local business and government leaders. The tour includes stops in the capitals of France and Belgium and at other sites in these countries, and features a combination of lectures, group projects and/or site visits” (Warrington College of Business, 2007, Executive MBA).
Students enrolled in other MBA programs at Warrington who elect to concentrate in Global Management are required to complete six credits of coursework from an approved international exchange university program (Warrington College of Business, 2007, Concentrations and Certificates). Warrington approved institutions are located in Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Korea, Liechtenstein, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Spain, Sweden, and Venezuela (Warrington College of Business, 2007; International and Joint Degrees).

Understanding the global nature of business is a fundamental competence Warrington hopes to engender in its students (Warrington Dean, 2006). To help build a global mindset, Warrington students learn about international law, ethics, and social issues through projects and coursework. MBA students can choose to pursue a concentration or certificate in Global Management or to pursue a dual MBA/Master of International Management (MIM) offered in collaboration with Thunderbird (The American School for International Management). Students participating in Warrington’s Traditional MBA program have no required courses that explicitly address global business issues. The year-long Professional MBA includes two international business courses – Global Strategic Management and International Marketing. International Macroeconomics is the one required course with a global focus in the two-year Professional MBA program, the Professional MBA in South Florida program, and the Executive MBA program. Warrington’s Internet MBA requires one course in International Business. Without access to a list of elective classes in any of the MBA
programs, an assessment of the breadth of additional international business offerings at Warrington is not feasible.

Warrington faculty members are encouraged to increase their understanding of international business issues through overseas travel and through projects with academic institutions, governmental agencies, and businesses abroad (Warrington College of Business Administration, Dean, 2006). The dean shared that some Warrington faculty members are helping a school in Russia to establish business curriculum in Kurdistan, while others are actively engaged with organizations in the Caribbean and Latin America.

Recognizing that cultural competence is an integral component of a global mindset, Warrington uses team-based projects and activities at the undergraduate and graduate level and builds discussions of culture and cultural differences into “almost all courses” to help build this aptitude (Warrington Dean, 2006). Learning from and with others from different cultural backgrounds is also acknowledged by the dean as important facilitators of international business acumen.

Student Diversity

The dean reported that Warrington’s student body has a “large Latin American population that is reflective of Florida’s demographics, and an African American student population of between 3 to 4%,” which is lower than the state’s representation at 15.7% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). (The dean indicated that 11% of the state populace is African American.) At the MBA level, African Americans are said to make up 8% of the student body (Warrington College of Business Administration, Dean, 2006). The dean attributes the divergence between the state’s African American populace and Warrington’s to the rural location of the school. Closer examination suggests that other
factors may be at work however, as the U.S. Census Bureau (2000) data for Gainesville shows its African American population to be higher than the state’s at 23.2. The dean described the Hispanic student population within the specialized master’s programs at Warrington as “pretty high, while African Americans account for 5-6% of student enrollment. Operating in a state that banned affirmative action in higher education in 2000 Warrington reports having “lots of programs for at risk students” as well as “programs to help fund first time college students” (Warrington College of Business Administration, Dean, 2006).

Faculty Diversity

Warrington’s dean described diversity at the faculty level as a “tougher issue” than student diversity, offering that 2% of the school’s faculty is African American. An examination of faculty biographies and vitas on line found that out of approximately 99 full and part-time faculty, 23 (23%) can be identified as Asian, one (.009%) can be identified as being of Hispanic origin, and two (2%) are Black or African. The majority of the diversity at the faculty level at Warrington appears to be derived from the international nature of the teaching staff, as approximately ¾ of the minority faculty members at Warrington appear to be foreign born. The dean indicated that he met with the university president to explore ways to attract African American faculty to the business school, but came away with “no new ideas” about how to do so. He explained that it is “particularly hard to attract African American faculty because they are going to top performing schools.”
Defining Social Responsibility

When asked how social responsibility is defined by Warrington, the dean offered examples of what the school does to demonstrate social responsibility. Warrington’s dean shared that the school is considering introducing an interdisciplinary minor in entrepreneurship as a complement to existing courses and a minor it currently offers at the graduate and undergraduate level in social entrepreneurship. The school’s encouragement of its students to take courses from other schools across the campus was also offered as an illustration of Warrington’s efforts to enact its social contract. Another exemplar of social responsibility presented by the dean was the school’s efforts to build in “softer skills,” including leadership, communication, and team building into all of its degree programs.

Ethics Education

Warrington’s focus on ethics in its curriculum was a final example of the school’s social responsibility proffered by the dean. He explained that ethics is a required course in the MBA program, and that ethics is built into the MBA curriculum. A subsequent examination of the program requirements for each of Warrington’s MBA programs found no required ethics course in one of the curricular options afforded to students participating in the one-year Traditional MBA program, and no requirement for an ethics course in the Professional MBA, the Executive MBA, or in the Internet MBA. Where ethics is taught as part of the MBA core at Warrington, it is either taught within the second session of a student’s first semester in the program (as in the two-year Traditional MBA program), or late in the student’s education (e.g., students in the Warrington Professional MBA in South Florida take the core ethics course in their seventh term).
The dean explained that Warrington faculty address ethics issues in core and elective courses including classes on strategy, corporate governance, accounting and finance, and students have opportunities to gain a great understanding of ethical challenges in business through additional “stand alone” elective courses on ethics. Students and faculty at Warrington can explore these challenges further by attending lectures sponsored by the Poe Center for Business Ethics and Research. Poe sponsors lectures by Warrington faculty and outside speakers that explore such topics as religion in government and the workplace, corporate fraud, and transnational corruption (Poe Center for Ethics and Research, 2007). Social responsibility, asserts the dean, is also blended into the curriculum at Warrington and is a prominent topic in the Poe Lecture Series (Poe Center for Ethics and Research, 2007).

_Socially Directed Research_

The Warrington College of Business Administration does not have an established research agenda. Its dean explained that publishing in “A-level journals is the school’s only research objective. An examination of faculty curriculum vitas found faculty pursuing divergent research interests. Table 22 summarizes self-reported faculty research interests and published studies that reflect a social purpose. Shared social research concentrations among Warrington faculty involve international business issues, ethics, public policy, economics, and decision making and reflect the focus of a number of the business school’s research centers and institutes.

_Infrastructure_

When asked about infrastructure to support the school’s social compact and its efforts to produce socially responsible graduates, Warrington’s dean pointed to significant
Table 22: Warrington Faculty Research with a Social Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Area</th>
<th>Number of Faculty with Interest/Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International business issues</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics/Economic Development</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teams/teamwork</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity/cross-cultural issues</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research to address social problems/with a social impact (i.e., poverty, voting, government efficiency, literacy)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efforts to raise funds for the Poe Center for Business Ethics, the Corporate Governance Institute, and the school's Center for Entrepreneurship and to fundraising efforts to create a student assessment center. The assessment center will provide students with resources to evaluate and grow their leadership skills, including ethics, social responsibility and other social skills.

Summary

Warrington recognizes its social obligations to the state and students that support it, and to the recruiters who are the conduits of its primary product to the marketplace. It enacts its social compact primarily through the work done by its research centers and institutes and through its desire to incorporate ethics into its curriculum and expand its efforts to graduate students with an appreciation of global business issues. As part of a university that is both a land-grant and a research institution, the business school appears to be somewhat disconnected from its research priorities and commitments to serving the community. Although the business school is working to achieve targets established by
the university, for service and international study experiences, it currently falls short in
both areas. Without the ability to review Warrington’s strategic plan, it is difficult to
determine how the school will achieve these institutional objectives or if it will expand its
power and reach to both influence and contribute to society further through direct service
to it or through research to address state, regional, national, or international business
issues, and social challenges.
CHAPTER 10

CASE: DARLA MOORE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Background

Finding out how the Moore School of Business thinks about and enacts its social contract was not an easy task. After the school's dean readily agreed to have his school included in this study and identified a person to represent Moore in the study, the designee for the interview changed several times over the course of two months until it came to rest with the Marketing Communications Manager for the International MBA (IMBA) program. The individual first suggested by the dean to be interviewed was the co-author of the chapter in the 2004 Wolverton and Penley book on excellence in public business schools, the Editor of Moore's journal *The Economic and Business Review*. After learning more about the scope and purpose of the current study, the dean's first choice felt that the academic dean might be more knowledgeable about the topic than she. Conversations with academic dean about the study uncovered his discomfort with the request for supplemental data and his belief that preparing to participate in the study would require time that he didn't have. Despite assurances that the provision of supplemental data about the school was optional, the academic dean elected not to participate in the study and identified a third person to be interviewed.
The school representative he identified, and with whom the interview was eventually conducted was the person responsible for completing the 2007 Beyond Grey Pinstripes survey for the World Resource Institute and the Aspen Institute. Because of her involvement in the Pinstripes survey, the Marketing Communications Manager for the IMBA program was believed to be in the best position to answer questions about Moore and social responsibility.

The Marketing Communications Manager was in her role just shy of four months when she was interviewed. Despite the manager’s recent involvement with the Beyond Grey Pinstripes survey, her newness to her role seemed to significantly limit her ability to offer responses or provide information that varied too much from the questions asked in the Aspen Institute study. Supplemental material about the school that would further illuminate our discussions and provide more detail about Moore’s understanding of its social contract and its efforts to fulfill it were not supplied by the interviewee, leaving the researcher to attempt to create a more complete picture of Moore by relying on materials available on its website and on data gathered from the University of South Carolina’s (USC) website as well.

The summary that follows relies heavily on these secondary sources of data. One final factor limited the initial portrait of the school and its commitment to social responsibility, and this limitation rests with the researcher. At the time the Moore representative was available for the interview, the tape recorder used to capture the conversation malfunctioned and the interview was not able to be transcribed. As such, much of the richness of this discussion was lost, again forcing the researcher to rely more heavily on additional sources of information than was originally intended.
A request to review this case for factual verification was sent to the interview subject on September 15, 2007 with a request to return comments to the researcher within two weeks. No response was received.

Institutional Context

To understand Moore and social responsibility, it helps to examine the larger institution in which it rests. The University of South Carolina (USC), a premiere Research I institution located in Columbia, South Carolina, educates over 25,000 students and attracts over $188 million in research funding annually. With its roots as an institution of higher education dedicated to the classical tradition, the University of South Carolina, like many American institutions of higher education, has evolved since its inception over 100 years ago in response to changing local, national, and international economic and social developments.

The university’s mission reflects both its status as a state institution and its social compact. USC’s mission identifies the citizens of the state as its primary constituency; focuses teaching efforts on providing diverse students with the skills needed to be citizens and to succeed in a complex world; commits to research that will enhance the quality of life of the citizens of the state; makes note of the university’s diverse faculty; dedicates its people and resources in service to the local, national, and international community, and positions the institution as a partner in addressing social, economic, public health, family, and educational efforts. Table 23 captures USC’s mission statement.
Table 23: Mission of the University of South Carolina

The primary mission of the University of South Carolina, a multi-campus public institution serving the entire state of South Carolina, is the education of the state's diverse citizens through teaching, research and creative activity, and service.

Teaching
The University is committed to providing its students with the highest-quality education, including the knowledge, skills, and values necessary for success and responsible citizenship in a complex and changing world. A particular strength of the University of South Carolina is the excellence, breadth, and diversity of the institution's faculty.

Research
Convinced that research and scholarship, including artistic creation, are essential for excellent teaching, the University pursues aggressively an active research and scholarship program. The University is dedicated to using research to improve the quality of life for South Carolinians.

Service
Another important facet of the University's public mission is service -- to its community, state, nation, and the world in such areas as public health, education, social issues, economic development, and family support systems.

(Sorensen, A., 2006)

In his 2006 Strategic Vision report, USC president, Andrew Sorensen outlined five strategic research priorities for the institution: nanotechnology, conversion of future fuels, the environment, biomedical sciences, and “projects that link these ‘thrust areas’ to the humanities.” Two of Sorensen’s targeted areas for research represent have an environmental impact, while the others address social problems including health, education, and civic engagement. Sorensen’s vision for the university also includes the creation of a research district housing biomedical and future fuels research. As with all other buildings included in USC’s master plan, every structure in the research park will be built to Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (L.E.E.D.) standards.
USC's strategic vision targets a number of additional key areas. In addition to research, the university is focused on being responsive to business and customer needs; bringing technology to students, faculty, and staff across the institution; investing in technology; replenishing a large number of retiring faculty with highly qualified replacements; attracting quality students; and supporting the health and wellness of the university community through its Healthy Carolina 2010 initiative. Absent in President Sorensen's vision for the university is responsiveness to the needs of the communities in which the institution operates and a desire to attract female and minority faculty or students to the institution. The latter appears to be significant when one considers that about 12% of the university's academicians in 2002 were identified as members of minority groups (University of South Carolina, 2002). Student diversity at the University of South Carolina was slightly better than that of faculty at 17.7% for undergraduates in 2006 and 3.2% for graduates (University of South Carolina, 2006) in a state with a minority population of 33.1% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000)

Service to the communities in which it operates appears to be enacted by the university through several key tactics. The university is actively engaged in helping the state develop foreign trade and investment by expanding academic exchange programs and research linkages with universities in Europe, Africa, South America, China and Japan; by remaining a top-ranked institution; and by enhancing the knowledge and "economic viability" of students while building "their sense of character, empathy, and mutual respect" (University of South Carolina, 2006). Service is also expressed through expansion of educational opportunities to the citizens of South Carolina through the addition of campuses throughout the state and through the provision of affordable and
Social Responsibility at the Darla Moore School of Business

The Moore School of Business offers bachelor's, master's, and doctoral programs to approximately 3,000 full and part-time students annually (AACSB, 2006). At the master's level, Moore's offers five MBA programs: The International MBA, the Executive International MBA, the Professional MBA, the Professional MBA Banking Option, and the MSN/MBA dual degree. Moore's International MBA is a full-time, comprehensive MBA program with a global focus. The Executive International MBA program is a joint degree program for mid-level Mexican managers offered in collaboration with the Instituto Tecnologico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey in Gaudalajara, Mexico. The Professional MBA is a part-time, 28-month program for working professionals delivered virtually. The Professional MBA in Banking is an online program offered exclusively to graduates of Louisiana State University's School of Banking. The MSN/MBA program is designed to prepare nurses for leadership roles in healthcare. The Moore School of Business is ranked 49th by the Wall Street Journal (Moore School of Business, 2007), 64th by Business Week (Career Dynamo, 2005) and 2nd for international business emphasis in 2006 by U.S. News & World Report (Moore School of Business, 2007). It also placed 51st in the most recent Beyond Grey Pinstripes (2007) report.
**Mission**

When asked about the purpose of the business school, the Marketing Communications Manager noted that the mission is to create knowledge and educate future business leaders. The official mission of the Moore School of Business, as reported to the AACSB (2006) reflects a much broader purpose, identifies a number of divergent stakeholders, a focus on preparing students and business professionals with skills needed to lead in a global and high-tech world and to serve and enhance their communities, a commitment to service, as well as a drive for rankings. In many aspects, Moore’s mission mirrors that of its host institution while focusing on the school’s core capabilities and unique function. Table 24 details the full mission of the Moore School of Business. The Moore representative interviewed for this study noted that the IMBA program has a more narrowly defined focus, which is to prepare students for global leadership.

**Table 24: Mission of the Moore School of Business**

| The Moore School of Business (MSB) is a comprehensive business school that serves a large constituency, including students, the business community, alumni, and the citizens of South Carolina. The mission of the MSB is to provide high quality teaching, research, and service that prepares students and practitioners for leadership roles in the global, high technology economy and to serve and enhance communities around the world. The overall goal of the MSB is to be recognized as one of the top 30 business schools in the world and one of the top five in the Southeast. The MSB continually strives to increase its high stature as an international leader in business education. |

**Stakeholders**

When asked to describe Moore’s stakeholders, the Marketing Communications Manager (2007) identified three major constituents served: society at large, the State of
South Carolina, and students. This represents a slightly smaller group than that which was outlined in the school’s mission statement. The manager shared that Moore serves society at large and the state by providing MBA students with a broad education designed to help them think differently than other MBA graduates by instilling in them a concern about social responsibility and environmental sustainability. The school cultivates this mindset by offering core and elective curriculum in these areas. The interviewee noted that Moore serves the state further by placing a number of graduates in businesses located in South Carolina. A search of the Moore website revealed that 42.4 percent of MBA graduates are employed by organizations throughout the state. When describing service to students, the participant indicated that Moore does so by providing them with a broad-based curriculum “infused with international business and a concern for the future of the globe, their own future, and that of their children.” Service to students is also achieved by making them “well-rounded, broad thinkers” who are more aware of other cultures.

Defining Social Responsibility & the School’s Role in Society

Upon direct questioning about how Moore defines social responsibility and about the sees its role in society, the participant noted that Moore doesn’t have a specific shared definition of social responsibility and speculated (her words) that because the school is part of a state institution and is funded by taxpayers, Moore is accountable to the citizens and policy makers of the state and that it is in Moore’s best interest to attend to issues of social responsibility.

Curricular offerings were the focus of responses to questions on how the school defines social responsibility and sees its role in society. Drawing from the school’s responses to questions on the Pinstripes survey, Moore’s Marketing Communications
Manager (2007) noted that the MBA program added additional courses on social responsibility and sustainability in response to student demands. In 2006, Moore introduced two new core classes on social responsibility in the IMBA program, *Globalization and Social Responsibility* and *Global Economics*. This brings the total of required courses on social responsibility in the IMBA program to three. The interviewee noted that seven of the required IMBA courses address social responsibility and/or sustainability, while 15 of the electives do. A deeper look at the core and elective curriculum of the IMBA and Moore’s three other MBA programs found one core course in the IMBA program that explicitly addresses social responsibility, but no similar courses in Moore’s other MBA programs. Six electives, available to students in all of Moore’s MBA programs, afford students additional opportunities to learn more about how to lead in a socially responsible manner and build an understanding of sustainability and social or environmental impact management. These include: *International Business and Sustainable Development*, *Environmental Economics*, and *The Firm and its Environment*.

*Global Connections*

Moore’s signature MBA program, its International MBA, is guided by the belief that “global business has to be experienced to be understood” (Moore School of Business, 2007). All students in the IMBA program take an international core. Following the completion of required coursework, students have the choice of either intensive study of a language and culture of a targeted region of the world or a global or European focus. The global track is tailored to students who do not need a foreign language and are interested in learning a “global approach to the culture and economies of the world.” (Moore School
of Business, 2007). The global track includes a three-week immersion class that requires travel to another country and study of that region’s political, economic, and business environments. Students participating in the European track complete coursework with a business and economic university in Austria. Students pursuing the language track study Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Portuguese, Spanish, or English for foreign nationals over a 20-34 month period.

As the “pioneer” (Moore School of Business, 2007) of the international internship, Moore requires all IMBA students to complete a three to four month internship with a U.S. based global firm or with an organization headquartered abroad. Moore’s international internships allow immersion in the language and cultural of the region studied and application of business skills learned in the classroom. Over the past 25 years, Moore IMBA students have completed internships in over 30 countries. An examination of the internship sites hosting the IMBA class of 2008, shows the disparate global opportunities available to students. Students in the class of 2008 completed internships in Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, China, Costa Rica, France, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, Puerto Rico, Rwanda, and Venezuela (Moore School of Business 2007). According to the Marketing and Communications Manager, in 2006, 11 students did their internships in non-profits or non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

After the completion of an internship, students return to the business school to study areas of interest for their last two semesters and choose a concentration in marketing, finance, supply chain and operations management, information systems, small enterprise, global management, human resources, or economic development. IMBA
students may also elect to complete a one semester exchange with a partner institution in Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, China, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Mexico, Peru, Singapore, the Netherlands, or the United Kingdom.

Moore offers a wide variety of electives that either deepen the IMBA’s global emphasis or allow students opportunities to build many of the skills deemed essential to lead global organizations or to manage firms in a socially responsible manner. Students with a desire to learn how to lead government organizations or non-profits are helped to that end by an assortment of electives focused on essential knowledge and skills in these areas. Table 25 provides a sampling of Moore’s elective offerings.

In Moore’s IMBA program, faculty teaching experience abroad, outside consulting work, and their research inform their teaching, while student internships allow them the opportunity to continue to learn about other cultures and apply classroom experience immediately to real-world issues.

Table 25: Sample of Moore Elective Course Offerings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electives developing skills needed for work/leadership in organizations committed to SR/Sustainability/Environmental-Social Impact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• International Business and Sustainable Development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental Economics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic Development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Firm and Its Environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electives developing skills needed for non-profit/government work or leadership:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Governmental and Nonprofit Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Urban Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Economics of Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Finance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional Economic Development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic Problems of the City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Volunteerism & Community Service

Although Moore’s website notes that its MBA students are encouraged to engage in philanthropic, volunteer, and other service activities, the school’s representative interviewed here did not support this assertion. When queried about student involvement in extra- and co-curricular opportunities in these areas, she noted that students don’t have much free time for volunteerism. She did indicate, however, that the school does have a Net Impact chapter on campus, and information on the school’s website supports this. Moore’s Net Impact chapter describes its primary activities as service projects and roundtables and luncheons featuring guest speakers. These activities are designed to explore issues related to social responsibility, the environment, economic development, social investing and entrepreneurship, and related. No further information about past and future guest speakers invited by the club or about community service activities supported by the chapter was available on-line. In fact it was difficult to assess whether this club is active as the most recent events discussed on-line took place in 2005. The interviewee noted that some Moore MBA students are also involved in the Finance Club which engages in activities related to microfinance, while still others participate in the National Association of Women MBAs that addresses social concerns for women. The Moore Association of Women MBA’s website indicates that members of the club are also engaged in service to the community by supporting a local food bank.

Faculty Service & Consultation

Faculty engagement with the community is not a focus for Moore. The interviewee revealed that although one faculty member is very involved with economic development in Africa, there is no requirement for this kind of activity. Moore’s
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manager of communications also indicated that because the goal of the school is to be consistently top ranked, much of their efforts are placed on work that will help achieve this end. Research is the most heavily emphasized in faculty evaluation, with teaching also valued significantly. Service is not part of faculty evaluation or compensation. An examination of faculty biographical statements and vita on-line revealed that 13 were engaged in service activities outside of service to the university or positions on the editorial boards of journals. Most of the service activities reported by faculty were to professional associations. Four of the school’s 122 faculty members reported roles on the board of directors for non-profits, two reported being actively engaged in service in civic, non-profits, and religious organizations in their communities. Faculty consultation with community, government, and not-for-profit organizations was also limited, with six reporting consulting work for public, non-profit, or government organizations. For example, two Moore professors served on the governor’s task force to evaluate and improve operations within South Carolina’s Department of Motor Vehicles.

Institutional Service

The extent of Moore’s direct engagement with the communities in which it operates appears to reside largely within the Institutes and Centers it hosts. The interviewee pointed to the school’s Center for International Business Education and Research (CIBER) Center as one institute which supports the community, but provided nothing of substance to illustrate the CIBER Center’s engagement efforts. Moore’s CIBER Center website provided the detail needed to more clearly understand its external reach and focus. There we found that the CIBER Center at Moore is engaged in a variety of activities with a social focus. The center sponsors a working paper series dedicated
primarily to such areas as microfinance, the interaction between global business and homeland security, and the interaction between multinational corporations and institutional environments (Moore CIBER Center, 2007). In collaboration with Duke University, the CIBER Center provides a web-based program called InterCulture Edge (ICE) to teach cross-cultural awareness in business settings, conducts research on cross-cultural issues, and develops new cross-cultural teaching approaches and materials to use in MBA, EMBA, and undergraduate business programs. The center also works in partnership with a variety of universities to bring together people dedicated to increasing the quality and impact of research on people and their effectiveness in international organizations through a cooperative called the International Organization Network or ION (Moore CIBER Center, 2007).

When it comes to outreach, the CIBER Center at Moore provides businesses with programs and research related to international business, develops faculty to effectively teach and research in areas related to international business; offers faculty, including those from Historically Black Universities, with scholarships to promote faculty development, travel, and study abroad; offers research grants to promote the study of international business issues; and holds conferences, seminars, and workshops for regional and state businesses and organizations. Moore’s CIBER Center also sponsors research on international business issues. We found a number of CIBER-sponsored research projects over the last several years focused on working cross-culturally, managing diverse teams, technology, and international business, and one study examining issues related to ethics in leadership.
Other centers and institutes at Moore that address social issues include the Division of Research (DOR), the Center for Business Communication, and the Riegel & Emory Human Resource Research Center (Moore School of Business, 2007). Information available on the Division of Research's website indicates that this center is actively engaged in research, education, and publications related to economic forecasting for the state and region. DOR is also the home of two non-profit centers for business education and support:

- The South Carolina Council on Economic Education, which provides K-12 teachers with education in economics and personal finance to be used in the classroom.
- The Export Consortium providing research and training to economic development agencies and small and medium businesses designed to help them "compete in the global marketplace" (Moore Division of Research, 2007).

The Center for Business Communication teaches faculty, staff, students, and alumni how to write, speak, and use visual communications in the workplace, and provides classes for these groups on topics ranging from intercultural communication, teamwork and small group communication, to English as a Second Language. The Riegel & Emory Human Resource Research Center funds research on issues that include work values, teams in the multinational corporation, and workplace dispute resolution (The Riegel & Emory Human Resource Research Center, 2007). It was interesting to note that the advisory board for this center, not unlike boards for other centers across business schools, is comprised almost entirely of individuals from for-profit...
organizations, with one exception. Business leaders share advisory board duties at the Riegel & Emory Human Resource Research Center with representatives from a major labor union as well.

Continuing Education

Education of the community, including business leaders, and continuing education of alumni by Moore extends beyond the efforts of the school’s institutes and centers just described. The Executive Education Division offers a program for South Carolina school administrators (Moore School of Business, Program News, 2007). This program is a collaborative effort with the Department of Education and USC’s College of Education. As a continuation of the training participants receive through the Center for Creative Leadership in Greensboro, North Carolina, the 12-course program trains 75 superintendents, principals, and assistant principles per year in areas, such as strategic thinking and analysis, crisis preparedness, project management, and using data-driven decision making. Besides this program, the Executive Education Division offers a variety of courses and programs on leadership and business management, many of which either address skills needed for socially responsible leadership or for leadership in global economy (See Table 26 for examples). Unlike the core and elective courses included in the school’s MBA programs, class offerings sponsored by this division frequently note the use of teaching techniques that promote social awareness including small group work, case studies, and application. The Executive Education Division also conducts an annual Economic Outlook Conference.
Table 26: Sample Courses and Programs Offered by Moore’s Executive Education Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Leading the Global Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Internationalizing Faculty and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Customized International Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Strategic Thinking and Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leading High Performing Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhancing Communication Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assertiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advanced Negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Balanced Scorecard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Socially Directed Research

While the president’s vision for the University of South Carolina articulates a research agenda for the institution, a similar agenda does not exist within the business school. The interviewee noted that there is a significant research focus within Moore on issues related to international business. Within the school, she reported that faculty members investigate issues of interest to them, including social responsibility. The researcher checked these assertions against faculty vitas and biographical statements on Moore’s website and found a wider array of research in areas with social and/or environmental implications or in areas related to the competencies needed to lead in a global and technology rich economy. A summary of findings related to research with environmental or social implications can be found in Table 27.

Faculty Diversity

When it comes to the diversity of Moore’s faculty, the interviewee revealed little beyond a statement that “it is a very diverse group internationally, with faculty drawn
Table 27: Summary of Moore Faculty Research with Social and/or Environmental Implications (as Reported by Faculty)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Area</th>
<th>Number of Faculty with Interest/Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Issues/Problems</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking, decision making</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity/Cross-Cultural Issues</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teams</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability/Environmental Impact</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

from India, Latin America, Asia, and Japan.” No information was forthcoming in the interview about the ethnic makeup of U.S.-born faculty despite this being a question on the Beyond Grey Pinstripes survey. Data about female and minority faculty at Moore was also not available. When asked about efforts to recruit female and minority faculty members, the interviewee indicated that she didn’t know of any specific efforts or initiatives to do so.

**Student Diversity**

More information about the ethnic makeup of students in the International MBA program was uncovered in both the interview and on-line. The Marketing Communications Manager (2007) shared that between 4 and 5% of MBA seats are filled by international students, and 4.5% of MBA students are underrepresented minorities (See Table 28 for a detailed breakdown). This number (8.5%-9.5%) includes U.S. minorities and international students. The interviewee reports that Moore engages in “recruiting events” in an effort to attract minority students. No specific information about recruiting strategies or practices was offered during the interview or available on the school’s website.
Table 28: Minority Makeup of Moore’s MBA Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Moore’s MBA Student Enrollment</th>
<th>State Population (South Carolina)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Leaders on Campus

Guest speakers in the classroom and in lecture series open to students and the public appears to be an exceptional occurrence at Moore instead of a regular part of the school’s educational and outreach activities. Even within the school’s institutes and centers, which often sponsor regular lecture series with specific themes at other business schools, little mention is made of such initiatives. The interviewee, drawing from the school’s Pinstripes survey, highlighted one example of guest speakers in the IMBA program’s sustainable development course, the Global Environmental Management Initiative (GEMI), and two examples of external speakers presenting to business school students, faculty, and staff on topics ranging from microfinance to social responsibility, ethics, community based development, and leadership for sustainable development.

A detailed examination of the course descriptions of all core and elective courses offered through Moore found only one instance (in the elective, Leadership in Organizations) where a faculty member noted the use of a guest speaker as a component of the class. The business school hosts a regular lecture series (The Wachovia Executive Lecture Series) that is open to business leaders in the community and required of all first year MBA students as well. The interviewer noted that within this series, speakers address issues of sustainability and social responsibility.
Summary

The Moore School of Business at the University of South Carolina enacts its social compact in a number of visible ways. Moore’s increasing curricular and co-curricular focus on social responsibility and sustainability reflect, not only an alignment with USC’s mission and strategy but responsiveness to a growing demand from students for opportunities to learn about these issues. The presence of a Net Impact chapter on campus and invitations to outside speakers to lecture on issues related to social and environmental impact management are further demonstrations of the social contract. The business school’s significant focus on the development of competencies needed to function in a global marketplace through extensive coursework on international business, culture, and language, three to four month-long required internships in multinational firms or international organizations, and study-abroad options serves as another illustration of Moore’s social awareness.

With a service-focused mission, Moore has great potential to become a socially responsive business school. If it elects to strengthen faculty and student diversity, ethics education, community service, interdisciplinary teaching and learning, and educational opportunities that promote interpersonal skills and analytic thinking, research with a social impact, the business school at the University of South Carolina will more fully prepare its students for civic and social engagement and will more wholly demonstrate its own responsibility to society.
CHAPTER 11

CASE: COLLEGE OF MANAGEMENT, GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Background

The Director of the Institute for Leadership and Entrepreneurship and former dean of Georgia Institute of Technology's (Georgia Tech) College of Management was interviewed for this study. The interview was conducted over the telephone and lasted 48 minutes. The interview was tape-recorded and transcribed. Supplemental data was not received from the business school. As a result, the researcher relied heavily on supplemental material in her efforts to confirm or refute information presented during the interview.

The interviewee seemed to be truly committed to the concept of social responsibility as indicated by several comments she made during our conversation and evidenced by the research center she founded, which is committed to socially responsible business practices. In a particularly telling comment, she shared, "...Some of my alums will say, 'Oh, you're a bleeding heart,' and I tell them I am proud to be a bleeding heart."

The former dean of the College of Management responded to the researcher's request to review the case by returning a number of fact changes to her by the deadline established. Corrected information is included in this summary.
Institutional Context

The Georgia Institute of Technology was established in 1885 in Atlanta, Georgia as a technological school designed to provide citizens with the skills needed to rebuild the "economy left devastated by the Civil War" and to bring the agrarian South into the Industrial Age (Georgia Tech Alumni Magazine Online, 2004). The school's founding is described as a "demonstration of a post-[Civil] War philosophy embracing cooperation with the North to establish Southern self-sufficiency through industrialization" (Georgia Tech Alumni Magazine Online, 2004). In 1948, the institution changed its name from the Georgia School of Technology to the Georgia Institute of Technology to reflect its evolution from a trade school to a technical institute and research university.

Today, Georgia Tech is a top-tier research institution with an endowment that exceeds $1 billion. With campuses located in downtown Atlanta; Savannah, Georgia; Metz, France; Shanghai, China; and Singapore, Georgia Tech offers bachelor's, master's, and doctoral programs to almost 18,000 students. The university confers degrees in architecture, engineering, the sciences, computing, management, and liberal arts and receives accolades for its engineering programs (Facts & Figures, 2007). U.S. News and World Reports consistently places Tech among the top 10 public universities in the United States.

Georgia Tech describes itself as the "technological university of the 21st century" (Georgia Tech Alumni Magazine Online, 2004) and prides itself on its efforts to infuse technology into all of its undergraduate and graduate programs. Over the past several years, Georgia Tech and its president, G. Wayne Clough, have been recognized as leaders in the United States' efforts to transform its industrial economy to an information
economy. In the 2006 reissue of the best selling book, *The World is Flat*, author and economist Thomas Friedman holds Georgia Tech out as a model academy for global transformation. Friedman highlights the school’s extensive use of collaboration, innovation, integration of the arts and science, and a technology-based educational platform as educational tools necessary for successful competition in the economy of the 21st. President Clough was appointed by George W. Bush to the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology in 2001 and to the National Science Board in 2004. Georgia Tech’s president also co-chairs the National Innovation Initiative, a council of business, educational, labor, and public sector leaders partnering to harness innovation in technology, ideas, and processes to create “better jobs, higher wages, and a higher standard of living” (Council on Competitiveness, 2004).

The mission of the Georgia Institute of Technology reflects its commitment to using technology, science, and innovation to promote economic development and sustainability and an enhanced quality of life for citizens of the state it serves. Community outreach, as well as education and research are tools that the university identifies as means it uses to achieve its purpose. Table 29 contains the complete Georgia Tech mission statement.

Table 29: Georgia Institute of Technology Mission Statement

| The mission of Georgia Tech is "to provide the state of Georgia with the scientific and technological knowledge base, innovation, and workforce it needs to shape a prosperous and sustainable future and quality of life for its citizens." The mission is "achieved through educational excellence, innovative research, and outreach in selected areas of endeavor" (Strategic Plan of Georgia Tech, 2002, p. 1). |
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Georgia Tech’s core values reflect a commitment to a number of key principles and practices. These include:

- ethical, moral, and service oriented leadership
- preparation of students for participation in a global society through education that imparts “a greater awareness and appreciation of broader differences in language, culture, and custom” (Strategic Plan, 2002, p. 4), and
- educational experiences for all students that are grounded in the liberal arts and provide students with the education that includes an appreciation of the “social and human context of science and technology” (Strategic Plan, 2002, p. 4).

Georgia Tech’s most recent strategic plan, updated and published in 2002, identifies a variety of tactics to achieve the university’s mission while addressing challenges and opportunities the school faces. This document elucidates a vision for the university’s future that expands Tech’s focus beyond the state, to the nation and the world and positions the institution as the model for technological research universities in the 21st century. In the 2002 strategic plan, Georgia Tech acknowledges its “responsibility to advance society toward a proper, fair, and sustainable future” (p. 2) and identifies the need for partnerships with public and private sector organizations in order to ensure that its scientific discoveries are disseminated to, benefit, and are widely used in society.

Among its strengths, Georgia Tech identifies a number of socially important issues including a diverse student body; research that drives regional, national, and international economic growth; education that produces leaders “concerned with the welfare of their communities and environments” (Strategic Plan, 2002, p. 2); and
buildings and campuses that facilitate interaction and collaboration within the university and out to the communities the university serves. Georgia Tech's strengths in terms of student diversity appear to be largely derived from the recognition it receives for the percentage of Black students and faculty in its engineering programs. In a 1998 press release put out by the university, the school reported the results of a survey published by The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education that found Georgia Tech, with 6.5% of its engineering students identified as Black, "far [outdistancing] the school with the next largest number of Black graduate students, the University of Maryland, with African Americans comprising 5.8% percent of their graduate engineering class” (Lange, S., 1998). Lange (1998) compares Georgia Tech's Black engineering faculty at 3.9% with the 1.5% percent of Black engineering faculty employed by other top-ranked graduate engineering programs.

In its reflection on its opportunities, Georgia Tech targets a lack of sufficient diversity among students and faculty and the need to "meet the lifelong learning demand of non-traditional and off-campus students” (Strategic Plan, 2002, p. 3). Demographic data provided by the university through its department of Institutional Research and Planning supports the school’s assertion of a need to improve institutional diversity. In 2006, 45 years after Georgia Tech voluntarily opened its doors to African American students, Blacks make up just 6% of the school's total enrollment. Black students comprise 7% of total undergraduate enrollment and 5% of graduate enrollment (Georgia Institute of Technology, History & Traditions, 2006).

These numbers are particularly troubling when one compares Georgia Tech's Black student enrollment to the demographic composition of the city and state that hosts
the school. African Americans make up 61.4% of Atlanta’s population and 29.8% of the state’s citizenry (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001). At Georgia Tech, students identifying as Hispanic make up 4% of the school’s total enrollment, 4% of the university’s undergraduate population, and 2.5% of its graduate student body (Georgia Institute of Technology, Institutional Research & Planning, 2006). Native American’s at Georgia Tech make up less than 1% of its total enrollment (Georgia Institute of Technology, Institutional Research & Planning, 2006). Enrollment of both Hispanics and Native Americans more closely mirrors the groups’ representation at the state and local level. Hispanics make up 7.1% of the populace in Atlanta, and 4.5% of the population in the state (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001). Native Americans at the state and local levels represent fewer than 1% of the citizenship (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001). Three percent of Georgia Tech’s fulltime teaching faculty are identified as Black, 2% are Hispanic, and far less than 1% are Native American (Georgia Tech Fact Book, 2006).

Many of Georgia Tech’s strategic goals reflect its compact with society. The most notable of these objectives include: the university’s focus on providing a students with “learner-centered education that prepares them for life and leadership” (Strategic Plan, 2002, p. 4); cross-disciplinary research that reflects the school’s commitment to “social responsibility and sustainability” conducted through collaboration with “other universities, industry, and government” (Strategic Plan, 2002, p. 6); using outreach and collaboration to promote local, national, and global economic development that improves the “economic conditions for all citizens” (Strategic Plan, 2002, p. 7); using technology to enhance student learning (at Georgia Tech and within the state’s K-12 educational system) and promote lifelong learning for alumni and professionals; leading and
administering the university in a collaborative, socially responsible, and ethical manner; and conducting facilities improvements and additions that use environmentally responsible designs and practices and promote cross-campus collaboration and cooperative relationships with neighbors.

An example of how Georgia Tech enacts these strategic goals was offered by the head of the university’s Institute of Leadership and Entrepreneurship during an interview for this study. Five Georgia Tech student associations, Georgia Tech African Students’ Association, Georgia Tech Alpha Phi Omega, Georgia Tech Engineering World Health, and Georgia Tech Phi Kappa Sigma, are engaged with a non-profit called MedShare International (MedShare International, 2007). MedShare collects unused medical equipment destined for landfills and redistributes it to medical organizations in emerging economies. Engineering students from Georgia Tech support the organization by repairing and refurbishing equipment, ensuring its readiness for re-use.

Specific strategic tactics reflecting the social compact include expansion of cooperative education programs, ensuring student opportunities to learn in non-profit, state, federal, and for-profit organizations; providing at least one-third of all Georgia Tech students with the opportunity to have an international study experience prior to graduation; expanding the school’s international presence and outreach efforts through partnerships with universities and other local and state organizations in Europe, Asia-Pacific, Asia, and Central and South America; increasing enrollment of female and under-represented minority students to 30% and 15% (respectively) of total enrollment; and institutionalizing best practices to recruit, promote and retain minority and female faculty members (Strategic Plan, 2002).
Georgia Institute of Technology’s commitment to sustainability captured in its mission and strategy manifests in the school’s *Twenty-Year Agenda*. Crafted in 1992 to bring Tech’s commitment to sustainability to life, the *Twenty-Year Agenda* details a strategy for institutional transformation and dedicates time and resources to its fulfillment. The plan to institutionalize sustainability into all facets of the university “began by engaging faculty and investing in research programs that advance [an] understanding of the many [aspects] of sustainable technology and development” and expanded to encompass interdisciplinary research “using innovative research neighborhoods and designated resources to promote collaboration” (Institute for Sustainable Technology and Development, 2007).

Building sustainability into the institution’s activities and practices meant incorporating this commitment into the school’s recycling and purchasing programs and into its campus master plan. Sustainability is the theme that runs through facilities and space planning at Georgia Tech, where its master plan uses green buildings, renewable energy and energy conservation, restoration of ecosystem functioning on campus, design and policies that reduce automobile traffic on campus and promote walking and biking, designs that promote cross-campus and campus to community collaboration, and eco-commons concepts “to manage the built environment” (Institute for Sustainable Technology and Development, 2007). Georgia Tech is entering the next phase of its *Twenty-Year Agenda*. This requires the university to build “sustainability into [all of its] academic programs….” in order to ensure that all Tech students receive an education that facilitates the ability to promote sustainable practices at home, in the community, and in the workplace (Institute for Sustainable Technology & Development, 2007).
Social Responsibility at the College of Management

The physical structure and location, curriculum and educational offerings, research, institutes, and activities of the College of Management at the Georgia Institute of Technology demonstrates the university’s commitment to sustainability, collaboration, and technology and reveals strong alignment with the university’s strategic plan. The College of Management occupies a L.E.E.D. certified green building in Technology Square in downtown Atlanta. Technology Square is a multi-use complex that incorporates many of Georgia Tech’s educational, research, and economic development activities with retail and hospitality features, all designed to enhance community and business access to and engagement with the university and ensconce Tech more firmly in one of the primary neighborhoods it serves. In an overview of the project, Georgia Tech describes Technology Square as the home to:

- The College of Management, with 189,000 square feet of classrooms, offices, and learning resource space, including Executive Education and Interdisciplinary Centers;
- The 252-room Georgia Tech Hotel and Conference Center, featuring an Executive Conference Center with 21,000 square feet of meeting space including a Grand Ballroom that can serve up to 600 people;
- A Global Learning and Conference center, including 113,000 square-feet dedicated to classrooms, computing labs, offices, and distance learning;
- A research building and the Advanced Technology Development Center;
- The Economic Development Institute, devoted to growing Georgia’s economy through technology-driven solutions;
• The Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development, a research center to study metro-Atlanta as a living laboratory for mixed-use development and related issues;
• The first ever bookstore in the neighborhood;
• Retail stores, restaurants, and parking; and
• Close proximity to rapid rail stations and the city’s international airport (Georgia Institute of Technology, Technology Square, 2004).

The university envisions Technology Square as a vehicle for outreach to the local community and the world as it seeks to harness technology to transform the economy of the state and nation and improve the economic standing of citizens of Georgia, the United States, and the world.

Community Access

The design and location of the Technology Square complex were chosen to benefit the city, region, state, university, and the College of Management. Locating the business school in the heart of the Atlanta business district promotes relationship development and accessibility between business students and faculty at Georgia Tech and emerging and established companies. Close proximity between the school and industry is seen by the university and the College of Management as a means of connecting students with research and consulting opportunities, co-operative jobs and internships, and employment opportunities upon graduation. The placement of Georgia Tech’s College of Management in the hub of commerce in the state reaffirms the College’s commitment to technology and community outreach and positions the business school to achieve a number of key objectives. These include the doubling of the size of its MBA program;
increasing its executive education programs and offerings; creation of stronger ties to the business community; promoting accessible executive and continuing education in a state-of-the-art setting; the ability to offer more classes to non-management students; and the chance for the business school to “explore new interdisciplinary programs with other Tech colleges and schools” (Georgia Institute of Technology, 2004).

The new home of the College of Management at Georgia Tech uses the latest developments in technology to promote digital-learning within and beyond the school’s walls. Students attending the College of Management in Atlanta find a learning environment replete with high-speed digital and wireless networks; electronic whiteboards and “Smart” podiums; and technology-based pedagogical tools that allow for interactive polling, electronic discussions, distance learning, videoconferencing, and more (Georgia Institute of Technology, 2004). These technological tools and features can also be found within the Hotel and Conference Center in support of the business school and university’s efforts to promote digital outreach and education, expanding their reach into the international marketplace (Georgia Institute of Technology, 2004).

Mission

The College of Management at Georgia Tech in 2007 stands in stark contrast to the school it was when it was founded almost 100 years earlier. In 1912, Georgia Institute of Technology began offering business education through the School of Commerce. In 1934, the university introduced an Industrial Management program “to meet the need for management training in a technical environment” (Georgia Institute of Technology, 2006, p. 1). Today, the College of Management offers bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral degrees in business using a “multidisciplinary focus on management of
technology, international business, and entrepreneurial and innovative processes” (Georgia Institute of Technology, 2006, p. 1). The business school is committed to “international education, ethical and sustainable business practices, technology, and innovation” (Salbu, S., 2007), and its mission dedicates the school and its resources to “preparing business leaders for changing technological environments (AACSB, 2004).

**Interdisciplinary Learning**

The business school at Georgia Tech enrolls over 1,000 full and part-time undergraduates, just under 200 MBA students, around 70 Executive MBA students, and about 40 doctoral students (AACSB, 2004). The College of Management offers an MBA in general business and two specialized masters programs, a Master of Science in Quantitative and Computational Finance and a Master of Management of Technology (AACSB, 2004). At Georgia Tech an MBA can also be paired with any other graduate program from the university (Dean’s Report, 2006). In 2007, in response to demand from working professionals, the College of Management will begin offering a part-time Evening MBA program for the first time in its history (Dean’s Report, 2006). Within the MBA program, small class sizes are maintained in order to promote a “close knit community and enriching student and faculty relationships” (Georgia Tech College of Management 2007 MBA Viewbook, 2006, p.6).

In 2007, U.S. News and World Report (2007) gave the College of Management a 25th place ranking. When comparing the Tech MBA with other internationally focused programs, the Financial Times (2007) ranked the program 97th. Forbes (2007) puts the Georgia Tech MBA program in 48th place, and mbaprograms.org (2007) rates the MBA program at Georgia Tech 27th. In the most recent *Beyond Grey Pinstripes* report, the
World Resources and Aspen Institutes ranked the College of Management 69th in terms of its research and teaching activities towards sustainable business practices.

During our interview, the former dean noted that she is sure that College of Management alumni would be happier to see the school garner higher rankings than they currently have. She, however, would be happier to have the school graduating students “concerned with the common good.” How a school balances these two desires, the former dean explained, is a big concern for business schools moving forward. She continued, “Having the wisdom and the courage to put all of your extra resources [into producing socially responsible leaders and engaged citizens instead of] into branding and public relations...is really an important aspect of business education [today and into the future]. I think as a profession, we don’t have the courage to do that.” This is the tradeoff leaders of business schools face. When pushed to make a choice, she said, administrators go for the ratings.

Stakeholders

The former dean of the business school at Georgia Tech identified the school’s stakeholders as students, employers, faculty, alumni, and the community. The College of Management serves its undergraduate and graduate students by providing them with a good education and preparation for life (Interview, 2006). The school attends to its MBA students by maintaining a program that is competitive with benchmarked schools and providing them with the “accoutrements they need...to keep them happy” (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006). For its doctoral students, the school focuses on being a “high quality research program, preparing only fulltime students for academic careers” (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006). Executive education and executive MBA
students form another constituency for the College of Management, which serves this group by offering them educational offerings that focus on innovation, leadership, international business, and technology management in a professional, state-of-the-art environment (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006).

Service to employers is delivered by preparing students to meet the demands of the workplace (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006). This means “paying particular attention to making sure that students [are proficient in] critical thinking, teamwork, and decision making…while being sensitive to cross-cultural issues that are going to be more important in the future” (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006). Students leave the business school at Georgia Tech as leaders who are not simply concerned with making money or delivering profits for a company, but who are also concerned about social and environmental sustainability (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006).

The former dean of the College of Management (2006) noted that the business school supports its faculty by helping them to maintain a manageable workload “while giving them incredible rewards…and the tools they need to reach our high aspirations for their teaching and…research.” The College of Management attends to the needs of its alumni by “trying to increase the reputation of the brand of their degree” and by inviting them to serve on the school’s advisory board where they can share insights about how to improve the business school and its offerings (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006). The community is served by the College of Management by providing organizations with student interns and volunteers and by graduating well-educated students who are will lead “for the common good” because they are well-grounded in
“business principles that make the world and the community a better place” (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006). The business school also serves the community by helping to shape public policy at the local, state, and national level (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006).

Defining Social Responsibility

Social responsibility is becoming an increasingly important issue at the College of Management. Within the business school at Georgia Tech, social responsibility is defined as doing well economically while attending to issues of environmental sustainability (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006). The former dean explained that the business school also considers cultural and global awareness and concern about social issues and diversity as other critical components of social responsibility.

According to the former dean of the business school, the College of Management and the larger institution to which it belongs are concerned with “walking the talk” on sustainability. Constructing a new home for the school that is energy efficient, uses renewable energy, and is certified by L.E.E.D. as a “green” building, the first of its kind at Georgia Tech, represents this commitment to practicing what the school preaches.

Commitment to social responsibility at the College of Management can be found in an administration that “is very serious about wanting to have graduates who care” (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006). To produce graduates who are concerned with issues beyond themselves and the financial bottom line requires the College of Management to infuse this concept into all of their programs and into the work the school does with its “K-12 partners” (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006).
Courses and Experiences in Social Responsibility and Sustainability

You won’t find a required course on social responsibility or sustainability in any of the programs within the College of Management. This, the former dean asserts, is because the college wants the concept “baked into the bricks” of its curriculum. Examination of the College of Management’s curricular offerings following the interview supports the former dean’s claims. The two-year, fulltime, general MBA program at Georgia Tech does not require students to attend individual courses on social responsibility or sustainability, but includes an Integrative Management Experience as a capstone at the end of the program. The College of Management does offer electives on sustainability at the master’s, doctoral, and undergraduate level.

The drive to incorporate sustainability and social responsibility into the business school’s programs, curriculum, and practices is led not just by its leaders, but by its students as well. In 2003, Georgia Tech students launched the 101st chapter of Net Impact in the business school (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006), and all of the school’s fulltime MBA students are members of this organization. The club’s charter calls for the partnership with college faculty and administrators to integrate the concept of social responsibility into all college activities and practices (Interview, 2006; Net Impact at Georgia Tech, 2007). One way that Georgia Tech’s Net Impact chapter has changed a fundamental practice within the business school is by influencing organizers of the annual Business Plan Competition to introduce a Social and Environmental Sustainability Award. Contestants now have the chance to compete for recognition and a cash prize given to the plan that best incorporates concepts of social and/or environmental sustainability into its design (Net Impact at Georgia Tech, 2007). Net
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Impact at Georgia Tech is also concerned with helping students to become effective civic leaders. To that end, the club established a Board Fellows Program that affords MBA students opportunities to learn more about non-profits and philanthropy. This program allows Georgia Tech MBAs the chance to serve “as non-voting members on Atlanta-area non-profit boards...[in order to promote an] awareness of board roles and functions” (Net Impact at Georgia Tech, 2007).

Sustainability and social responsibility form the backbone of a number of the College of Management’s Institutes and initiatives, especially within the Institute for Leadership and Entrepreneurship (ILE) established and led by the school’s former dean. The ILE is an interdisciplinary institute concerned with promoting values-driven leadership that supports “economic growth, social responsibility, and environmental sustainability” (Institute for Leadership and Entrepreneurship, 2007; Interview, 2006). The research, curricular, and co-curricular activities sponsored by the institute are designed to develop leadership capabilities that include self-awareness, cultural sensitivity, social responsibility, and citizenship (Institute for Leadership and Entrepreneurship, 2007; Interview, 2006). ILE partners with other colleges, units, disciplines, students, and groups across the Georgia Tech campus and with other colleges, universities, interest groups, corporations, government and non-governmental agencies, and non-profits to create educational offerings, research studies, and initiatives that promote ethical, attentive, and responsible leadership (Institute for Leadership and Entrepreneurship, 2007).

The Institute for Leadership and Entrepreneurship offers interdisciplinary courses at the undergraduate and graduate level and continuing education programs for business
and community leaders that are designed to empower people from “every industry and discipline to take the economical, social, and environmental impact of their actions into consideration when making every day business decisions,” increasingly the likelihood that they will be agents of positive change in their organizations and their communities (Institute for Leadership and Entrepreneurship, 2007). ILE courses use team-based learning, case studies, experiential learning, and guest speakers from business, government and non-governmental agencies, and non-profits, and other pedagogical tools to “expose [students] to the cultural, economic, and social issues they’ll face as leaders...in order to...better [prepare them] to perform in an increasingly complex world” (Institute for Leadership and Entrepreneurship, 2007).

The institute also convenes meetings and panels to discuss and address emerging issues including domestic and international microfinance and hosts the weekly Impact Speaker Series providing students, alumni, faculty, and the community the chance to network with and learn from entrepreneurs, venture capitalists, and business leaders (Institute for Leadership and Entrepreneurship, 2007; Former Dean, College of Management, 2006). Among its various research projects, the ILE is currently engaged in a sustainable transportation project in partnership with Ford and Georgia Tech’s Institute for Sustainable Technology and Development (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006).

Georgia Tech’s College of Management blends issues of social responsibility, ethics, and environmental sustainability into its curriculum. Instead of focusing on stand-alone required courses in social responsibility and sustainability, the school integrates these themes across its curriculum at the undergraduate and graduate level. The decision
not to create majors in sustainability and not to require individual courses in this subject area and in social responsibility was a deliberate one. The former dean explained that the administration wants sustainability to “be put through the whole curriculum at Georgia Tech.” She shared that the same goes for leadership. She declared, “I can’t certify somebody to be a leader” by having them take a few classes in leadership and then “have the impression they can lead.” Instead, the College of Management holds the belief that when students receive an integrative education focused on leadership and sustainability, they will graduate truly knowing how to lead in sustainable, responsible ways.

**Ethics Education**

Ethics is not a stand-alone course in the MBA program either. Instead, it is a one credit module in a required class. In other courses within the MBA program like accounting and supply chain management, the former dean asserted, students encounter discussions and curricular activities directed toward ethics, social responsibility and sustainability. The College of Management’s ECLIPS Center offers business students a number of specialized courses and electives on ethics, sustainability and social responsibility, including: *Business and the Environment, Ethics of Business Sustainability, and Business Ethics* for MBA and MS students, and *Environmental Considerations in Managerial Decision-Making* for PhD students (ECLIPS, 2007). Additionally, at the end of the MBA program, students participate in “some special topics classes on ethics and sustainability” (Interview, 2006).
A Responsive Curriculum

Admitting about 75 new students a year, the Tech fulltime MBA program focuses on the development of global technology management and interpersonal skills. According to the MBA program brochure (2007), the school’s decision to make interpersonal skills as important as general management and technology management capabilities is driven by studies finding that 98% of CEOs feel that communication skills are critical to a leader’s success in organizations today. As such, all Georgia Tech MBA students complete an 18-hour communications skills course, learn in small classes, using experiential learning, and team projects to develop the requisite social capabilities for 21st century leadership. Participation in the Graduate Students in Management Organization, a requirement of all Tech MBA’s, offers students further opportunities to hone these skills through networking, social events, guest speakers, and community service projects.

Student Volunteerism

Volunteerism and community service are not required of business students at Georgia Tech. The Director of ILE explained that community service may be undertaken as class projects, for example, through practicum classes in the MBA program, or may be completed independently. She noted that the college “greatly encourages” but does not grant credit for service activities. One example of a class sponsored service project at the MBA level is one in which a faculty member and his students explored the feasibility of growing soybeans in South America as a source of bio-fuel for a U.S. company (2007 MBA Viewbook). Some business school students also volunteer with Tech Bridge, an organization that provides IT support and consulting to non-profit groups (Interview, 2006). The former dean of the business school cited MBA student clubs as a vehicle for
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providing service to the community, however, a subsequent examination of these clubs
and their activities found none, other than Net Impact, involved in any such activities. In
a follow-up communication with the researcher, the former dean of the College of
Management clarified that the school’s Entrepreneurship Club and Consulting Club
engage in community service work.

MBA students at Georgia Tech can find service opportunities through the
Graduate Student Membership Organization (GSM), the Philanthropy Committee, and
the Student Development Committee. Through the GSM, students engage in community
service projects and through the two committees students serve as donors or fundraisers
for the College of Management or outside charitable organizations. The MBA Office
also coordinates charitable giving and community service opportunities such as blood
drives, Habitat for Humanity, and others (Former Dean, College of Management, 2007).

Internships were offered as another means of providing service to the community
(Former Dean, College of Management, 2006). At the MBA level, internships are not
required, but are encouraged, and students receive credits for this work when it “has an
academic component to it” (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006). The former
dean explained that students participating in service-based internships at the
undergraduate level don’t receive college credit for their work, but do receive student
loan forgiveness for this activity (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006).
Internships and co-operative work experiences are available to Georgia Tech business
students in the private and public sectors, and the former dean noted, that some of the
school’s cooperative education partners donate their co-op experiences to the school
system. So, for example, the school might have a student assigned to a co-op experience
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Faculty Service

As with students, volunteerism and community service are not requirements for business school faculty at Georgia Tech (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006). The former dean shared that College of Management faculty are evaluated on service and indicated that “service could be service to the profession” or to the university. She went on to say, “I don’t know anybody who has gotten tenure [based] on service” (Interview, 2006). In the absence of this obligation, few faculty were found to report community-based service work. An examination of faculty vitas and biographies posted on-line found only two of the school’s 58 fulltime faculty involved in service to government or non-profit organizations and four indicated that they serve on not-for-profit boards. Most external service reported by faculty is delivered to professional organizations and editorial boards.

External service in terms of consulting work with businesses, government and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and non-profits was equally limited. Just 17 faculty members reported such work. Three faculty indicated that they were or had been engaged in consulting with non-profits or NGOs, four reported work with other universities, six indicated consulting work for for-profit businesses only, while another four reported consulting work with a variety of different types of organizations, including corporations, non-profits, and government agencies.

The director of the Institute for Leadership and Entrepreneurship shared that the school’s centers and institutes have discretionary funds and resources that are
periodically used to help encourage faculty to participate in community service projects that address socially important issues of problems. She explained, "It is essentially with our resources that we are able to buy people’s time to get them to do the things that we want done" and not through the use of evaluation and tenure review processes.

*Socially Directed Research*

The College of Management at Georgia Tech does not have a designated research agenda. Their focus instead is primarily on publications. Research conducted through different centers and institutes within the business school, however, does reflect the unique purposes of those entities. For example, Georgia Tech’s CIBER Center, a collaborative venture with the Ivan Allen College of Liberal Arts, works to “integrate and advance international business education, research, language training, international student and faculty exchanges, and executive education for the business community” (Georgia Tech CIBER, 2007). BIZ Lab is another research center within the College of Management. This center conducts interdisciplinary research combining disciplines like psychology and economics to study judgment and decision making, group behavior, information sharing and communication (Georgia Tech College of Management, Centers and Initiatives, 2007).

The College of Management at Georgia Tech also sponsors a Financial Analysis Lab that conducts “unbiased, independent stock market research” and produces reports designed to help market participants make informed investing choices that take into account accurate data regarding a firm’s earnings, cash flow, and stock prices (Georgia Tech College of Management, Centers and Initiatives, 2007). One of the issues addressed by the Financial Analysis Lab is “the identification of reporting practices that
give investors misleading signals, positive or negative, of corporate earning power” (Georgia Tech College of Management, Centers & Initiatives, 2007).

The former dean of the business school shared that there is a critical mass of faculty researching areas such as natural and sustainable systems building at the business school, and this group is attracting substantial funding from the federal government and other sectors. It is this influx of money that is helping the school’s administration to see an increasing value in research on sustainability at the business school (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006). In the absence of a research agenda in total and one focused on social issues in particular, it is not surprising to find the research interests of faculty following a variety of different strands. Table 30 provides a summary of the reported research interests and areas of study with a social focus for the faculty at the College of Management. One of the business school’s associate professors, Beril Toktay, is involved in the study of closed-loop supply chains or remanufacturing (also known as Re-X). Dr. Toktay heads Expanding Closed Loops in Production Systems (ECLIPS), an interdisciplinary research center dedicated to researching and teaching about remanufacturing, recycling, and the re-use of products. Toktay’s desire is to “see the idea of sustainable, environmentally friendly business practices incorporated into all of the College of Management programs” (2007 MBA Viewbook, p. 22).

Global Connections

Providing business students with an educational experience that prepares them to work in an increasingly global world is a focus at Georgia Tech. Full and part-time MBA students are required to take an international business elective and may pursue a specialty and/or a certificate in international business. Tech MBA’s may also complete
Table 30: College of Management Faculty Research Interests with a Social Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Area</th>
<th>Number of Faculty with Interest/Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teams/teamwork</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Issues (ex., substance abuse,</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>microfinance, corruption, volunteerism,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problems encountered by government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

international internships and participate in study-abroad opportunities. Georgia Tech also offers a Global Executive MBA (GEMBA) program focused on preparing students to conduct business in emerging economies. The 17 month GEMBA program includes two overseas residencies that incorporate lectures, company visits, and examination of the culture, social, and economic features of the regions of study (Global Executive MBA, 2007).

The Center for International Business Education and Research (CIBER Center) at Georgia Tech supports the business school's efforts to produce graduates with a global mindset. To this end, the center funds research on international business, assists with the development of international business curriculum, hosts conferences and other educational opportunities on global business issues, facilitates overseas educational opportunities for business students and faculty, coordinates international internships and cooperative work experiences, supports international academic research projects conducted by students and faculty, and creates partnerships with colleges and universities in Mexico, South America, Europe, Asia, and the Pacific (Georgia Tech CIBER, 2007). At the MBA level, the CIBER Center also supports the graduate certificate in
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international management, the Global Executive MBA, and study abroad programs (Georgia Tech CIBER, 2007). According to the former dean of the business school at Georgia Tech, the College of Management has a goal of getting 50% of its students into an international learning experience. Joint programs across the world, internship and cooperative learning experiences in other countries, and opportunities to specialize in international business at the undergraduate and masters level are tools the school is using to reach this target (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006).

**Other Tactics**

Technology is another driving force in the curriculum at the College of Management. Georgia Tech full and part-time MBA students are required to take one course in technology and may pursue a certificate and/or concentration in technology management. Global Executive MBA students are required to take three courses that focus on or emphasize technology in management. Georgia Tech also offers an Executive Masters in Management of Technology that prepares students to be “strategic planners, technology innovators, and successful entrepreneurs” (Georgia Tech Executive Masters, 2007).

**Faculty Diversity**

Gender and ethnic diversity within the faculty at the College of Management is admittedly a challenge (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006). The former dean of the business school, a woman, shared that attracting more women into faculty positions both within the business school and across Georgia Tech has been a focus and a problem for a number of years. Today, the former dean said, women make up 15% of business school faculty. Data from Georgia Tech’s department of Institutional Research
and Planning (2006) shows the number of fulltime female faculty members at the College of Management is about 19%, slightly higher than the former dean’s estimate. This number rises when one takes into account professors in practice, visiting lecturers, and other non-tenure-track teaching staff.

The former dean described racial diversity at the college as dismal and compares the troubles the business school has had attracting ethnic minorities to teaching positions with the ease with which the school has been able to attract international faculty, particularly from China and India (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006). Demographic information from the department of Institutional Research and Planning (2006) indicated that the business school has no underrepresented minorities in their fulltime teaching staff. It is interesting to note that the College of Management is the only college at Georgia Tech with no underrepresented minorities in fulltime teaching positions. Despite efforts to replicate successful Black faculty recruitment practices used in the College of Engineering and offering competitive pay packages, the business school is losing potential African American faculty to top-tier schools like Wharton, Northwestern, and NYU (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006).

Student Diversity

Creating a diverse student body is another admitted struggle for the College of Management, despite the belief of its leaders that a diverse student body enriches and supplements academic learning” (2007 MBA Viewbook, p. 5). The former dean of the business school described gender diversity within the fulltime MBA program as “not very high” and attributes this to the way the program has been structured in the past. She
asserted that by only offering a fulltime MBA that requires incoming students to have four or five years of work experience, the school erected a barrier to women. The recent addition of a part-time evening MBA program is seen as a means of increasing gender diversity within Georgia Tech's MBA programs.

The interview revealed no additional information about the demographic makeup of students within the College of Management. To help fill in the blanks, the researcher turned again to data from the department of Institutional Research and Planning at Georgia Tech and to the school's 2007 MBA Viewbook. The Viewbook reported that the class of 2008, which includes students attending the part-time, evening MBA program, will be 28% female, 28% international, and 18% U.S. minority (including Asian Americans). Statistics for graduate students in the College of Management for the 2006 school year reveals that 15% of the school's total graduate student body identify as underrepresented ethnic minorities (African American, Hispanic, Native American), with 8% of graduate students identifying as African American, 6% as Hispanic, and less than 1% as Native American (Institutional Research and Planning, 2006). These numbers include doctoral, master's, and MBA students and do not allow direct comparison with the data provided by the business school in its marketing brochure. No information was available either through the interview or on-line about programs and initiatives used by the College of Management to recruit or retain minority students. The lack of faculty and student diversity in the College of Management is reflected in the absence of student clubs for minorities. The College of Management is, however, home to the Women in Business student organization.
Diversity Building Education

Efforts to help business students develop an appreciation of differences includes the use of a tool called the Intercultural Development Inventory to assess student sensitivity to people who are different from them (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006). The results are then benchmarked against a UCLA database and are used to help create curricular and co-curricular programs at the undergraduate level that help promote greater cultural sensitivity. The use of team-based projects and experiential learning activities are other pedagogical techniques employed by College of Management faculty to teach students how to work with others who are different from them. While the former dean reported that students tend to “hate” working in teams the school is committed to their continued use.

Community Leaders Engaged on Campus

Learning from others at Georgia Tech extends beyond lessons learned from peers and from faculty. The College of Business, through its centers and institutes, student organizations, and faculty, regularly hosts lecture and speaker series, conferences, and forums on campus, allowing students, alumni, faculty, and the community the chance to meet and learn from entrepreneurs and leaders from a variety of industries and types of organizations. The dean regularly convenes an advisory board of alumni and business leaders who meet to discuss current business issues and to solicit input regarding improvements to the business school.

The College of Management reaches out to the community to offer a number of customized and open-enrollment education programs for business leaders and executives through its Huang Executive Education Center. Programs include general management,
technology management, Six Sigma, finance and accounting for non-financial managers, ethics in leadership, and organizational communication (Growenstein, L., 2003).

**Infrastructure**

The College of Management at Georgia Tech works to ensure that its strategic priorities including those related to curriculum, fundraising, program expansion, and others become reality through collaboration, alignment of day-to-day work with strategic goals, and by ensuring that what the school values and believes to be important are integrated into the school’s programs and practices. The former dean asserted that her colleagues at the College of Management believe, “If it's worth doing, it's worth integrating.” She continued, “When you don’t integrate strategic priorities into all you do, and you leave them as ‘set aside initiatives,’ they’ll often fall off when you have a change in leadership.”

**Interdisciplinary Learning**

The interview with the Director of the Institute for Leadership and Entrepreneurship and former dean of the business school concluded by asking her if there was anything else she’d like to share that would help to illuminate the College of Management's efforts related to social responsibility. In response, she offered, “Except for some core classes, all classes at the business school are open to the whole university. So, 30% of our credit hours are taken by non-management students...resulting in a diversity of disciplines and backgrounds in business school classrooms. The business school also offers a number of specialized courses in accounting, finance, and principles of management for non-business majors, and the College of Management currently has “at least one quarter of its students at any given time pursuing dual degrees” (Former...
Dean, College of Management, 2006). These efforts promote an interdisciplinary perspective that will make students more effective in the workplace upon graduation (Former Dean, College of Management, 2006).

Summary

Through its programs, initiatives, research centers and institutes, infrastructure, and priorities, the College of Management reflects not only the mission and vision of the Georgia Institute of Technology but its strategic objectives as well. The business school’s emphasis on technology, global issues, social engagement, and sustainability, and its efforts to infuse these issues into all it does reveals an awareness of the social compact that exists between public institutions and society at large and a desire to fulfill its social obligations. The commitment of the former dean of the College of Management to social responsibility and sustainability as core business principles is demonstrated in the school’s curricular and co-curricular activities and its physical space and location. With the recent appointment of a new dean whose background lies in ethics, one can expect to see an expansion of both a culture of honesty and integrity in the business school and an enhanced focus on ethics in its core and elective curriculum, in its research endeavors, and in its outreach and continuing education efforts. If this prediction comes to pass, and the College of Management demonstrates the ability to attract faculty of color and expand the outreach of its students and faculty, the business school, like its host institution, will become a model of social responsibility and sustainability and a truly transformative partner with the communities it serves.
CHAPTER 12

CROSS CASE-ANALYSIS: THE COLLECTIVE RESULTS

Overview

Individual and cross-case analyses conducted on interview and secondary data obtained from the six schools included in this study (e.g., the Carey School of Business at Arizona State University, the Kelley School of Business at Indiana University, the Smith School of Business at the University of Maryland, Warrington College of Business Administration at the University of Florida, the Moore School of Business at the University of South Carolina, and the College of Management at the Georgia Institute of Technology) revealed a number of significant trends and several unique features related to the research question and interview questions guiding our inquiry. Through interviews and analysis of archival documents we wanted to learn what elite public business schools are doing to fulfill their contracts with society – to demonstrate social responsibility themselves and to create socially responsible, civically engaged business leaders and private citizens. Through interviews with business school representatives, we explored:

- how public business schools define social responsibility;
- how public business schools envision their role in society;
- who public business schools see as their primary stakeholders;
- how public business schools serve identified stakeholders; and
- what elite public business schools are doing to fulfill their social contracts and the
efforts they are taking to create socially responsible business leaders and graduates who are engaged members of society in terms of curriculum and instruction; community engagement and economic development; diversity (including efforts to create a diverse faculty and student body and to develop an appreciation of differences and the ability to work with those who are culturally different from oneself); infrastructure to support these efforts (e.g., mission, strategy, budget/finding, staffing, compensation, fund-raising, etc.); and other strategies.

The analysis brought to light additional similarities between the schools that extended beyond the research questions. These parallels provide both a context to help better understand the schools and the forces that drive their work and raised new questions about differences that exist between them.

In this chapter, we present the collective findings and report emergent themes that surfaced outside the scope of our framework, including those related to the larger institutional contexts in which the schools operate, identified stakeholders, perceived role in and responsibility to society, and shared definitions of social responsibility. We also identify trends and differences among the business schools in each of the major elements in our framework (e.g., curricular content and delivery, diversity, community outreach and engagement, and infrastructure). A tabular summation of comparative results in relation to the framework is included in Appendix E. We discuss and expand upon these findings in relation to past research in Chapter 13, compare the results with those predicted by our framework in Chapter 14, and present a new understanding of social responsibility in public business schools and a revised frame in the final chapter.
Social Engagement in Six Public Business Schools:
Emergent Themes and Unique Variations

Institutional Context

The origins and evolution of the missions of larger institutions that house and support the business schools under study illustrate the flexible and responsive nature of higher education in the United States over the past 300 years, elucidated by Boyer (1996), Boyer and Hechinger (1981), Bok (1982), Hutchins (1963), and others. The changing and responsive nature of higher education was most evident in our exploration of the universities that house the six business schools under examination. Two of these universities, the University of Florida and the University of Maryland, have their origins as land-grant institutions, and both institutions reflect this history in their current missions, strategies, and tactics. The University of South Carolina's origins as a college grounded in the classical traditions can be seen in its enduring emphasis on education tied to the humanities, which is reflected in programs and curriculum in its business school. Indiana University was created as a seminary school, while Arizona State was launched in 1885 as a teacher's college. Georgia Tech was established during the Reconstruction Period as a technological school tasked with transforming the skills of state citizens and the region’s economy from agrarian to industrial. Today, all six schools are research institutions with multi-million dollar research budgets and endowments that approach or exceed the billion dollar mark.

Five of the six universities examined have strong socially focused institutional missions. Arizona State University was the only institution without a mission identifying service to or partnership with the community as critical to its purpose. By contrast, the
mission statement of the University of South Carolina emphasizes community service, remediation of social problems, and education to create responsible citizenship, while Georgia Tech’s highlights research, education, teaching, and outreach to promote a sustainable future and quality of life for Georgia citizens.

All of the larger institutions examined made their strategic plans readily available to the public through placement on the worldwide web. Each of these plans articulates strategic objectives that reflect the institutions’ identities as publicly funded entities and commit organizational resources to teaching, research, and service to society. Socially directed targets and tactics were detailed in each of these documents. As example, two key objectives in the University of Maryland’s strategy include the use of research and enriched educational experiences to prepare students to be “productive members of society” and engagement in partnerships to promote economic development within the state and enhance the “well-being of the citizens of Maryland” (University of Maryland, 2000, p. 2). The strategic plan of Arizona State University identifies eight imperatives to guide and measure the institute’s progress, including commitments to address regional problems; capitalize on local knowledge; consider the local relevance of its research; demonstrate environmental stewardship; transform society and improve the human condition; promote social advancement and sustained economic growth; conduct research that benefits society; engage in public service; use inter-, multi-, trans-, and post-disciplinary research and teaching; and expand the diversity of its student body. Indiana University’s plan directs the school’s resources toward economic development; expansion of arts and culture across the state; partnerships with communities to solve social and economic problems; service to business through internships, graduate
placement, and continuing education; faculty incentives in the school’s promotion and tenure policies to facilitate greater faculty participation in community and economic development activities; enhanced community access to the institution; interdisciplinary research; more effective knowledge sharing with the community; subsidization of internships in non-profits, start-up businesses, and key growth industries; and expansion of cooperative and service-learning opportunities.

The social compact is reflected in the strategic plan of the University of South Carolina as well, where the president outlines research priorities directed toward technology, alternative fuels, the environment, medicine, and the humanities; the creation of a research district that will promote partnerships between the academy and industry; and a green building plan for the university. Georgia Tech’s strategy also demonstrates a commitment to sustainability in its building plans, and extends concerns with environmental protection much further, into the school’s research agenda, curricular and co-curricular activities, partnerships, and outreach. Tech’s plan and vision for the future focus on the use of technology to transform the local, national, and international economies; dedicate the institution to collaboration and partnerships that extend across its campuses and into the community; commit the school to facilitating lifelong learning and creating graduates capable of ethical and responsible leadership and engagement. All of Tech’s objectives are designed to realize the school’s acknowledged responsibility to “advance society toward a proper, fair, and sustainable future” (Georgia Institute of Technology, 2002, p. 2). A strong social purpose resonates through the strategy of the University of Florida as well. Florida’s plan commits the institution’s resources to solving local and national problems, with particular priority placed on issues related to an
aging populace, education, agriculture and economic development, globalization, the
search for renewable energy, and health. The University of Florida is also concerned
with helping its students acquire the skills needed to live and work in a global society and
to increasing the diversity of its student body.

The six universities share a number of key strategic tactics including a focus on
sustainability in their building plans (University of South Carolina, Georgia Tech); a
commitment to increase student and/or faculty diversity (University of Maryland,
Arizona State University); service to society through research and economic development
activities (University of Maryland, Arizona State University, Indiana University, Georgia
Tech); dedication to addressing regional problems (Arizona State University, Indiana
University, University of Florida, University of South Carolina); student, faculty, and/or
institutional service (Arizona State University, Indiana University, University of South
Carolina); interdisciplinary teaching or research (Indiana, Arizona State); and
environmental stewardship or sustainability (Arizona State University, University of
South Carolina, Georgia Tech).

The Business Schools

Socially Responsive Business School Missions

Among the six business schools included in this study, two articulate missions
that reflect a compact with society. In its statement of purpose, Indiana’s Kelley School
of Business commits to use education and research to transform lives, organizations, and
communities through a demonstration of ethical standards; the use of collaboration and
innovation; by embracing diversity and deploying curriculum that build critical thinking
skills, responsible action, and leadership; using technology to serve students; infusing the
school's coursework and research with a global perspective; creating a culture that encourages outreach, service, and research; and establishing national and international partners with corporations and other communities. The mission of the University of South Carolina's business school also demonstrates the school's contract with society. USC's Moore School of Business sees its purpose as one that serves students, alumni, the business community, and the citizens of the state through teaching, research, and service that prepares students and professionals to lead and provide service to communities around the world.

The missions of business schools at Arizona State University, Georgia Tech, the University of Maryland, and the University of Florida do not reflect a social connection, and focus exclusively on teaching and/or research, without mention of service to or engagement with the community (beyond the business community). The business schools at Maryland, South Carolina, and Arizona State, either mention the pursuit of excellence or a desire to achieve top-tier status in business school rankings in their mission statements. Of the three schools with a ratings or status-focused mission, only one, Smith at the University of Maryland, was identified as a top 30 business school within the last two years by *U.S. News and World Report*. By contrast, neither the Kelley School of Business at Indiana University nor the College of Management at Georgia Tech focus on rankings in their missions, but the MBA programs at Kelley and the College of Management are were acknowledged among the top 25 business schools nationally by *U.S. News and World Report* (2007).

*Stakeholders*

When asked to identify their primary stakeholders, all six business schools
identified students, five of six named faculty or faculty and staff, four recognized the state as a constituency, and three pointed to alumni. Two schools acknowledged the local community as stakeholders, and two others named recruiters as constituents served. The dean of the Kelley School of Business at Indiana also identified the media and parents of undergraduates as stakeholders, while the Moore School of Business in South Carolina pointed to society at large as a primary group served, and the Smith School of Business at Maryland recognized anyone trying to start or operate a business in the region as a constituent. Precisely how each school serves its stakeholders varied greatly, reflecting the unique missions and institutional capabilities of the schools (Rameley, 2005) and the distinct philosophies and priorities of business school leaders.

The Kelley School of Business at Indiana University provided an example of the influence the beliefs of a school’s leader has on service to it constituents. The dean of the business school at Indiana University envisions service to faculty and staff enacted, in part, through his vision of the school as a large consulting group, with the dean serving as the managing director, who treats faculty as partners, while ensuring their needs are met. Serving as the “managing director” of the business school requires regular communication with university administrators to secure needed resources by reminding leaders that the business school is the university’s “cash cow.” By contrast, the dean of Florida’s Warrington College of Business sees the school serving faculty by giving them the freedom to teach anything they want, any time they want to in order to leave them time to conduct research.

Other prominent distinctions in service to a shared constituency were found in descriptions of assistance given to students. South Carolina’s Moore School of Business
addresses the needs of students by providing them with a broad-based curriculum “infused with international business, a concern for the future of the globe, their own future, and that of their children,” and by making students “well-rounded, broad thinkers who are more aware of other cultures” (Marketing and Communications Manager, 2007). At Arizona State University, Carey serves its students by providing them with a return on their investment through the school’s 95% placement rate post-graduation.

In only one shared stakeholder group did similarities in service delivery emerge, and that was with assistance provided to alumni. Here, all three schools identifying alumni as stakeholders saw service to this group delivered via efforts meant to re-engage graduates with the business schools. Alumni engagement was accomplished by affording graduates opportunities to mentor students (University of Florida, University of Maryland), marketing degree, executive education programs, lecture series, and networking events to alumni (University of Florida, University of Maryland) and by inviting graduates to serve on the school’s advisory board to help shape the business school and its offerings (Georgia Tech).

Perhaps the most striking theme that emerged from answers to interview questions posed about stakeholders was that many of the responses regarding service to alumni were framed in terms of service that was delivered in order to receive something back from the constituent group, including direct donations to the school or revenue from executive education programs. The dean of Indiana’s Kelley School of Business illustrated this trend most clearly in our interview, when he explained that he tries to instill the importance of philanthropy in Kelley students because he wants graduates to give the school a portion of the “substantial financial return on investment” it provides.
Defining Social Responsibility

With the exception of Georgia Tech, none of the business schools queried acknowledge having an official definition of social responsibility that transcends departments, faculty, and programs. Interviewees most frequently responded to the question, “How does your school define social responsibility?” with answers similar to these: “We don’t have a shared definition;” “Each faculty defines the concept him/herself.” Moore’s Marketing and Communications Manager hypothesized that South Carolina’s business school does not have a shared definition of social responsibility because it is assumed that the school must give back to society because it is publicly funded, and it is in the school’s best interest to attend to issues of social responsibility. Replying to this same question, Warrington’s dean offered examples of what the school does to programmatically and academically to demonstrate social responsibility. For example, the dean shared that Florida’s business school enacts its social compact through an undergraduate minor in social entrepreneurship and by teaching students in all the school’s programs “soft skills,” including leadership, team building, and communication.

The associate dean of the Carey School of Business replied to this question with a rejection of the notion of the common good, arguing instead that firms and academies serve the community out of self-interest. He further argued that he didn’t think teaching social responsibility is appropriate in business schools. The response of Smith’s dean echoed a similar theme, when he acknowledged that he didn’t see business school’s as having a role to play directly in solving social problems. Instead the dean asserted that Smith demonstrates social responsibility by graduating students who will, themselves, play key roles in solving the world’s problems, and they will do so by bringing
"advanced ideas into the marketplace." Kelley's dean saw the school’s role in a comparable way, reporting that Indiana’s business students learn that organizations are transformative agents in society, and that business "should be an enterprise that makes the world a better place." He noted that Kelly students learn that their role as leaders is to mold organizations, which in turn, act as positive agents for change in society. By contrast, the past dean of the business school at Georgia Tech explained that the College of Management characterizes social responsibility as doing well economically while attending to issues of environmental sustainability. Social responsibility, she said, also entails cultural and global awareness and a concern about diversity and social issues.

Within the business school and across the Georgia Tech, the former dean explained, administrators and faculty "walk the talk" on social responsibility through strategic plans and tactics that include a green building plan and efforts at the business school and across Georgia Tech to infuse issues of social responsibility and sustainability into all curriculum.

Tactics used to create socially responsible graduates also vary from school to school. Georgia Tech, for example, cultivates a concern for others and for the environment by permeating sustainability and social responsibility into its programs, curriculum, and into the work it does with the K-12 education system. The former dean of Tech’s business school explains that the College of Management engages in these activities because administrators are "very serious about wanting to have graduates who care" about the environment, each other, and the communities in which they live and work. Sustainability and social responsibility also inform the missions of a number of the College of Management’s institutes and initiatives, including its Institute for Leadership
and Entrepreneurship (ILE) and the Expanding Closed Loops in Production Systems (ECLIPS) Center. Established and run by the former dean of Tech's business school, ILE is an interdisciplinary institute dedicated to values-driven leadership that supports economic growth, environmental sustainability, and social responsibility. The focus of the ECLIPS Center is on sustainable activities including product reuse, recycling, and remanufacturing (ECLIPS, 2007).

Students attending the Kelley School of Business at Indiana University learn that because businesses are sanctioned by society, firms and their leaders must give something back. Precisely how Kelley students learn this lesson is unclear. South Carolina uses core and elective curriculum to teach students how to lead in a socially responsible manner, while Maryland's dean asserts that Smith builds this competence through student engagement in volunteer activities. Arizona provided no examples of how the school delivers on its motto, "Doing good while doing well."

A Responsive Curriculum

In order to evaluate the activities that comprise a responsive curriculum, the researcher broke this broad category into smaller, more narrow sub-groupings that included: problem centered learning, interdisciplinary learning, balanced scholarship, ethics education, coursework and experiences in social responsibility, and coursework and experiences to build global leadership competence.

Problem-Centered Learning.

Individual and cross-case analysis revealed that all schools in our study utilize problem-centered teaching and learning approaches, to some degree. Opportunities to acquire problem solving and decision making skills through courses such as Decision
Analysis and others were available at all the schools we looked at. Those schools that demonstrated this criterion most strongly, used multiple scholastic activities like case studies and case competitions, experiential learning activities, learning teams, capstone experiences, consulting projects, and practicum experiences in their MBA programs. Business schools at the University of Maryland, Georgia Tech, Arizona State, and Indiana University were leaders in their use of problem-centered learning. The business schools at the University of South Carolina and the University of Florida provided evidence that these same tools were used less frequently and less consistently across courses in their MBA programs and across all of the MBA programs offered by the business schools.

MBA programs at Arizona State, Maryland, and Indiana University emphasized the use of experiential learning as key learning tools. For example, MBAs at Smith can practice analyzing and managing investment portfolios by participating in the Mayer Fund; learn leadership decision making through a number of experiential learning modules, or be trained to use a number of financial instruments through involvement with the Financial Trading Laboratory. The dean of the business school at Indiana University described experiential learning as the cornerstone of the Kelley experience. Kelley uses case projects with companies, team-based learning, overseas travel, and other experiences that “jar students,” taking them out of their comfort zones and into unfamiliar situations. The goal of these activities is to transform the way students think and behave.

To promote the ability to think systemically, Ramaley (2005) and Thomas (1999) suggest offering interdisciplinary majors or minors in environmental, urban, women’s, cultural, or ethic studies and learning communities or curricular clusters that link two or
more disciplines in the exploration of common or civic themes. We found no evidence that any of the six business schools we studied used the interdisciplinary teaching or learning strategies advanced by Ramaley or Thomas.

We did discover, however, that all six business schools offered students the chance to pair their MBA with other degrees including Law, Nursing, and Engineering. The College of Management went the furthest of the schools in our study by allowing its students to couple their MBA with any other graduate program from Georgia Tech. As a result of this policy, one-fourth of all Tech MBA students are pursuing a dual degree. Carey also promotes interdisciplinary learning by permitting MBAs to customize their degrees by taking electives from departments across the business school and the university. Opening up MBA classes to students from other disciplines was also reported as a strategy to promote interdisciplinary learning by Warrington and the College of Management. The business school at Georgia Tech reports that 30% of the credit hours it offers are taken by non-management students, creating a classroom experience that exposes students to others from different disciplines and with different backgrounds. Research centers and institutions at each business school are engaged in and support interdisciplinary research, courses, conferences, seminars, and other developmental opportunities. These activities allow students and faculty the chance to study with and learn from others from different disciplines and with varied areas of expertise.

Balanced Scholarship.

With the exception of the Warrington College of Business at the University of Florida, all the schools studied demonstrated some balance between research, teaching, integration, and practice in their MBA programs (Note: Insufficient data was available to
assess Florida's effectiveness in this area). Moore demonstrates this element the most succinctly. Within the International MBA program at the University of South Carolina, students encounter faculty members with consulting experience, international teaching, and research backgrounds that inform what they teach and how they teach, while mandatory internships and international travel or study allow students the chance to learn about international business first hand, apply classroom experiences immediately to real-world issues, and learn about other cultures directly.

*Courses and Experiences in Social Responsibility/Sustainability.*

Across the six business schools studied here, four offer students courses on social responsibility, sustainability, or social entrepreneurship. Moore was the solitary school in this study that requires MBA students to take such courses, while business schools at both South Carolina and Georgia Tech offer MBA students a number of electives that explicitly address sustainability or social responsibility. The decision not to make stand alone courses on social responsibility and sustainability available, beyond the elective Tech offers, was based on the belief by school administrators and faculty that integrating these topics into all program curriculum is the most effective means of ensuring students graduate with both the knowledge and ability to lead in socially responsible ways. At Moore, required classes with a social or environmental focus are only evidenced in one, but not all of its MBA programs.

Although the Kelley School of Business offers no required or elective courses on social responsibility at the undergraduate or graduate level, but the school does give its MBAs the option of pursuing a certificate in social entrepreneurship. The dean explained that the school once had undergraduate electives in ethics and social responsibility, but
eliminated these classes when the school worked to integrate discussions of on these topics into the undergraduate curriculum. Further rationale for this change is reflected in the assertion by Kelley’s dean that when you leave ethics and social responsibility as electives, you end up “preaching to the choir.” Warrington offers MBA students one elective course in social entrepreneurship.

MBA students at four of the six schools studied are expressing an active interest in issues of social responsibility and sustainability through membership in Net Impact, a student association dedicated to teach future leaders about corporate social responsibility, sustainability, social entrepreneurship, nonprofit management, international development, and social change (Net Impact, 2007). Active Net Impact chapters were found at four of the six schools included in this study. Arizona State does not have a chapter in the business school, and Maryland’s chapter has been inactive for over a year. The most active chapter of the club was found at Georgia Tech, where the dean reports that the majority of the school’s MBA students participate in the organization. Net Impact at Tech is working in partnership with business school faculty and administrators to integrate the concept of social responsibility into all college activities and practices; influenced the organizers of the annual Business Plan Competition to add a Social and Environmental Sustainability Award to its list of competitive categories; and established a Board Fellows program to allow MBA students the chance to learn about non-profits and philanthropy by serving as non-voting members on the boards of directors for Atlanta area not-for-profits.

Ethics Education/Focus.

As with coursework on social responsibility and sustainability, schools either
offered stand-alone courses in ethics, or report that they are working to instill this topic throughout their curriculum. All schools in this study offered ethics as a required course in at least one of their MBA programs. Where schools offered ethics as a both a required and a stand-alone class (Georgia Tech, Florida, and Arizona State), it was found to be a one credit course. In three instances where ethics was part of the required MBA coursework, the topic was presented jointly with one or two subjects, like leadership at South Carolina's Moore, culture and communication at Maryland's Smith School of Business, and critical thinking at Indiana's Kelley School of Business. The only school in the study that reported infusing ethics across courses in their MBA programs was Florida's Warrington College of Business. Ensuring that discussions about ethics occur across curriculum was found to be an effective means of developing skills needed for civil discourse and social responsibility by Stephens, Colby, Ehrlich, and Beaumont (2000).

At both Georgia Tech and the University of Maryland, school leaders asserted that discussions about and activities that explore ethics in business take place in other MBA courses, such as accounting. Despite these claims, it appears that such discussions occur at Smith, not because the business school works to ensure that they do, but instead because different professors find them to be important or because they spontaneously emerge from students. Comments made by Smith's dean during his interview for this study and in the press form the basis for this conclusion. In these instances, he noted that ethics discussions don't happen very frequently at the business school and when they do occur, they are not the result of deliberate efforts on the part of faculty to surface them (Interview, 2006; Hindo, 2002).
The Associate Dean of the Carey School of Business explained that teaching business students to be law abiding, and ethical students is absolutely essential at Arizona State. He contended that Carey uses ethical behavior as a recruiting criteria when looking for students, enacts strict standards on ethical behavior to enforce honesty and integrity among students, and exploits the school’s focus on ethics with recruiters, calling character and ethical behavior a competitive differentiator in the marketplace. Carey’s marketing materials, including web pages for recruiters and potential students do not, however, mention ethics, integrity, or moral character, and core course syllabi did not uniformly stress academic integrity.

A lack of consistency was observed in both requirements for ethics education across different MBA programs within schools and when ethics is offered in the MBA program schedule. For example, Warrington requires MBA students attending its two-year traditional MBA and its MBA in South Florida programs to take an ethics course, but students participating in the school’s one-year Traditional MBA, Executive MBA, Professional MBA, or Internet MBA programs have no similar obligation. In the two Warrington MBA programs that require ethics, one places ethics in the second session of a student’s first semester, and the other has students participate in an ethics course toward the end of their program. At Georgia Tech, MBA students in the full-time program take ethics in the first semester of their second year. Both the University of Florida and Georgia Tech offer MBA students the chance to take a number of elective courses on ethics, and Warrington, has a research center dedicated to the study and teaching of ethics.
Other Pedagogical Tools.

In response to research findings that show corporate CEO's identified communication skills as critical to a leader's success as general and technology management capabilities, Georgia Tech implemented a mandatory communication skills course for MBA students. This multi-week communications skills course is augmented by opportunities for students to apply these skills through networking, social events, and community service projects through their participation in the Graduate Students in Management Organization, an organization that all Tech MBAs are compelled to participate in.

Global Connections.

It appears that the increasingly global nature of the economy and of business is impacting the activities of some of this nation's preeminent business schools. In an effort to promote study abroad opportunities for students and faculty, inform the content of curriculum and curricular offerings, explore issues affecting global business, increase faculty knowledge of international business issues, and extend the reach of their educational offerings to a much broader constituency, all six of the schools we studied have and are expanding their formal relationships with international businesses, foreign governments, and colleges and universities outside the United States. Two business schools, Smith and Moore, leverage these partnerships to offer masters and MBA programs to students in Mexico, Tunisia, China, and Switzerland, while four schools offer on-line MBA programs to students around the globe. Five of the six schools we looked at here host conferences on international business issues that draw speakers and
participants from international businesses, and foreign governments, and academic institutions.

Faculty knowledge of other cultures, practices, and countries is being strengthened at all six schools through an increase in the hiring of international faculty and a growing focus on research on international business issues. We uncovered evidence that faculty at five of the six schools in our study are researching global concerns and also found this area to be the most frequently researched by faculty at all schools except Moore. Five of the six schools we studied also offer faculty the chance to teach, travel, and study abroad. International learning opportunities for faculty are sponsored by research centers at each school dedicated to the study of and teaching about international business issues. We found only one school in our study, Carey at Arizona State University, without an international research center or institute. Internationally directed centers provide educational resources to support the development of curriculum in international business; build relationships with international universities and corporations; facilitate faculty and student study and travel abroad; offer training in language and culture for faculty, staff, students, and outside organizations; host conferences, seminars, and publications on global business, and conducting and supporting research on international business issues.

Coursework and Experiences to Build Global Leadership Competence.

In an increasingly global world, business students are requiring education and experiences that will prepare them to operate in various countries, with differing cultures, laws, customs, and practices. Business schools in this study are all working to help students build the understanding and abilities to operate in an international marketplace.
through coursework in international business, culture and language; study and travel abroad opportunities; international internships; dual degrees, certificates, concentrations or specialization in international business, or specialized master’s degrees in international management.

Business schools at the University of South Carolina, and Indiana University share the belief that international business has to be experienced in order to be truly understood. The dean of the Kelley School of Business at Indiana University envisions travel to developing countries as essential and transformative experiences that can fundamentally change students’ understanding of the world and of the role that business can play internationally. Florida, Maryland, and Georgia Tech have established goals to increase the number of students engaged in international travel, study, and other experiences. For example, The College of Management at Georgia Tech wants 50% of its students to complete an international learning experience.

All six schools in this study offer MBA students the chance to participate in international trips or study abroad programs. The length of international exchange programs varies from school to school, ranging from six weeks at Warrington, to one semester at Moore and Smith, to one year at Carey. The duration of global travel also differs from school to school. As illustration, MBA students at Carey can participate in one to three week study trips to China or Central Europe; Warrington’s Executive MBA’s and students pursing a Masters in International Business complete a one week trip to France and Belgium; Smith MBA’s have the option of completing a seven to 10 day trip; and Kelley MBA’s pursuing a specialized course of study or certificate in international business can complete a 10 to 12 day field research trip abroad. MBA students in the
global track of the International MBA at the Moore School of Business complete the longest international immersion trip, spending three weeks in a region, learning about the politics, economics, and business environment of the area.

None of the six schools require all MBA students to complete an international learning experience. The dean of the Smith School of Business explained that Maryland does not mandate this type of study because the school believes it would be necessary to pay for international travel if it did make this a requisite experience, and it is currently not in a position to do so. Three programs in study schools did, however, require MBA students to learn or travel abroad. The International MBA (IMBA) at the University of South Carolina includes a mandatory three week immersion trip for students enrolled in the program's global track. Students in Warrington’s Executive MBA and Masters in International Business programs must leave Florida for a one week trip to France and Belgium. The Global Executive MBA at Georgia Tech also requires students to complete two overseas residencies during this 17 month program. Study trips generally include coursework at a foreign university or selected readings, lectures, or guest speakers; excursions into the local community; and opportunities to meet with local business and government leaders. At Warrington and Moore, these trips also include coursework in regional culture, while Warrington also includes language study as a component of these experiences. The International MBA program at Moore provides students with the strongest preparation for these trips by grounding them in an understanding of global business through an international core curriculum, complimented by either intensive study of the language or culture of the region under study before students leave for international visits or study.
Although all six schools in this study identify global business acumen as a critical competence for business leaders, they vary in how they build this knowledge and skills through core and elective curriculum. Arizona State, Indiana University, the University of Florida, and Georgia Tech offer no core courses in international business in their fulltime MBA programs. The University of Maryland requires its MBA students to complete three core courses in international business, and offers students nine electives in this area. Full and part-time MBAs at Georgia Tech must complete one international business elective. Students enrolled in Florida’s one year Professional MBA program must take two courses in international business, while two year Professional MBA students, and students enrolled in the Professional MBA in South Florida, Internet MBA, or Executive MBA programs at Warrington must take one course in global business. International MBA students at Moore complete an international core, and students enrolled in other MBA programs at Moore find a wide variety of electives in international business. All of the schools in the study offer MBA students the chance to pursue a specialization or certificate in global management or international business. Florida’s Warrington School of Business also offers a dual MBA/Master of International Management in collaboration with Thunderbird at the American School for International Management.

Business schools at the University of South Carolina, Indiana University, and Georgia Tech also provide MBA students opportunities to participate in international internships. IMBA students at Moore are required to complete a three to four month internship with an international firm. At Indiana, MBA students pursuing a concentration or certificate in international business find international internships as one of several
required international experiences that can choose from. International internships are available to Georgia Tech MBA’s, but are not required of them.

_Diversity Building Education._

Beyond student clubs and associations for women and minority students, curricular and co-curricular activities to promote a greater understanding of different cultures, traditions, and practices were notably absent at the MBA level across most of the six schools. The University of Maryland and Georgia Tech did, however, offer examples of diversity building activities targeted towards undergraduates. Smith’s dean explained that he is exploring ways to bring a university diversity program to undergraduates in the form of a one-credit course. Georgia Tech’s former dean noted that the school is currently using a tool called the Intercultural Development Inventory to assess student sensitivity to people who are different from them. The results of the assessment are then used to target curricular and co-curricular activities to promote greater cultural sensitivity. Georgia Tech, the University of South Carolina, Indiana University, and the University of Maryland cited the use of team-based learning activities as a potent tactic deployed to teach MBA students how to work with others who are different from themselves.

_An Engaged Campus_

All of the remaining activities in our original frame were organized under the heading – An Engaged Campus. Each of these sub-categories details programs or practices that connect students, faculty, administrators, staff, and school resources with the community, bring community leaders and members to campus, or extend the reach of
the school to traditionally underserved populations (e.g., through faculty or student diversity).

*Faculty Diversity.*

Assessing faculty diversity at each of the six business schools was difficult. None of the interviewers offered specific, verifiable data about the demographic makeup of their teaching staff, choosing instead to offer approximations, to not answer questions about faculty diversity directly, or to respond to our inquiries with a focus on the international makeup of staff (USC) or the gender composition of faculty (Arizona State and Georgia Tech). The dean of the Smith School of Business said that he couldn’t quantify the ethnic makeup of his staff because he doesn’t “think that way.” He did, however, offer that 25% of Smith’s fulltime faculty members are women and about 50% are foreign born. None of the business school websites offered specific demographic information about faculty (e.g., racial/ethnic group or gender), beyond what faculty members themselves disclosed in their vitas or biographical statements. Information about the gender and ethnic makeup of business school faculty was only available at the university website of Georgia Tech through its department of Institutional Research and Planning. In order to estimate the ethnic backgrounds of teaching staff, the researcher examined faculty biographies and vitas and presented this data to all six schools for verification in the case review process. None of these assumptions were challenged in the fact reviews conducted by the business schools. Table 31 provides a summary of the demographic makeup of the faculty at the six schools we studied derived from all sources: interviews, estimates, and archival documents.
Through interviews and examination of archival documents, it became clear that most of the faculty diversity found within these six schools is the result of international hires, with faculty born in China, India, and other Asian countries accounting for most of the ethnic divergence observed. As an example, we estimate that 19% of Warrington’s faculty and 14% of Carey’s faculty are of Asian origin. Schools identified by the researcher as having some diversity within its faculty ranks met this criterion predominantly through international hires (Carey, Warrington, and Smith).

Table 31: Faculty Diversity at Six Public Business Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business School</th>
<th>Percent Minority Faculty</th>
<th>Percent International Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carey-Arizona State University</td>
<td>20 Total Diversity – U.S. and International</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley-Indiana University</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington-University of Florida</td>
<td>5.5-6.5% (Source: Interview with Dean, 2006)</td>
<td>16.5-19.5 (Source: Interview with Dean, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22% Total Diversity – U.S. and International (Source: 2007 Budget Review)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith-University of Maryland</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>50* (Source: Interview with Dean, 2006) (*)In 2007, the Financial Times put this number at 27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore-University of South Carolina</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College of Management-Georgia Tech</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the researcher looked at faculty diversity in terms of the groups identified as underrepresented minorities in the United States (i.e., African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Native Americans/Pacific Islanders), none of the schools in the study faired
well. With just 3% of its faculty members identified as ethnic minorities (excluding international faculty), the Kelley School of Business illustrates this deficit. The College of Management at Georgia Tech provides a more salient example of this deficiency. Tech’s business school had no underrepresented minorities in full-time faculty positions. When the ethnic makeup of faculty was compared with the demographic makeup of local and regional citizens, the issue of faculty diversity became more dramatic. For example, 5% of Carey’s faculty is Hispanic, while 28% of Arizona’s populace is identified as Hispanic by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Florida, Maryland, and Georgia Tech reported challenges recruiting Black and Hispanic faculty members, noting that candidates opt to work for top tier schools instead of theirs, despite competitive salary and benefit packages. Only two business schools, the College of Management at Georgia Tech and the Kelley School of Business at Indiana University, reported specific efforts to recruit or hire underrepresented minorities. The College of Management has attempted to employ the recruitment practices used successfully by the College of Engineering, but to no avail. At Indiana University, Kelley recruits teaching staff of color by hiring them before they complete their doctorates and by inviting them to serve as visiting lecturers or scholars. It does not appear that the business schools are finding much help from university leaders or in university resources in their efforts to expand the diversity of their staff. As evidence, Warrington’s dean shared that he met with the president of the University of Florida to explore strategies to attract African American faculty, but left without any new ideas about how to do so.
Student Diversity.

Interviewees were more a bit more forthcoming with information about the demographic makeup of their student bodies than with faculty. Information about student race and ethnicity was also slightly more accessible through business school and university websites. Again, however, it was exceedingly difficult to assess the precise ethnic makeup of the student bodies of the business schools under investigation. Despite these limitations, we found that all six business schools appear to be more successful in their efforts to recruit diverse students than they are in attracting a disparate group of faculty members, with two exceptions (Moore and Warrington) (See Table 32). As evidence, the dean of the Smith School of Business at the University of Maryland detailed that two-thirds of the school's undergraduates are ethnic minorities and between 14 and 22% of its MBA students are from minority groups.

Table 32: Student Diversity in Six Public MBA Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business School</th>
<th>Percent Minority Students</th>
<th>Percent International Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carey</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington</td>
<td>22 (Source: Dean)</td>
<td>1 (Source: Warrington College of Business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College of Management</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As with faculty diversity, it appears that most of the ethnic variance among students is the result of international recruitment and not to efforts to enroll U.S.-born minorities. For example, 30% of the student body at Carey is derived from international students, while less than 1% of its students are African American or Native American. Carey does not provide information on the number of Hispanic students enrolled in its programs. Warrington’s dean reported that African Americans account for 8% of its MBA student body, between 5 and 6% of its specialized master’s students, and between 3% and 4% of its total student body. Warrington’s dean offers no data on Hispanic student enrollment.

Academic leaders at Georgia Tech and Arizona State acknowledged the importance of a diverse student body in enriching and supplementing student learning. Maryland, Arizona State, and Georgia Tech expressed dissatisfaction with the diversity of their student populations. Smith’s dean acknowledged that student diversity there is “less than splendid,” and Tech’s former dean admitted that creating a diverse student body is a struggle for them. The dean of the Kelley School of Business also declared student and faculty diversity two of the biggest challenges the school faces, yet asserted that he is not willing to accept a lack of diversity because of the school’s location in the ethnically homogeneous state of Indiana. The associate dean of MBA programs at Carey shared that student diversity is a constant focus for the business school and expressed a desire to increase the school’s international student body beyond its current rate of 30%. Warrington’s dean did not express dissatisfaction about the minority makeup of the school’s student population, but did attribute small number of African American students (between 3 and 4%) to the rural location of the school. Examination of U.S. Census
bureau data for Gainesville, Florida found that Blacks make up 23.2% of the city’s population, and about 16% of the state’s populace, intimating that factors other than location may be affecting the student diversity at Warrington.

When asked about efforts to attract students from divergent ethnic backgrounds, business schools offered a number of different strategies. Carey reported using targeted marketing and financial aid as recruitment tools at the MBA level. While continuing to explore new and innovative recruitment practices, Smith uses a program called Volunteers in Business Education (VIBE) to attract minority students to Maryland’s MBA programs. VIBE hosts admissions events around the world and pairs prospective minority students with Maryland MBA’s, who provide potential applicants with tours of the school and information about the school and its programs.

Georgia Tech launched a part-time evening MBA program in the Fall of 2007 in an effort to expand gender diversity. Although increasing the ethnic composition of the MBA program was not an expressed goal for the part-time MBA, it appears that the addition of this new program positively impacted the ethnic diversity of graduate business students. In 2006, 15% of College of Management graduate students were ethnic minorities, while 18% of students in the new part-time MBA are from U.S. minority groups. No additional recruitment strategies were provided by Georgia Tech through the interview and none were found on-line.

The Kelley School of Business at Indiana University is exploring creative ways to attract minority students, including partnering with HBCUs to create student exchange programs, participation in two consortia that recruit women and underrepresented minorities, and offering full scholarships to the two-year fulltime MBA program. Both
Moore and Warrington reported that they were engaged in recruiting events to attract a diverse student group, yet neither offered further description of these events or examples of additional recruitment strategies.

*Faculty/Administrators Engaged in Relationships with Community.*

None of the schools featured in this study require or encourage faculty to consult with or engage in voluntary service to the community, non-profits, government agencies, or even businesses. Not mandating community service for faculty was reported to be a deliberate choice, tied to the importance placed on research and teaching as measures of faculty performance by the larger research institutions that house the business schools. At the University of South Carolina, this omission was linked to the importance placed on rankings by the business school. Service to the college or university and to professional organizations were of secondary importance when evaluating and compensating faculty at all six schools, while service to the community was entirely absent in faculty review and tenure practices or deemed important in “name only” at three institutions (Florida State, Indiana University, and Georgia Tech).

The Dean of the Kelley School of Business explained that if the school included community service as a component of faculty evaluation and compensation, then faculty would do it, and this would get in the way of them focusing on the things he feels are most important (e.g., research and teaching). Kelley’s dean shared that he leaves it to faculty to “do the right thing on their own.” Smith’s strategic plan identifies outreach (by faculty, students, and the institution) as a key differentiator from competitors, targets it as a strategic imperative, and acknowledges it as a weakness, yet does not establish requirements or tactics to address this deficit in its strategic plan. The former dean of the
College of Management at Georgia Tech noted that the school's research centers and institutions periodically use discretionary funds to persuade faculty to engage in community service projects that address socially important issues. She shared that it is through these incentives, and not through evaluation or tenure review, that the College of Management "gets faculty to do the things they want done."

In the absence of requirements for volunteerism and other forms of community service, it was not surprising to hear just a handful of examples of faculty engagement offered by interviewees or to find that these activities were reported by very few faculty members at any institution in their on-line biographies and vitas. The only exception to this was observed at the Carey School of Business. Many business school faculty members at Arizona State University noted either consulting work with government agencies, non-profits, non-governmental organizations, or businesses, sitting on boards of not-for-profits, volunteering in the community, or partnering with community organizations to solve problems in their on-line vitas. In a discussion about these findings with the co-author of *Elite MBA Programs at Public Universities*, Wolverton observed that the level of faculty engagement discovered among ASU faculty may have been a function of the former dean, Larry Penley's focus on service (Personal conversation, 2007). Support for this proposition was found in a statement Penley wrote in 2004, in which he asserted, "Involvement with the community is taken seriously at the W. P. Carey School of Business."

In on-line biographical statements and vitas, faculty at all schools reported service to editorial boards and professional associations most often, and consulting work for businesses, non-profits, NGO's, and government agencies with the next highest
frequency. For example, at the Moore School of Business in South Carolina and at the Kelley School of Business at Indiana, 5% of faculty members reported consulting work for non-profit and government organizations.

Community Leaders Engaged on Campus.

All six schools examined in this study connect with community, business, and educational leaders to some degree. Most frequently, these relationships are established through the extension of invitations to attend lectures, executive education, or professional development programs, and by having, leaders (mostly drawn from the business community), serve as guest lecturers in classes or in any number of lecture series. Completely absent in the six schools was any mention of community leaders serving as student mentors, unless those leaders were alumni. Community leaders were notably absent on deans’ advisory boards across the six schools. One school, the University of South Carolina, did have a substantial number of non-profit leaders and one union leader on the board of its Riegel & Emory Human Resource Research Center. We also found few examples of research projects that involved partnerships with government or community organizations or that were explicitly designed to solve community problems. By contrast, our examination of the numerous research centers across these six schools revealed a significant amount of industry sponsored research and funding for buildings and equipment.

All of the schools examined in this study offered continuing education programs. These programs were most commonly packaged as executive education programs, lecture series open to students, faculty, and business leaders, and specialized courses, training programs, and conferences sponsored by research centers and institutes. The six schools
differed from one another on this dimension only in terms of the number of continuing and executive education programs offered, the content of the courses, and the focus of the conferences hosted. A number of Centers for International Business Education and Research at the different institutions offer educational outreach to K-12 teachers. Through one of its research centers, the University of South Carolina conducts a leadership development program for superintendents, principals, and assistant principals. None of the schools offered cooperative education opportunities to MBA students.

Socially Directed Research.

None of the six schools in this study have an established research agenda, leaving faculty free to study what interests them. The associate dean of MBA programs at the Carey School of Business detailed the reasoning for this at Arizona State. He explained that the competitive research environment prevents the school from recruiting faculty with specialized research interests. Florida’s dean clarified that Warrington lacks a research agenda because publishing in “A-list” business journals is the school’s singular research objective. Georgia Tech foregoes a set research schema for the same reason. While Moore and Smith also abdicate a research plan, both identify research areas either targeted for expansion or where a great deal of study is underway across the business school. At Smith technology and entrepreneurship are distinguished as important areas for enhanced study in alignment with the school’s mission and strategic plan. Smith’s dean commented that the strategic plans of each department within the business school drives research in that area and informs the business school’s strategy.

A strategic emphasis on research with a social purpose or impact, on studies that address social, environmental impact, or research in collaboration with community
groups or government agencies was also notably absent in all six schools. These exclusions are especially significant because they represent disconnects between the business schools and the research priorities and approaches established by the larger academies to which these schools belong. The strategic plans of all the universities housing business schools under study, detail research priorities that reflect collaboration with government agencies and communities to identify social problems and a desire to address these issues using the institutions’ resources, an approach advanced by Thomas (1998). Absent, however, is the translation of these priorities into research drivers within the business schools. This divergence in priorities is best reflected in a quote by the dean of the Robert H. Smith School of Business at the University of Maryland, who said, “I don’t know if business schools have a role in curing poverty....”

The emphasis on pursuing research that considers the public good and assumes responsibility for the economic, social, and cultural vitality of the community detailed in Arizona State University’s vision statement is not reflected in Carey’s philosophy regarding or practices related to research at the business school. Carey’s approach to research also does not reflect key strategic priorities established for the institution by its president, including, calls to consider the local relevance of research, demonstrate planetary stewardship, transform society, improve the human condition, and foster “sustained social advancement and economic growth,” and “harness...knowledge for maximum societal benefit” (ASU, A New American University, 2007). Carey, like other schools in the study, does conduct research and engage in activities that support economic growth, through the efforts of its research centers and individual faculty members.
Moore represents another critical example of the disconnection between the research priorities of the university and the research activities of the business school. The University of South Carolina's 2006 strategic plan establishes five research priorities for the institution: nanotechnology, conversion of future fuels, the environment, biomedical sciences, and studies that tie these areas to the humanities. A review of Moore faculty vitas and biographical statements on-line found no connection between these research priorities and the research interests and publications produced by business school faculty.

While none of the six schools we examined had an established research agenda, nor did they demonstrate a deliberate connection between their research priorities and the social priorities detailed in the research agendas within the larger institutions that house them, each of the schools have faculty who are engaged in research in areas that support the common good and reflect issues related to social responsibility and civic engagement. We also found business schools using many of the tactics identified in the literature as vehicles for demonstrating a social connection in their research efforts and outcomes. For example, we found faculty at all six schools reporting research in a variety of areas identified by the Aspen Institute and the World Resources Institutes (2003) as socially directed, including workplace diversity, sustainability, stakeholder theory, globalization, environmental management strategies, and others. Table 33 summarizes these findings.

Knowledge Sharing with the Community.

For all the schools included in this study, publication of research was a high priority. Through publication, continuing and executive education programs, conferences, seminars, public lectures, economic reporting, and other similar activities, the six schools share knowledge and information with peers, business leaders, and
Table 33: Number of Faculty Reporting Socially Directed Research at Carey, Kelley, Smith, Warrington, Moore, and the College of Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Area</th>
<th>ASU</th>
<th>IU</th>
<th>UMD</th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>USC</th>
<th>GA Tech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking/Decision Making/Analysis</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Issues</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Issues</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment/Sustainability</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teams/Teamwork</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict/Negotiation/Cooperation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

community members. Notably absent in all the business schools examined is what, ASU president Michael Crow calls for in the school’s strategic plan, “gaining wisdom through local knowledge.” Ramaley describes this two-way flow of information between the academy and the community as a hallmark of an engaged institution (Ramaley, 2005).

*Initiatives with an Economic or Political Purpose.*

None of the business schools we examined sponsors or coordinates service activities for faculty or staff. Instead, service to the community appears to occur predominantly through the research centers and institutes they establish. A great deal of the work done by these centers is targeted toward regional, national, and international
economic development, and to research, teaching, and publishing on issues of importance to businesses and government agencies, including leadership, culture, economics, global business, entrepreneurship, ethics, corporate governance, and others. Five of the schools examined had centers or institutes committed to the study of international business and all had at least one institute engaged in economic analysis and forecasting. Beyond this, the types and focuses of the institutes and centers varied significantly across the institutions.

At each of the schools, at least one research center is engaged in work with an economic, political, social, or environmental purpose. As an example, the Division of Research at the Moore School of Business houses two non-profit centers: The South Carolina Council on Economic Education provides primary and secondary school teachers with resources and training to teach personal finance and economics. Moore’s Export Consortium delivers research and training to economic development agencies and small to medium businesses in an effort to help them compete in the global economy. Moore’s Center for Business Communication teaches students, faculty, staff and alumni teamwork, inter-cultural communication, and English as a Second Language.

Kelley’s Benecki Center for Real Estate Studies partners with the Bloomington Housing and Neighborhood Development office to evaluate the existence of and create policies to support affordable housing. The Randall L. Tobias Center for Leadership, also at Kelley, conducts research and hosts public educational programs that explore the theory and practice of leadership in corporate, public service, education, religion, politics, medicine, and non-profit organizations. The Tobias Center hosts the Semlar Lecture Series devoted to philanthropy, community leadership, and stewardship issues.
The College of Management at Georgia Tech is home to several unique research centers and initiatives. In alignment with Georgia Institute of Technology’s mission and strategic plan, its business school houses ECLIPS (Expanding Closed Loop Production Systems), a center that focuses on research and education on re-use, remanufacturing, and sustainable business practices. The head of the ECLIPS center is committed to integrating the study of sustainable business practices in all business school courses. Biz Lab is another specialized center within the College of Management. Biz Lab is an interdisciplinary research center that studies decision making, information sharing, and communication. The Financial Analysis Lab at Georgia Tech conducts market research and produces reports that help investors make sound decisions that include accurate information about a firm’s real value. The business school at Georgia Tech recently established an Institute of Leadership and Entrepreneurship (ILE) to promote leadership and entrepreneurship concerned with values, social responsibility, and sustainability. The ILE sponsors a business case competition and the Impact Lecture series to promote entrepreneurship; supports the local Net Impact Chapter; conducts research on entrepreneurship, leadership, corporate social responsibility, values-driven leadership, and ethics; and helps drive the business school’s efforts to infuse social responsibility and sustainability across its curriculum.

Indiana University, the University of Florida, and Georgia Tech each sponsor centers that promote and support entrepreneurship. The Johnson Center for Entrepreneurship at Kelley offers fulltime MBA students a certificate in social entrepreneurship that prepares them to lead non-profit, government, and community organizations. In addition to educational offerings on entrepreneurship in general,
Warrington’s Center for Entrepreneurship and Innovation delivers courses on social entrepreneurship; hosts case competitions focused on the creation of organizations committed to solving local or international social problems; provides undergraduate and MBA students with opportunities to help businesses and non-profits establish themselves, sometimes in economically distressed areas; sponsors the student organization committed to positive social change around the globe, Change the World; and supports a six week summer academy for high school students focused on leadership, entrepreneurship, community service, and civic engagement.

The Carey School of Business hosts the Spirit of Enterprise Center, designed to help small, emerging, and family owned businesses in Arizona prosper and to promote social entrepreneurship. The Smith School of Business at the University of Maryland is home to a Private Investor’s Network that matches emerging entrepreneurs with angel investors who fund business ideas. Smith also houses the largest venture capital fund ever established by a business school. This for profit-venture allows students the opportunity to work as fund associates while participating in a year long-course in venture investment, and provides loans to regional businesses that commit to establishing themselves in low-income areas in the region.

We also found that, like schools identified as best in class in the bi-annual Beyond Grey Pinstripe study, three of the six business schools in our study have at least one academic center or institute that conducts research and engages in other activities related to issues of social responsibility, social impact management, environmental management, or sustainability. Indiana’s Kelley School of Business and Georgia Tech’s College of Management each have two such centers, and Florida’s Warrington College of Business
Administration has one socially directed research center. Table 34 identifies these centers and institutes.

Table 34: Institutes or Research Centers that Engage in Socially Directed Research or Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business School</th>
<th>Name or Research Center or Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kelley School of Business, Indiana University</td>
<td>• The Randall Tobias Center for Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Johnson Center for Entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Management, Georgia Institute of</td>
<td>• ECLIPS Center (Expanding Closed Loops In Production)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>• Institute for Leadership &amp; Entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington College of Business Administration,</td>
<td>• The Center for Entrepreneurship &amp; Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For-Credit Learning and Student Service Opportunities.

All six schools examined in this study either encourage students to participate in activities that connect them with the community, such as internships, practicum experiences, or consulting work, or provide them with opportunities to do so. None of the six schools studied, however, requires all MBA students to complete an internship or routinely grants credit for community based learning or service. The University of South Carolina requires International MBA students to complete a for-credit, three to four month internship with an international organization in the United States or abroad. MBA students at Indiana University pursuing a certificate in social entrepreneurship must complete an internship, and may do so in a public or non-profit organization. Although the University of Maryland does not require MBA students to complete an internship, Smith does provide academic credit to those who do so. Georgia Tech issues credit for internships when they have an academic component to them. Students at all six schools
can complete internships in government, non-profit, and non-governmental agencies as well as in businesses, however, it appears that most internships are completed in for-profit firms.

None of the six business schools studied require MBA students to volunteer in the community or establishes community service goals for MBA students, as many do with undergraduates. Five of the six schools we examined sponsor at least one MBA club that engages in community service with or philanthropic activities in support of community-based organizations or non-profits. Two business schools, Georgia Tech and Indiana University strongly encourage MBA students to engage in service work.

Kelley's dean noted that his business school does not require student volunteerism but encourages it because he believes that individuals cannot be "compelled to develop a social compass." Instead, he asserted, they must develop this themselves. Indiana provides its undergraduate business students with resources, support, and encouragement to participate in service activities. Kelley administrators promote the value of community service to undergraduates by underscoring the importance of volunteerism to recruiters and by providing a variety of volunteer opportunities for students through the school's Civic Leadership Development Program (CLDP). A comparable program is not available at the MBA level at Kelley. Instead, Kelley MBA students who want to volunteer can find opportunities to do so through two student associations, Net Impact and the Kelley Association of Women MBAs, or can seek them out on their own. The dean of Indiana's business school explained that the school encourages its MBA students to take on year long projects with non-profits and community organizations that are larger in scale and
require a more significant time commitment than service projects they will find in the two student associations that engage in such work.

At Georgia Tech, student volunteerism is encouraged by not required. Much of the student service engaged in by Tech MBA’s is done through class projects, through the work done by the school’s Net Impact chapter, and through the Graduate Student Membership Organization. Tech MBA students can also participate in two other service oriented committees devoted to fundraising for the business school. USC’s business school reported that their students are too busy to volunteer, yet two student associations at Moore, Net Impact and the Moore Association of Women MBA’s, report service activities as part of their missions. The dean of the business school at the University of Maryland asserted that there’s lots of student volunteerism at Smith, yet the researcher found only one example student service in any of the school’s supporting materials and no student association with service noted as a component of its mission or as a reported activity. Smith’s dean (2006) offered MBA student consulting to businesses, community, and non-profit organizations on a discounted, fee-for-service basis as an example of student service to the community.

Infrastructure

An infrastructure to support the civic or social mission of the business schools examined, including the funding, staffing, and oversight of initiatives that demonstrate the school’s commitment to civic and social engagement (Stephens, Colby, Ehrlich, & Beaumont, 2000), was largely missing in each of the six schools when we looked beyond their research centers and institutes dedicated to these ends. Only one of the six schools responded to questions about how the college supports and evaluates their civic and
social engagement efforts with answers that extended beyond fundraising to support the school’s research centers and institutes. Answers provided by the deans of Warrington and Smith and the former dean of the College of Management illustrate this point. Florida’s dean pointed to efforts to fundraise for the Poe Center for Business Ethics, the Corporate Governance Institute, and Warrington’s Center for Entrepreneurship, as well as fundraising efforts to support the establishment as a student assessment center as examples of efforts to support the school’s social compact.

Maryland’s dean pointed to the school’s seven institutes or centers as a primary vehicle used by Smith to fulfill its social contract, noting that these centers create vital partnerships with public, private, and non-profit organizations, and provide integrated, interdisciplinary teaching and research opportunities for students and faculty. Georgia Tech responded that the College of Management is focused on ensuring that the things the school feels are important, including sustainability and social responsibility, are integrated into all the school’s programs and practices, and on raising the funds needed to support other strategic priorities, including the expansion of existing programs to serve a wider, more diverse group of students.

Community Access to Campus Space and Resources.

No evidence was available through interviews or a review of archival data to suggest that Smith, Warrington, Carey, Kelley, or Moore provide the community with access to their facilities and technology. The College of Management at Georgia Tech goes the furthest of the six colleges in this study in its efforts to afford the community accessibility to its buildings, programs, and technologies. In the planning and design of the new building for the business school, university and college administrators made the
deliberate decision to locate the College of Management in downtown Atlanta in the complex named Technology Square. The choice of location was made in order to encourage collaboration with other Tech colleges, the community and area businesses, and other academic institutions. The location of the business school close to regional transportation lines, in the heart of the business district, and side-by-side with retail, conference, and meeting space makes the College of Management visible to and easily accessed by members of the community. The new home of Georgia Tech’s business school features state-of-the-art technology throughout the building and meeting and study space that promotes collaboration. In the short time since the business school moved to its new location, the College of Management further expanded the reach of its MBA program through the addition of a part-time, evening program and web-enabled educational offerings.

Assessment of Civic/Social Effectiveness.

All of the schools examined measure one or more element of social engagement including student diversity, the percentage of students studying or traveling abroad, and/or student volunteerism. Table 35 provides a detailed summary of assessment activities. Each of the six schools tracks and reports on the diversity of its students. Three schools evaluate the percentage of students studying or traveling abroad. The business school at the University of South Carolina collects data on international travel and study. Administrators at Moore also monitor the number and variety of countries visited through international study and internships.
Table 35: Elements of the Engagement Framework Measured by Business Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>ASU</th>
<th>IU</th>
<th>UMD</th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>USC</th>
<th>GAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student diversity</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student community service</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students study/travel abroad</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty engagement with the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Percent of graduates employed in-state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Number of countries visited by students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender diversity of faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Number of credit hours taken by non-manage-ment students; percent of business students pursuing dual degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

In this chapter, we reported all of the socially-directed activities observed within the business schools at Arizona State University, Indiana University, the University of Maryland, Florida State University, the University of South Carolina, and the Georgia Institute of Technology, explored the missions and strategic plans and initiatives that tie these six universities to society, and detailed the missions of six public business schools, their perceived stakeholders, and the beliefs of school leaders about the role and purpose of these schools in society. We filter this data further in the subsequent chapters, by first comparing key findings related to ethics education, socially directed research,
coursework and experiences to build an understanding of social responsibility and sustainability to past studies on these issues. Then, in Chapter 14, we discuss how these results support or vary from those anticipated by our framework, examine possible explanations for divergence, and suggest areas for future study. The results are used again in Chapter 15 to inform a new understanding of social responsibility and civic engagement in public business schools and the creation of a new framework to use when studying the social contract moving forward.
CHAPTER 13

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS IN LIGHT OF RESEARCH ON BUSINESS SCHOOLS
AND THEIR MBA PROGRAMS

Background

Previous studies by McCabe & Trevino (1995), Williams, Barrett & Brabston (2000), Kretovics (1999) and Atcha, Bunch, Layke, Gentile, McGaw & Samuelson (2001) and articles by Ghoshal (2005), Pfeffer (2005), and Friga (et al, 2003) paint a bleak portrait of American public business schools and their MBA programs today. These and other authors portray U.S. business schools as unresponsive to the needs of 21st century business (Friga, Bettis & Sullivan, 2003; Porter & McKibbin, 1988); criticize them for failing to prepare students to adequately and courageously face the ethical dilemmas present in the modern firm (Aspen Institute, 2002); accuse them teaching MBA students and business leaders outdated and detrimental theories of management and business (Ghoshal, 2005; Pfeffer, 2005; Moss-Kanter, 2005); and charge them with producing leaders who are ill prepared to manage human capital (Moss-Kanter, 2005) or to sufficiently prevent safety violations in the workplace (Williams, Barrett & Brabston, 2000).

Investigations of MBA programs done by Hahs (1999), Pfeffer (2005), Jensen, Porter, Ghoshal, (2005), and Stott and Wolverton (2005) present a more optimistic picture of business schools and their cadillac program. Their findings intimate that a
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A closer look at American business schools would reveal that, while business schools might be missing the mark in a number of key areas, they are actively pursuing strategies that support the common good and prepare graduates capable of contributing to the social and environmental wellbeing of their communities and the larger world.

This study attempted to examine both the merits of the criticisms directed toward public business schools and to more deeply explore the tactics deployed by business schools to fulfill the social missions of the public institutions that house them. Through individual and cross case analysis this study explored the strategies used by six elite public business schools to contribute to and support their communities and stakeholders and prepare MBA students to be successful, responsible leaders, and engaged citizens.

In this chapter we explore how our findings support or challenge the work of other academics who have studied various aspects of social engagement in business schools. Then, in Chapter 14, we discuss how the engagement activities of the public business schools we examined align with those found in higher education overall, explore how the beliefs, backgrounds and priorities of business school leaders influence civic connectedness, and pose questions to be answered through future research. Changes to our original framework, identification of exemplars, and recommendations for greater social responsibility in public business schools are presented in the final chapter.

Comparison of Findings with Previous Research

Several key elements of our original framework are derived from research on or criticisms of business schools and their curricular and co-curricular offerings with implications for civic and social engagement and responsiveness. These include business
ethics and focus, coursework and experiences in social responsibility and related fields, socially directed research, and stakeholder theory. Because of the significance of our findings in these areas, we will address them first.

*Ethics Education*

Studies on ethics education in MBA programs done by McCabe & Trevino (2001; 1993) and the Aspen Institute (2000) suggest that business schools are not adequately preparing students to think critically about and resolve the moral challenges they are likely to face in the workplace. Worse still, McCabe and Trevino's (1993) finding that business students are twice as likely as their peers to admit cheating hints that the education business students are receiving might even contribute to unethical behavior. One might assume that given these bleak results, requirements by the AACSB to address ethics in business curriculum, the plethora of recent accounting and financial scandals plaguing U.S. businesses since the end of the 1990s, and a growing body of research on business ethics education (McCabe and Trevino, 1993; 2001; Gilbert, 1992; Gioia, 2004; Crane, 2004), that business school leaders and faculty would be focusing intently on business ethics in and across MBA curriculum and would be emphasizing a culture within the business school that promotes and encourages moral action. The results of this study suggest that this is not the case. Instead, the current inquiry shows that ethics is not garnering much attention in MBA programs.

Across the business schools studied here, ethics was delivered as a stand-alone course in three schools, and shared the curriculum with one or two additional subjects at the other three schools. Two schools, the University of Florida and Georgia Tech, provide students with opportunities to learn more about the subject by hearing speakers
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address the topic in a lecture series or by taking elective courses in ethics. One school, Warrington, has a research center devoted to the study of ethics in business. There was no consistency across the six schools in terms of when a course on ethics is delivered to MBA students. For example, at the Smith School of Business in Maryland and at the College of Management at Georgia Tech, ethics is introduced to MBA students at the beginning of their studies, but within two MBA programs at the University of Florida, students encounter ethics late in their first year or toward the end of their program. Even within business schools that offered multiple MBA programs, there was no consistency in requirements for ethics courses across programs or continuity in terms of where in the MBA curriculum students take this course. The best example of this was found at Warrington, where MBA students in two programs have an ethics requirement in their core coursework, but those attending four of its MBA programs have no similar mandate.

These practices run contrary to McCabe and Trevino’s (1993) recommendation that students are introduced to ethics at the beginning of their studies, that they encounter deliberately placed discussions about ethics in all of their business courses, and that students revisit ethics through a capstone or other experience that promotes synthesis and application of learning at the conclusion of business studies. These practices, at times, also run counter to models of ethics education proposed by Gilbert (1992), Gioia (2004), Crane (2004), and others. Gilbert (1992) advocates that MBA programs teach business ethics “before functional studies begin in order to better inform...and stimulate ethical reasoning in courses in accounting, marketing, and so forth” (p. 5-6). Gioia (2002) and Crane (2004) suggest ethics in MBA programs should be prominently emphasized through the use of a stand-alone business ethics course, while Gioia (2002) and McCabe
and Trevino (1993) argue that a thorough business education in ethics requires integration of this topic into core business courses like finance, accounting, management, marketing, and others. In the meta-learning model for business education advanced by McCabe and Trevino (1993), the authors also encourage schools to create a culture that supports ethics through the creation and deployment of strict honor guidelines, engagement of students in the review of and decisions regarding honor-code violations, and other related activities.

The only school in this study that asserted that ethics is infused across the MBA curriculum was Indiana's Kelley School of Business. Kelley's dean and Carey's associate dean of MBA programs also affirmed that their schools place a significant emphasis on ethics in their recruitment of students, focus on ethical behavior through their honor codes, and highlight the ethical competence of students when marketing students to recruiters. None of these claims were substantiated through an examination of archival data, including the syllabi for core courses in Carey's MBA program, or via a review of marketing materials for prospective MBAs or recruiters for the school, and received only minimal attention in Kelley's core MBA curriculum and marketing materials. The school that most closely resembled the model set forth by McCabe and Trevino (1993), Smith, admits that discussions about ethics do not take place in any planned way in business school courses.

At the University of Maryland, the Smith School of Business goes the furthest of any of the schools examined in its desire to produce ethical business leaders through its MBA programs. Smith introduces MBAs to ethics at the start of their studies, requires all students to sign an ethics pledge, and engages students in the review and decision making around honor code violations. The business school also advocated for and succeeded in
strengthening the university’s academic integrity code. All MBA students at Smith are also required to participate in an ethics week program at the conclusion of their studies, which includes a visit to a federal prison and visits with executives convicted of legal and ethical wrong doing.

All six schools studied used one or more pedagogical tools deemed to be effective vehicles to teach business ethics (Crane, 2004, Hatton, 1996; Pincoffs, 1986). These include case studies, experiential learning activities, presentations by business leaders, and others that expose students to ethical issues they may encounter in the real world and provide them with opportunities to learn and practice using ethical reasoning skills (Hatton, 1996).

The lack of a significant focus on ethics at five of the six schools investigated here provides support for the concerns that business schools may not be doing enough to prepare students for the moral uncertainties that they will encounter in the increasingly complex and global world of work (Gioia, 2002; Pfeffer, 2005; Hatton, 1996; Khurana, 2007), or to meet the needs and interests of MBA students to learn about ethics and how to handle workplace dilemmas as identified by the Aspen Institute (2001) and Crane (2004). The marginalization of ethics within the schools we studied supports concerns raised about the ethical training of business students by Khurana (2007) who argued “If students do not...see business schools as the custodians of high business ideals, or if they believe that ethics gets in the way of progressing in business, they will regard ethics courses as peripheral to managerial practice or a cynical attempt by business schools to placate external critics during periods of business scandals” (p. 370). If this is occurring across a broader swath of schools than we examined here, one might expect to see no end
to the corporate scandals that dominated the news in the late 1990s and into the new millennia. The inattention to business ethics we uncovered in this study may also be fodder for continued arguments that we encountered through our interviews with business school leaders and those reflected in the literature – that you cannot teach ethics to adults. Our findings indicate that this is true if, as Khurana (2007) asserts, “teaching ethics [means] simply adding another item to an already wide-ranging curriculum” (p. 370).

Our results also suggest that business schools are not attending as strongly to ethics in their curricular and co-curricular activities as they are inferring in their marketing materials and self-promotion, suggesting that business schools are not creating the organizational structures needed to promote such concrete effects as moral reasoning and behavior, but are instead relying on myth and ceremonial activities that reflect social expectations in order to maintain appearances (Meyer & Rowan, 1991). Without reviewing the syllabi of all core MBA courses across these six schools, directly observing classroom discussions, or assessing the ethical competence of MBA students at the beginning and end of their programs of study, it is impossible to fully assess the how extensively ethics is covered in the MBA programs at these six school or how effective the schools’ existing ethics education is in the development of ethical and moral reasoning skills. Future studies of ethics education, using a much larger number of business schools, would help confirm whether the approaches taken by these six schools are exceptional practices or the norm in business education today. Such studies might well include examination of syllabi for all core courses and direct observation in a cross section of required courses delivered at the business schools under study. Other researchers may want to examine the impact of an MBA degree on students’ moral
reasoning and evaluate how effective these programs are in shaping student perceptions of the ethics education they receive and their ability to respond to the real ethical dilemmas they encounter in the workplace. Studies of this nature would help to further substantiate or call into question, the extensive criticism of ethics education in business schools and our findings that suggest that business schools are doing far less than they could to teach students to think and act ethically.

**Social Responsibility in Curricular and Co-Curricular Activities**

The 2003 *Beyond Grey Pinstripes* report details a growing interest among students and business leaders in issues of social responsibility, sustainability, and environmental impact management and a desire to understand how businesses can deploy these practices and remain profitable. To help satisfy these demands, business schools are exposing students to social and environmental stewardship through coursework, business case competitions, certificates in social entrepreneurship, and extracurricular activities such as clubs, conferences, and lecture series. While the World Resources Institute and the Aspen Institute, sponsors of the *Beyond Grey Pinstripes* study, report a growing number of course offerings since 2001, they also found fewer than half of the 90 schools completing their 2003 survey provide MBAs with less than five electives with any social or environmental content and provide scant coverage of these topics in core courses. By contrast, the report reveals that the schools receiving top honors by reviewers are offering three times as many elective course in these areas as other business schools, are integrating social responsibility and sustainability into core coursework, and host more extracurricular and student initiated activities including speaker series, clubs, and events that broaden students' understanding of social and environmental stewardship.
None of the business schools we studied met the *Pinstripes* bar in terms of curricular offerings. We found just one school, Moore, with any core course that addresses social responsibility, sustainability, or social entrepreneurship, and four schools (Moore, The College of Management, Warrington, and Kelley) with elective offerings on these subjects. Within our schools we found just one attempting to integrate sustainability and social responsibility into its curriculum at the urging of some of its students and faculty. None of the schools in our study reflected the innovation seen in top ranked schools in the *Beyond Grey Pinstripes* study, including full topical integration within the MBA core, multiple elective offerings, and an extensive array of extracurricular opportunities that promote an understanding of social responsibility or sustainability.

On a more promising note, we did find the presence of student organizations and clubs, like Net Impact, devoted to the study of social responsibility or sustainability all schools except Carey and Smith. Additionally, business schools at Georgia Tech, Maryland, Warrington, and Indiana provide students, faculty, and the business community with at least one program, event, or extra or co-curricular activity focused on social or environmental impact and responsibility. For example, Georgia Tech’s annual Business Plan Competition includes an award for Social and Environmental Sustainability, and the business school sponsors meetings, panel discussions, and a lecture series, all of which explore issues of social responsibility. A lecture series addressing service, stewardship, or social and environmental issues was also found at both Smith and Kelley. These discoveries confirm the conclusions contained in the 2003 *Beyond Grey Pinstripes* report, that students are interested in social responsibility and
environmental stewardship but coverage of these topics in the classroom remain “severely limited.”

A future study that seeks to use our methodologies and revised framework to assess the full extent of engagement at those business schools ranked highest by the World Resources Institute and the Aspen Institute would help illuminate whether the excellence found in the research, teaching, and co-curricular activities focused on social responsibility and sustainability translates into extensive engagement efforts such as MBA student and faculty service to the community, commitment to economic development, global connections and competence, and others.

**Socially Directed Research**

Through faculty and institutional involvement in socially directed research and in research designed to address social, economic, and environmental issues, staff and students gain first-hand knowledge of key issues facing society, gather data that informs their curriculum, identify issues that can help shape the school’s research agenda and key officials from government and community organizations interested in working with students and partnering with the institution on key initiatives and demonstrate usefulness to and engagement with society (Braskamp & Wergin, 1998; Chapple et al, 2003; Stephens et al, 2000).

Top performing schools in the *Beyond Grey Pinstripes* biennial surveys are extensively researching issues related to the “social and environmental dimensions of enterprise management” (2003, p. 6) on topics ranging from diversity, sustainability, globalization, stakeholder theory, social responsibility, and others. While we were not able to quantify and compare the volume of research produced in these areas at the six
schools we studied with a hundred peer institutions as *Pinstripes* did, and come to a judgment about the relative extent of research in these areas, we were able to find faculty at all schools conducting research in areas of social or environmental import, in the areas identified by the *Pinstripes* reports, and more. And like top performing schools in the *Pinstripes* rating system, three of the business schools we looked at have at least one, if not more, research center of institute dedicated in whole or part to social or environmental impact management.

*Stakeholders and Stakeholder Theory*

Ghoshal (2005), Pfeffer (2005), and Khurana (2007) found fault with business schools, in part for their advancement of theories of management, including stakeholder theories that consider investors in firms as the primary and most important constituents served. Ghoshal and Khurana trace corporate wrong doing, such as the scandals that plagued Enron and WorldCom, to this imbalance, as leaders work to maximize returns to shareholders without concern for the effects on stakeholders. Evidence of the existence of this type of thinking about stakeholders was apparent across the schools interviewed. Yet the schools’ responses to questions about their perceived stakeholders also yielded promise that business schools are defining their constituents more broadly to include more than just those individuals and collections of individuals (the state, its citizens, society at large) who fund the enterprise. As an illustration of the latter point, all schools interviewed named students, faculty and staff as stakeholders, suggesting an appreciation of the importance of these groups in the school’s functioning and success. All other groups identified as stakeholders reflect those with a financial investment in the institutions or groups or groups like recruiters and the media who can further the school’s
reputation in the marketplace. In all instances, service to stakeholders was described in terms of what a school could receive in turn from the group. For example, outreach to alumni appears to be done largely to reengage graduates with the school as both donors and as consumers of one of the schools’ highest priced commodities, executive education programs.

Each of the six schools acknowledged society, the local community, or the state as one of a variety of constituents, most often because these groups contribute financially to the schools. As an example, the Marketing and Communications Manager for the Moore School of Business identified the state of South Carolina as a primary constituent, saying that this is widely accepted because they “pay the bills.” Despite widespread and explicit acknowledgement of society or its agents as key stakeholders across the schools we studied, little attention appeared to be paid to serving these constituents directly. When asked how Smith serves its stakeholders, the dean of the business school at the University of Maryland described Smith’s greatness as its primary contribution to the state. While another school saw service to the communities that supports it in terms of producing graduates who will transform organizations, which will, in turn, change society for the better. None cited the economic impact they make through their research centers and institutes as societal contributions, and one school (Smith) pointed to the support provided to area organizations through student volunteerism and discounted consulting services delivered by students as an important give back.

Perhaps the most striking illustration of the concern expressed by Ghoshal (2005), Pfeffer (2005), and Khurana (2007) about how business schools are teaching students to think about stakeholders was found in the interview with, writings of, and subsequent
phone call from the Associate Dean of MBA programs at the Carey School of Business at Arizona State University. In the interview for this study, the associate dean firmly asserted that he rejects the notion of the public good and the premise of this study, saying that he doesn’t believe that business schools should be teaching social responsibility. After reading a draft of the Carey case summary provided to him by the researcher, the associate dean called to clarify these statements and provide further information that would shine light on his position. In this call, he explained that his research has shown that organizations cannot serve the public good because they cannot know or understand what is in the public’s interest. He elaborated that in a pluralistic society such as ours, competing group interests prevent the very formation of a common good. Therefore, he said, organizations must focus instead on the satisfying the interests of those groups that can ensure their success, and do so because of self-interest and a desire for self-preservation. Evidence to support this position, he said, can be found in conversations he’s had with corporate leaders. When he asks them about activities like charitable giving, he said that they tell him that they engage in philanthropy because their customers expect them to. And when he digs further to find out who they give to, the associate dean said that he often finds charitable contributions to the arts, which he says only benefits the leaders.

Conversations with the associate dean of MBA programs at Carey both underscored concerns about business education raised by Ghoshal (2005), Pfeffer (1999) and Khurana (2007) and provided possible, partial explanations for some of our findings. We will address the theoretical issues these conversations surfaced first and return to theory to help elucidate other findings later in the chapter. The concept of enlightened
self interest is a derivative of Adam’s Smith’s economic theory, which some critics of modern business education including Ghoshal (2005) and Khurana (2007) describe as characteristic of the theories that are guiding the curriculum at business schools – theories that they describe as detrimental to ethical, responsible leadership in the modern firm. Khurana takes aim at Smith’s economic theory and the emphasis placed on the primacy of shareholders in his most recent book on business education, *From Higher Aims to Hired Hands*, in which he characterizes the philosophical undercurrents in business schools over the last 30 years as “neo-liberal utopianism” that values “market processes over contingent concerns and decisions of human actors, including managers and their constituents other than shareholders” (2007, p. 363). Robert Frank, a behavioral economist, argued that teaching students that individuals are driven primarily by self-interest denies them of opportunities to consider the importance of other motives, including competition, achievement, and relationships with and connectivity to others, and teaches students that the success requires taking “advantage of every conceivable opportunity to gain at the expense of others” (Schmotter, 1998, p. 15).

A 2003 study of MBA students by the Aspen Institute suggests that ideologies including the importance of creating value for shareholders taught by faculty across business schools have a powerful impact on student ideas about stakeholders, when it revealed that MBA students become increasingly concerned with return on investment to shareholders and less interested in the needs and demands of other stakeholders, like customers, employees, and the community, as their business education progresses. It is important to note that the “neo-liberal” ideology identified by Khurana was most strongly reflected in interviews with the associate dean of MBA programs at Carey but was also
revealed, to a much lesser extent in conversations with leaders and managers at several of the other business schools (e.g., Smith, Kelley, and Warrington), particularly in discussions surrounding stakeholders and their beliefs about social responsibility in business schools.

Conversations with the associate dean of MBA programs at Carey also surfaced issues that can be explained, in part by organizational theory. When describing why business leaders engage in socially responsible activities such as philanthropy, he intimated that they do so out because they say it is what their customers expect them to do. This type of behavior might best be described, not by Smith’s concept of “self-interest” but by theories of organizational behavior. When writing about institutionalized organizations, Meyer and Rowan (1991) note that firms engage in activities prescribed by actors in their internal and external environments in an effort to appear “legitimate.” Legitimacy in turn, strengthens the support an organization receives from its constituents and, thus, ensures its survival.

Through our analysis we found, comparatively speaking, public business schools reported less direct service to society (e.g., government and community based organizations, non-profits, and non-governmental organizations, and “the common good) than to other constituents, and less specificity regarding the services provided to the communities, states, and the nation that house and support the schools than to others. The diminutive attention paid to the communities in which the six schools operate or to society at large as a core or primary constituency may be due in part to the ever decreasing role states play in the budgets of business schools, and the rise in what we saw – a concomitant increase in revenues from business and industry in terms of tuition paid
(for degree and non-degree programs), donations, funded research, and monies to support the construction of research centers, parks, and other buildings. Smith’s notation in its strategic plan that state revenue accounts for just 10% of the business school’s operating budget provides support for this assumption. As “cash cows” of public universities today, bringing in substantial amounts of money for themselves and for their host institutions, it seems that business schools may have little motivation to change their thinking about who is important to them and how to best meet the needs of all their constituents when doing as they have been doing has paid off handsomely. The assertion by the former dean of Harvard University, Harry Lewis, that money appears to be the predominant driving force in decisions in academia (2006) appears to be reflected in the business schools we studied.

Future studies are needed to gain a deeper understanding of the stakeholder theories taught in business schools today. Comparing this data with an assessment of who business school leaders see as their primary constituents and how they serve those groups would help clarify even further the extent that traditional stakeholder theories are being taught in business schools, how widely shared these beliefs are among business school leaders, and the influence these theories have on business school strategy and operations. Research that attempts to better understand public business school revenue streams and their relationship with strategic priorities would allow for further exploration of our suggestion that a potentially strong relationship exists between the two.
COMPARISON OF RESULTS WITH THE LITERATURE ON CIVIC ENGAGEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Introduction

When we move away from a narrow, comparative review of our findings against those presented in past studies to a larger view of business schools and the contributions they make to society against an engagement framework derived from the literature on civic responsibility and higher education, the outcomes become much more positive. Each of the six schools examined is engaging with society in ways directed by their own unique missions; the missions, values, and strategies of the larger institutions to which they belong; and the belief systems that guide business school leaders and faculty.

In the section that follows, we detail our findings in light of the elements in our original framework and our cross-case analysis (see Appendix E), which were guided by the literature on civic responsibility in higher education. We describe how the realities of business schools and their MBA programs both align with and differ from what we expected, and we raise key questions to be explored through future studies. Interviews also surfaced a number of significant trends outside of our original framework. Primary among them were: how business school leaders and managers perceive the role of these institutions in society; the varying ways they define social responsibility; who leaders identify as stakeholders and how they serve these groups; and the extent of the
connection between the socially directed missions and tactics articulated by host institutions and those deployed by business schools. We wrestle with some of these patterns in this chapter and return to them again in the last section.

The Role of Business Schools in Society through the Eyes of Business School Leaders

As we sifted through and analyzed the extensive data collected through this endeavor, we were struck by how differently leaders of six distinguished public business schools envision the role of these schools in society and how often their ideas and the activities of their schools and MBA programs not only varied from the mission, vision, and strategies of their host institutions but from the growing movement in academia concerned with reinvigorating the mission and tactics of higher education in service to society, as represented by the work of such groups as the Campus Compact, the Kellogg Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good, the Aspen Institute, the World Resources Institute, the Education Conservancy, and others. As illustration, one leader interviewed rejected the premise of this study from the outset of the interview, while another did not see business schools as having a role in teaching students about social responsibility. A third leader saw social responsibility as an important component of business education, but because of competing strategic priorities, it was not front-and-center in the school's curricular or co-curricular activities at present. The same administrator did not see a role for business schools in solving community problems. This last position is reflective of Votruba's (1996) belief that colleges and universities are not social service agencies whose primary purpose is solving social problems, but instead are institutions that must make their intellectual resources available to communities in
ways that are consistent with their educational missions. A fourth leader, the former dean of the College of Management at Georgia Tech, considers the business school as responsible for preparing students capable of leading “for the common good” because they are well-grounded in “business principles that make the world and the community a better place” (Interview, 2006). Business education at the College of Management is designed to teach students to lead and manage organizations in a socially responsible manner, which requires attention to revenues and profitability and to environmental sustainability, social issues, and an understanding of cultural and global issues and diversity (Interview, 2006). The business school at the University of South Carolina is also focused on instilling in its graduates an appreciation of social responsibility, environmental sustainability, global issues and cultural issues (Interview, 2006).

When describing how their schools enact their social compact, differences of opinion also emerged. One leader we spoke with envisioned the school’s role as preparing students to become agents of change in society by teaching them how to transform businesses and organizations, which they saw as having the power to impact the community. Another did not see business schools as having a role in serving the common good, while a third explained that, while business schools do not have a role in solving social problems, they can positively impact society by producing students who will bring advanced ideas into the marketplace. These same leaders did not see their schools as direct agents of social change. This view is contrary to those espoused by Bok, Boyer, Hechinger, Hutchins, and others, and more closely resembles that of Bowen who argues that academics serve the long-term interests of society through research and the instillation of democratic and civic values in students, who will serve others through
their vocations and as citizens. Two schools in the study, the College of Management
and Moore, described their schools as having a much more direct role in community
transformation by preparing students who themselves would be active, socially
responsible citizens and business leaders.

Precisely why some business school leaders approach issues of social
responsibility and the covenant between higher education and society as they do is a
matter for future study. Our interview with the former dean of the College of
Management raised one possible explanation. She suggested that the desire for prestige
and rankings often takes precedence over service to the common good when business
school leaders are faced with decisions regarding how to allocate their resources.
Organizational theorists Meyer and Rowan (1991) validate this assumption when they
describe institutionalized organizations like colleges and universities as environmentally
connected and sensitive entities that pursue external “criteria of worth” such as rankings
and the “prestige of programs or personnel in external social circles” as useful functions
that legitimize organizations with internal and external constituents and socially
demonstrate the “fitness of the organization” (p. 51).

Meyer and Rowan assert that structures and activities with “high ceremonial
value,” such as publication in peer-reviewed journals, presentations at academic meetings
and conferences, accreditations, awards and rankings bestowed by the media and other
similar bodies, make organizations credit worthy and more likely to receive funding in
the form of loans, donations, investments, and for universities – tuition dollars and
revenue from continuing and executive education programs. Externally conferred
acknowledgements of status (e.g., “ceremonial assessments) are also useful to units
within an organization, where they serve as “accounts of productive service to the organization” (Rowan and Meyer, 1991, p. 52). The work of Ghoshal (2005), Pfeffer (2005), and Khurana (2007), however, raise the possibility that the philosophical leanings of some of the business leaders we talked with may reflect indoctrination into the management theories that dominate business education. We will return to this proposition in the section on Stakeholders and Stakeholder Theory.

Despite these philosophical disparities, the business schools we studied are actually engaged in many of the activities that demonstrate social responsibility, enact the compact that their larger institutions have with society, and reflect initiatives that are detailed in the literature on civic engagement in higher education. In some instances, however, they are not. In the pages that follow, we detail where the six schools we examined align with and diverge from our framework and from the growing engagement movement in higher education, and introduce a new framework, and raise questions to be answered by future studies.

Discussion of Results in Relation to the Original Framework

A Responsive Curriculum

A responsive curriculum provides students with a broad, civic education (Checkoway, 2001; Wellman, 1999) that enhances a student’s ‘understanding of and commitment to the principles of democracy and engaged citizenship’ (Ramaley, 2000, p. 6). This requires that schools teach students a sense of social responsibility and develop civic competence in students by using teaching techniques that allow students to examine their own assumptions and those of their peers (Checkoway, 2001). It also mandates a
curriculum that teaches students to think critically, solve problems effectively, formulate and present arguments, listen intently, appreciate and resolve differences, and communicate and work with others who are different from themselves (Boyte & Hollander, 1999). In our initial schema, we grouped activities that fell beneath this broad category together into sub-groupings that we felt best summarized the elements. Table 36 details the elements of our original framework that reflect an organization’s efforts to deploy a responsive curriculum. In the next section, we describe how the business schools in our study promote student civic competence and social responsibility through coursework and curricular, co- and extra-curricular activities.

Table 36: Components of a Responsive Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular Content &amp; Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem centered learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics education/focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses and experiences in social responsibility, social/environmental impact management, sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework and experiences to build global leadership competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity building education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship equally balanced between discovery, integration, practice, and teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Problem Centered Learning*

Coursework and teaching techniques to prepare students to analyze and solve problems, individually and collectively, resolve conflict, advance a position, and negotiate solutions help build the skills needed for civic engagement (Thomas, 1999; Stephens et al, 2000). Providing students with classes on problem solving, decision making and analysis, and other related topics, and using case studies and team-based
learning are among the tools advanced by Thomas (1999) and Stephens (et al, 2000) in the literature. All of the schools we examined offered courses to develop decision making skills and used case studies, experiential learning, internships, consulting and practicum experiences, and capstone courses to help students acquire the capacity to think critically, solve problems, make decisions, and synthesize and apply learning.

Team-based learning was a pedagogical tool used by five schools to teach students how to collaborate to solve problems and work with others with different backgrounds, skills, and experiences.

Interdisciplinary Learning

Civic engagement requires an appreciation of the complex and interconnected nature of people and organizations and the ability to think about issues and problems systemically (Ramaley, 2005; Stephens, Colby, Ehrlich & Beaumont, 2000). Colleges and universities can help students develop this competence through learning communities, linking two or more disciplines through curricular clusters that examine civic issues or themes, and via interdisciplinary majors and minors in cultural, ethnic, women’s, or environmental studies (Ramaley, 2005; Thomas, 1999). None of the schools we examined used the interdisciplinary learning approaches advanced by Ramaley or Thomas, but each is engaged in cross-disciplinary teaching, learning, or research.

All six schools afforded MBA students the chance to pair their degree with others, including a Jurist Doctorate, a Master of Science in Nursing, or a Master of Science in Engineering. The College of Management at Georgia Tech permits its MBAs to pursue a second degree from any other college within the university, while Carey MBAs can customize their degree through electives taken from departments across the business
school and Arizona State University. Warrington and the College of Management promote interdisciplinary learning by opening MBA classes to students from other disciplines. Additionally, research centers and institutes across the schools we studied are engaged in and support interdisciplinary research, courses, and professional development offerings.

**Ethics Education**

The literature on social responsibility and engagement in higher education indicates that universities can develop the citizenship skills of students through coursework and programs that teach students moral reasoning, professional responsibility, and ethical decision making and action (Stephens, Colby, Ehrlich, and Beaumont, 2000; Thomas, 1999). By offering students required coursework in ethics and capstone experiences, incorporating moral and ethical issues into classes, and affording students opportunities to discuss and wrestle with moral dilemmas in the classroom and to engage in extra and co-curricular experience that allow them the chance to take personal responsibility for helping solve social problems in the community, schools teach students how to address ethical challenges directly and to live and work as socially engaged individuals (Ramaley, 2005; Thomas, 1999).

Business schools in our study all required students in some, but not all of their MBA programs, to complete a course in ethics, and each of the six schools offered MBA students opportunities to participate in volunteer activities in the community. We found evidence that just two schools, Smith and Warrington, were using any of the other tactics advanced by Thomas and Ramaley. Smith requires its MBAs to complete a capstone course focused on ethics, and Warrington builds ethical issues into its MBA coursework.
Coursework and Experiences in Social Responsibility and Sustainability

Chapple and associates, authors of the 2003 Beyond Grey Pinstripes report argue that leading organizations in an increasingly complex and competitive marketplace requires “the knowledge and skills to tackle not only the financial but also the social and environmental challenges faced by today’s corporations” (p. 2). Business schools can facilitate the success of future leaders by introducing them to the social and environmental impact management through coursework and extracurricular activities, and by infusing these concepts across core curriculum in MBA programs.

We found curricular opportunities to explore social and environmental issues affecting business to be extremely limited within the schools we studied. For example, only four schools we examined offer students opportunities to learn about social responsibility and sustainability through elective courses. One school exposes students to these issues in core MBA coursework, and one business school is attempting to build the study of sustainability and social responsibility into all of its courses. Four of the six schools we looked at are, however, offering students the chance to explore these issues through co-curricular activities including student clubs or institute sponsored lectures or conferences. These results support those articulated in the 2003 Beyond Grey Pinstripes Report, indicating that most business schools are not providing MBA students with deep or extensive coverage of social responsibility and sustainability either within or outside the classroom, limiting the ability of graduates to manage the triple bottom line of organizations – financial, social, and environmental.
Global Connections

Businesses, government agencies, non-governmental organizations, and non-profits are increasingly in need of leaders with an understanding of global and international business issues and those who are able to build and sustain relationships with firms and governments in communities that span the globe. This need has direct implications for the curricular and co-curricular offerings of business schools and for school administrators and faculty themselves. Lorange (2003) and others suggest that a sound business education grounded in international business begins with business schools that model transnational outreach and partnerships with businesses, organizations, and universities outside the United States, global meetings, conferences, web-casts, and course offerings that connect with others around the world, research on international business issues, and faculty with knowledge of global issues drawn from their own work with international firms and from teaching, living, researching and studying abroad.

Our data suggest that the increasingly global nature of the economy and of business is impacting the activities of some of this nation’s preeminent business schools in the very ways suggested by the literature. All six of the schools we studied report partnerships with governments, businesses, and academic institutions in other nations; five host research centers or institutes concerned with international business issues; and four schools include an on-line MBA program in their suite of program options. Two business schools offer MBA and other masters programs to students and executives in other countries. The international expertise of faculty also appears to be strong at each of the business schools. This global awareness appears to be derived in part from efforts to hire foreign-born faculty, from a growing emphasis on research on international business
issues and an interest in this area among faculty, and through opportunities to study, travel, and teach abroad, provided primarily by international focused research centers.

All activities we discovered at Carey, Smith, Kelley, Moore, Warrington, and the College of Management aligned exactly with those detailed in the literature and outlined in our original frame. The existence of internationally focused research centers or institutes at almost all of these schools expanded the way we defined this category in our revised schema. These findings hint that future studies might also reveal the presence of strong relationships with international organizations at other U.S. business schools.

Coursework and Experiences to Build Global Competence

In an increasingly global world, business students are in need of coursework and experiences that will prepare them to operate in various countries, with differing cultures, laws, customs, and practices and in collaboration with people who are very different from themselves (Checkoway, 2001; Lorange, 2003; Webb, Mayer, Pioche & Allen, 1999). Despite rising pressure to produce internationally savvy graduates, we found little evidence that business schools are working towards this end using all of the tactics advanced in the literature (See Table 37). As illustration, calls to ground business students in human resource management, organizational dynamics, human rights, and labor of environmental law argued by Lorange (2003) or to help students learn to appreciate and capitalize on diversity appear to be largely ignored by the schools in our study. Within the core curriculum of each school’s primary MBA program, we found just two schools requiring students to learn about business law and two requiring a course on organizational behavior. Coursework to expose students to cultural issues and international business, however, were slightly more prevalent. For example, Smith
Table 37: Suggested Tactics to Create Global Connections and Cultivate Global Competence

- Coursework that provides students with a thorough grounding in human resources, organizational development, human rights, labor law, environmental law.
- Coursework and experiences to understanding and appreciation of different cultures, practices, customs, religions, and geo-political issues.
- Exposing students to different peoples and cultures through an international mix of students and faculty members.
- Use of case studies which address globalization issues and challenges.
- Small and large-group learning opportunities which allow cross-cultural discussions to occur.
- Creating global learning opportunities through internship and projects with global firms.
- International linkages forged with companies and business schools outside the U.S.
- Exchange programs with international business schools.
- Development of global meeting places, which include conferences, the formation of international networks, and Web casts that reach and connect with students and others around the world.
- Faculty with extensive knowledge about the global dimensions of business drawn from their own experience working with international firms, from researching issues relevant to the needs of international businesses, or from teaching, living or studying abroad.
- Research agendas focused on social and environmental responsibility and sustainability issues and on the generation of new theories of leadership that reflect the realities of business in the new millennia.
- Opportunities for students to engage with and learn about cutting edge business practices necessary for the survival of the modern firm and to develop the skills needed to think critically about complex issues and innovate rapidly.
- Coursework and co-curricular activities that build skills needed to communicate, negotiate with, and manage diverse work groups, facilitate the development and enhancement of leadership skills needed today.
- An interdisciplinary and diverse educational experience that demonstrates the interconnectedness of courses and issues faced by businesses and integrates critical topics like ethics, social responsibility, and sustainability into core coursework. (Lorange, 2003; Webb, Mayer, Pioche & Allen, 1999).

requires its MBAs to attend one core course on Culture, Ethics, and Communication, and two schools include coursework on culture as part of their international study trips.

Business schools in this study are all working to help students build the understanding and abilities to operate in an international marketplace through elective
coursework in international business; study and travel abroad opportunities; international internships; or dual degrees, certificates, concentrations or specialization in international business, or specialized master’s degrees in international management. Five schools in this study have an institute or center focused on international business education and research. These centers provide educational resources to support the development of curriculum in international business; build relationships with international universities and corporations; facilitate faculty and student study and travel abroad; offer training in language and culture for faculty, staff, students, and outside organizations and individuals; host conferences, seminars, and publications on global business; and conduct and support research on international business issues.

Business schools at the University of South Carolina and Indiana University share the belief that international business has to be experienced in order to be truly understood. The dean of the Kelley School of Business at Indiana University envisions travel to developing countries as essential and transformative experiences that can fundamentally change students’ understanding of the world and of the role that business can plan internationally. Business schools at Florida, Maryland, and Georgia Tech established objectives to increase the number of students engaged in international travel, study, and other experiences. For example, The College of Management at Georgia Tech has the goal of having 50% of its students participating in international learning experiences.

All six schools in this study offer MBA students the chance to participate in international trips or study abroad programs, yet none require these experiences for all MBA students. The length of international exchange programs and duration of
international travel trips, however, vary from school to school. Although all six schools in this study identify global business acumen as a critical competence for business leaders, they vary in how they build this knowledge and skills through core and elective curriculum. Most schools offer no core courses in international business in their fulltime MBA programs, relying on electives instead, to build global competence. All of the schools in the study offer MBA students the chance to pursue a specialization or certificate in global management or international business, while two schools, Warrington and Carey, provide opportunities for MBAs to obtain a dual degree in business management and international management. Three business schools offer MBA students the chance to participate in international internships.

Diversity Building Education

When we looked at what the schools were doing to promote an appreciation of diversity and the ability to work across cultural lines using recommendations advanced by Wellman (1999) in the Building Communities Project, we found evidence that five out of the six schools were demonstrating one of the project's recommendations – providing students with opportunities to learn and practice problem solving, team building and collaborative skills through the use of team-based learning. Only one school, the College of Management at Georgia Tech, was found to be deploying another tactic advanced by the project, teaching MBA students communication skills. We were unable to assess or find evidence that the schools were using any of the other tools suggested by participants in the Building Communities Project (See Table 38) within their MBA programs.

Creative or innovative activities initiated by the schools and extending beyond the criteria in our original frame were also scarce across all programs, and completely absent
Table 38: Strategies to Build Cultural Competence from the Listening to Communities Project

| • Integrate themes of social justice (e.g., racial diversity and civics) across the curriculum. |
| • Model and teach collective problem solving skills |
| • Teach communication skills, influence, negotiation, critical thinking, and conflict resolution skills. |
| • Make explicit linkages between living in a diverse society and the strength of American civic and democratic ideals. |
| • Provide students with opportunities to learn and practice problem solving, team building, and collaborative skills (Wellman, 1999). |

in the MBA programs studied. As illustration, Smith and the College of Management are both engaged in activities to facilitate a greater appreciation of diversity among undergraduate students, including a special student initiated culture days and events that highlight the customs and practices of different groups, and diversity training program for undergraduate business students at the University of Maryland, and an assessment of cultural awareness administered to undergraduate business students at Georgia Tech. Neither school expressed plans to extend these initiatives to MBA students.

Five of the six schools studied host student clubs or associations for women and minority students, providing students with the support of others who are like themselves and the chance to advocate within the school for the needs of specific minority groups. Gilliard (1996) found “that students participating in such minority-related services interact more with faculty and are more likely to also use other general support services on campus” (Hurtado & Dey, 1997, p. 425). Both factors have been linked to greater student engagement on campus and higher rates or retention and graduation among minority students. Hurtado and Dey caution that reliance on such “marginal activities” is not sufficient to create the fully inclusive campus climate needed to attract and retain a
diverse student body. Instead, they urge campus administrators to find and deploy
diversity programs and activities that "become central to the institutional mission" (Hurtado & Dey, 1997). We found one example of these types of initiatives in the
courses on language and culture in the International MBA program at Moore. None of
the other business schools in this study provided MBA students with opportunities to
participate in comparable classes, and no MBA programs we examined offered a stand
alone course on cultural diversity or provided evidence that discussions about diversity
are occurring in any of their core courses.

Our discoveries suggest that business schools are using a variety of pedagogical
tools to help develop the skills needed to work with divergent groups without affording
students an understanding of cultural and normative differences that would sharpen their
effectiveness as leaders and citizens. Additional research is needed to evaluate the
efficacy of business schools' curricular and co-curricular tactics to build cultural
competence, for example, using the Intercultural Development Inventory tool the College
of Management is deploying with its undergraduates. Assessing the cultural competence
of MBA students at the beginning and end of their program of study, would provide
insights into the impact of the educational experience on cultural understanding and
acumen. An assessment of cultural competence alone, with incoming MBA students
would help us understand whether cultural awareness education is needed and determine
the content of this course of study.

Future studies on diversity in business education might also consider exploring:
1. How business school leaders and faculty define diversity and uncover similarities
   between their ideals and those of the AACSB, which characterizes diversity as "a
complex, culturally embedded concept rooted in historical and cultural traditions, legislative, and regulatory concepts, economic conditions, ethnicity, gender, and opinion (2007, p. 9).

2. How these definitions shape decisions regarding curricular and co-curricular activities designed to increase cultural understanding and create an inclusive campus climate.

3. The tactics business schools are using to teach students to appreciate diversity and work with divergent individuals and groups.

*Faculty Mentorship of Students*

Through this study we could find no evidence that business school faculty are mentoring MBA students as advocated by Stephens et al (2000).

*Balanced Scholarship*

Ernest Boyer (1997) defined an engaged campus as one that pays equal attention to multiple forms of scholarship, including research, teaching, synthesis, and application. With the emergence of the research university, critics argue that Boyer’s balanced scholarship model has been compromised as schools focus more intently on research at the expense of other important activities. While we found evidence to suggest that research occupies an extremely important place in business schools, we also discovered that schools continue to focus on teaching excellence in faculty recruitment, evaluation, and tenure and promotion practices. Research centers sponsor interdisciplinary research and courses, and provide the primary vehicle within business schools for collaborative work between scholars, promoting what Boyer calls the scholarship of synthesis or integration.
The business schools we examined are not encouraging or rewarding faculty service activities beyond those to the institution or their professions, which is essential to Boyer’s notion of the scholarship of application. Many of the business school leaders we spoke with told us that community service is a component of faculty evaluations in “name only” and explained that they do not want to encourage or reward faculty for service to the community because it would detract from activities with the most value to the schools only (e.g., teaching, research, and service to the profession and institution). Engagement, according to Boyer, also includes research with a social impact. This includes studies that benefit society, governments, business, non-profits, and professions. We found evidence that faculty and research centers at business schools are conducting research that is useful to, and even funded by commercial enterprises and advance the management profession, and data that suggest far fewer investigations that address social or community problems.

These discoveries provide some support for concerns that research is assuming a dominant position in business schools housed in research universities and that scholarship in public business schools is not approaching Boyer’s balanced model, yet they suggest a new model of scholarship in business education. This pattern of scholarship is captured in Table 39.

Jaschik (2005) reports that a movement is underway to realize Boyer’s ideals in some academic institutions. A recent survey of institutions attempting Boyer’s reforms found that when schools adopt this schema, they also increase the emphasis they place on research productivity. The survey, published in the book, *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered*, also found that adopting Boyer’s schema places additional pressure on
Table 39: A Preliminary Model of Scholarship in Public Business Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Demonstration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discovery (research)</td>
<td>• Faculty tenure and promotion practices focused on research productivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>• Faculty tenure and promotion practices focused on teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Integration     | • Interdisciplinary teaching and research coordinated and sponsored by research centers and institutes.  
                    • Interdisciplinary majors are offered                                           |
| Application     | • Faculty research focused on solving problems of the profession and of constituents including commercial entities, communities, governments, and non-profit organizations.  
                    • Faculty fulfilling leadership roles in professional organizations.          
                    • Faculty service to the institution.                                       
                    • Faculty serving industry or government as external consultants.           
                    • Faculty tenure and promotion practices focused on service to the institution and/or professional associations.  
                    • Use of pedagogical tools, including experiential learning, internships, consulting projects, experiential learning activities, capstone experiences, case competitions, and others with students. |

Plater (1999) argues that truly balanced scholarship requires significant changes to faculty tenure and promotion practices and to fundamental agreements between faculty and universities regarding faculty independence and freedom in order to align faculty work with institutional missions and allow campuses to fully engage with society. At most institutions today, faculty exercise significant control over how they spend their faculty to achieve excellence in all areas, including “traditional models of scholarship….suggesting that reform may mean asking a lot more of faculty members across the board” (Jaschik, 2005, p.2).
time outside the classroom, and in decisions about what they research and which professional service activities they engage in (Plater, 1999). We heard about faculty independence in research during our interviews where leader after leader explained that their school does not dictate what faculty will study, allowing them instead to follow their own interests and agendas. Adopting Boyer's model, however, would require a "radical reordering of the nature of faculty work from the individual to the collective, from the personal to the social" (Plater, 1999, p. 14) as faculty and administrators partner to define the school's mission, establish research priorities, and collaborate with one another to pursue interdisciplinary research and create and deliver coursework that also crosses disciplines (Plater, 1999; Holland, 2000).

It is not clear whether business schools will pursue Boyer's model of scholarship, but our study suggests that their leaders may not find value in its full pursuit. Their articulated focus on research and teaching over other faculty activities, and failure to adopt changes in faculty and tenure practices used by their host institutions (as was seen at Carey) may mean that these ideals are not a priority. Surveys of other business schools and interviews with additional leaders may help illuminate whether the schools we examined are unique or representative of scholarship practices that are more extensive. Deeper investigation is also needed to understand more fully why research is so central to public business schools.

*An Engaged Campus*

Activities that described a business school's efforts to engage with the community beyond its coursework and co-curricular activities formed the basis of the categories in the second portion of our framework. Here we sought to understand how schools
connect to "public life and society’s pressing problems (Thomas, 2000, p. 64) and prove their worth, not on their own terms but through service to their communities, the state, the nation, and the world (Boyer, 1996). We examined how the missions of business schools address outreach; the partnerships schools form with outside organizations and agencies; how the schools create and support research centers and institutes devoted to social, economic or political issues; the access schools afford community members to their resources and space; and how students and faculty connect with and contribute to society through consulting work, research, service and other activities (Thomas, 2000). Table 40 details the characteristics of an engaged campus is our original framework.

Table 40: Characteristics of an Engaged Campus in the Original Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An Engaged Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Diverse Learning Environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Outreach and Engagement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty/administrators engaged in relationships with community and community leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community leaders engaged on campus (i.e., visiting lecturers, student mentors, participating in continuing/executive education programs, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meetings with community leaders focused on social issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initiatives with an economic or political purpose (i.e., institutes, competitions, clubs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lower in-state tuition than competitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lower out-of-state tuition than competitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Placement of students with in-state employers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cultivating a Diverse Learning Environment*

An educational environment replete with students from diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds that reflects the changing social and economic nature of society helps
students better understand themselves and others, provides students with opportunities to learn to collaborate with people who are different from them, and helps students develop sensitivity to and an appreciation of the values and beliefs of others (Checkoway, 2001; Wellman, 1999; Boyte & Hollander, 1999). Each of these competencies enables students to more fully engage in a democratic society and to live and work effectively in an increasingly diverse culture.

While the literature reviewed for this study does not precisely detail the composition of a diverse student body, Wellman (1999) suggests that it is one that reflects the social and economic fabric of society. Extrapolating from this, one might then determine that a student body that represents a mix of ethnically diverse students both from the United States and abroad would approximate this ideal. Such a conceptualization aligns with Ramaley’s (2005) description of an accessible campus as one that provides access and opportunity for students of all backgrounds to pursue and education. This is the assumption we used as we analyzed the data we extracted from our six participating schools.

Diversity was a component of the missions of four of six universities that house the business schools in this study (e.g., Indiana University, the University of Maryland, the University of Florida, and the University of South Carolina), and increasing student and faculty diversity was a strategic imperative at four institutions (e.g., Arizona State University, the University of Maryland, the University of Florida, and Georgia Institute of Technology). This formal institutional focus on creating a diverse learning environment was not reflected in the missions of the business schools we examined, with one exception – the Kelley School of Business.
Student Diversity.

Leaders from four of the six schools we studied either acknowledged the importance of a diverse student body to the school or expressed a lack of satisfaction with the diversity of their student populations at both the graduate and undergraduate level. Despite expressed displeasure, minority students (e.g., U.S. born Black, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, and/or Native American) account for 14% or more of the entire MBA student body at Smith (14-22%), Carey (15%), Kelley (15%), and the College of Management at Georgia Tech (18%), and international students occupy 28% or more of the seats in MBA programs at Carey (35%), Kelley (41%), Smith (40%), and the College of Management (28%).

These statistics coupled with the extensive use of team-based learning at all but one of the study schools suggest that, through interaction with diverse peers, MBA students at many public business schools may be gaining the exposure and opportunities needed to gain an appreciation of divergent cultures, norms, and values and an ability to work and live side-by-side with individuals who culturally, ethnically, and geographically different from themselves. Troubling, however, is the low percentage of minority students at Warrington (8% minority; 15% international) and Moore (4% minority; 4.5% international). Future studies are needed to delve more intently into this issue in an effort to evaluate student diversity in a larger number of MBA programs in order to determine whether most programs are approach the diversity we saw in four schools or reflect the diminutive numbers we found at Moore and Warrington.

Efforts to attract a diverse student body in MBA programs used across the schools included part-time, evening, and internet-based MBA programs, MBA programs at
various locations across a region, relationships with HBCUs, recruitment and marketing
efforts directed towards minorities, financial aid (including scholarships and fellowships),
and membership in consortia committed to increasing the number of women and
minorities in business schools. All schools we studied offered on-line or part-time MBA
programs to extend the reach of the organization to previously underserved groups
locally, nationally, and internationally, and four schools identified and most reported
using scholarships, fellowships and financial aid as incentives for enrollment.
Deployment of creative recruitment strategies like those reported by Kelley (e.g.,
membership in multiple consortia committed to increasing the number of women and
minorities in graduate business education, and partnerships and exchange programs with
HBCUs) was found to be the exception, and not the rule in the MBA programs we
studied. Additional research is needed to assess the tactics used by MBA programs to
attract and enroll minority students and to evaluate the impact of those strategies on the
ethnic composition of student bodies.

Our interviews also revealed a difference in the approaches business schools use
to recruit minorities at the undergraduate level and those used with MBA programs, and
provided some data to suggest that minority student recruitment efforts may be more
aggressive with undergraduates than with MBA students. This divergence establishes
additional lines of inquiry to be pursued in the future. Tactical differences in recruitment
strategies at the undergraduate and graduate levels and the difference between the
percentage of minority and international students enrolled in MBA programs raise
questions about what differences exist at other business schools, why international
students are occupying more seats in MBA programs in public business schools than
minority students, and why business school leaders who are dissatisfied with the diversity of their student bodies are not taking more aggressive action to raise the bar even higher. We have a few thoughts on these issues.

Financial considerations or a simple cost benefit analysis might be behind the differences we discovered between enrollment of U.S.-born minorities and international students in the MBA programs we studied. Several of the business school leaders we spoke with highlighted the significant financial contributions business schools make to the operating budgets of their host universities. If public business schools truly are the “cash cows” of their universities, as Kelley’s dean asserts, this may place school administrators under considerable pressure to continue to pursue activities that produce significant financial returns, including enrollment of international students. Examination of the difference in tuition paid by in-state and international MBA students at three of the schools we studied illustrates this point. International students at Kelley pay tuition that is twice as high as in-state students ($33,414 versus $16,796), while international students at Carey pay almost three times the tuition of Arizona residents ($17,920 versus $6,228), and at Warrington, international students assume tuition and fees that are four times higher than in-state charges ($43,117 versus $11,367).

These figures intimate that recruitment of international students is a highly rewarding endeavor. Contrast this with the costs the schools assume to provide U.S. minority students with free or subsidized tuition, a tactic that almost all the schools in this study deploy, and one might assume that differences in enrollment between U.S. minority and international students may be due, in part, to conscious or un-conscious cost-benefit analyses on the part of school administrators. Faced with a set pool of resources (e.g.,
financial, human, physical, etc.), leaders must make decisions about how to use their capital, and when it comes to student diversity, business school leaders appear to be choosing resource deployment in support of activities with the highest return on investment – recruitment of international students.

The differences we noted between the importance placed on faculty and student diversity at the institutional level in mission statements and strategic priorities was almost absent at the business schools. While business school leaders often reflected the sentiments expressed by their universities in interviews, value was not placed on diversity in the majority of school missions. The relatively low enrollment of underrepresented minority students (between 4 and 22%) in comparison with the high number of international students (ranging from 4.5-41%) in the MBA programs we studied, and the paucity of innovative strategies to recruit minority students raises questions about how truly important a diverse MBA student body is to public business school administrators. Jepperson’s (1991) theory of institutionalism provides a possible explanation of the disconnect we observed between espoused organizational ideals regarding a diverse campus and the realities of minority enrollment. Institutionalism proposes that organizational rhetoric and activities sometimes operate as myth and ceremony and do not have a substantive impact on organizational work or outcomes (Rowley, Hurtado, & Ponjuan, 2002).

In a comprehensive study of student and faculty diversity across U.S. colleges and universities, Rowley, Hurtado, and Ponjuan (2002) found several predictors of student diversity, including core leadership support for and an emphasis on diversity priorities in mission statements and strategic planning documents, evaluation and rewards for
diversity, and innovation relative to peer institutions in creating a diverse environment. They also found a higher percentage of minority faculty in public schools with low selectivity in admissions and in private colleges and universities, regardless of admissions selectivity. Beyond articulated leadership support for a diverse student body, a singular mission statement that addressed diversity, and one school with creative recruitment practices, none of the business schools we studied displayed any of the other activities that Rowley, Hurtado, and Ponjuan found to positively impact student diversity. This discovery suggests that assertions about the primacy of diversity in public business schools may be little more than organizational attempts to express ideals of importance to constituents (i.e., to “talk the talk” as it relates to student diversity) in order to secure legitimacy and stakeholder support needed to ensure their ongoing success (Meyer & Rowan, 1991; Adelman, 1997), and that business schools may not be establishing the organizational structures or functions needed to make substantive improvements in the number of underrepresented minority students occupying seats in MBA programs. This finding also highlights the relative success the Kelley School of Business demonstrated in its efforts to achieve diversity in its MBA program.

Kelley operates within the most homogeneous state and county of any of the schools we examined, yet the extensive focus placed on diversity by Indiana University in its mission and strategy, and by Kelley’s mission and leaders, and its use of relatively creative recruitment tactics, including partnerships with HBCUs, and membership in multiple consortia committed to increasing the presence of women and minorities in graduate business education, appear to be bearing fruit. With minority students comprising 15% of its MBA student body, Kelley has managed to approximate the
diversity of the state populace (16.1%) and exceed the minority population of the county in which it operates (12%). The significance of this achievement is highlighted by the disparity seen between MBA student enrollments at the other five schools that operate in much more diverse environments (see Table 41).

A more expansive study of public business schools that examines the ethnic composition of students in MBA programs and schools' missions, strategies, admission criteria, evaluation and rewards practices for diversity, and tactics to recruit and retain a diverse study body would test Rowan, Hurtado, and Ponjuan's findings further, with a more narrowly defined academic population. A similar study that compares MBA student diversity at public and private business schools might uncover whether private business schools are able to create more diverse student bodies, and if so, precisely how they achieve these ends.

Table 41: Comparison of Diversity in Public MBA Programs and State and County Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Percentage of MBA Students Identified as Minorities</th>
<th>Percent of State Populace Identified as Minorities</th>
<th>Percent of County Populace Identified as Minorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carey</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40 (Arizona)</td>
<td>40 (Maricopa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.1 (Indiana)</td>
<td>12 (Monroe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>14-22</td>
<td>41.6 (Maryland)</td>
<td>82 (Prince George)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.7 (Florida)</td>
<td>32.9 (Alachua)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.1 (South Carolina)</td>
<td>55.3 (Richland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College of Management</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41.1 (Georgia)</td>
<td>55.6 (Fulton)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our discoveries coupled with those reported by Rowley, Hurtado, and Ponjuan (2002 study) raise questions about the role that increased selectivity has played in diversity in MBA programs as the institutions that house these programs have transitioned from their original missions (i.e., land grant, classical tradition) to research universities. Examination of minority enrollment in MBA programs prior to and following a university's transition to a research institution would further test Rowley, Hurtado, and Ponjuan's conclusions regarding the role of selectivity in student diversity.

Additional study is also needed to gain a greater appreciation of why public business schools are not attracting more U.S. minority students and how they can best do so. This study simply raises awareness that business schools may not be making "every effort to diversify the participants in the educational process and...guarantee that a wide variety of perspectives is included in all activities," as required by the AACSB in its 2007 standards. Future research may seek to illuminate more fully how business schools are working to demonstrate this standard, how well they are truly doing in this area, and what additional steps are needed to achieve these ends.

Faculty Diversity.

It was exceedingly difficult to assess the diversity of the faculty ranks at the participating schools due to reluctance on the part of our interview participants to share exact numbers. We were further frustrated by the unavailability of data on faculty diversity on most of the websites of the business schools and universities under examination here. Through our interviews with school leaders, only one provided us with some appreciation of the diversity of the school's faculty, with Smith's dean reporting that 50% of his faculty members are foreign born. We were unable to obtain...
any information on the ethnic makeup of faculty at Moore. In the absence of firm data from all of the schools, we attempted to assess faculty diversity by examining the biographical statements and vitas of faculty at each school where we could. From this data source, we estimate that 3% of Kelley’s faculty members are underrepresented minorities from the United States. We calculate that the percentage of minority and international faculty combined at Carey is about 20%, approximately 25% at Warrington, and 32% at Smith, with most of this divergence appearing to be achieved primarily through international hires. We obtained information from Georgia Tech’s website that revealed that the College of Management has no minority faculty members. We shared our findings with the interviewers for validation, and in no case were they corrected or refuted. These numbers suggest that faculty diversity in public business schools is as “miserable” as Kelley’s dean asserted it is at his school, if one is concerned with creating a community of scholars that is inclusive of underrepresented minorities.

Four the schools expressed dissatisfaction with the ethnic composition of their faculty and challenges with recruitment. Surprisingly absent in our discussions with business school leaders were defined strategies to attract and retain diverse faculty. Instead of innovation, administrators told us that they weren’t aware of any defined tactics to attract diverse faculty (Moore) or that the school lacks defined policies around faculty diversity and has not consciously engaged in any practices to recruit diverse faculty (Carey). Smith did not share any recruitment strategies with us. Warrington’s dean noted that a recent meeting with the university president to explore tactics to attract minority faculty generated no new ideas about how to address this problem. The former head of the business school at Georgia Tech compared the relative ease the school has
had in attracting international faculty, particularly from India and China, with the trouble she said they have encountered attracting underrepresented minorities. Despite efforts to attract minority faculty using the tactics successfully deployed by Tech's College of Engineering, the College of Management currently has no U.S.-born minority faculty. Tech's former dean explained, that despite these efforts and competitive salaries and benefits, the college finds itself losing minority faculty to more highly ranked institutions.

None of the school leaders told us that they are members of the PhD Project, a corporate and academic partnership to increase minority representation among business professors, but a subsequent search of the consortium's website revealed that all of the schools we studied are members (PhD Project, 2007). As with student diversity, we found novel approaches to faculty recruitment at just one school, Kelley. Indiana University's business school is using a variety of tactics to change the face of its faculty, including offering minority doctoral students the chance to teach at Kelley before completing their degrees or to engage in post-doctoral work with them. Kelley is also inviting faculty of color to serve as visiting lecturers and scholars.

Our findings do not corroborate those of Rowley, Hurtado, and Ponjuan (2002) who, in a comprehensive study of student and faculty diversity in higher education, found the percentage of minority faculty at research institutions to average 16%. Interviews with business school leaders also suggests that difficulties they are having recruiting minority faculty may be due in part to Trower and Chait's (2002) finding that minority faculty are much more likely than white faculty to work at less prestigious institutions and Rowley, Hurtado, and Ponjuan's (2002) discovery that faculty diversity is greater in private than public institutions.
Precisely why public business schools are not able to hire underrepresented minority faculty is not readily apparent. Interviews with administrators indicate that a lack of deliberate policies, goals, and strategies may be one reason and competition from more prestigious institutions another. It is also not clear why business schools that exist in institutions that have clear commitments to affirmative action in faculty hiring, like the University of Maryland, or hiring goals that reflect the rich ethnic composition of the state, as seen at Arizona State University, are not more aggressively attending to this issue and realizing more meaningful outcomes. Rowley, Hurtado, and Ponjuan (2002) attributed similar failings they observed to the theory of institutionalism (Meyer & Rowan, 1991). Institutionalism suggests that organizations often craft public statements of support for initiatives, like a diverse faculty, that are valued by constituents in an effort to garner legitimacy in the marketplace and maintain the support of stakeholders.

The absence of clear goals, firm data, and carefully crafted plans to improve faculty diversity we observed across most of the business schools examined are identified by Hurtado and Dey (1997) as impediments to campus diversity. Hurtado and Dey explained that universities fail to achieve the diversity they desire because they do not begin these initiatives with well-defined, realistic goals derived from an assessment of the school’s climate of diversity or, most commonly, do not appropriately plan for this undertaking. They write:

As a rule, academics excel at researching and describing problems but are not as facile in developing practical plans to systemically address such problems. In contrast, administrators interested in quick fixes may consider add-on types of solutions to diversity dilemmas without sufficient...
study of the complexity of the dilemma. A commonly encountered barrier
takes the form of efforts to develop and execute plans without the benefit
of guidance provided by empirical data. In this instance, plans that
include specific goals, timetables, areas of responsibility, and practical
activities, informed by empirical study of the problem, can be developed
and implemented” (1997, p. 421).

Failure to appropriately monitor progress towards goals and evaluate the success
of policies and initiatives are also linked to poor diversity outcomes (Hurtado & Dey,
1997). They explained:

Evaluation data are essential in making informed choices about how to
best allocate scarce resources between competing programs. Moreover,
the reports that flow from on-going evaluation efforts can help keep the
campus engaged in and informed about the institution’s efforts to change.
By keeping the issue before the campus community, a forum is created
whereby success can be celebrated, shortcomings can be identified and
corrected. Perhaps more importantly, success in the areas of developing a
supportive climate for diversity can engender public support for
institutional initiatives and have the effect of attracting more students,
faculty, and staff who wish to be affiliated with such a learning and work
environment (p. 421).

Alternative explanations for the lack of faculty diversity in business schools are
also worthy of exploration, including Rowley, Hurtado, and Ponjuan (2002)’s discovery
that greater faculty diversity exists in institutions with a high percentage of minority
students and in colleges and universities where enrollments reflect the demographics of the surrounding communities. The small percentage of African American, Hispanic Americans, and Native Americans we observed in the MBA student bodies in six public business schools relative to international and Caucasian American students, and the inability of the schools to approximate the ethnic diversity found in the states and counties that house them (except at Kelley) offer validation for Rowley, Hurtado, and Ponjuan's findings.

Milem & Astin's (1993) conclusion that minority faculty are attracted to colleges and universities that are engaged in solving social problems and promoting racial understanding and Trower and Chait's discovery that minorities are more likely to join academies with accommodating cultures offer other possible explanation for the small number of minority faculty in the schools we examined. While all of the business schools in our study are engaged in research with a social impact, we found very few examples of collaborative research directed toward the resolution of pressing social problems and little evidence that the socially directed research agendas of the host universities were translating into actual faculty work in business schools. The almost complete absence of tactics to promote greater racial understanding through curricular and co-curricular offerings across the six schools we observed also lends credence to this possible explanation.

Future research is needed to examine a number the issues that emerged from here in relation to faculty diversity. One question that deserves further investigation is why public business schools are not more forthcoming with data that shines light on the demographic makeup of their personnel. The answer may simply be that the data is so
dismal that it might diminish school reputations in a highly ratings driven environment. It is also important to examine why public business schools are not more aggressively pursuing efforts to increase faculty diversity, particularly where doing so is an institutional priority. Also essential are identification of exemplars in faculty diversity and an exploration of the tactics used to realize more divergent campuses. Sharing these discoveries widely with business and professional schools will provide them with tactics they can replicate and integrate into their existing recruitment repertoires.

The patterns uncovered through this study hint that faculty diversity in public business schools is a potentially significant problem that may diminish a student’s ability to develop a global mindset and an appreciation of differences, and may send a message that diversity is not truly valued by these institutions. The paucity of underrepresented minorities in the faculty ranks in the schools we studied poses a number of additional concerns. First, minority business students at these schools have few, if any, role models to emulate, have diminished opportunities to see underrepresented minorities in positions of leadership and authority, and have fewer opportunities to learn from others who are different from themselves. These factors may impede their ability to succeed in a divergent society. Additionally, the failure of business schools to find, create, and deploy tactics to change the demographic makeup of a critical group of employees does not provide future business leaders with models to emulate, or strategies to replicate as they look to enhance diversity in key positions in their own organizations.

Community Outreach and Engagement

Through this study we attempted to understand what approaches public business schools are using to model good institutional citizenship through external partnerships
and activities. Here we examined what schools are doing to bring business and community leaders on campus, form relationships with community leaders to address social problems through research and other activities, involvement in initiatives with an economic or political impact, and promote student and faculty involvement with and service to the community through volunteerism, consulting, and other activities.

Faculty/Administration Engaged in Relationships with the Community.

Thomas (1998) and Wellman (1999) detail the importance of relationships between faculty and administrators and community and business leaders as a vehicle for the identification of placement sites for student internships, field-based learning, research, and practicum experiences, service, and consulting projects; as a tool to discover pressing problems and issues to address through research and collaborative work; and as a means of culling a pool of guest lecturers for courses and co-curricular programs. Relationships also allow administrators the chance to involve community members and leaders of other academic institutions in the creation of a vision and strategies that take into account the needs of the community and avoid duplicative and parallel efforts (Thomas, 1998). Relationships can be developed through faculty and administrator volunteerism, consulting, and socially directed research.

None of the schools we examined required or encouraged faculty volunteerism in the community, even in cases where such activities were identified as priorities by the host university (ex., at Indiana University and at the University of Maryland). Business school leaders told us in interviews that requiring service beyond that which is delivered to the institution of the profession would detract from those activities administrators deemed most important (e.g., research, teaching, and professional service). As a result,
we found few faculty members across the schools reporting community service in their vitas or on-line biographical statements. In these documents we discovered evidence to suggest that some faculty are engaging in consulting work with businesses, government, and non-profit entities, with the most significant amount of consulting occurring in for-profit firms.

Least often seen was faculty and administrator engagement with community and government leaders to solve pressing social and environmental problems, an important academic function of engaged universities, according to the Campus Compact (2006), Wellman (1999), and Ramaley (2005). Examples of this type of outreach were in evidence at Carey, where one faculty member reported helping a community address its litter problems and another shared an experience he had assisting a local bank increase its blood donations, and at Moore where two faculty detailed their efforts to assist the state Department of Motor Vehicles streamline service delivery. These were just three of a handful of examples we found of faculty collaboration with the community to solve public problems, and they illustrate the impact that faculty and business schools can make in the community when their knowledge and resources are harnessed towards these ends.

The paucity of faculty service to the community through volunteerism, research, and collaboration to address social and community problems we observed may be attributed, at least in part, to the fact that every business schools we examined is part of a research university. In these institutions, research is one of the primary vehicles for the maintenance of a school’s Carnegie classification. Research also furthers a school’s reputation in the marketplace and generates significant revenue in the form of grants and private funding (Meyer & Rowan, 1991). This emphasis on research above service,
however, does not reflect changes made to the Carnegie classification system in 2000, which created a new taxonomy that moved away from research as a primary measure of performance and toward a more balanced criteria that recognizes the importance of teaching and service, two areas that Carnegie Foundation leaders believed were suffering under the 1994 standards (Basinger, 2000). While most of the academies that house the six business schools we studied appear to have modified their missions and strategies to align with these new standards, business schools do not seem to have followed suit. Future investigations that examine the impact of these changes in the Carnegie system on faculty community service at a larger number of business schools housed in research institutions could assess whether the trends we saw here also exist across a broader section of schools.

Administrative and faculty collaboration with community leaders to shape the school’s vision and strategy were not unearthed in this study. Future investigations are needed to evaluate whether these types of partnerships are occurring at other business schools and to what extent.

Meetings with Community Leaders Focused on Social Issues.

Administrator-led roundtables, public forums, and private meetings organized to surface and collaboratively address pressing social issues or craft a school’s mission and strategic priorities is a meaningful vehicle for civic engagement (Thomas, 1998; Holland, 1999). Our investigation found no evidence that these types of events were occurring at business schools beyond occasional discussions focused on regional economic development or those that are occurring through Georgia Tech’s Institute for Leadership and Entrepreneurship. Administrative and faculty collaboration with community leaders
to shape the school’s vision and strategy were not unearthed in this study. Future investigations are needed to evaluate whether these types of partnerships are occurring at other business schools and to what extent.

*Community Leaders Engaged on Campus.*

Invitations to community and business leaders to participate in campus-based programs and initiatives (ex., continuing and executive education programs, conferences, and seminars, serving as guest speakers) strengthens the connection between the academy and the community, and provides students with opportunities to meet and learn from individuals with divergent experiences and areas of expertise (Thomas, 1998). Business school leaders and faculty appear to be engaging with community and business leaders predominantly through continuing and executive education offerings, invitations to business and community leaders to participate in conferences, workshops, and seminars, and through requests to business leaders to serve as advisors to the dean. We found community leaders involved in the advisory board of just one research center, yet absent in deans’ advisory boards or committees. We encountered a number of examples of community, non-profit, and government leaders and agents serving as speakers in lecture series and far fewer instances where these individuals served as guest lecturers in the classroom. By contrast, business leaders had a significant presence on advisory boards, were frequently invited to be guest speakers, and appeared to be the primary targets of continuing and executive education programs. Additionally, our examination of the numerous research centers across these six schools revealed a significant amount of industry sponsored research and funding for buildings and equipment. These discoveries suggest that business leaders and industry, more than non-profits, non-governmental and
government agencies are shaping the agendas of business schools today, including the research that they generate.

*Socially Directed Research.*

Faculty engagement in research directed towards social problems and issues demonstrates the academy’s concern with and connection to society, impacts the common good, and offers students examples of socially responsive work (Checkoway, 2001; Stephens et al, 2000). Through faculty and institutional involvement in socially directed research and in research designed to address social, economic, and environmental issues, staff gain first hand knowledge of issues facing society, gather data that informs their curriculum, identify issues that can help shape the school’s research agenda, and find key officials from government, community, and for-profit organizations interested in working with students and partnering with the institution on key initiatives (Braskamp & Wergin, 1998; Chappie et al, 2003; Stephens et al, 2000).

None of the schools in this study identified strategic socially-directed research priorities that aligned with those of their home institutions, and the business school leaders we interviewed clearly affirmed that their divisions do not have research agendas of their own. Leaders argued instead for the importance of faculty freedom to study issues they deem important. Deviation of business schools from the research priorities of their host institutions demonstrates a lack of multi-dimensional engagement across the university (Holland, 2000). While we found little connection between the research interests and publications of business school faculty and the strategic, socially directed research priorities of their universities, we did discover research at each school with a social or environmental impact.
Philosopher Charles Peirce (1900) chastised academia for creating and perpetuating practices such as these that promote the solitary pursuit of individual interests over those that make faculty work socially useful by connecting it with the common good. The dominance of academic research directed by the interests of faculty and not towards the needs of communities, facilitated by tenure and promotion practices that "encourages disengagement and even penalizes professors whose work becomes useful to non-academics or popularized (Boyer, 1996, pp. 13-14) has eroded the three-fold academic mission of teaching, research, and service, and led to a devaluation of the role universities play in their communities and diminishing community engagement (Bringle, Games & Malloy, 1999). Plater (1999) suggests that efforts to align research with the common good requires a significant reordering of the way academies think about and reward the work of faculty, and leadership that will build a new vision for the academy – one that focuses on collective work and outcomes that benefit society over individual activity and individual gains. Our findings intimate that business schools are far from ready to make these radical changes. Other researchers may wish to investigate this theme further by examining the research agendas, outcomes, and tenure and promotion practices in a larger sampling of business schools, both public and private.

*Knowledge Sharing with the Community.*

All of the six schools in this study appear to engage in traditional knowledge sharing activities (e.g., publication in scholarly journals and the creation and dissemination of articles and reports for professional groups) but are not translating this knowledge into forms that can be understood or used by non-academic members of the community or participating in a two-way exchange of information that would promote
greater public understanding, as advanced by Checkoway (2001). Each of the business schools disseminates information to the community primarily through teaching, distribution of specially tailored reports to targeted groups (e.g., economic forecasts) and through writing published in scholarly journals and books, thus limiting the scope and reach of the schools and restricting opportunities for dialogue and knowledge exchange with constituents. Such tactics are limiting both for the schools, which miss out on the prospect of learning from a broad range of stakeholders, and community members who miss vital information that could promote greater economic prosperity and advancement.

*Initiatives with an Economic, Social, Environmental, or Political Purpose.*

Each of six business schools we examined has at least one research center or institute with an economic, social, environmental, or political purpose (Wellman, 1999; Ramaley, 2005), and two schools, the College of Management and Warrington, have more than one such center. These divisions appear to be the primary means by which business schools directly engage with society.

*For-Credit Learning Opportunities in the Community.*

Extra and co-curricular experiences, like field-based learning, internships with community organizations, service learning, and for-credit service projects, can involve students in real projects with impact and relevance for government, non-profits, or community based organizations help students learn and practice civic engagement and provide students with the chance to work with others who may be different than them, socio-economically, racially, ethnically, or culturally (Checkoway, 2001; Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Ramaley, 2005). None of the schools we looked at placed any notable emphasis on community based learning opportunities with government or non-profits and
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focused, instead, most intently on co-curricular learning in businesses. All six schools did, however, afford MBA students the chance to participate in field-based learning experiences. Field learning included three-credit consulting projects at Smith, practicum and other class projects that take students into the community, and international study trips and tours such as those offered by Warrington, Smith, Moore, Carey, and Indiana. Additionally, all schools in the study offer students internship opportunities in businesses and community based organizations. Credit for these experiences was not universally offered, however.

**Student Involvement in Community Service.**

Curricular activities with a strong civic purpose, including student-initiated volunteerism or community service supported or assisted by professional staff, participation in political activities, peer mentoring or mentorship of disadvantaged children in the community, Alternative Breaks, and other similar activities (Checkoway, 2001), expose students to moral and social challenges and “can expand the range of people for whom one feels empathy and responsibility, and fosters the capacity to understand other’s perspectives” (Stephens et al, 2000, p. 6). Community service has also been shown to enhance student commitment to their communities, promote racial understanding, help develop social values and leadership abilities, and increase self-confidence and critical thinking (Astin and Sax, 1998.). Student service benefits the universities that sponsor and support these activities by enhancing their reputations in the community, increasing student perception of the value of their education, and contributing to a higher rate of alumni giving (Astin, Sax & Avalos, 1999).
In alignment with these ideals, four of the schools in our study encourage MBA volunteerism, two strongly promote these activities, and five sponsor at least one MBA club that engages in community service with or philanthropic activities in support of community-based organizations or non-profits. No school we looked at requires MBA's to volunteer in the community, establishes community service goals for MBA students as many do with undergraduates, or sponsors community service activities. Exactly why service goals are established and supported at the undergraduate, but not at the graduate level is unclear, and is suggested as an area of future study. The assertion by the dean of the Kelley School of Business that one cannot develop the moral compass of another provides a line of inquiry to be pursued in other investigations.

Hynes & Nykiel (2008) propose that a lack of investment in resources to support or promote volunteerism might be attributed to conclusions by colleges and universities that the cost of these activities might outweigh their proven benefits, particularly in an environment characterized by limited resources and competing financial and strategic priorities. The prosperity we observed in the six institutions in our study raises doubts that such a cost-benefit analysis might be at work here, however, business schools like the larger institutions that house them, must make tactical decisions within the resources that they have. It appears that business schools are choosing instead to pursue other priorities more in alignment with their unique missions, including the quest for status and rankings.

*Other Community Engagement/Outreach Activities.*

There were a number of elements in our original framework related to engagement activities on the part of the schools and their administrators in which we
were either unable to assess the presence or absence of policies and practices identified in
the literature or in previous studies or were not able to find substantial evidence that
schools were enacting these behaviors. Through our investigation, we discovered only
two schools, South Carolina’s Moore and the University of Florida’s Warrington business
schools, placing graduates of their MBA programs with in-state employers. We were
unable to evaluate whether the schools offer lower in-state or out-of-state than their
competitors, as we did in our earlier study.

*Infrastructure to Support Social/Civic Engagement*

Civic engagement in higher education is a dynamic process that requires
institutional missions that connect the academy’s purpose with the needs of its
constituents, leaders who will commit organizational resources to social purposes,
organizational initiatives dedicated to social, economic, political, and environmental
aims, a commitment to providing the community with access to the university’s space
and resources, and regular oversight and assessment of engagement activities (Thomas,
1998; Holland, 1999; Wellman, 1999; Stephens et al, 2000; Checkoway, 2001). Our
study examined the infrastructure used by public business schools to increase their
capacity for engagement in each of the areas identified in Table 42.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission statement reflecting civic/social responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy reflecting civic/social mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community access to campus space and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure to support a civic/social mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of social/civic mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy reflecting civic/social mission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42: Activities that Promote Institutional Capacity for Engagement
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Mission Statement Reflects Civic/Social Responsibility

By establishing a mission statement that reflects a school’s commitment to society, leaders communicate their values and intentions to stakeholders and establish a framework to evaluate their civic engagement efforts (Thomas, 1998; Holland, 1999; Stephens et al, 2000). These statements of purpose also afford schools the opportunity to demonstrate their alignment with the larger institutions that house them while articulating the unique function they play in these organizations (Holland, 1999). In fact, the AACSB, the accrediting body of business schools requires a business school to ensure that its mission is “consonant with [those of any] institution of which it is a part” (2008, p. 13).

All of the business schools we examined are part of larger institutions that acknowledge their contract with and responsibility to society through their mission statements, operational priorities, or both. A comparable focus on social engagement was found in the missions of just two business schools, Kelley and Moore. We also discovered significant connections between the socially directed strategic and operational priorities and tactics of business schools and their home institutions in just two cases – Smith and the College of Management. In its curricular and co-curricular activities, Smith reflects the University of Maryland’s focus on state and regional economic development; technology; continuing education; elevation of the quality of undergraduate education; increasing the number of students who participate in international experiences; and a heightened emphasis on ethics and academic integrity. The College of Management mirrored a number of Georgia Institute of Technology’s strategic priorities. Shared priorities include sustainability; research to promote economic growth;
collaboration; interdisciplinary research; meeting the learning needs of non-traditional and off-campus students; research on sustainability and technology; continuing and professional education; ethical leadership; and green building design.

The four other schools in this study appeared to be far less connected to the missions and priorities of the academies that host them. Two clear examples of the disengagement between universities and their business schools were found at Kelley and Warrington. At Indiana University we found the business school excluded from Advancing Indiana, a significant regional economic development plan created and deployed by the university. The disconnect between the University of Florida and its business school was most evident in relation to strategic targets. To illustrate, the president of the University of Florida established several key goals for the business school in alignment with its own strategic imperatives. While Warrington is showing evidence that it is working one target – having 30% of its students involved in overseas study, it appears to be ignoring goals to have 100% of its students engaged in community service and to mobilize faculty and staff to engage more fully with the community. It is unclear how Warrington will increase faculty service to the community when its dean describes this activity as important "in name only" or involve all students in community service when this remains an elective component of graduate education.

Disconnects from society and from universities with clearly articulated missions of social engagement provides commentary on both the business schools themselves and the public universities they belong to. Truly engaged universities infuse their civic missions throughout all of their units (Checkoway, 2001) and use these statements as overarching guides for action across all levels of the institution" (Holland, 1999, p. 9). In
the absence of "widely adopted and well-articulated missions" that address the role a school has in service to the community, Holland argues, "institutes are perceived [by communities as] as confused, unfocused, unreliable, and disingenuous partners" (p. 61). Holland also draws a causal connection between the lack of planned linkages between missions and performance, like those we observed, with internal and external conflicts over the role a school has in service to the community.

Our discovery that business schools did not consistently articulate a social commitment in their purpose statements or mirror the social priorities found in the missions and strategic plans of their own universities draw into question the extent of the social commitment of many of the universities and business schools examined in this study and provides fodder for future investigations. Additional research is needed to determine whether business schools are uniquely exempted from the social efforts of public universities, or represent a more widespread disconnect between the socially directed rhetoric of academies and the realities of engagement across their divisions. These findings also suggest that that the extreme profitability of business schools and the contribution they make to the operating budgets of their home institutions may be, in part, the cause of this disconnect, excusing business schools from some of the engagement activities that other, less profitable units are not. Future studies can test this assumption further.

The very nature of business schools and the backgrounds and orientations of their leaders may also contribute to the detachment between the focus on engagement in missions and tactics at universities and their business schools. If business schools are, in fact, designed primarily to serve the needs of businesses, and their leaders are taught and
embrace prevailing economic theories, one would expect to see what we did – limitations in direct engagement with society guided by views that such an orientation has no place in business schools as expressed by the dean’s of Smith and Carey.

We argue that business schools do have an important role in society through the generation and promulgation of new theories of leadership and management; engagement in research designed to improve productivity, promote sustainable, ethical, and socially responsive business practices, to solve pressing business, social, and economic problems; promotion of economic development; preparation of men and women of all ethnic and racial backgrounds for leadership roles in organizations, and much more. We also contend that leaders play a pivotal role in more fully engaging business schools with society and all school stakeholders, equally. This requires entrepreneurial skills to identify opportunities and plans for engagement and encouraging people to get involved, advocacy to “provide resources to support and encourage faculty involvement in service and connect service to the institutional mission and reward system;” and symbolic leadership – demonstrating commitment to service to society through his or her own actions (Singleton, Hirsch, & Borack, 1999, p. 129).

*Strategy Reflects Civic/Social Mission*

A school’s strategic plan and operational tactics, like its mission, are tools to communicate to stakeholders those things the organization deems most important, and provides schools with yet another platform from which it can demonstrate and evaluate its social commitments (Thomas, 1998; 1999). With access to only one strategy (e.g., that of Smith) we encountered great difficulty evaluating this element of our frame, and were unable to fully assess the schools against this criteria.
Community Access to Campus Space and Resources

Access to campus space, resources, and technology (Thomas, 1998) was notably absent in all schools except Georgia Tech, which made a deliberate decision to locate the College of Management in the heart of the business district in Atlanta in an effort to promote greater collaboration between the school and the community and facilitate more openness between the two.

Structure to Support a Civic/Social Mission

We found no evidence that any of the schools in this study have a centralized office to monitor and promote the institution’s civic activities nor that any person was tasked with oversight of these initiatives as advanced by Stephens et al (2001), Checkoway (2001), and Holland (1999). Instead of being widely diffused across the entire business school, we found a predominance of funding, staffing, and support for socially directed work to be concentrated in research centers and institutes with those purposes. This discovery confirms Holland’s contention that “every postsecondary institution has individuals and programs that are engaged with the community” and the extent and “centrality of that work to the institutional mission varies widely from one institution to another” (1999, p. 59).

Assessment of Social/Civic Assessment

Each of the schools interviewed currently inventories or evaluates at least one of its activities that enacts its compact with society or attempts to replicate those programs and initiatives that have demonstrated success as advocated by Stephens, Colby, Ehrlich & Beaumont (2000), Thomas (1998), Holland and Ramaley (1998), and Holland (1999). For example, Smith tracks the economic impact of MBA consulting projects, while all six
schools measure the diversity of their student bodies, and Smith, Kelley, and Moore account for the percentage of students who complete international travel and study experiences. Three of the schools, Smith, the College of Management, and Moore, have participated in the World Resources Institute *Beyond Grey Pinstripes* survey, demonstrating either the desire to have their programs evaluated against criteria focused on sustainability and social responsibility in MBA program curriculum and research and/or the pursuit of additional rankings.

Instead of the comprehensive, deliberate, planned evaluation of the school’s overall success in achieving its social mission as Holland (1999) found in the most socially connected universities in her large scale study of civic engagement in academia, the measurement efforts we observed appeared to be more narrowly focused. Further, evaluation activities across the business schools we studied did not appear to be part of a “campus-wide exploration and assessment of the organizational elements that constitute an institution’s sense of mission” or designed to help the schools “match institutional rhetoric to actions across all elements of the institution’s mission in order to make “clear, candid, fact-based choices regarding its appropriate level of commitment and then organize, support, and evaluate itself and its faculty and students in light of that commitment” (Holland, 1999, p. 59). Holland found these activities in the most socially responsive institutions she examined. Additional study is needed to more fully determine whether assessment of civic and social effectiveness within public business schools is, as we suggest, a limited activity or whether it is part of a larger, more comprehensive effort driven by the universities.
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Summary

In the preceding chapters, we compared our findings with past research on business schools and their MBA programs and presented and discussed our data in light of the growing literature on civic engagement in the academy that informed our original framework. In the remaining pages, we explore the appropriateness of our starting frame to our research questions, describe how our findings influenced the formation of a revised schema that more adequately reflects the realities of business schools and social engagement, and present recommendations designed to help business schools elevate their work to a more engaged level.
CHAPTER 15

A NEW UNDERSTANDING OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN PUBLIC BUSINESS SCHOOLS

The Framework as a Tool for Discovery

Instead of beginning this exploratory study with a blank slate, as ethnographers might, we approached the project as cartographers, intent on validating and updating our understanding of the terrain. The map we used at the start of this journey was derived from the writings and research of educators, philosophers, legislators, policy makers, and academic leaders across history and was heavily influenced by the recent resurgent interest in civic engagement and social responsibility in higher education, championed by such groups as the Campus Compact, the Aspen Institute, and the World Resources Institute, and writers including Thomas, Ehrlich, Holland, Ramaley, Tierney, and others. All of these works coalesced in our original framework, which shaped the questions we asked business school leaders at Carey, Kelley, Smith, Warrington, Moore, and the College of Management, and served as the tool we used to sort through, compare, and make sense of what we found as we attempted to deepen our understanding of how public business schools enact their contracts with society. This schema also allowed us to assess whether business schools realize their compacts with society in the same or similar ways as many colleges and universities do.
At times, our framework proved to be a useful map of the terrain we were covering, predicting what we would find. Yet at other points, the schema either lacked precision or did not align at all with what we discovered, causing us to redraw the map, removing some of its original elements while redefining others. This newly reshaped framework now reflects the realities we encountered “on the ground,” and stands as an emerging picture of social responsibility in public business schools and their MBA programs. Modifications to our framework were made in places where we found differences between the actions the study’s business schools were taking and those we expected. For example, where the literature prescribed that schools would enact an element of our frame in a specific way, and no school did so, we removed that element from our framework. We also established a three-school threshold to our analysis of the data, which we used to assess whether at least one-half of schools were behaving in similar ways. When we found three or more schools engaging in activities predicted by the literature, we kept the element of the framework as it was when we began. In the places that we found three or more schools to be demonstrating new and similar behavior (e.g., activities related to an element of our framework but enacted in novel ways from those we anticipated) we redefined that element to reflect these realities. We use this chapter to briefly recount the story of social engagement in six public business schools as we found it, describe the changes we made to the framework, and reveal our newly revised schema in its totality.
A New Understanding of Social Responsibility in Public Business Schools

Infrastructure

Appreciating how public business schools engage in society begins with an understanding of how their leaders perceive their place in society. With just one exception, the leaders we spoke with did not see business schools as having a role to play in social, environmental or economic problems, but envisioned schools as impacting society best by providing students with an education that would prepare them to use the organizations they are part of to transform society, or by providing students with the education needed to live and work responsibly. This perspective was reflected in the mission statements of the business schools as well, which most often described education, research, and even the school’s rankings, rather than direct service to the community, as the primary tools for engagement with society. The beliefs of leaders also informed the strategic plans that we were able to review – documents that focused intently on improved marketing efforts and promoting excellence in research and teaching through a variety of initiatives and not on efforts that would engage schools directly with society and its agents or help any constituent besides businesses address or resolve pressing issues. While leaders identified society (e.g., the state, nation, or community), students, and faculty as core stakeholders, a broader group than stakeholder theory would predict, ideas about the function of business schools in society influenced the tactics schools are using to directly serve the public. These strategic actions extended little beyond the school’s own greatness, scattered examples of student service, and research centers or institutes created to fulfill social aims (ex. economic development, ethical or socially responsible leadership, sustainable business practices).
The articulated ideologies of leaders also appeared to shape how business schools shared knowledge, space, and resources with the community, and used their own human and financial capital in service to their missions. In these areas, the literature on academic engagement calls for openness, two-way dialogue that promotes greater understanding, knowledge sharing that extends beyond the academic community to the public at large, community access to space, technology, and other assets, and a structure to support civic engagement (e.g., people, funding, and processes such as oversight to ensure that needed service to society is delivered) (Ramaley, 2005). Within all the schools we examined, knowledge sharing seemed to be limited to publication in academic journals, presentations at professional conferences, narrowly tailored reports created for specialty groups like businesses or government agencies. Business schools also seemed to be spatially or geographically separate from the communities that house them, with one exception, and the structure to support the social contract appeared to be largely marginalized outside the primary work of the schools, enacted instead through the work done by research institutes and centers with their own social missions. How and why these centers are founded is unclear and worthy of future study. Our interview with the former dean of the College of Management at Georgia Tech, who now heads one socially directed institute, suggests that their origins may lie in the individual interests of school leaders or faculty members, who, through research grants and private funding find support for these pursuits. Assessment of civic engagement efforts within public business schools also appears to be limited to such areas as student diversity, international study and travel, and student service initiatives at the undergraduate level.
These discoveries caused us to significantly reshape the portion of our original framework that comprised the umbrella category – Infrastructure. Due to the paucity of activities and initiatives we found around business school missions, strategy, structural support, knowledge sharing, and community access, we removed all these categories from our framework. Because all of the schools we examined described research centers and institutes as the primary structures they use to engage directly with society and all six were evaluating at least one initiative that supports the academy’s social compact, we left these elements in our revised schema, and defined them in a more limited manner. We also renamed the Structure to Support Civic/Social Mission category to reflect that our discovery that tactics and structures for engagement are being used by business schools, not to support their own social missions (because most purpose statements lacked a social purpose), but as a demonstration of social responsibility. We also added one new element to the Infrastructure category as a result of our findings. The new grouping is: Stakeholders. Table 43 provides an overview of our changes to the frame. A detailed description of the revised framework is provided in Appendix G.

Table 43: Original and Revised Elements of the Framework Related to Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Framework</th>
<th>Revised Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mission statement reflecting social/civic responsibility</td>
<td>• Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strategy reflects civic/social mission</td>
<td>• Structure to support civic/social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community access to space and resources</td>
<td>engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knowledge sharing with the community</td>
<td>• Assessment of social/civic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Structure to support civic/social mission</td>
<td>effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment of civic/social effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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An Engaged Campus

Community Outreach and Engagement

Academies have a variety of opportunities to engage directly with the communities and constituents that support them, through meetings with community leaders to discuss, evaluate, and shape their missions and strategies in alignment with stakeholder needs, through relationship building and collaboration, via consulting and voluntary service to identify and resolve pressing social problems, and by expanding campus diversity. Despite periodic examples of faculty consulting and volunteerism found in faculty vitas and on-line biographical statements and two examples of administrator service shared in our interviews, we found no evidence that business schools value, promote, reward, or participate in these activities with any regularity. As a result, we eliminated the following elements from our revised framework:
Faculty/Administrators Engaged in Relationships with Community and Community Leaders and Meetings with Community Leaders Focused on Social Issues.

While faculty involvement in the community does not appear to be a priority for the public business schools we examined, MBA student outreach does. All of the business schools in this study are involving students in the community through internships, practicum and consulting experiences, and international study trips and tours, but are not always rewarding these activities with college credit, nor are they universally requiring MBA students to participate in these initiatives. The sporadic issuance of credit for community based learning opportunities caused us to change the name of this element in the new frame to – Learning Opportunities in the Community.
Five of the business schools also encourage MBA student volunteerism in the community, and two of these schools “strongly encourage” this activity. In no instance did we find service to be recognized, rewarded, or required, as it often was at the undergraduate level in these same schools. Nor was student involvement in community service a school goal at the MBA level as it was for undergraduates at a number of business schools. Five schools host student service organizations that report community service activities on their websites. Student Involvement in Community Service remains as an element in our revised framework, with its definition shifting to reflect these findings. In the revised framework, we moved this element and Learning Opportunities in the Community under the category Community Outreach and Engagement because of their connection to other faculty and business school outreach initiatives.

We also found business schools engaging with and serving their communities through initiatives with an economic, social, environmental, or political purpose; via research with a social or environmental impact; and through invitations to community and business leaders to participate in campus programs and initiatives. As a result, we left these elements in our revised framework.

Three other elements included in the Community Outreach and Engagement category of our original framework were removed from the new schema because we were either unable to assess whether the schools were engaging in this activity (e.g., Lower Instate Tuition than Competitors and Lower Out of State Tuition than Competitors), or because we found just two schools doing so (e.g., Placement of Students/Graduates with In-State Employers).
A Diverse Learning Environment

Civic competence and organizational competitiveness in an increasingly connected and global economy requires the ability to live, work, and collaborate with those who are ethnically, socially, and socio-economically different from oneself. To build these capabilities, academic institutions are asked to diversify their faculty ranks and student bodies and to teach students the skills needed to understand and work through differences that emerge when people with divergent backgrounds and cultural experiences are brought together for common purposes. Many of the leaders we spoke with acknowledged the importance of student and faculty diversity in providing MBAs with the skills needed in the marketplace or identified a more diverse campus as a goal for their schools, yet only one business school, Kelley, articulated these priorities in its mission. Four of the six schools we looked at achieved some degree of diversity in their MBA programs through the recruitment of both U.S.-born minority and international students, and markedly more success with the latter group. The primary vehicle used by most schools to attract underrepresented minorities to MBA programs was financial aid in terms of fellowships and scholarships, and other more innovative approaches recommended in the literature were largely absent, except at Kelley. These findings caused us to keep this element in our revised framework, and to redefine the criteria more narrowly to reflect the realities on the ground (See Appendix G).

All of the schools we looked at reported more significant difficulties with the recruitment of diverse faculty than diverse students, and appear to be remarkably unsuccessful in their efforts to attract faculty of color. None of the schools we spoke with were forthcoming about the demographic composition of their teaching staff, and
obtaining this data from other reliable sources, including school websites, was exceedingly difficult, suggesting that faculty diversity in business schools is as “dismal” as one of our participants intimated. Where we were able to make estimates about the ethnic composition of faculty, we found three schools with faculty diversity ranging from 20 and 32%. At each of these schools, faculty diversity appears to be derived almost entirely from international, mostly Asian, hires. With two exceptions, business school leaders did not report using any innovative tactics to attract underrepresented minority faculty, and none of the tactics used appear to be paying off for the schools. The leaders we spoke with attribute their failings to decisions by faculty of color to accept positions at more prestigious institutions. While we were tempted not to eliminate this element in our revised framework, the challenges we encountered with it in our study and our inability to firmly and accurately assess faculty diversity using data derived from sources other than estimates (our own and others) caused us to remove it from the new schema.

Curricular and co-curricular activities to promote greater appreciation of cultures and diversity advanced by the literature were almost entirely absent in the MBA programs we studied, and innovative approaches used to build these competencies with undergraduates at two schools were not similarly deployed with MBAs. Five of six schools did, however, use one tactic deemed important in the creation of an inclusive campus climate – support for student clubs or organizations for women and minorities. As a result of these findings, we kept, but renamed the category – Diversity-Building Education. In the new framework, we call this activity – Diversity Promoting Activities, and moved it from the category – Curricular Content and Delivery, which was a component of the umbrella category, A Responsive Curriculum, to Community Outreach
and Engagement, within the master category, An Engaged Campus. This modification was made because the schools are not routinely addressing cultural differences through coursework and pedagogical approaches. In the new schema, we also redefined this element to include only student clubs and associations for underrepresented groups.

Table 44 summarizes the changes made to the framework under the heading, An Engaged Campus, which includes A Diverse Learning Environment and Community Outreach and Engagement.

| Table 44: Characteristics of an Engaged Campus in the Initial and Revised Frameworks |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Original Framework                               | Revised Framework                                |
| An Engaged Campus                                | An Engaged Campus                                |
| A Diverse Learning Environment                   | A Diverse Learning Environment                   |
| • Diverse student body                           | • Diverse student body                           |
| • Diverse faculty                               | • Diversity-promoting experiences                |
| Community Outreach and Engagement                | Community Outreach and Engagement                |
| • Faculty/administrators engaged in relationships with community and community leaders | • Community leaders engaged with on-campus       |
| • Community leaders engaged on campus            | • Socially directed research                     |
| • Meetings with community leaders focused on social issues | • Initiatives with an economic, political, or social purpose |
| • Socially directed research                     | • Initiatives with an economic or political purpose |
| • Initiatives with an economic or political purpose | • Lower in-state tuition than competitors       |
| • Lower in-state tuition than competitors        | • Lower out-of-state tuition than competitors    |
| • Placement of graduates with in-state employers | • Placement of graduates with in-state employers |
In alignment with the literature and our original framework, all six of the schools we examined engage in problem centered learning via MBA coursework and learning opportunities, such as case studies, team-based learning, experiential learning, case competitions, and capstone experiences to facilitate MBA students’ abilities to think critically, make decisions alone and in collaboration with others, synthesize learning, and work collaborative, all of which are requisite skills for civic engagement. As such, this element of our frame remains unchanged.

By contrast, we were unable to find any business schools approaching interdisciplinary learning using tactics advanced by the literature and our original framework. Instead, we discovered an appreciation at each school of the value of interdisciplinary learning in helping students to think contextually about issues, and shared tactics to achieve these ends. Shared approaches included dual degree programs like the MBA/MSN, MBA/JD, and others, opportunities for MBA students to customize their degrees through elective coursework taken within and outside the business school, opening MBA courses to student from other disciplines across campuses, and interdisciplinary teaching and research promoted and sponsored by research centers and institutes. As a consequence, the definition of this portion of our frame changed moving forward, while its title remains the same.

Only one of the six business schools we examined is approaching ethics in its MBA programs in a manner that reflects a number of best practices in business ethics education, and five business schools are giving the subject only cursory attention. The failure we observed to require all MBA students to take at least one course on ethics, to
deliberately work to infuse this topic across business school curriculum, or to address the
topic at the beginning and the end of a degree program demonstrated what critics have
asserted – business schools are not providing MBA students with the grounding in moral
reasoning or decision making needed for responsible leadership or civic life. Because of
this discovery, ethics education is no longer an element in our framework.

Social responsibility and sustainability are topics of increasing importance to
MBA students, and this was reflected at four schools we studied. Within these schools,
MBA students have the chance to learn about social and environmental impact
management through core or elective coursework on related topics, including social
entrepreneurship, and/or through involvement in a student club such as Net Impact or
Change the World. While none of the schools we examined approached the levels of
scholarship advanced and recognized by the World Resources Institute in its biennial
Beyond Grey Pinstripes studies and reports, the majority of schools in this study are at
least exposing students to issues of social responsibility and sustainability that are of
interest to students, businesses, and consumers. This element remains in the new
framework with a modified definition (See Appendix G).

Each of the six business schools we looked at is creating global connections in
ways advanced by Lorange (2003) and others, including forging relationships with
international businesses, governments, and universities; offering on-line programs and
degrees delivered and granted overseas; and providing students with exposure to faculty
who are knowledgeable about international business issues because they have lived,
worked, or studied abroad. Business schools are also expanding the international acumen
of faculty through opportunities offered by internationally directed research centers that
sponsor research on global business issues, provide faculty with professional development experiences, and support and promote international travel, study, and teaching for faculty. No changes were made to the framework as a result of these discoveries.

Public business schools also appear to be providing MBA students with coursework and experiences to build the competencies needed to live and work in an increasingly global world. The tactics that we observed, however, did not always align with the literature and our original framework. For example, all of the schools in our study offer MBAs the chance to study abroad via exchange programs with international universities and some offered or required international internship experiences as the frame predicted. No school grounded MBA’s in human resources, organizational development, human rights, labor and environmental law through coursework as advised by Lorange, and only one school required all students to participate in a class on culture. All six schools are, however, helping students acquire a global mindset through a number of tactics we did not anticipate, including elective coursework and minors or specializations international business and student study or travel abroad opportunities. Five business schools host research centers with an international focus. As a result, our revised framework maintains this element with modifications to tactical expectations.

Contrary to worries expressed by Ghoshal (2005), we found evidence to suggest that business schools are approaching Boyer’s balanced scholarship model through their focus on the importance of research, teaching, and interdisciplinary work, and through institutional and professional service. Schools appear, however, to be less concerned with the scholarship of application through service to the community, an important
demonstration of civic engagement. These findings caused us to slightly redefine this element in our new framework (See Appendix G).

We were unable to find evidence that business schools faculty are actively mentoring MBA students, so we removed this item from the revised schema. Table 45 succinctly summarizes the changes made to the Community Outreach and Engagement portion of the framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 45: Characteristics of a Responsive Curriculum in the Original and Revised Frameworks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Original Framework</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Outreach &amp; Engagement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty mentorship of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For-credit learning opportunities in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student involvement in community service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Problem centered learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interdisciplinary learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ethics education/focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Courses and experiences in social responsibility/social/environmental impact management/sustainability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of Frameworks in Future Studies

Our decision to use a framework to guide the present study and our findings in relation to the original schema evoke a number of thoughts. First, the outcomes of this study suggest that the original frame, excluding elements relating to tuition, might be a
more useful tool to deploy in studies of entire universities rather than in those concerned with sub-units like professional schools. The study of civic engagement and social responsibility in higher education is a growing field, with researchers approaching their projects with varying, and somewhat more limited questions than we posed here. If the original frame we crafted was applied to six public universities, including those that house the six business schools we examined, we anticipate that the results would be more favorable. We also believe that the simultaneous use of this tool to explore how selected colleges within these institutions (including business schools) are enacting the school’s social contract would yield valuable insights regarding the university’s true level of engagement. Doing both would also test assumptions that widely articulated, yet difficult to substantiate, priorities, such as faculty diversity, ethics, and serving society are a reflection of institutional myth and rhetoric used to garner the support of stakeholders and not distinct organizational objectives tied to tactics and structures that will ensure their attainment. Deploying the original framework to explore engagement at the institutional level might also lead to the identification of exemplary colleges and universities and a deeper understanding of how and why civic engagement occurs.

Researchers interested in using our revised framework with other business schools, whether public or private, are encouraged to see this tool as a fluid construct, subject to continued modifications as more schools are examined. Familiarity with the original framework and all of its elements and openness to expanding or contracting the newly constructed map as novel discoveries are encountered will help to deepen and extend our growing appreciation of social engagement in business schools and their MBA programs. Familiarity with the original frame will also counter our worries that some of
limitations in areas like faculty diversity, student and faculty volunteerism and community service, and ethics education we encountered might be exceptional phenomena limited to the populations we studied, and not reflective of the realities in business schools overall. As such, we believe that it is important to continue to ask business schools questions similar to those we used and to probe their practices more deeply to determine their approaches to ethics education, expanding faculty diversity, community service, and other important dimensions of civic engagement not present in our revised framework. On-going investigations of this nature may also serve as catalysts to push business schools towards higher levels of excellence in the areas that we and other scholars have found to be lacking.

A Cautionary Note About Linguistics

The literature we drew from and our own belief systems drove us to name the phenomenon under study – social responsibility in public business schools. We chose this term because it seemed to us to be an umbrella under which all that we were considering seemed to neatly fall. Through our interviews, we quickly learned that our chosen terminology was politically charged and potentially off-putting, causing at least one of our participants to tell us that he rejected the study’s very premise. In hindsight, it is clear that our choice of language revealed not only the biases of the researcher, but brought to the fore those of others. While this “clash of prejudice” surfaced important issues and helped clarify the perspectives of business school leaders and guided us to a deeper understanding of the organizations we examined, we believe that future researchers would be wise to use less value laden terminology (i.e., civic or social
engagement) when studying this concept in similar settings. The use of different
language to frame future studies will arguably open dialogue more fully and promote a
far greater appreciation of what business schools are, in fact, doing to enact their social
contracts.

Commendable Examples of Social Engagement in Business Schools

Readers looking to this study for guidance in the creation of a more engaged
business school will find some help with the newly crafted framework in Appendix G.
Those who are hoping to find examples of fully engaged business schools, however, will
be sorely disappointed. As we reflect on the findings of this study in their totality, we are
forced to conclude that our initial desire to find such exemplars now seems to have been
an unrealistic aspiration. Not satisfied with this assessment, we turned to Holland’s
(1999) framework for assessing the level of commitment to service through six key
organizational functions: mission; promotion, tenure and hiring; organization structure;
student involvement and curriculum; faculty involvement; community involvement; and
publications and university relations (See Appendix H). This comparison confirmed our
initial assessment but allowed us slightly more precision in determining precisely how
engaged these six business schools are with their communities. Holland’s frame revealed
that most of our schools are demonstrating low to moderate levels of engagement in all
areas except two. In terms of student service and curriculum (e.g., internships, practicum
experiences, and other service-learning opportunities) and publications and university
relations (e.g., linkages between the community and the school through centers and
institutes), the schools in our study appear to be demonstrating a fairly substantial level of
commitment to community engagement. While we end this study without clear leaders insocial responsibility within public business schools, we are left with a few models ofexcellence in several key areas of engagement, including student diversity, curricular andco-curricular activities to promote an understanding of social responsibility andsustainability or build global leadership competence, access to campus resources, andethics education. These exemplars offer business schools interested in expanding theirown commitments to society with some ideas about how to do so.

An Exemplary Approach to Campus Diversity

The dean of the Kelley School of Business was not content to allow the ethnichomogeneity of the state and local community to limit his efforts to create a diversecampus. Through partnerships with Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Kelleyis planning exchange programs that allow traditionally underrepresented students thechance to pursue coursework at the business school and retain access to all of theresources available to its students once they return to their home institutions. Thisincludes the ability to use the school’s career center and receive assistance withplacement. Kelley participates in multiple consortia committed to increasing theproportion of minority and women in MBA and other graduate business educationprograms across the country. Kelley also uses financial aid including scholarships andfellowships to help attract minority students to its programs.

Kelley’s success in creating a diverse student body may also be traced to itsmission that espouses the value of diversity and establishes diversity in its programs aspart of its identity. Kelly’s mission and focus on diversity as a firm and achievable goalalso represents a connection with the mission of Indiana University, which identifies “full
diversity” as an important objective. These initiatives have paid off handsomely for the school, which can boast that its MBA student body approximates or exceeds the ethnic makeup of the county and state in which the school resides – a claim that no other school in this study can make.

Kelley is deploying a variety of innovative tactics to increase faculty diversity, which the dean describes as “dismal.” This includes participation in the PhD Project, a consortium that works to increase faculty diversity in business schools, invitations to doctoral students of color to teach for Kelley prior to completion of their degrees, and hiring of minorities to serve as visiting lecturers. Because Kelley did not reveal data regarding the demographic makeup of its faculty, we were not able to assess whether their recruitment efforts are providing them with the returns they are hoping for. The dean’s assertion that faculty diversity continues to be one of his biggest challenges leads us to believe that they are not. Despite this, Kelley’s unique recruitment tactics far exceed efforts used by other schools to change the face of their schools’ faculty, which ranged from a complete lack of strategy and inattention to this issue to the sense of defeatism we observed at most of the other schools we examined. Kelley’s practices are worthy of continued attention and evaluation over time and should be compared with those used by business schools that have demonstrated greater success in attracting minority faculty.

Excellence in Education and Practice in Social Responsibility and Sustainability

Providing students with opportunities to learn about social responsibility and sustainability is a strength of the College of Management at Georgia Tech. Guided by university commitment to sustainability in its mission, strategic plan, and multi-year
sustainability initiative, Tech’s business school “walks the talk” on sustainability by operating in a L.E.E.D. certified green building and through curricular and co-curricular activities to expose students to issues of social and environmental impact management.

The College of Management is working to infuse sustainability and social responsibility into its graduate and undergraduate curriculum and offers students the chance to explore these issues in depth through a number of elective course offerings and via participation in Net Impact, a student association dedicated to these topics.

The business school at Georgia Tech also has two research centers devoted to social and environmental impact management – the Institute for Leadership and Entrepreneurship led by the former dean of the business school, and the ECLIPS Center dedicated to sustainable business practices. These centers sponsor research on issues related to sustainability and social responsibility, and host a series of lectures, conferences, roundtables, and other educational events to further understanding of these topics among students, faculty, business and community leaders, and the academic community. Like other schools in this study, Georgia Tech faculty are also engaged in a variety of research projects with a social or environmental impact. While these efforts did not garner the College of Management top honors in the Beyond Grey Pinstripes report, they did ensure that it emerged as an exemplar in this study.

A Model of Access

The College of Management also serves as model for community access to its space and resources. The school’s location in downtown Atlanta, in the heart of the business district, ease of access by public and mass transit, presence in a complex that includes retail, dining, and hotel accommodations, and opportunities for others to lease
space in the building for meetings, trainings, and other events, were all deliberate choices by college administration and faculty to extend the reach of the school and its ability to interact and collaborate with business and community leaders and other academic institutions more readily.

International Business Education at its Best

While all the public business schools we studied are working to help MBA students gain the knowledge and skills needed to compete in a global economy, none goes further towards this end than the Moore School of Business at the University of South Carolina. Moore’s primary MBA program is an International MBA with a 13 course internationalized core curriculum, a mandatory internship with an international organization, and a requirement for an overseas study/travel trip with extensive pre-trip preparation, the option of completing one semester of study in a partner university in another country, and a global or language track that involves in-depth study of a foreign language or of a region of the world. These approaches clearly provide MBA students with a firm grounding in international business through intensive study of language and culture, not found in any other school we examined, and offers a distinctive, aggressive program of study that better prepares graduates for competitive opportunities in the global marketplace than its peers.

Raising the Bar on Business Ethics

While many business schools are paying little attention to ethics in their curricular and co-curricular activities, the Smith School of Business at the University of Maryland proves that excellence in ethics in business education can be achieved. Smith demonstrates distinctiveness through an intensive, widely shared commitment to ethical
behavior captured in its stringent academic integrity policy—a policy that is shared with all incoming students. The business school also requires new students to sign an ethics pledge, and then introduces them more fully to the topic in a core course in the MBA program. Ethics is revisited with MBA’s through a lecture series on ethics, and again in their final semester when they participate in Ethics Week. Ethics Week includes a trip to a federal penitentiary where students tour the prison, participate in panel discussions led by former executives-turned-inmates, and spend time practicing ethical decision making through role plays. Smith also involves faculty in committees that review and decide on alleged violations of academic integrity, demonstrating the school’s commitment to ethical behavior and action, and enhanced opportunities for members of the business school community to evaluate and sanction unethical behavior.

Miles to Go

From the outset of this study we were guided by one burning questions—is social responsibility in public business schools a reality or an oxymoron? Although a preliminary study by Stott and Wolverton (2005) held promise that business schools might be actively engaged in the fulfillment of the social compact of their home institutions, past research on business schools suggested a bleaker outlook. The results of this study intimate that both propositions are true: business schools, in their own unique ways, and in alignment with their distinct purposes, are contributing a great deal to the communities that support them and are failing them in a number of key areas at the same time. By graduating MBA’s commanding strong starting salaries in the workplace; through continuing and executive education; and through the efforts of research centers,
institutions, and via research and consulting work by individual faculty members and students, business schools help drive local, regional, national, and international economic development, and bring new ideas to the marketplace that enhance organizational performance and support sustainable and socially responsible business practices.

These same institutions, however, are missing key opportunities to contribute more fully to the communities that support them. The schools examined in this study, without exception, did not appear to build extensive relationships with community or government leaders with the express purpose of using those relationships to help business schools evaluate their missions and strategies in alignment with the needs of all of their constituents or to identify social and environmental problems. Nor did the schools mobilize their extensive human capital (e.g., faculty and students) to partner with local and regional organizations to resolve these pressing issues. Instead, these resources were found to be directed largely in service to the business schools themselves, the universities that house them, and for-profit firms that serve as significant sources of revenue for the schools. Where community service is occurring, it is initiated and motivated most often by individual faculty and students, is delivered to agencies at a discounted fee (as at Smith), or occurs with the prompting of and funding by a research center of institute (as at the College of Management at Georgia Tech).

With little more than encouragement and cursory support for service work, we worry that MBA students are graduating with less than adequate preparation for civic engagement and without an adequate appreciation of the value of charitable giving and service work within the business community. In order to more fully realize these aims, we argue that business schools must more adequately reinforce community work at the
MBA level through college credit for these activities, recognition or reward for such work, and additional support to find and secure volunteer, internships, and consulting opportunities in non-profit and public service organizations.

Business schools studied here are also taking initial steps to help MBA students acquire the requisite competencies needed for work and life in a complex, global world. They are doing this through coursework, international travel and study abroad programs, specializations and certificates in international management, and partnerships with international firms and foreign academies. However, the absence of any required courses in international business in MBA programs at four schools and the struggles that many schools have had attracting minority faculty and MBA students, bring to light that possibility that business schools have a much longer road to travel in order to graduate students who possess both the cultural and business acumen to adequately navigate within the increasingly internationalized waters of business today.

This study also revealed that while business schools are attending to issues of ethics in business, as required of them by their accrediting body, they are often doing little more than meeting the minimum requirements of the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business to provide students with learning experiences that include the study of “ethical and legal responsibilities in organizations and society” (2007, p. 10) and to develop codes of conduct that detail standards of personal and professional behavior for faculty, students, and staff (2007, p. 11). The Smith School of Business at the University of Maryland emerged as a model of ethics in business education, most closely approximating the ideals advanced by experts on business education. Missing, however, at all schools is attention to ethics across all MBA programs and deliberate
efforts to address ethics in core courses. These limitations mean that key opportunities for students and faculty to surface, discuss, and explore ethical dilemmas, and for students to learn and practice addressing ethical challenges as they arise are limited, leaving students inadequately prepared to deal with the moral dilemmas they will surely encounter in the workplace. Smith showed us that business schools can do more.

Research and real life experience show us why they should.

Social responsibility and sustainability appear to be emerging as key areas of interest to students, and this is translating, in some schools, into curricular and co-curricular activities that allow students to explore these topics and learn skills that will help them lead in socially responsible and sustainable ways. Four of the schools in this study either provide students with courses on social or environmental impact management or on social entrepreneurship, and one school is working to infuse these topics across the curriculum. Four of the schools in this study have active clubs concerned with social responsibility and sustainability, and two schools are part of larger institutions whose building plans are committed to the deployment of L.E.E.D. standards in all future construction. The College of Management at Georgia Tech is housed in a “green building” and is working to realize the final goals of a university sustainability plan that involves integration of sustainability into all curriculum. Even at Georgia Tech, however, this final step in a multi-year plan is not an easy one. Faculty and students are still attempting to influence business school leaders to go the last mile, and administrators are becoming more willing to do so as they see more and more money funneled in to the school’s research center devoted to sustainable business practices (Former Dean, The College of Management, 2006). We urge other schools to follow Tech’s lead.
This study also found that the ideologies and values of business school leaders seem to be a significant force behind a school’s agenda and priorities, and may impact the connectivity, or lack thereof, between the missions and strategies of business schools and their universities. The results also show that a push for money, status, and rankings too may pull a business school away from its social compact and influence an institution to make choices that are in its own best interest and not in the interest of its constituents. The decision of Georgia Tech’s last dean, a self-described “bleeding heart,” to leave her leadership post to establish a center devoted to socially responsible and values-driven leadership, also suggests that leaders who choose to focus a business school’s efforts on the common good, might tire from those efforts and find it easier to make a difference in a division of the school where such choices are less common place, and where missions can be much more narrowly focused. We will leave it to future researchers to determine whether similar thinking leaders will increasingly grab the helm of public business schools or fade into the background and whether pressure from student groups, faculty, and business leaders, the public, and the presidents of the universities that support business schools will amass to push more socially conscious individuals into leadership roles in these colleges and further enable business schools to more fully serve the common good. We’re hoping for the latter. In the meantime, we sleep well at night knowing that while public business schools may not be enacting their social compacts in all the ways we envisioned them to, each is, in its own unique manner, serving society in meaningful ways.
APPENDIX A

EMAIL FROM DR. WOLVERTON TO BUSINESS SCHOOL DEANS

From: "Mimi Wolverton" <mirni.wolverton@unlv.edu>

To: Dean, XXX Business School

Subject: A Study About Social Responsibility

Date: Tue, 16 May 2006 17:46:29 -0700

Dear XXX,

In 2004 Larry Penley and I edited a book entitled *Elite MBA Programs at Public Universities: How a Dozen Innovative Schools Are Redefining Business Education*. Indiana was one of the 12 schools that participated in the study. XXX wrote the chapter for your school.

I am currently a professor in the higher education leadership program at UNLV. Kim Stott, one of my doctoral students, has an interest in how public colleges and universities fulfill their contract with society. I mentioned to her that although Larry and I did not ask about social responsibility, it was definitely a thread that ran through the 12 cases. Kim decided that for her dissertation research she would like to revisit the 12 schools and ask specifically about the ways in which they meet their responsibilities to society. I’ve attached a two-page paper that states her rationale for the study and the approach she will take.

Your commitment to the study would involve an interview with either you or a designee and your willingness to have someone pull together archival materials. These materials include but are not limited to curricular examples, strategic plans, policies and procedures, marketing pieces, information pieces, articles written about the school, and the like that Kim can have shipped to her.

Based on a secondary analysis of the original 12 cases, which Kim conducted, I believe that her dissertation will show your school and the other 11 to be exemplars when it comes to fulfilling this important covenant.

Please let us know whether you will participate in the study and who are contact person will be.

Thanks,

Mimi
Policy makers have much to say about the purpose of higher education and about how well its public institutions fulfill their social and civic missions. Most recently, business schools and their flagship MBA programs have become the subject of considerable scrutiny. Driven in part by the recent spate of business scandals involving the leaders of companies from Smith Barney, to Enron, WorldCom, Author Anderson, Health South, and others, this criticism might seem to some like scape-goating if it weren't for the larger context in which it rests.

A primary driver of any national disposition toward civic and social conduct derives from its economy, which is forged by business. This nation’s business schools were specifically designed to educate and culturally inculcate our future business leaders, and to introduce new and innovative ways to manage organizations and resources in order to generate economic returns. Public business schools and the programs they offer play a crucially dynamic social and civic role in the United States. Indeed, the recent increase in corporate scandals, some of which were orchestrated by corporate leaders with MBAs from this country’s finest and most respected schools, has led some to question the ability of business schools to adequately prepare students to lead such complex organizations (Ghoshal, 2005; Pfeffer, 2005, Pfeffer & Fong, 2002, Hahs, 1999, Paton, 2001, Kretovich, 1999). Disparaging voices have singled them out not only for their failure to produce capable, ethical business leaders, but for their inability, and perhaps unwillingness, to provide meaningful service to society and educate civic-minded individuals (Walsh, Weber, and Margolis, 2003).

If we were to evaluate public business schools, not by examining placement rates of graduates, but instead by looking at how well they contribute to the public good, how would they fair? To date, no single study has sought to answer this question. This study represents an effort to do so.

Drawing upon the writings of American scholars and policy makers from the 18th century forward, we examined the nation’s changing contract with public higher education and the role that business schools play in society. We also examined the literature on social responsibility in business and in higher education, including business schools, in order to uncover the strategies that are being successfully deployed by business schools and academies in general to fulfill their social contract. Using these sources, we built a theoretical and analytical framework which identified four broad categories, comprised of a variety of diverse activities used by business schools and institutes of higher education alike to create socially responsible schools and graduates, as well as ethically and socially aware citizens and business leaders.

In order to test this framework, we used it to examine secondary data derived from a study of 12 prominent business schools housed at public universities conducted by Wolverton and Penley (2004). This study consisted of written descriptions provided by the schools, which outlined how each achieved its level of quality graduate business education over the last decade and where the school’s vision and strategic choices will lead it over the next ten years. Data were analyzed and coded using Yin’s (1994) comparative case study method. Such cross-case analysis ensured that all relevant data were taken into consideration in the analysis (Manning and Cullumn-Swan, 1994; Miles and Huberman, 1984). To make sure that the analysis in the study was accurate and complete, one researcher looked for patterns and themes across the data; the other researcher validated data coding and modified it where necessary. This process provided...
definitional clarity and contextual agreement on themes (Miles and Huberman, 1984; Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

Although the schools included in the Wolverton and Penley (2004) study were not asked directly about their efforts in our current area of interest, a remarkable picture emerged. It appears that these 12 schools are actively engaged in the development and delivery of curriculum, research agendas, infrastructure, community outreach, and diversity in service to society. Despite this discovery, it is clear that our findings are only preliminary and require further examination in order to determine the breadth and extent of the schools’ work in this area.

This study will attempt to ascertain more precisely what these 12 premiere American business schools are doing to fulfill their social contract and produce ethical, socially aware, and critically thinking business leaders and citizens. Because the study is exploratory in nature, we will use qualitative methodology. In order to answer our research question, we will conduct interviews with the deans, or their designees, of each of the 12 business schools included in the Wolverton and Penley (2004) study: University of Maryland, University of Pittsburgh, Indiana University, Purdue University, Georgia State University, Georgia Institute of Technology, University of Florida, University of Georgia, University of South Carolina, Arizona State University, Texas A&M University, and the University of Washington. Interviewees will have the questions prior to interview so that they have time to reflect on their answers prior to the interview session. Interviews will take place over the telephone, and are expected to last one to one and one-half hours. Interviews will be fairly open and unstructured and will focus on the following questions:

- Tell us about your efforts to fulfill your social contract – to demonstrate both social responsibility as a business school and to create socially responsible business leaders and graduates who are engaged members of society.
- Specifically, describe your school’s efforts toward these ends using strategies related to the following areas:
  - Curriculum and instruction
  - Community engagement and development
  - Diversity (including efforts to create a diverse faculty and student body, and to develop an appreciation of differences and the ability to work with those who are culturally different from oneself)
  - Creating an infrastructure to support these efforts (e.g., mission, strategy, budget/funding, staffing, fund raising, etc.).
  - Other strategies (including, “green campuses”, and others. Please specify.)

We will also ask the schools to provide us with documents, including memos, newsletters, course descriptions, course curricula, mission statements, strategic plans, demographic data about student enrollment and faculty makeup by gender and ethnicity, marketing materials, press briefings, videos, photographs, and other official and popular culture documents (Bogden & Biklen, 2003) which will illustrate their efforts more fully. Interviews will be transcribed and coded, and interview transcripts and all collected documents will be analyzed using the existing framework, which we anticipate will be expanded as the data is analyzed. A comparative, cross-case analysis (Yin, 1994) will be conducted.

We anticipate that this study will result in a more complete portrait of social responsibility in public business schools and provide other schools interested in developing this competency with a variety of novel ideas, strategies and models to guide them to this end.
APPENDIX C

CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION

Elite Public Business Schools & Social Responsibility: A Search for Exemplars

The following information is provided to you for you to decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You are free to decide not to participate or to withdraw at any time without affecting your relationship with this department, the investigator, or the University of Nevada Las Vegas.

The purpose of this study is to understand how some of the nation’s leading public business schools are fulfilling their social contract – specifically, how they themselves are engaging with the larger communities in which they rest, and how they are engaging their students with society and preparing them to be responsible business leaders and citizens. The procedure used will be a multi-site case study which examines the schools surveyed in the 2004 Wolverton and Penley survey of elite public business schools. We will attempt to develop an understanding of your school’s activities through a one to one and one-half hour interview with you and through an examination of documents which illustrate your school’s efforts in this area.

Do not hesitate to ask any questions about the study either before participating or during the time you are participating. We will be happy to share our findings with you after the research is completed. There are no known risks and/or discomforts associated with this study. The expected benefits associated with your participation in the study include your contribution to an emerging area of research on social responsibility in business education and increased visibility of your school’s efforts towards this end.

Please sign your consent with full knowledge of the nature and purpose of the procedures. A copy of this consent form will be given to you to keep.

__________________________________________  __________________________
Signature of Participant                      Date

Kim E. Stott, Doctoral Candidate, University of Nevada Las Vegas,  
Principal Investigator  
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Interview Protocol

Project: Elite Public Business Schools & Social Responsibility: A Search for Exemplars

Time of Interview: __________________________________________________________
Date: _______________________________________________________
Interviewer: _______________________________________________________
Interviewee: _______________________________________________________
Position of Interviewee: ____________________________________________________
School: ________________________________________________________________

(Briefly describe the project)

Questions:
1. Tell me about your efforts to fulfill your social contract – to demonstrate both social responsibility as a business school and to create socially responsible business leaders and graduates who are engaged members of society.

2. Specifically, describe your school’s efforts toward these ends using strategies related to the following areas:

   a. Curriculum and instruction (ex: ethics education, social responsibility in business, social and/or environmental impact management, sustainability, etc.).

   b. Community engagement and development

   c. Diversity (including efforts to create a diverse faculty and student body, and to develop an appreciation of differences and the ability to work with those who are culturally different from oneself)

   d. Creating an infrastructure to support these efforts (e.g., mission, strategy, budget/funding, staffing, fund raising, etc.).

   e. Other strategies (including, “green campuses”, and others. Please specify.)
APPENDIX E

**Project:** Elite Public Business Schools & Social Responsibility: A Search for Exemplar

**CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Business School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Across School Comparison</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty mentorship of students</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For credit learning opportunities in the community</td>
<td>SOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student involvement in community service</td>
<td>SOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem centered learning</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary learning</td>
<td>SOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially directed research</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics education/focus</td>
<td>SOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses and experiences in SR, social/environmental impact mgt/ sustainability</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global connections</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework &amp; experiences to build global leadership competence</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity building education</td>
<td>SOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship equally balanced between discovery, integration, practice and teaching</td>
<td>SOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>An Engaged Campus</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse student body</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse faculty</td>
<td>SOME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Across School Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Business School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>An Engaged Campus</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/administrators engaged in relationships with community and</td>
<td>SOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders engaged on campus</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings with community leaders focused on social issues</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiatives with economic or political purpose (Institutes, Competitions,</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower tuition in state than competitors</td>
<td>Cannot Assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower out of state tuition than competitors</td>
<td>Cannot Assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement of students with in state employers</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission statement reflecting social/civic responsibility</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy reflects civic/social mission</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community access to campus space and resources</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge sharing</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure to support civic/social mission</td>
<td>SOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of social/civic effectiveness</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX F

#### INITIAL ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis by School</th>
<th>In Evidence</th>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Data Source: Interview</th>
<th>Data Source:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curricular Content and Delivery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty mentorship of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem centered learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics education/focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework and experiences in social responsibility/sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework &amp; experiences to build global leadership competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity-building education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship equally balanced between discovery, integration, practice and teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A RESPONSIVE CURRICULUM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AN ENGAGED CAMPUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Diverse Learning Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse student body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Outreach/Engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/administrators engaged in relationships with community and community leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings with community leaders focused on social issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders engaged on campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially directed research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge sharing with the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiatives with economic or political purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-credit learning opportunities in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student involvement in community service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower tuition in state than competitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower out of state tuition than competitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement of students with in state employers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission statement reflecting social/civic responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy reflects civic/social mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community access to campus space and resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure to support civic/social mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of social/civic effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACROSS SCHOOL COMPARISONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty mentorship of students</td>
<td>ASU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem centered learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics education/focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework and experiences in social responsibility/sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global connections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework &amp; experiences to build global leadership competence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity-building education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship equally balanced between discovery, integration, practice and teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AN ENGAGED CAMPUS</strong></td>
<td><strong>A DIVERSE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Outreach/Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/administrators engaged in relationships with community and community leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings with community leaders focused on social issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders engaged on campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially directed research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge sharing with the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiatives with economic or political purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For credit learning opportunities in the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student involvement in community service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower tuition in state than competitors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower out of state tuition than competitors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement of students with in state employers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFRASTRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission statement reflecting social/civic responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy reflects civic/social mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community access to campus space and resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure to support civic/social mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of social/civic effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

REVISED ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK

A New Framework for Social Responsibility in Public Business Schools: Abbreviated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Responsive Curriculum</th>
<th>Curricular Content and Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Centered Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework and/or Experiences in Social Responsibility, Social and Environmental Impact Management, or Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Connections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework and Experiences to Build Global Competence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Diverse Learning Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse Student Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity-Promoting Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An Engaged Campus</th>
<th>Community Outreach and Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socially Directed Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Community Leaders Engaged with and on Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiatives with an Economic, Social, Environmental, or Political Purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Opportunities in the Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Involvement in Community Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure to Support Civic/Social Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Civic/Social Initiatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A New Framework for Social Responsibility in Public Business Schools: Detailed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular Content &amp; Delivery</th>
<th>Demonstrated through...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Problem Centered Learning    | ▪ At least one course on problem solving, or decision making.  
▪ Teaching and learning techniques like experiential learning, capstone courses, case studies, internships, practicum and consulting experiences. |
| Interdisciplinary Learning   | ▪ Interdisciplinary majors, minors or specialty areas of study, or dual degree programs.  
▪ Interdisciplinary approaches to learning by allowing students from other disciplines and programs across the institution to take courses in the business school or allow MBA’s to create customized degrees by taking electives from departments across the business school or the university.  
▪ Interdisciplinary research and learning opportunities provided by research centers and institutions. |
| Coursework and/or Experiences in Social Responsibility, Social and Environmental Impact Management, and Sustainability | ▪ Offer courses in social responsibility, sustainability, social entrepreneurship or related topics
▪ Active student clubs, like Net Impact, concerned with social responsibility and/or sustainability.  
▪ Initiatives like case competitions, conferences, seminars, panel discussions, or lecture series that address issues of social and/or environmental impact. |
| Global Connections           | ▪ Relationships and linkages with international businesses and business schools.  
▪ Global meetings, conferences, web-casts, and course offerings to connect with others around the world.  
▪ Faculty with knowledge of international issues from work with international firms, research, teaching, living, and studying abroad.  
▪ Research on international/global issues.  
▪ Research centers or institutes with a focus on international business. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular Content &amp; Delivery</th>
<th>Demonstrated through...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Coursework and Experiences to Build Global Competence | - Require MBAs to complete at least one international business course through core or elective offerings.  
- Allow MBAs to specialize in or complete a certificate in global management or international business.  
- Provide students with opportunities to travel or study abroad.  
- Offer MBAs the chance to complete internships with international organizations.  
- Curricular activities and coursework to build an appreciation of different cultures, norms, and practices.  
- Learning teams |
| Balanced Scholarship | - Discovery (research): Faculty tenure and promotion practices focused on research productivity.  
- Teaching: Faculty tenure and promotion practices focused on teaching.  
- Integration: Interdisciplinary teaching and research coordinated and sponsored by research centers and institutes.  
- Application:  
  ✓ Faculty service to the institution.  
  ✓ Faculty serving industry or government as external consultants.  
  ✓ Faculty tenure and promotion practices focused on service to the institution and/or professional associations. |

A Diverse Learning Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity</th>
<th>Demonstrated through...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Diverse student body | - 14% or more of MBA students are identified minorities.  
- International students comprise over 23% of the MBA student body.  
- Extend reach of programs through on-line and part-time offerings  
- Use of financial aid to increase enrollment |
| Diversity-Promoting Activities | - Host student clubs or associations for women and minorities |
An Engaged Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Outreach &amp; Engagement</th>
<th>Demonstrated through...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Socially-Directed Research     | ▪ Some research with a civic, social, or environmental impact.  
                                 | ▪ At least one academic center or institute, housed within the business school, that conducts research and engages in other activities related to issues of social impact management, environmental management, or sustainability. |
| Business and Community Leaders Engaged with and on Campus | ▪ Attend continuing and executive education offerings, conferences, workshops, lecture series  
                                                                  ▪ Serve as guest speakers in classes and in conferences, seminars, and lecture series |
| Learning Opportunities in the Community | Offer MBA students opportunities to participate in field-based learning experiences including consulting projects, practicum experiences and class projects, international study trips or tours, or internships (with credit available or not). |
| Student Involvement in Community Service | ▪ Encourage MBA students to engage in service projects.  
                                           ▪ Sponsor at least one club for MBAs that engages in service or philanthropic work for non-profits or community-based organizations. |
| Initiatives with an Economic, Social, Environmental, or Political Purpose | At least one research center or institute with an economic, social, environmental, or political purpose |
| Infrastructure                 | Demonstrated through... |
| Key Stakeholders               | Business school leaders identify society and its agents (e.g., citizens, state, local, and national governments, community groups and organizations, etc), students, and faculty as primary constituents. |
| Structure to Support Civic/Social Engagement | Hosts/sponsors at least one research center or institute with a social purpose |
| Assessment of Social/Civic Initiatives | Track success of at least one element of engagement like student diversity, global experiences, economic impact of service work or consulting, or others. |
APPENDIX H

LEVELS OF COMMITMENT TO SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Level One Low Relevance</th>
<th>Level Two Medium Relevance</th>
<th>Level Three High Relevance</th>
<th>Level Four Full Integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>No mention or undefined rhetorical reference</td>
<td>Service is part of what we do as citizens</td>
<td>Service is a vital element of our academic agenda</td>
<td>Service is a central and defining characteristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion, Tenure, Hiring</td>
<td>Service to campus committees or discipline</td>
<td>Community service mentioned; volunteerism or consulting may be included in portfolio</td>
<td>Formal guidelines for documenting and rewarding service</td>
<td>Community-based research &amp; teaching are key criteria for hiring &amp; evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Structure</td>
<td>None focused on community service or volunteerism</td>
<td>Units may exist to foster volunteerism</td>
<td>Centers and institutes are organized to promote community service</td>
<td>Infrastructure includes flexible unit(s) to support widespread faculty and student participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Involvement and Curriculum</td>
<td>Part of extracurricular student life activities</td>
<td>Organized support for volunteer activity</td>
<td>Opportunity for extra credit, internships, practicum experience; service learning visible in the curriculum</td>
<td>Service-learning course integrated throughout the curriculum; student involvement in community-based research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Involvement</td>
<td>Campus duties; committees; little interdisciplinary work</td>
<td>Pro bono consulting; community volunteerism acknowledged/encouraged</td>
<td>Tenured/senior faculty pursue community-based research; some teach service learning courses</td>
<td>Community research &amp; service-learning a high priority; interdisciplinary &amp; collaborative work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>Random or limited individual or group involvement</td>
<td>Community representation on advisory boards for departments or schools (usually from businesses)</td>
<td>Community influences campus through active partnership or part-time teaching</td>
<td>Community involvement in defining, conducting, &amp; evaluating community research &amp; service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and University Relations</td>
<td>Not an emphasis</td>
<td>Stories of student volunteerism or alumni as good citizens</td>
<td>Emphasis on economic impact, links between community &amp; campus centers</td>
<td>Community connection as central element; fund-raising has community service as a focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Holland, B. A. (1999), p. 60)
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