



**CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT REVIEW PEER REVIEW TEAM REPORT - 2020**  
**FOR BUSINESS ACCREDITATION**

The AACSB International Peer Review Team has completed its review for:

**Organization: Weber State University**

**Business School Name:** John B. Goddard School of Business & Economics

John B. Goddard School of Business & Economics

3801 University Cir

Ogden, Utah 84408-3801

United States

**Business Degree Level(s) Offered:** Undergraduate, Masters

**Date of visit:** 2023-02-26 to 2023-02-28

**I: Peer Review Team Recommendation**

The peer review team recommends **Extension of Accreditation** of the degree programs included in the scope of accreditation offered by Weber State University. This recommendation reflects the opinion of the peer review team only and will be reviewed by the Continuous Improvement Review Committee during the next scheduled meeting on 2023-03-27. The primary role of the Continuous Improvement Review Committee is to ensure consistent application of the AACSB International accreditation standards and processes across peer review teams.

Concurrence by the Continuous Improvement Review Committee and ratification by the Board of Directors are required prior to the confirmation of the accreditation extension. Following ratification by the Board of Directors, the Official Representative of the school will be notified initially via email and subsequently by letter from AACSB. The applicant must wait until the Board of Directors ratifies the recommendation before making any public announcement.

Within ten days following the visit, the team provides the peer review team report to the school and the Continuous Improvement Review Committee Chair. Prior to issuing the final report to the school and the Continuous Improvement Review Committee, the school should be provided a review of the report in order to offer any clarifying comments and corrections related to factual information noted in the report. The school may also submit a response to the Continuous Improvement Review Committee ([circ@aacsb.edu](mailto:circ@aacsb.edu)) within ten business days of receipt of the final peer review team report.

**II: Accreditation Standards Issues**

**1. Identified by the prior Peer Review Team**

The previous CIR resulted in a CIR2. All concerns raised in the CIR were satisfactorily addressed in the CIR2. No additional Accreditation Standards Issues were raised in the CIR2 PRT report.

**2. Identified by this Peer Review Team that Must Be Addressed Prior to the Next Peer Review Team Visit.**

- Strategic Planning (Standard 1)- over the previous five-year cycle, GSBE experienced several administrative changes (deans) at the School level. This appears to have contributed to a somewhat disjointed strategic planning and execution process midway through the five year cycle. As a result, the CIR addresses the second half of the five-year cycle (2020-2022). It was clear from the CIR that many continuous improvement activities had occurred. However, it was difficult to see the alignment to the strategic priorities and mission. To this end, the PRT requested supplemental documentation that demonstrated the alignment of activities to the GSBE's strategic initiatives. The updated strategic plan summary clarified the work accomplished over the 2020-22 time period, and provided the overarching plans moving forward. This document satisfied the pre-visit request from the PRT.

In order to better ensure greater continuity and consistency in GSBE's strategic planning process and execution, for the next review the PRT recommends the following:

While the documentation provided outlines past activities, as well as future general plans, a more robust, well-defined and detailed strategic planning process and documentation is critical for the communication and

execution of a strategic plan. Work related to the strategic priorities and initiatives should permeate all levels of the School, strengthening its immunity (at the macro level) from multiple administrative changes. In addition, the strategic plan should be clearly linked to GSBE's mission, and protocols for allocation of resources.

For the next CIR GSBE is expected to have a well-documented strategic plan and process that demonstrates its effectiveness in guiding the School's priorities, initiatives, actions, and resource allocations that result in continuous improvement.

- Impact of Scholarship (Standard 8). Review of faculty intellectual contributions in research and scholarship shows that GSBE faculty are active in research related to respective disciplines. Less clear is how GSBE defines and values the impact and quality of this scholarship. As stated in standard 8, 'The outcome sought from these intellectual contributions is to impact the theory, practices, and/or teaching of business. The standards seek to elevate impact of intellectual contributions of a simple count of, for example, peer reviewed journal articles, and we encourage schools to incorporate a demonstration of impact into their assessments of quality of intellectual contributions for all faculty.' In addition, 'Schools are also expected to have a societal impact through their intellectual contributions and engagement in thought leadership with external non-academic stakeholders.' A clear, well documented and defined guidance on how quality and impact of Intellectual Contributions are measured is needed. While faculty appear to have a general understanding of expected quality levels for their IC's, well documented articulation of those expectations is important for aligning impact expectations with faculty effort and alignment to mission. Currently, faculty are expected to individually justify quality and impact of their ICs. Tied to this is the need for clear workload expectations in terms of effort across teaching, research, and service to provide guidance to faculty in carrying out responsibilities. The 2020 Interpretive Guidance for AACSB Accreditation document provides additional guidance on the standards and is updated periodically to include the continuous improvement of execution and application of other standards.

### **III: Peer Review Team Observations and Feedback that Form the Basis for Judgment for the Recommendation**

#### **1. Strategic Management and Innovation:**

- a. Describe the mission and strategic planning process utilized by the school, and plans in place to mitigate risks identified by the school;
- b. Describe the financial strategies, financial model, sustainability and alignment with the school's mission and strategic goals;
- c. Explain how the faculty and staff are supported and set up for success in their positions;
- d. Address whether the school has adequate participating faculty to support the mission of the school;
- e. Address the appropriateness of the school's definitions for participating and supporting faculty;
- f. In instances where recommended faculty sufficiency and qualification ratios are not met, the peer review team should address whether the school is producing high-quality outcomes for these programs to support this faculty staffing model (e.g. student learning outcomes, placement, employer satisfaction, etc.);
- g. Address the appropriateness and consistency of the school's faculty qualification criteria.

Overall, is the school aligned with the spirit and intent of Standards 1-3?

- a. Describe the mission and strategic planning process utilized by the school, and plans in place to mitigate risks identified by the school;

In 2019 GSBE revised its past strategic planning process to create a more inclusive, systematically crowdsourced process that was intentional in allowing cross-collaboration among programs, college-wide participation, and systematic evaluation of new ideas. The more mission-focused revised process intentionally emphasizes a holistic quality education which is highlighted in their mission. While a solid process has been

implemented, it will be necessary for GSBE to demonstrate longer term continuity of a strategic plan as the foundation for its future endeavors.

Weber and GSBE face the same risks as many state supported higher-ed institutions in the US: budget reductions at the state level, shrinking enrollments, increased competition, etc. GSBE's strategic initiative, Bridges to Goddard, was identified to help mitigate risks they are facing. Greater outreach to high schools to build a 'school of choice' position has been implemented to supplement existing activities such as summer camps and case competitions. Currently, Utah has an above average birth rate which should help mitigate enrollment declines; over the next five years, Utah is projected to see an increase in the number of traditional college-age students (18-24).

b. Describe the financial strategies, financial model, sustainability and alignment with the school's mission and strategic goals;

Between 2013/14 and 2017/18 GSBE's state-funded budget grew 35% from 7 to 9.4 million dollars. During the most recent five-year period, funding increased another 17% from 9.46 to 11.1 million dollars. Current budgets are expected to remain flat or decline. The University appears to utilize an incremental budget model with the school budget increasing or decreasing incrementally over prior year's budget. The budget model does not appear to incorporate or incentivized enrollment growth. Given the current budget allocation practice, GSBE's ability to support innovation and continuous improvement will be substantially hindered and unsustainable.

c. Explain how the faculty and staff are supported and set up for success in their positions;

Using GSBE's current faculty standards, and faculty management policies follow accepted practices in US higher education. Policies are centralized and are articulated in the University's Policies and Procedures. GSBE's faculty qualifications document outlines expectations specific to the School.

GSBE has a variety of sources to support faculty and staff activities, including budget allocations and school-funded support (revenue-generating programs) for faculty. Given the downward enrollment trend, some of the school's self funding has decreased, making it more challenging to support ongoing initiatives as well as new ones.

d. Address whether the school has adequate participating faculty to support the mission of the school; GSBE's participating faculty ratios exceed the minimum by discipline required in the standards, as well as the 75 percent minimum overall. A large majority of their faculty are full-time participating faculty; more than 75 percent of faculty are SA/PhD faculty. Only about 14 percent of faculty are in the SP/IP categories; GSBE has no SP faculty. The high proportion of SA/PA faculty helps to ensure consistency in their mission-guided continuous improvement processes.

e. Address the appropriateness of the school's definitions for participating and supporting faculty;

The definitions for participating/supporting faculty is outlined in the Faculty Qualifications Guidelines, most recently updated in November 2022. The definitions are appropriate. Participating faculty are defined as those actively and deeply engaged in the activities of the school in matters beyond direct teaching responsibilities for both full and part time faculty. Supporting faculty are defined as those who typically do not engage beyond direct performance of teaching responsibilities.

Definitions aligns with the standards. For continuous improvement, clearer definition of what it means (e.g. examples) to be 'actively and deeply engaged' would improve guidance.

f. In instances where recommended faculty sufficiency and qualification ratios are not met, the peer review team

should address whether the school is producing high-quality outcomes for these programs to support this faculty staffing model (e.g. student learning outcomes, placement, employer satisfaction, etc.);

Faculty sufficiency and qualifications are met in all areas with the exception of finance. SA faculty qualifications far exceed the 40 percent minimum and the overall 90 percent threshold. In finance one faculty member is not meeting expectations and has started a professional development plan with an expectation of reaching SA by June 2024. GSBE's faculty qualifications guidance document has a clear process for re-establishing expired qualifications.

g. Address the appropriateness and consistency of the school's faculty qualification criteria.

GSBE's faculty qualification criteria are well documented in their Faculty Qualifications Guidelines document which was most recently updated in November 2022 (it is reviewed each fall). Expectations are well defined and clear. Moving forward, it is suggested that GSBE refer to the AACSB 2020 Interpretive Guidance document to strengthen alignment with its criteria for SA and SP.

A clear, well documented and defined guidance on how quality of Intellectual Contributions are measured is needed. While faculty appear to have a general understanding of expected quality levels for their IC's, well documented articulation of those expectations is important for aligning impact expectations, with faculty effort and alignment to mission. A framework for differentiating quality levels of intellectual contributions (PRJs, IOCs,) is needed. Also needed are clear definitions and measures of impact that align with research/scholarship workload, and mission. Continuous improvement in this area is expected by the next CIR.

Overall, is the school aligned with the spirit and intent of Standards 1-3?

Standards 1-3 are generally met. GSBE's strategic planning process and plan provide a good foundation for prioritizing activities and resources related to the strategic direction of the college. The budget structure of the University may hinder the pace of continuous improvement for the School. Definitions and guidelines for faculty work have been developed and provide a basic structure. Given the maturity of GSBE as an accredited program, greater refinement and alignment to the spirit of the standard was expected. Continuous improvement in this area should be a priority; greater clarity and continuity in interpretation of the related standards is needed.

## **2. Learner Success:**

- a. Describe how curriculum is current, relevant, forward-looking, globally oriented, aligned with program competency goals and consistent with the school's mission, strategies, and expected outcomes;
- b. Describe how the curriculum content cultivates agility with current and emerging technologies;
- c. Describe how the technology embedded within the curriculum is sufficient to prepare learners for work-preparedness expectations in their field of study;
- d. Address whether the school has a systematic process, appropriate to their cultural context and school's mission, in place for assessing student learning. Provide an overview of learner outcomes that demonstrate success. Describe how the curriculum demonstrates continuous improvement;
- e. Describe how the school demonstrates overall learner success, including adequacy of degree progression;
- f. Summarize how the school supports quality teaching and assesses the impact of teaching on learner success.
- g. Summarize the business school's executive education portfolio including the faculty who are involved, and how it is linked to the school's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies. Describe how the school ensures the quality of executive education and summarize any continuous improvements made as a result of feedback received.

Overall, is the school aligned with the spirit and intent of Standards 4-7?

- a. Describe how curriculum is current, relevant, forward-looking, globally oriented, aligned with program competency goals and consistent with the school's mission, strategies, and expected outcomes;

GSBE continuously updates its curriculum. Over the last five years, they have implemented 156 substantive curriculum changes. The University uses Curriculog to track changes through the University approval process for larger curricular changes that require University approval. For incremental improvements, the process remains within the School; those related to GSBE learning outcomes are integrated into the AOL system.

At least one globally-oriented course is required for all GSBE students. Study abroad experiences are available to undergraduate and MBA students. This offering was paused during the pandemic and revived in summer 2022. GSBE has also focused on expanding international 2+2 agreements as a member of the Transatlantic

Business School Alliance (TABSA). A newly developed agreement is with Konan University, Japan; students have the option of earning a degree from their home University as well as the foreign partner within a four-year period. One of the students in the meeting with the PRT participates in this program and reinforced the value of the experience and the dual degrees.

As part of GSBE's strategic initiative 'Bridges to Goddard,' GSBE participated in the the Utah System of Higher Education (USHE) concurrent enrollment (CE) of high school students in college level classes. Students are able to earn credits toward high school graduation, and also earn credits toward a post-secondary degree. GSBE has been offering Entrepreneurship and Intro to Business courses. More recently they have added Personal Finance, and Economics as a Social Science.

b. Describe how the curriculum content cultivates agility with current and emerging technologies;

Several examples were provided to demonstrate changes in the curriculum to enhance the integration of emerging technologies. These include: updated Data Analytics courses and a new Data Analytics minor, a new undergraduate certificate in Data Analytics Essentials (certificate of proficiency), and new graduate certificates in cybersecurity, and business analytics). At the graduate level, GSBE has expanded its reach for those interested in pursuing an MBA by launching an MBA virtual pathway to meet student demand locally and beyond GSBE's traditional service area. All MBA courses are available in synchronous or asynchronous mode.

In addition to programmatic changes, GSBE has updated classroom and other learning spaces with updated space configurations and technology. Examples include:

- Innovation Lab WB – a space for 3D printing, Laser printers, and VR/AR demonstrations. This is used for an 'emerging technologies' course, high school outreach activities, and community education courses.
- Active Learning Space – configuration of 5 pods with 6 seats each, with technology to enhance individual/team learning (TVs, ability to connect to individuals' devices)
- Tech for Hybrid delivery - all classrooms were refitted to utilize zoom or other virtual communication technology, as well as the capability to capture classroom lectures in the cloud.

c. Describe how the technology embedded within the curriculum is sufficient to prepare learners for work-preparedness expectations in their field of study;

In addition to the initiatives described under 2b above, GSBE has integrated technology and analytics into existing courses in order to better prepare certain majors. Included are the following:

- Accounting data analytics (new course)
- AI tools in Auditing and integration of Tableau across multiple accounting courses
- Econometrics, research methods, and a data analytic student group (Economics)
- Business Analytics and spreadsheet modeling (Supply Chain)
- Cybersecurity, analytics, and emerging tech such as blockchain (MIS)
- Marketing research using R (Marketing)

Also of note is GSBE's approach to its Entrepreneurship program. In order to widen its reach beyond traditionally matriculated students, it converted its typical three-credit, face-to-face courses into a curriculum consisting of eleven one-credit hour courses, and one three-credit course. All are available online. This allowed GSBE to retain its minor in the area, and create a new certificate of Entrepreneurship. Courses were also made available to the community. Courses are delivered by a mix of full time faculty as well as practitioners engaged in entrepreneurial endeavors. This is a good example of blending theory and experiential learning through curriculum.

d. Address whether the school has a systematic process, appropriate to their cultural context and school's mission, in place for assessing student learning. Provide an overview of learner outcomes that demonstrate success. Describe how the curriculum demonstrates continuous improvement;

GSBE takes a systematic approach to assessing learning outcomes that are informed by the School's mission and strategies. In the report, the School illustrated this alignment. Learning outcomes are developed and measured for its undergraduate degree program, Master's of Business Administration, Master of Accounting, and Master of Taxation degrees. The accounting related AOL outcomes are discussed in the supplemental accounting accreditation report.

Since the last CIR, and CIR2 focused on AOL, GSBE has streamlined the activities in its process in order to improve the relevance and focus on the outcomes instead of the measurement process (prior to this change, learning goals were measured annually). It involves broad-based faculty participation. The AOL committee (chaired by the Associate Dean), consisting of faculty from each department, Chair of the GSBE Curriculum

Committee (ex-officio), the Head advisor of the advising office, AOL directors in accounting and the MBA program. This group serves as the core driver of the process.

GSBE holds a faculty wide meeting annually to discuss review and discuss the most recent outcome measures and potential modifications to curriculum. The annual meeting is also used to focus on a single learning goal to take a 'deep dive' to determine that it remains an appropriate goal/measure. The efficacy of this process was demonstrated by the improvement made in the 'effective communicators' learning goal. As a result of the 'deep dive' into the assessment outcomes, it was identified that the learning goal measures student ability to communicate through writing and presentations. However, it did not measure interpersonal communication skills, considered a critical aspect of being an effective communicator. As a result, a third objective was added to this learning goal.

The MBA has four learning goals, each with at least one objective. Assessment takes place across six courses, and across different delivery modes (hybrid and online). GSBE provided examples of continuous improvement in curriculum to improve student learning outcomes.

e. Describe how the school demonstrates overall learner success, including adequacy of degree progression;

GSBE uses an admissions process for Weber students interested in pursuing business. The curriculum is structured in three phases - Business Foundations and Admissions (17 credit hours) - Business Core (33-34 credit hours) - Major Course Requirement (24-33). Curriculum progression follows best practices in business education. Degree progression is clear for students, and faculty have a strong focus on continuous improvement in the curriculum. GSBE programs also integrate experiential learning into the curriculum to provide students with hands-on learning.

Discussion with the GSBE support staff underscored the student-focused approach of the School. Support staff included academic advisors, career services, graduate program directors (MBA and accounting), and development. It was clear the individuals worked as a collaborative team to ensure student success. The PRT's meeting with students reinforced the value and impact of the staff; many of the students identified individual staff by name and shared an experience where the staff member was instrumental in helping the student with guidance, advice, coaching, etc.

f. Summarize how the school supports quality teaching and assesses the impact of teaching on learner success.

GSBE faculty are evaluated annually. They are required to report on their teaching with respect to class size, grade distribution, development of new courses, curricular improvement, and alignment to mission. Faculty are supported (professional development funds) in efforts to maintain currency and relevance in their areas of teaching. Faculty are also provided opportunities to engage with advisory board members in order to better understand needs of the community impacted by GSBE programs.

g. Summarize the business school's executive education portfolio including the faculty who are involved, and how it is linked to the school's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies. Describe how the school ensures the quality of executive education and summarize any continuous improvements made as a result of feedback received.

N/A

Overall, is the school aligned with the spirit and intent of Standards 4-7?

Overall, GSBE activities align with the spirit and intent of Standards 4-7. They have demonstrated intentional continuous improvement focused on learner success through strong and continuous curricular improvement and innovation, the addition of new programs (certificates, minors, etc.), and a robust and effective AOL process. Faculty and staff work collaboratively to provide students with the knowledge, experiences, and professional development to prepare them for their future.

### **3. Thought Leadership, Engagement, and Societal Impact:**

- a. Describe the quality and demonstrated impact of the faculty intellectual portfolio and alignment with the school's mission, and how the school supports faculty in the production of high-quality scholarship;
- b. Provide exemplars of the school's research that have made a positive impact on society;

- c. Describe other school-supported activities that demonstrate a positive societal impact.

Overall, is the school aligned with the spirit and intent of Standards 8-9?

a. Describe the quality and demonstrated impact of the faculty intellectual portfolio and alignment with the school's mission, and how the school supports faculty in the production of high-quality scholarship; Overall, the school is aligned with the spirit and intent of Standards 8 and 9; greater definition, and guidance is needed for measuring impact of intellectual contributions. Currently, faculty have the responsibility of providing justification of the quality and impact of their respective ICs, there does not appear to be a systematic and mission linked approach to this area. A summary of citations was provided in the CIR, however, the broader context of how citations are valued was not evident. The GSBE portfolio of peer-reviewed publications is notable in its volume, quality and impact. In addition, GSBE faculty actively engage in their academic associations, including participation in related meetings and conferences. Faculty productivity in scholarship strongly reflects the GSBE Mission which highlights research as one of its values.

The GSBE faculty's intellectual contributions related to teaching are part of the on-going dialogue towards better learning outcomes. Across the portfolio are peer-reviewed publications that touch upon varied aspects of pedagogy: case-study development, classroom experiments with new pedagogical approaches, and studies related to international students and education.

There appears to be considerable engagement between learners, the faculty, and the regional professional community. During our visit, and in the written materials, the team learned about a significant number of engagement activities including contests, mentoring opportunities, tax preparation services, supply chain "returnships", speakers, student organizations, among others. Thus, it is clear that the students and faculty are actively engaged with the business community which supports the production of high-quality scholarship – and this is true across majors and departments.

- b. Provide exemplars of the school's research that have made a positive impact on society;

The GSBE faculty are enhancing the community through the proliferation of intellectual work to the local, state, national, and global community. One faculty member, an expert in cybersecurity, spoke to local media on nine separate occasions during the last five years to answer questions related to his expertise of systems security. Another faculty member's research related to price-gouging during the pandemic was cited in several local, state, and national media outlets, including National Law Review, and Reason magazine. Another faculty member was featured and interviewed on local news and radio on separate occasions to discuss her work on genderwashing.

- c. Describe other school-supported activities that demonstrate a positive societal impact.

Societal impact activities are supported by several active centers located within the GSBE and by numerous faculty activities across all departments. The GSBE has a strong portfolio of activities that support sustainability. Since 2019, the university Sustainability Practices and Research Center has recognized faculty and students for exceptional sustainability projects. Each year, GSBE faculty and/or students have earned at least one award. Dr. John Mukum Mbaku is frequently involved in high-level conferences that promote institution building and good governance in Africa.

The Jerry & Vickie Moyes Center for Supply Chain Excellence fostered collaboration among supply chain faculty, its industry advisory board, and the State of Utah to design and implement a supply chain certificate, the SCM 'returnship', for residents of the Red Barn Academy. For 36 weeks, all supply chain faculty taught a weekly class at the Red Barn facility in Farmington - a residential facility for men who struggle with a history of addiction, criminality, and homelessness. The program graduated 14 students and is currently in its second year. Other programs including the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) program, support of continuing education for community members and investment in entrepreneurship development all help GSBE provide a positive societal impact.

Overall, is the school aligned with the spirit and intent of Standards 8-9?

Overall, GSBE's activities and curriculum align with standards 8-9. They have been engaged in and focused on societal impact well before the standard was implemented. Moving forward an intentional strategic framework is needed to more clearly align activities with mission, strategy, and resources.

**4. Other noteworthy high-quality outcomes consistent with the school's mission and strategies not included elsewhere in this report.**

**IV: Commendations and Best Practices**

**Describe any noteworthy best practices or initiatives in which the school engages.**

The Red Barn Initiative described under 3.c

The Nye Lecture Series. This initiative is a one-credit course required for all students entering the business program. The course consists of a number of presentations by business professionals with the purpose of helping students learn about different business professions, careers, needed skills, etc. The value of this program, and the Red Barn initiative, was reinforced by business advisory members at the dinner with advisory board members (many are presenters in the course), as well as with students who met with the PRT. Innovation in the Entrepreneurship curriculum structure. To better serve and broaden its reach to students, GSBE substantially revamped the curricular structure of its Entrepreneurship program.

The revised program consists of eleven one-credit courses and one three-credit course. This structure provides students with greater flexibility in scheduling the courses and allows them to somewhat customize areas of focus. The curriculum is also delivered in multiple modalities. This innovation is a good example of the greater flexibility needed in business schools to better 'meet students where they are' as they juggle many competing responsibilities. This is especially important for adult learners (of which GSBE has a relatively high proportion) who need to juggle many priorities such as work, family, and school.

**V: Consultative Feedback**

**Faculty Qualifications**

SA – The standard is clear regarding normal expectations of PRJs plus other intellectual contributions (OICs). GSBE's faculty qualifications document that a higher number of PRJs is sufficient for SA without other OICs. While this exception to the normal expectation is appropriate, greater clarity on the appropriate proportionality of this exception may be useful; is there an expectation that only a limited number of faculty would meet SA with only PRJs? If the proportion of faculty who meet SA with only PRJs is large, this could bring into question whether the spirit of the standard is being met.

SP – A requirement for maintenance of SP status is a PRJ. SPs are typically master's qualified. Greater clarity on how this work is supported for SA faculty (e.g. reduced teaching load) as well as guidance for the types of PRJs expected would provide clarity on the alignment of the expectation with the faculty preparedness for producing PRJs. In other words, is there a difference in the PRJ focus, quality, etc., for SAs and SPs?

Turnover of deans and other administrators seems to be more prevalent in the current higher education environment. Although it is expected that the current interim dean's position will continue, it may not be viewed as definite for everyone in GSBE. According to the CIR, the current interim position (one year) position ends 30 June 2023; the University will conduct a search for a new dean during the 2023/24 academic year, potentially leaving a one-year leadership gap. And, although difficult to predict or control at times, instability in leadership roles can hinder the ability to maintain a strong culture focused on collaborative continuous improvement. A decisive and transparent plan for identifying stable leadership may reduce uncertainty.

**VI: Visit Summary**

**Date of visit**

2023-02-26 to 2023-02-28

**Peer Review Team Members**

Diana Lawson, Chair  
Dean  
Grand Valley State University

Shane Hunt, Member  
Dean  
Idaho State University



## Comparison Groups

### Comparable Peers - Weber State University

- California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
- Eastern Washington University
- Idaho State University
- Montana State University
- Portland State University
- University of Idaho
- University of Montana
- University of Northern Colorado

### Competitors - Weber State University

- Brigham Young University
- Southern Utah University
- University of Utah
- Utah State University
- Utah Valley University

### Aspirants - Weber State University

- California State University, Sacramento
- Grand Valley State University
- Northern Arizona University
- The University of Akron
- University of North Carolina Wilmington
- Western Washington University

## Included in Scope Programs

### Education Level - Degree Title - Major Emphasis

- Masters-Generalist (MBA) - Master of Business Administration (MBA) - Master of Business Administration
- Masters-Specialist - Master of Accountancy (or Accounting) - Accounting
- Masters-Specialist - MS in Taxation - Taxation
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science (BS) - Accounting
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science (BS) - Business Administration
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science (BS) - Business Administration
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science (BS) - Economics
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science (BS) - Economics, Business
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science (BS) - Finance
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science (BS) - International Business Economics
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science (BS) - Management Information Systems
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science (BS) - Marketing
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science (BS) - Supply Chain Management

## Excluded from Scope Programs

### Education Level - Degree Title - Major Emphasis

- Masters - Master of Science (MS) - Computer Science
- Masters - Masters in Health Administration -
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science (BS) - Computer Science
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science (BS) - Construction Management Technology
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science (BS) - Interior Design
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science (BS) - Professional Sales
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science/Bachelor in Information Systems - Business/Multimedia Technologies
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science/Bachelor in Information Systems - Network Management Technology
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Arts - Business Education
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Arts - Business Education
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Arts - Marketing
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Arts - Technical Sales
- Undergraduate - Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Arts - Telecommunications Administration

**Additional information the team received outside of the Continuous Improvement Review Report that would benefit the committee in their review process.**

No files were found.

## Weber State AACSB CIR Visit 2023 - Final

Sunday, February 26

<p><b>5:30pm – 7:30pm</b></p>	<p>Courtyard by Marriott, 247 24<sup>th</sup> Street, Ogden  Cottonwood Room</p>	<p>Dinner with advisory board members and other external stakeholders.  <b>Dress code:</b> Business casual</p>	<p>AACSB Team, Interim Dean, Associate Dean, Accounting Chair, BAM Chair</p>			
<p><b>Attendees:</b></p>	<p>Doris Geide-Stevenson Eric Smith James Hansen Jennifer Anderson Alex Crowley April Mao Bekah Moore Chad Witcher Chris Bauco Daniel Penrod Gabe Chino</p>	<p>Garrett Sill Howard Stoker Joe Tomon Jonene Johanson Matt Williams Melanie Webber Mike Kattelman</p>	<p>Mike Memmott Nathan Day Paul Skeen Sarah Shelburne Susan Speirs Timothy Seeber Wade Watkins Yifan Zhou</p>			

**Monday, February 27**

<b>7:40am</b>	Doris and James will pick up WSU - AACSB CIR Team at hotel and transport to WSU					
<b>8:00am</b>	Wattis Business Building, Room 212	Breakfast meeting with members of the Goddard School Business Leadership team	AACSB Team	<b>Attendees:</b>	Doris Geide-Stevenson Eric Smith James Hansen	
<b>8:45am</b>	Wattis Business Building, Room 205	Meeting with the academic dept. chairs of SCM/MIS, ECON, BAM, MBA Director	Business PRT <b>Attendees:</b> Seokwoo Song, Gavin Roberts, Jennifer Anderson, Francois Giraud-Carrier	Meeting with Accounting Chair, MTAX Program Director, and full-time accounting faculty	Accounting PRT <b>Attendees:</b> James Hansen, Ryan Pace, Andrew Gouldman,, Darcie Costello, David Malone, Lausanne Kattelman, Valerie Chambers, Weiwei Wang	Wattis Business Building, Room 201E
<b>9:15am – 10:05am</b>	Wattis Business Building, Room 201E	Meeting with the Strategic Initiative Office	AACSB Team	<b>Attendees:</b>	Evan Barlow Alicia Ingersoll Randy Boyle Brett Merrell Doris Geide-Stevenson Kyle Braithwaite	

					Mary Ann Boles Weiwei Wang Jesse King	
<b>10:15am - 10:45am</b>	Wattis Business Building, Room 205	AACSB PRT Team Meeting Break				
<b>10:45am - 11:35am</b>	Wattis Business Building, Room 115 (downstairs)	Meeting with the College Rank and Tenure Committee	AACSB Team	<b>Attendees:</b>	David Malone Randy Boyle Shane Schvaneveldt Marjukka Ollilaninen Valerie Herzog John Mbaku	
<b>11:45am – 1:00pm</b>	Wattis Business Building, Room 201E	Lunch with Business/Econ students (UG and Grad)	Business PRT	Lunch with Accounting students (UG and Grad)	Accounting PRT	Wattis Business Building, Room 212
<b>Attendees:</b>	Preston West Sadie Bunderson Megan Harris Preslee Bradshaw Lydia Muster Botao Cao Sieg Coronel Grace Halindo Herrera			<b>Attendees:</b>	David Waite Brooke Thomas Zerik Jacobson Leland Carney Jaylee Grotegut Ashley Stephens Morgan Dickason Cache Lowry Neftali Castaneda	

<b>1:15pm – 2:00pm</b>	Wattis Business Building, Room 104 (downstairs)	Meeting with the Curriculum Committee and AOL Committee	AACSB Team (combined for about 20 minutes or so)	SAT AoL Committee members and SAT Chair	Break out at about 1:35 – Accounting PRT	Wattis Business Building, Room 103 (downstairs)
<b>Attendees:</b>	Eric Smith Clinton Amos Darcie Costello Dave Noack Evan Barlow Francois Giraud-Carrier Gavin Roberts Karen Hicks	Alvaro La Parra Perez Shane Schvaneveldt David Read Jeff Clements Matt Thue Terrilyn Morgan		<b>Attendees:</b>	James Hansen Jeff Davis Weiwei Wang Darcie Costello Valerie Chambers Ryan Pace Lisa Hopkins David Malone Andrea Gouldman	
<b>Approx. 2:00pm</b>	Wattis Business Building, Room 105 (downstairs)	SCM/MIS, ECON BAM tenure-track (untenured) faculty, BAM/FIN Instructors	Business PRT (Shane Hunt)	ACCT instructors and adjuncts	Richard Hill	Wattis Business Building, Room 112 (downstairs)
<b>Attendees:</b>	Alicia Ingersoll Atmadeep Mukherjee Ben Neve Brandon Stoddard Charles Durbin Evan Barlow Valentinas Rudys Matt Thue			<b>Attendees:</b>	Loisanne Kattelman Lisa Hopkins	

	Terrilyn Morgan					
<b>Approx. 2:00pm</b>	Wattis Business Building, Room 117 (downstairs)	SCM/MIS, ECON, BAM, FIN tenured faculty	Business PRT (Diana Lawson)	ACCT tenure-track faculty (untenured)	Susan Eldridge	Wattis Business Building, Room 106 (downstairs)
<b>Attendees:</b>	Andrew Keinsley Randy Boyle Brandon Koford Bryant Thompson Clinton Amos Dave Noack David Read Doris Geide-Stevenson Francois Giraud-Carrier Jeff Clements Jeff Steagall John Mbaku Alvaro La Parra-Perez	Taowen Le Grace Zhang Matt Gnagey Mike Stevens Nazneen Ahmad Shane Schvaneveldt Sky King Sandeep Rangaraju Therese Grijalva Yuhong Fan Jim Turner Jesse King		<b>Attendees:</b>	Darcie Costello Valerie Chambers Weiwei Wang	

<b>Approx. 2:30pm</b>				ACCT tenured faculty	Susan Eldridge/Richard Hill	Wattis Business Building, Room 201E
				<b>Attendees:</b>	Andrew Gouldman David Malone Ryan Pace Jeff Davis	
<b>3:00pm - 3:30pm</b>	Wattis Business Building, Room 205	AACSB PRT Team Meeting Break				
<b>3:30pm – 4:20pm</b>	Wattis Business Building, Room 201E	Meeting with development, undergraduate advisors, career services director, MBA Enrollment Director, MACC/MTAX Enrollment Manager	Business PRT and Richard Hill	Accounting Chair: James Hansen	Susan Eldridge	Wattis Business Building, Room 212



<b>Attendees:</b>	Alex Muller Andrew Wright Brett Merrell Karen Hicks Kyle Braithwaite Natalie Peterson Patti Glover					
<b>4:30pm</b>		Doris and James to transport PRT back to hotel				
		AACSB Team meeting time	AACSB Team		Hotel	
		Team dinner on your own	AACSB Team			
<b>Tuesday, February 28</b>						
		Breakfast meeting for team <i>(complimentary)</i>	Team		Hotel (Team checks out of hotel; will have luggage with them)	

<b>8:40am</b>		Transport to Campus (Doris and Eric)	
<b>9:00am</b>	Wattis Business Building, Room 201E	Meeting with dean, associate dean, and Accounting & Taxation chair to review findings and recommendations (Doris Geide-Stevenson, Eric Smith, James Hansen)	
<b>9:45am</b>	Miller Administration Building, Lampros Board Room (3rd floor across from Elevator)	AACSB PRT and GSBE leadership team meeting with President and Provost to review findings and recommendations (Brad Mortensen, Ravi Krovi, Doris Geide-Stevenson, Eric Smith, James Hansen)	
<b>10:30am</b>		Return to SLC Airport (Doris and Francois)	