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To better understand the trends and profiles of those leading administrative activities at business schools, AACSB International conducts the Senior Business School Administrators Survey every three years.

The Senior Business School Administrators Survey is conducted with the cooperation and support of AACSB member institutions and their staff. Participation in the survey is voluntary and is not connected to AACSB accreditation.

The survey, which was launched on October 4, 2023, and closed on November 8, 2023, offers a comprehensive view of the influential figures who lead and support business school administration. This year, 143 senior administrators from 23 countries and territories participated in the survey.

Some of these findings have been used to inform the web report Leading Today's Business Schools: Insights from Deans, which provides insights into the goals, challenges, and ambitions of current business school deans.

We trust that the data from this survey and the detailed observations from the web report will be both intriguing and valuable to you.

## Participant Characteristics

## 143 Total Survey Participants

## By Gender



Note: For those who indicated gender ( $n=131$ ), 53 percent are female and 47 percent are male. Twelve respondents did not indicate their gender. The category of "Other (specify)" was not selected by any respondents. Some percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

## Total Participation

| Overall Survey Participation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female | Male | Gender Not Reported | Total | \% of Grand Total |
| Accredited | 62 | 54 | 11 | 127 | 89\% |
| Americas | 51 | 46 | 10 | 107 | 84\% |
| Asia Pacific | 5 | 6 | 1 | 12 | 9\% |
| EMEA | 6 | 2 | - | 8 | 6\% |
| Not Accredited | 8 | 7 | 1 | 16 | 11\% |
| Americas | 2 | - | - | 2 | 13\% |
| Asia Pacific | 2 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 44\% |
| EMEA | 4 | 3 | - | 7 | 44\% |
| All Schools | 70 | 61 | 12 | 143 | Regional \% of Grand Total |
| Americas | 53 | 46 | 10 | 109 | 76\% |
| Asia Pacific | 7 | 10 | 2 | 19 | 13\% |
| EMEA | 10 | 5 | - | 15 | 10\% |
| Grand Total | 70 (49\%) | 61 (43\%) | 12(8\%) | 143 |  |

Note: Some percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

## Experience Level, by Gender

## Experienced vs. New Senior Administrators



Note: For purposes of this survey, "Experienced" refers to current senior administrators who have had multiple appointments or have been in their current, first appointment since 2017 or earlier. "New" refers to senior administrators in their first appointment since 2018 or later.

For those who indicated gender among experienced senior administrators ( $n=72$ ), $58 \%$ are female and $42 \%$ are male. 8 respondents did not indicate their gender. Among new administraors ( $\mathrm{n}=59$ ), $47 \%$ are female and $53 \%$ are male. The category of "Other (specify)" was not selected by any respondents.

Some percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Experienced vs. New Senior Administrators

| Experienced Senior Administrators |  |  |  |  |  | New Senior Administrators |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female | Male | Gender Not Reported | Experienced Total | \% of Experienced Total | Female | Male | Gender Not Reported | New <br> Total | \% of New Total | Total Participation (Experienced and New) |
| Accredited | 37 | 27 | 7 | 71 | 89\% | 25 | 27 | 4 | 56 | 89\% | 127 |
| Americas | 29 | 23 | 6 | 58 | 82\% | 22 | 23 | 4 | 49 | 88\% | 107 |
| Asia Pacific | 4 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 10\% | 1 | 4 | - | 5 | 9\% | 12 |
| EMEA | 4 | 2 | - | 6 | 8\% | 2 | - | - | 2 | 4\% | 8 |
| Not Accredited | 5 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 11\% | 3 | 4 | - | 7 | 11\% | 16 |
| Americas | - | - | - | - | 0\% | 2 | - | - | 2 | 29\% | 2 |
| Asia Pacific | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 44\% | - | 3 | - | 3 | 43\% | 7 |
| EMEA | 3 | 2 | - | 5 | 56\% | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | 29\% | 7 |
| Grand Total | $\begin{gathered} 42 \\ (53 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (38 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (10 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 80 |  | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ (44 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 31 \\ 49 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 63 |  | 143 |

Note: Some percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Race and Ethnicity of U.S. Senior Administrators ( $n=90$ )

## Race and

 Ethnicity of U.S. Senior Administrators

Note: U.S. schools only.

By Gender ( $\mathrm{n}=131$ )


New vs. Experienced Administrators ( $\mathrm{n}=143$ )
Current Administrative Position

Senior Administrators, by Current Position



By Region ( $n=143$ )


Age of Senior Administrators

By Gender ( $\mathrm{n}=130$ )


New vs. Experienced Administrators ( $\mathrm{n}=131$ )


By Region ( $\mathrm{n}=131$ )


Age of Current Senior
Administrators
Minimum
34
Mean
54
Maximum
77
$n=131$

Senior Administrators With Active Faculty Position, by Gender ( $\mathrm{n}=131$ )


Senior
Administrators With Active Faculty Position member of the institution.

Senior Administrators With Active Faculty Position, by Region ( $n=134$ )


Note: For purposes of this survey, an active position is one in which an administrator actively performs teaching and/or research duties as a faculty

5/ \% of Senior Administrators Have an Active Faculty Position


| Languages Spoken Fluently by Senior Administrators |
| :--- |
| Region |
| 1 Language |

## Languages

 Spoken
## Pathways to Senior Administrator Role

Senior Administrators in Their First Role by Gender ( $\mathrm{n}=131$ )


Senior Administrators in Their First Appointment, by Region ( $n=143$ )


## Position Immediately Prior to First Senior Administrator Role

| By Gender Position | Female ( $\mathrm{n}=70$ ) | Male ( $\mathrm{n}=61$ ) | Total ( $\mathrm{n}=143$ ) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Faculty member | $30 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| Department head/chair | $16 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| Program director | $17 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| Other academic or administrative | $9 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Assistant dean | $7 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Non-academic (e.g., government, business, NGO/ <br> nonprofit) | $6 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Interim current role | $9 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Associate dean | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Vice dean | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ |  |

Positions Prior to First Appointment

Note: Total includes counts of respondents who did not report gender.

## By Region

| Position | Americas ( $\mathrm{n}=109$ ) | Asia Pacific ( $\mathrm{n}=19$ ) | EMEA ( $\mathrm{n}=15$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Faculty member | 28\% | 42\% | 47\% |
| Department head/chair | 23\% | 42\% | 0\% |
| Program director | 17\% | 11\% | 7\% |
| Other academic or administrative (please indicate) | 10\% | 0\% | 7\% |
| Assistant dean | 7\% | 0\% | 13\% |
| Non-academic (e.g., government, business, NGO/ nonprofit) | 5\% | 5\% | 0\% |
| Interim current role | 5\% | 0\% | 7\% |
| Associate dean | 5\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Vice dean | 1\% | 0\% | 20\% |

## Position Immediately Prior to Current Role

## By Gender

## Position Immediately Prior to Current Role

| Position | Female $(n=70)$ | Male $(n=61)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{n}=143) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Faculty member | 20\% | 30\% | 24\% |
| Department head/chair | 13\% | 33\% | 22\% |
| Assistant dean | 21\% | 8\% | 15\% |
| Program director | 11\% | 15\% | 13\% |
| Associate dean | 13\% | 3\% | 8\% |
| Other academic or administrative | 6\% | 3\% | 6\% |
| Interim current role | 9\% | 0\% | 4\% |
| Vice dean | 3\% | 5\% | 3\% |
| Non-academic (e.g., government, business, NGO/ nonprofit) | 3\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| Interim/acting dean | 1\% | 2\% | 1\% |
| Dean | 0\% | 2\% | 1\% |

Note: Total includes counts of respondents who did not indicate gender.

## By Region

| Position | Americas (n=109) | Asia Pacific ( $\mathrm{n}=19$ ) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EMEA } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=15) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Faculty member | 23\% | 37\% | 13\% |
| Department head/chair | 21\% | 37\% | 13\% |
| Assistant dean | 17\% | 5\% | 13\% |
| Program director | 13\% | 5\% | 20\% |
| Associate dean | 9\% | 5\% | 7\% |
| Other academic | 7\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Interim current role | 5\% | 0\% | 7\% |
| Vice dean | 1\% | 0\% | 27\% |
| Non-academic (e.g., government, business, NGO/ nonprofit) | 2\% | 5\% | 0\% |
| Interim/acting dean | 2\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Dean | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% |

Years of Non-Academic Experience ( $\mathrm{n}=95$ )


55\%
of senior administrators with non-academic experience said that their professional experience was very helpful to their administrator role. n=94

Non-Academic Positions Held by Senior Administrators ( $n=95$ )


[^0]
## Relationship Type With Business School During Professional Years ( $\mathrm{n}=95$ )

Relationship With Business School During Non-Academic Experience


Note: Percentage does not equal 100, as respondents could select more than one item.

Search Process Leading to Current Appointment

## Search Progress Leading to Current Appointment

| Search Process | Female <br> $(\mathrm{n}=70)$ |  | Male <br> $(\mathrm{n}=61)$ | Total <br> $(\mathrm{n}=143)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I was recruited/appointed by the dean | $26 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $31 \%$ |  |
| I was not actively searching but was invited to <br> apply | $29 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $26 \%$ |  |
| I was actively searching and applied directly | $10 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $14 \%$ |  |
| I was serving as interim and was promoted | $14 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $13 \%$ |  |
| I was not serving as interim but was promoted | $11 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $7 \%$ |  |
| Other | $7 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $6 \%$ |  |
| I was actively searching and was nominated | $1 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ |  |
| I was contacted by or involved with a search <br> consultant | $1 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ |  |

[^1]
## Average Time in Current Appointment ( $\mathrm{n}=143$ )

| 6 Years |
| :---: |
| Mean of Total |

## Administrator

 Terms

Note: Total includes counts of respondents who did not report gender.

## Senior Administrator Activities

## Number of Faculty Direct Reports ( $\mathrm{n}=143$ )



Number of Non-Faculty Staff Direct Reports ( $\mathrm{n}=143$ )


Range of Non-Faculty Direct Reports


## 91\%

of respondents directly report to the dean at their institution.
$n=143$

Senior Administrator Areas of Responsibility ( $n=143$ )

Areas of Responsibility at Business School



## $29 \%$

of senior administrator respondents are interested in pursuing deanship. n=134

## Senior

Administrators Interested in Pursuing Deanship

Interest in Pursuing a Deanship, by Gender ( $\mathrm{n}=131$ )


Note: Total includes counts of respondents who did not report gender.

## Of Those Interested in Pursuing Deanship

Perceived Levels of Proficiency and Desire for Development Across Dean Activities

## Senior

 Administrators Interested in Pursuing DeanshipAdministration

| Activity | Proficiency | Desire for <br> Development |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Accreditation management/ <br> continuous improvement | 4.10 | 4.44 |
| Financial performance/budget <br> management | 3.69 | 4.34 |
| Strategic planning | 3.92 | 4.30 |
| Brand reputation, communications, <br> crisis management | 3.64 | 4.43 |


| Proficiency-Desire for <br> Development Gap |
| :---: |
| 0.34 |
| 0.65 |
| 0.37 |
| $\mathbf{0 . 7 9}$ |

## Student Focused

| Activity | Proficiency | Desire for <br> Development | Proficiency-Desire for <br> Development Gap |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Curriculum/program development | 4.31 | 4.14 | 0.17 |
| Student recruitment/retention | 4.00 | 4.26 | 0.26 |
| Extracurricular/student <br> engagement/local community <br> activities | 3.85 | 4.11 | 0.26 |

[^2]Faculty Focused

| Activity | Proficiency | Desire for <br> Development | Proficiency-Desire for <br> Development Gap |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Faculty recruitment | 3.79 | 4.35 | 0.17 |
| Faculty management and <br> development | 3.95 | 4.35 | 0.26 |

## Senior Administrators Interested in Pursuing Deanship

## External Relations

| Activity | Proficiency | Desire for <br> Development |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Fundraising/endowment | 2.54 | 4.34 |
| Academic community networking/ <br> engagement | 3.49 | 4.32 |
| Business community networking/ <br> engagement | 3.38 | 4.49 |
| Alumni relationship development | 3.21 | 4.30 |
| Government/political engagement | 2.74 | 3.97 |


| Proficiency-Desire for <br> Development Gap <br> 1.80 <br> 0.83 <br> 1.10 <br> 1.09 <br> 1.23 |
| :---: |



Note: Respondents who indicated they aspire to be dean were asked to rate activities that are typical of the role of a business school dean on a scale of 1 to 5 ( $1=$ low and $5=$ high) regarding their perceived current level of proficiency for each activity and their desire for developing proficiency in that activity in order to successfully become a business school dean one day. The top table displays results as weighted averages. Gaps greater than 0.7 can be regarded as notable.

## Professional Development and Work-Life Balance

|  | No Time | Very Little <br> Time | Moderate <br> Time | Sufficient <br> Time | More Than <br> Enough Time |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time available for <br> professional <br> development $(\mathrm{n}=133)$ | $16 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $0 \%$ |


|  | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Neither Agree <br> Nor Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I have a desired <br> balance between my <br> personal and <br> professional life <br> (n=134) | $6 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $19 \%$ |
| I feel fulfilled by my <br> work as dean ( $n=134$ ) | $1 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| I feel positive about <br> my career progression <br> (n=134) | $4 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $22 \%$ |  |  |

Competencies in Which Senior Administrators Feel Most Proficient ( $\mathrm{n}=130$ )


Note: Based on categorical analysis of open-text responses regarding competencies/skills that senior administrators feel most proficient in. Respondents could indicate multiple competencies/skills.

Top Competencies/Skills Senior Administrators Would Like to Develop More ( $\mathrm{n}=118$ )

Comperencies/ Skills of Senior Administrators


Note: Based on categorical analysis of open-text responses regarding competencies/skills respondents would like to further develop. Respondents could indicate multiple competencies/skills.

Most Important Competencies of Effective Senior Administrators ( $\mathrm{n}=128$ )


Desired Resources of First-Time Senior Administrators ( $\mathrm{n}=132$ )

Note: Percentage does not equal 100, as respondents could select more than one item.
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Desired Resources of First-Time Senior Administrators, by Gender ( $\mathrm{n}=130$ )


Note: Percentage does not equal 100, as respondents could select more than one item.

## Resources

 Desired by
## By Region

| Resource | Americas $(n=100)$ | Asia Pacific $(n=17)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EMEA } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=15) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mentorship | 42\% | 35\% | 27\% |
| Opportunities for peer, best-practice sharing | 40\% | 24\% | 47\% |
| Staff/faculty resources | 31\% | 41\% | 40\% |
| Knowledge of accreditation expectations | 29\% | 53\% | 27\% |
| Professional development opportunities specific to your needs | 28\% | 29\% | 33\% |
| Awareness of expectations going into the role | 26\% | 24\% | 27\% |
| Administrative training e.g., budgeting, finances, etc. | 29\% | 24\% | 7\% |
| Management experience/training (e.g., program, people, project) | 23\% | 24\% | 13\% |
| Leadership training | 19\% | 6\% | 27\% |
| Experience in fundraising/endowment | 12\% | 12\% | 20\% |
| Other | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% |

## AACSB

## Americas

777 South Harbour Island Blvd.
Suite 750
Tampa, Florida 33602 USA

Europe, Middle East, and Africa
UP Building Piet Heinkade 55
1019 GM Amsterdam
The Netherlands

## Asia Pacific

331 North Bridge Road \#10-04/05 Odeon Towers Singapore 188720


[^0]:    Note: percentage does not equal 100, as respondents could select more than one item.

[^1]:    Note: Total includes counts of respondents who did not report gender.

[^2]:    Note: Respondents who indicated they aspire to be dean were asked to rate activities that are typical of the role of a business school dean on a scale of 1 to $5(1=$ low and $5=$ high $)$ regarding their perceived current level of proficiency for each activity and their desire for developing proficiency in that activity in order to successfully become a business school dean one day. The top table displays results as weighted averages. Gaps greater than 0.7 can be regarded as notable.

