



UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
The Graduate School
G-1 Communications
Box 353770
Seattle, Washington 98195-3770

Telephone: (206)543-5900

Fax: (206)685-3234

May 17, 2018

To: Anita Krug, Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, University of Washington Bothell
Sandeep Krishnamurthy, Dean, School of Business, University of Washington Bothell

From: Rebecca Aanerud, Interim Dean
Kima Cargill, Interim Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Planning

RE: Review of the School of Business at the University of Washington Bothell (2017-2018)

This memorandum outlines the Graduate School's final recommendations from the academic program review of the School of Business at the University of Washington Bothell. Detailed comments on the review can be found in the documents that were part of the following formal review proceedings:

- Charge meeting between review committee and administrators (November 2, 2017)
- Self-Study (December 14, 2017)
- Site visit (January 22-23, 2018)
- Review committee report (February 15, 2018)
- Unit response to the report (April 16, 2018)
- Graduate School Council consideration of review (May 17, 2018)

The review committee consisted of:

Howard Smith, Dean, UWT Milgard School of Business (Committee Chair)

Nives Dolsak, Professor and Associate Director, UW School of Marine and Environmental Affairs

Tim Wilkinson, Dean, Whitworth School of Business

Chung-Shing Lee, Professor and Dean, School of Business, Pacific Lutheran University

The School of Business at University of Washington Bothell offers the following degrees: Bachelor of Arts in Business Administration and Master of Business Administration. The School also offers a Master of Science in Accounting, which is due for a 5-year review in 2019-2020.

Members of the Graduate School Council presented findings and recommendations to the full Council at its meeting on May 17, 2018. A summary of this report, composed by Graduate School Council Members, is attached to this document.

Graduate School Council Recommendations

The Graduate School Council commends the School of Business on the strength of its programs, faculty and students.

The Council recommends the next review be conducted in ten years (2027-2028).

We concur with the Council's recommendations.

cc: Mark Richards, Provost and Executive Vice President
Patricia Moy, Associate Vice Provost for Academic and Student Affairs, Office of the Provost
Jason Johnson, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Academic Affairs
Becky Corriell, Director, Academic Program Review and Strategy, The Graduate School
Academic unit Review Committee Members
Members of the Graduate School Council
GPSS President

Attachment

University of Washington | Graduate Council

Program Strengths:

1. The School has acquired accreditation (independent of the Foster School on the Seattle campus) by the Association for the Advancement of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), the primary global accrediting body in the schools of management space. Only 25% of business schools in the US currently meet AACSB standards.
2. Curriculum delivery is very efficient. FTE student-to-faculty ratios are at or near the highest on the UWB campus for the last several years.
3. The School exhibits a culture of strong alignment around mission and core values in addition to well-established governance structures that ensure input from relevant stakeholders within the School as well as those in the business community. Faculty, staff, and UW Bothell Business School leadership appear to work collaboratively around a strong vision for the School and for student development. The School has been entrepreneurial in pursuing opportunities in the graduate and executive education spaces.
4. The School features a strong commitment to diversity in both undergraduate students and faculty on both gender and ethnic dimensions. A number of women faculty have earned tenure in recent years with several earning tenure even since completion of the self-study and review. Graduate student gender diversity is in line with or above typical levels in the graduate management space.
5. Incoming faculty quality appears quite strong with new hires having graduated from several top Ph.D. programs in the fields of management. The research culture is strong, and productivity in leading journals is strong for a school of this size and mission.

Challenges & Risks:

1. Both professional development and experiential learning activities are absent, difficult for students to find, and/or underutilized.
2. Relevance of the School, its programs, and its research to the local community it serves is not deemed to be as high as it should be to sustain current rates of growth. Differentiation of the value proposition relative to the Seattle campus must be expanded in order to support continued growth.
3. The School lacks a dedicated advancement staff organization and advancement plan. This appears less of a challenge or risk than a missed opportunity to provide additional support for the School's student development activities, research activities, and physical infrastructure.

4. Faculty are physically dispersed across campus, and this leads to fewer interactions between them and perhaps less of a sense of place for students/fewer interactions between faculty and students than is optimal. Advancement activity might lead to funds for a dedicated building to host classrooms, faculty offices, and School administration.
5. The School does not provide the optimal level of financial support for faculty scholarship in the form of summer support or release time, student scholarships, and community engagement by staff. Financial and coaching support for lecturers should be strong enough for them to obtain Instructional Practitioner status with the AACSB framework.
6. Although the size of the faculty and programs have grown, the size of the staff has not. Employee retention and employee advancement opportunities are related, and both appear problematic.

Areas of Concurrence/Disagreement:

1. The program and Review Committee exhibit broad general agreement across most program strengths and challenges.
2. The Review Committee commends the School for clarity in criteria for promotion of assistant professors to the rank of associate but believes that stronger clarity is needed in criteria for promotion to full; the Review Committee similarly urges the School to more strongly encourage associates to apply for promotion to full. Conversely, the School believes that its criteria for promotion of associates to full are clear and that strong coaching is provided to eligible faculty.