

**Comments Posted to AACSB's Online Resource Center Regarding the  
Report of the Impact of Research Task Force (Draft for Comments)  
August 6, 2007 – October 30, 2007**

---

We are currently preparing some more comprehensive comments. However, I would like to stress the most important point in this first submission by web-form.

While I agree with your views about "pedagogical research", this term is very misleading, especially in multi-disciplinary universities, as it suggests that the faculty of the Business School is about to hi-jack the work of the School of Education. I.e. the BizSchool will conduct research about schools, teaching and learning as such. I know you don't mean this, but rather the preparation of teaching material WITHIN the scope of Business/Management.

I would suggest calling it "business education oriented research" - admitting it is a bit longer, but at least it won't get us into trouble with neighboring schools ...

Regards,

Andreas Bergmann.

Comment by Andreas BERGMANN, Prof Dr on 8/6/2007 @ 4:55:56 AM

---

This is a very thoughtful report, with many interesting suggestions. To include the impact of research in the accreditation review will no doubt to be burdensome. But the benefits may be worth the cost. However, this recommendation raises the issue of the appropriate time period over which to evaluate faculty intellectual contributions. I have always felt that a time frame of the most recent five years was too short. If impact is to be measured, the time frame should be lengthened. It often takes years before the impact of an intellectual contribution is felt. Consider the example of faculty member Smith in the Report. Suppose that Smith did his work on lean manufacturing six years ago, and that industry is first adopting Smith's suggestions today. Suppose they are revolutionary and lead to significant productivity gains. Under the present standards, Smith's work would not even be included in the review.

Comment by Michael Sesnowitz on 8/6/2007 @ 10:03:39 AM

---

Industry based research that benefits the practitioner along with teachable lessons is very powerful. There has been growth with such organizations as the Sloan Industries Studies who focus on this very aspect of research. I am happy to see this area of research garner more attention.

Also, with industry based research, as mentioned in the Chronicle article with the consultant developing software, is in line with discovery of new knowledge through development. However, since it may not have been developed in an academic setting, the individual may not get the appropriate credit towards their research program.

Comment by Dana Johnson on 8/6/2007 @ 10:07:21 AM

---

One issue that needs to be addressed with the issue of impact is the corresponding effect on the type of studies undertaken. Some studies are of a high-risk/high-return variety that may or may not offer high impact at the end of the study but are nonetheless quite valuable. Certainly some of these studies will end up with high impact but others might simply showcase the incorrect pathway undertaken. To the extent that this serves as guidance for future researchers, it has an impact but it may not be possible to

document that impact since few researchers document through citation research that demonstrates methodologies that ought NOT be undertaken.

Similar to this is that the emphasis might be towards showcasing a technique as opposed to research that discredits an approach that has been proposed. In other words, suppose that we have two papers that come out within a few months of one another: the first purports to demonstrate the benefits of an approach and the second purports to demonstrate that it is not a useful approach. The impact of the first article might be measured by showing that the approach was undertaken. However, the impact of the second article cannot be measured by showing that the approach was NOT undertaken because it might not be undertaken for reasons unrelated to the critique.

In addition, controversial research that does not have an immediate impact may have an impact sometime in the future that cannot be easily measured by such impact studies. Indeed, I must second the comment of Michael Sesnowitz. For revolutionary (rather than evolutionary) approaches, it may take a long time for the research to have an impact but, when it does, that impact may be substantial and potentially more important to the field. Such research may be discouraged under these guidelines.

While I have no issue with the notion of impact being a 'plus' factor in assessing research (considering it to be 'more worthy' if it has an impact), I hesitate to discount research that 'fails' to have an impact as measured by crude metrics as may be used in assessment. Thus I would argue that all research should still be counted based on inputs but allow for that research to count "for more" if it has an impact rather than to dismiss the notion of inputs into the process entirely.

Comment by Zagros Madjd-Sadjadi on 8/6/2007 @ 8:12:16 PM

---

The issues that emerge in the report are echoes of conversations I have had with peers at meetings and within my institution over the past few years.

Issue 1:

The report itself appears rather disjointed with examples for specific disciplines within particular sections. I assume this is because the author(s) of the particular section simply use examples from what they know (a quick glance of the reference section will demonstrate this). Consequently, issues that are supposed to be "universal" appear to be discipline specific by virtue of the examples cited. This may not be a writing flaw, but an indication of a deeper issue.

When my school began to assess journals and research quality, we found out very quickly that different disciplines are "different" in regard to the number of journals available, measures of quality (impact factors, etc.), and journal circulation. Cross-sectional comparisons are very difficult. Consequently, perhaps the report should examine each discipline individually in regard to research quality issues.

Issue 2:

Narrowly defined research that may have little "impact" is not merely an issue of what academicians are willing to study, but also an issue as to what journals are willing to publish. Colleges changing research expectations to be more practitioner or pedagogically or "impact" oriented does not change the journal outlets for publication. Consequently, such efforts are futile if journals are not willing to broaden scope or more journals are not accepted as "quality" journals. The report does not recognize the role of academic journals in this endeavor. Yet, the editorial policies of these journals may be the most critical factor if a change in research is to occur.

Issue 3:

How are schools to consider the Social Science Research Network (SSRN)? What is AACSB's view of the scholarship contained within the SSRN? The volume of papers and downloads has grown tremendously over the past number of years.

Issue 4:

Recommendation 1 obviously recognizes that "impact" should matter. Despite extensive examples, the fact of the matter is: defining and defending "impact" is the given school's problem and not AACSB's problem. This leads one to wonder: what exactly is AACSB's contribution to changing the direction and recognition of research? The added complexity for accreditation will not necessarily change journal editorial focus nor create a new standard for tenure, promotion, or merit raises. Although somewhat a cynical view, why create more complexity if there is most likely no gain other than to say AACSB addressed the issue by "passing the buck" to the given college under review.

Issue 5:

How exactly can AACSB "encourage and support" in recommendation 2? Deny accreditation, make funds or a journal available for a particular line of inquiry.....etcetera. Again, what is AACSB going to do to make this happen other than place the burden on the individual school that may not necessarily agree with AACSB's idea of diversity. Is this addressed by Recommendations #3, #4, and #7? If so, then combine the recommendations.

Issue 6:

I understand the sentiment of Recommendations #5 and #6, but I prefer wording and context that addresses all of the business disciplines and not solely the discipline of management.

Comment by Tom Arnold on 8/7/2007 @ 3:36:34 PM

---

The accreditation process has turned into a bean-counting exercise of business deans. All they seem to be able to do is count PhDs and PRJs. I hope other means of assessment of quality and learning will be developed.

Comment by John Corless on 8/7/2007 @ 6:09:05 PM

---

I would like to congratulate the task force on the draft report "Impact of Research". Below are some comments that I hope will be useful.

(1) I think that it would be helpful to have a more explicit discussion of the advantages of "integrated research" - that is cooperative research between different groups within a business school. My experience is that joint research between faculty in say accounting and finance, or statistics/quantitative and management, is inherently more likely to "have an impact". This kind of integrated research is also more likely to have a pedagogical benefit since the faculty involved will then relate their courses to the wider business school curriculum.

(2) It seems logical that the "impact" of a piece of scholarly work should only relate to what that piece of work is, rather than to who created it or to where that person is employed. However, with the 4 models in Table 2 on page 27 and the 4 faculty members on the subsequent pages, it seems that if White in Model D writes an article, then it is judged to have higher impact than if the same article were written by Smith in Model A. While a particular kind of business school may desire and search for faculty of a certain nature, it seems to me that the measurements of the impacts of scholarly items has to be consistent across all business schools.

Anthony Hayter, Ph.D.

Chair and Professor, Department of Statistics and Operations Technology  
Daniels College of Business  
University of Denver

[www.daniels.du.edu/AnthonyHayter](http://www.daniels.du.edu/AnthonyHayter)

Comment by Anthony Hayter on 8/8/2007 @ 11:38:32 AM

---

I read the report and I think the committee did an excellent job. Based on my interpretations it allows schools to define their own level and composition to research productivity and research products, but ties these levels to the schools peer group. I think it is consistent with the spirit of the standards and differentiates the opportunities based on level of degrees offered and peer group. The committee did an excellent job of providing a working policy for a difficult accreditation problem. It will also help schools develop their definitions of AQ and PQ faculty.

Comment by John Kraft on 8/9/2007 @ 11:28:28 AM

---

The committee should be applauded for their efforts to deal with a most challenging area of academics. This report will serve as a catalyst for further discussions concerning research. It is particularly fitting that the AACSB has undertaken this effort because mutual understanding and cooperation among the business disciplines is essential for us to make progress toward promoting our research both to those within the academic community and to those who are external, in helping us to realize the benefits of a wide variety of research, and in helping us to focus on the problems related to measuring the impact of our research and the rewarding of our research efforts. It is essential, however, that we consider this report as the beginning of an important work in progress.

Comment by Thomas J. Phillips, Jr. on 8/14/2007 @ 10:57:49 AM

---

This is an excellent report, and timely. Even though many of the points have been made before, the recommendations are on target and worthy of a lot of discussion and for some, adoption. Thanks to the task force for focusing us where we need to be!

The quote on Page 24 says it all. The report could have noted that of all of the thousands of articles written these past two decades, most were simply a means for faculty to secure rewards. The references and appendix of articles that impacted practice are nice examples; one wonders how exhaustive that list might be.

Consider reducing the number of recommendations. The diffusion of issues may well create a situation where the power of the report is diminished. Clearly, Recommendation #1 is key and I believe that implementing that will ultimately lead to the fulfillment of many of the remaining recommendations. Doing the first well will make the difference; trying to do it all may well lead to frustration.

As to Recommendation #2, AACSB has attempted to spur diversity many times but thwarted by the deans themselves as long-time participants in accreditation reviews. Fear of making subjective judgments, ease in counting things, and unease in encouraging other schools to be "different" have been the major challenges. Perhaps we need to consider more education of reviewers, "term limits" for participants, and evaluation of accreditation committee and review team members as the more effective mechanism.

I cannot concur with Recommendation #4; criteria and selection will strangle this initiative. Recommendations #5 and #6 will follow the first recommendation and Recommendation #7 will be essential if the first recommendation is adopted. But we must ask how well we have done in assembling and disseminating other "best practices."

Many deans will resist yet another accountability process but we must make our intellectual contributions relevant to the faculty, our students, and our business constituents. Many peer reviewed journals could (and should) be eliminated because they seem to exist to provide outlets rather than contribute to a knowledge base. At the same time, reviewing what European schools and faculty have published as intellectual contributions creates strong links to their business constituents. Great textbooks, simulations, executive development seminars, and other non-refereed outlets have been recognized as contributions to the education and change in business and industry.

Well done!

Comment by Bob Taylor on 8/14/2007 @ 1:07:04 PM

---

Congratulations and thank you to the committee. This is an insightful and challenging document which deserves careful consideration and discussion within the business academy. The ends are worthwhile, the means are not nearly so clear in some cases.

While the concept is worthy, one might ask that Recommendation 1 start a bit slower with a suggestion rather than a requirement.

I concur with Recommendation 2. However, it will be necessary for AACSB to "retrain" many reviewers to understand that things other than top tier academic journals actually should count.

I concur with the remaining recommendations.

Comment by Jim Burton on 8/16/2007 @ 12:50:22 PM

---

Given the importance of the topic, the number of comments thus far is a bit disappointing (though not the quality). I am hopeful that the task force has plans to elicit broader participation in the debate - say by postings on disciplinary mailing lists or panel discussions at disciplinary conferences. We must ensure a high degree of faculty awareness about the process and recommendations.

I encourage and generally endorse the task force's efforts in addressing our most glaring weakness. However, having chaired P&T committees at department, college, and the university level, I know, as you do as well, that P&T is a very conservative process, remarkably resistant to change. Change must be introduced and accepted at every level of review (external evaluators, department committee, department, college committee, chair, dean, university committee, provost), the composition of which changes regularly. And then there are the faculty members themselves, who, particularly if untenured, must be concerned with their own external marketability.

Agreeing on the objectives will be hard - and, perhaps, impossible; but the real challenge will be getting from where we are today to the successful implementation of any such objectives

Comment by Blake Ives on 8/18/2007 @ 12:08:06 PM

---

The proposal is well written and timely. My comment builds on the (1) comment of Anthony Hayter.

One area that seems to be missing in the proposal is addressing the issue of cross-disciplinary research. It is possible that one major barrier to research having practical impact is that research is usually conducted in functional silos whereas application must usually consider multiple areas of impact on the company (the "worldview" mentioned on page 14).

For example, I have published research involving mathematical optimization of service systems in leading operations research journals. I also have used that research in consulting practice. For the journals, the rigor of the mathematics and methodology are of paramount importance. Interestingly, for the consulting, the mathematical rigor is secondary, but the psychological concerns of various stakeholders tends to dominate. Even though I am hired for my mathematical expertise, I satisfy the client largely through application of social psychology techniques. (I actually tried submitting the research to an organizational psychology conference but it was rejected -- it appears that my math programming finesse was not appreciated by the reviewers.)

I would argue that a key to improving the practical impact of any form of business research would be increasing the amount of cross-functional knowledge going into the research. Boundary-spanning research has a greater potential for impact than isolated research which is aloof to general business concerns. In addition, the ability to translate concepts between disciplines relates to the ability to translate concepts of research with concepts as understood by practitioners in specific industries.

Unfortunately, boundary-spanning research is not generally supported by the traditional infrastructure of academia. In fact, it is often punished, as my example above illustrates. What is needed are mechanisms for promoting and rewarding high-quality research that breaks out of functional silos. IMHO.

Comment by Scott Sampson, Brigham Young University on 8/21/2007 @ 11:30:23 AM

---

As a faculty member who has taught in MBA programs on four continents, I enjoyed reading the report and the thoughtful recommendations contained therein.

I think the most important and challenging recommendation is that of altering incentives to encourage diversity. After all, what gets measured, gets done.

It would be a significant contribution to the future of business schools to mandate that accredited schools establish a "clinical" career track that enables practitioner-scholars to gain respect (and security of tenure) within their institutions.

The terminal degree for these clinical faculty could be based on a European/Australian DBA style qualification, which emphasizes mastery of advanced coursework and an action research based dissertation. Measuring research outcomes by the quality and quantity of action-research based projects would be a great way to measure clinical contributions and automatically strengthen the practice-theory link.

Comment by Steven Phelan on 9/5/2007 @ 3:20:41 PM

---

The question needs to be asked, "Should practitioners, managers and consultants read research?" The benefit to reading research is staying in touch with leading management theories.

Instead of summarizing journal articles so they can be read by practitioners it may be better to teach practitioners how to read journal articles. While it takes years of doctoral work to learn how to conduct research, the effort to learn to read and glean information from published works is much less.

Comment by David Longstreet on 9/5/2007 @ 3:52:45 PM

---

The report makes many good points and deals with an issue that the Academy of Management has dealt with for at least 10 years and one that I feel very strongly about. One area that I would strengthen in the report is the manuscript review process of many journals in the various business disciplines. Journals, even top level scholarly ones should make "contributions to practice" or "relevance to managers

in organizations" a key criterion for acceptance or rejection of a manuscript. Too often, a paper does not address this issue or has a short insufficient section at the end dealing with this. In fact, when deciding on a research question, relevance to professional managers is often not even a consideration. As a reviewer, I do look for the paper's worth to practicing managers. It often is not there. Sometimes we spend too much time and effort dealing with methods issues when the real question is does the paper/research really matter to professional managers. We write for each other--other academics and Ph.D. students--not for the professional manager. They would have trouble reading our articles anyway. We need to change how we present information and gear our writing to those who can really use it. We ought to take more of a medical or law school approach and write for those out in the field. Now if someone writes for the practitioner, the publication is not as valued at most schools as one who publishes in tier 1 academic journals--journals not read by professional managers. Your report does address this some, but you really need to get at this whole issue more and deal with the manuscript review process.

Comment by Bill Anthony on 9/6/2007 @ 9:08:05 AM

---

I think the AACSB needs to consider the fact that all professions (e.g., medicine, biology) conduct (a) basic research, and (b) applied research. We also need to place some emphasis on basic research in order to enhance organizational effectiveness.

In many cases we need to understand basic phenomena or processes before developing principles that will apply to organizations. I believe that all types of research are important to our field.

Comment by Dianna Stone on 9/6/2007 @ 10:43:02 AM

---

It is wrong to assume the use/relevance to "managers" is the benchmark of research practicality !

Does economics judge its relevance primarily by the use of its ideas by economists? Medicine by the use of its ideas by doctors alone? No, both identify their primary responsibility socially - to the economy, to patients.

Our primary responsibility, therefore is to "the managed" in society - organizations, people in them, institutions, the environment, and so on. For sure, we will discharge that responsibility most often in a relationship with managers. But they are not our primary clients.

In our research we must be prepared to speak truth to power; and recognize that sometimes the most "relevant" research is precisely that that managers do not want to hear. This report therefore should revisit and broaden the way it defines relevance.

Comment by Professor Bill Cooke on 9/7/2007 @ 8:00:16 AM

---

Add to Section – Last Paragraph: The Need for Further Inquiry

Furthermore, ongoing management education and research should investigate other industries where specific industries can train its managers with minimal training. For example, within the engineering field, the engineering field could train managers to fill entry level management positions by created a new business management curriculum that does not require an engineering background. Other trades could investigate this same process.

Recommendation #8

AACSB should identify and disseminate information about best practices for creating linkages between academic research and management engineering practice.

Many schools have created business management curriculum that fails to provide the engineering industry with the technical managers needed. Many companies are forced to go outside the United States to hire managers needed to replace retiring individuals. Most schools provide specific management or engineering degrees but fail to provide companies with individuals that are trained in management that understand basic engineering concepts. To fill this deficiency, companies promote senior engineers to management positions that do not have the basic management skills. These individuals lack basic management or marketing classroom knowledge that slows down their progress in becoming effective managers. Current MBA programs are not filling the vacant positions required by managers with a basic engineering background. AACSB could devote time in conference or space in publications to address this topic to identify best practices.

Related to this is the need for greater recognition of the value of including basic engineering curriculum within the management field (i.e., Engineering Manager or Engineering Management). This effort might assist companies in filling vacant engineering positions while filling specific engineering management positions without taking individuals from within the engineering discipline to fill management positions. In minimal time, such a business approach would benefit the Department of Defense and its contractor companies.

Comment by Rene H Contreras on 9/7/2007 @ 11:39:20 AM

---

During the course of my 16 years of teaching at two large comprehensive state universities, I have often wondered about the benefits to anyone besides traditional researchers of a promotion process that rewards publications wholly unrelated to teaching and learning. Not only has pedagogical research and writing not been encouraged until the past few years, it has been discouraged as intellectually inferior to theoretical writing and "research"-based writing generated by opinion surveys. All that money, time and energy going into a black hole of journals few read and fewer use. I am convinced after having this discussion with hundreds of colleagues over the years, that defenders of theoretical and applied research who cannot show applications for classroom instruction have only tradition and the lost benefit of using their developed skills for personal advancement as their justifications to continue producing work that does not benefit those paying for it. The sciences can produce useful original research, but to me, business theory and stakeholder opinion must connect to the real world of business practices, and hence classroom instruction, to have meaningful value. The paradigm of theory over pedagogy has had its day, and I'm thrilled AACSB is finally reexamining it. We are in the business of educating students, not ourselves.

Comment by Brad on 9/7/2007 @ 2:53:40 PM

---

This is likely to encourage many traditional researchers to target multiple works towards much less rigorous trade journals. Instead of attempting to provide more rigorous criteria for evaluating what are "good" research outlets this really sounds much more like a coward's exit. Proponents should show a little more backbone - challenge the existing "top journals" rather than simply adding to the pile of "common" text.

Comment by anonymous on 9/17/2007 @ 8:55:31 PM

---

Already, because of AACSB, business school faculty spend an extraordinary amount of time in meetings, writing reports, and engaging in a variety of activities that are indirectly related to teaching and research. The committee's recommendations only guarantee that more money will be spent on administrators, staff, and paper work. I don't think the AACSB is qualified to judge research. I would hope that leading schools would ignore the AACSB and hope that some other accrediting agency would take its place.

I do wish my field, strategic management, could find its way to different approaches to research. However, I don't think administrators and staff and other non-researchers (people in the AACSB) can be much help.

Comment by David Hoopes on 9/29/2007 @ 4:40:59 PM

---

I appreciate the level of thought and effort that has gone into preparing this report. It's quite evident that the task force has thoroughly considered the perspectives of research, teaching, and practice in their commentary and recommendations.

A question I have regarding the recommendations is whether the models presented to demonstrate Recommendation 1 (Table 2, p. 27) make the pursuit of Recommendation 2 mutually exclusive. For example, how can doctoral institutions be encouraged to attract "teacher-scholars" when their mission models marginalize teaching and teaching-related research? Perhaps some more thought can be given to making the implementation of these two recommendations more complementary.

Comment by Ben Arbaugh on 10/3/2007 @ 9:31:56 AM

---

My main comment on this is that it is from the perspective of tier one schools. Many of the problems listed by the report are not problems at our school, or at other schools like ours (public/private comprehensives). We do not have problems valuing contributions to practice or pedagogical contributions, other than those created by review teams. Our incentives do not point to discipline-based scholarship as opposed to other types. A growing number of outlets exist to translate discipline-based work to practice.

On another topic, I believe the report should be required reading for peer review teams and for members of accreditation committees, as I believe it makes a solid case for expanding the prevailing definitions of intellectual contributions, particularly for standard 10 decisions.

on recommendation 2, particularly on page 31, impact does not automatically equal quality. More generally, this recommendation is problematic. I understand the comparison with student learning outcomes, but measurement of student learning is easy. Measurement of impact of research is far more difficult.

On recommendation 4, I would argue for the option of AACSB co-sponsoring awards where they exist and helping organizations start them where they don't instead of duplicating effort.

On recommendation 5, I believe an excellent way of accomplishing this is through case research, whether for teaching cases or papers based on case research. AACSB should make a point of encouraging this type of scholarship.

I look forward to seeing the final report.

Comment by Brian Burton on 10/28/2007 @ 9:49:34 PM

---

I think the report really makes sense and that it is time to remember that business schools are professional schools and should as such have a research with obvious outputs for companies and managers and which reaches a large audience.

Comment by anonymous on 10/29/2007 @ 10:56:54 AM

---

I enjoyed reading the report. It is timely and contains valuable information. However, I have some comments that may certainly overlap with what others have already written. One point that did not occur in the report is whether managers (and also employees, why not?) are willing to read publications in business disciplines. Even though there are some excellent 'practitioner-oriented' journals, such as California Management Review, Harvard Business Review, Organizational Dynamics, and Sloan Management Review to name the most popular, I am not sure that all these outlets find room in 'corporate libraries.' My point is that the multiplication of outlets may probably create 'information overload' for the very customers that business schools want to serve. For academic journals, some outlets are already indicating to potential authors to include a section related to the article's implications for management practice. I think this practice should be encouraged by mainstream academic journals. Not only should the article contribute to the advancement of knowledge but it should also contribute to the improvement of management practice. Although what constitutes true scholarship in business has yet to be defined, I personally believe that research that does not advance knowledge should not be encouraged even in business schools.

Comment by Constant D Beugre on 10/30/2007 @ 5:52:35 PM

---

What can AACSB do to motivate Business schools to invest only in research that advances theory, practice, and/or pedagogy? The views of two faculty members at FIU follow the quotations from the report.

#### Recommendation 2

"But what if AACSB went a step further to require business schools, if applicable to their mission, to demonstrate they have faculty systems that support and reward practice-oriented or pedagogical contributions in addition to basic research published in refereed journal articles? More schools may be motivated to create multiple faculty tracks. The end result could be to create more vibrant "practice-scholar" or "teacher-scholar" markets among business schools, thus improving academic mobility among faculty who focus more on practice or pedagogy in their research".

Having this as an AACSB requirement might encourage pedagogical contributions. Creating multiple faculty tracks is an option; however, this could result in a situation where the "research" faculty continue to publish only in certain kinds of journals (which will likely be considered more "prestigious"). The calls for developing broader competencies (and not just technical skills) in students require considerable investment of time and energy in designing appropriate learning environments and assessing learning. Thus changing the incentive system wherein such contributions are highly regarded is more likely to encourage all faculty to invest in such efforts and thus enhance the overall quality of business education.

I firmly believe that curriculum development and pedagogical research should be valued more. We just do not have an incentive system where such work is truly respected. While the multiple track idea is better than nothing, it will not motivate "research faculty" to become more engaged with curriculum development and pedagogical work (which I personally think is not a good state of affairs).

"Alternatively, AACSB might assist in developing faculty models that support "translational" research by clinical scholars who understand and interact with business to test and refine results from basic research and help to define problems of mutual interest. This model might build on existing "centers," which are common among business schools, and create simulated practice fields for academic research. The primary issue will be to support models that clearly align institutional mission with the types of intellectual contributions expected of faculty."

Physicians are encouraged to contribute to teaching while carrying on their practices or working in hospitals. It is time that Business schools begin allowing the free flow of their Faculty in and out of Corporations – possibly through sabbaticals – outside of the typical consulting realm. Universities should avoid conflicts of interest by keeping the individual on their payroll and allowing the Corporations to donate to a University foundation account for services rendered. This way Faculty can begin an investigation into what type of research assistance is needed by the Corporations.

### Recommendation 3

“Furthermore, the most obvious way that faculty research impacts practice is through education. AACSB International accreditation standards require faculty involvement in designing curricula, developing courses, and delivering instruction in degree programs, but the explicit relationship between research and teaching is not well understood. Current accreditation standards do not require schools to demonstrate how faculty scholarship by their own and other faculty contributes to degree based education (e.g., how such scholarship is integrated in course work). The Task Force recommends that AACSB undertake a comprehensive study of the relationship between research and teaching and, based on the results, consider developing recommendations to increase the positive impact of research on education and learning. Among the issues to consider are lag times in textbooks, effectiveness of various instructional resources, impact of information technology, and the role of teaching and pedagogical research.”

With the proliferation of the “Wiki” mentality and “open source” applications, AACSB may look toward publishers to encourage textbook sites etc. to introduce topical issues and analysis. Blogs at the College level should encourage collaboration across disciplines. Again, if it were open sourced it would be easy to develop basic ideas into something more advanced.

Comment by Interested FIU Faculty on 10/30/2007 @ 8:24:10 PM

---