

Faculty Expectations and Expectations of Faculty in the Evolving World of Business Education

David W. Stewart
Loyola Marymount University

Jack Gregg
Loyola Marymount University

This paper addresses the changing expectations of faculty members within business schools and the changing expectations among faculty members in those schools in response to changing market conditions. Six roles of faculty members are discussed in light of these changes. The paper concludes with suggestions for managing expectations.

INTRODUCTION

A gulf, sometimes quite broad, often exists between the expectations we have of ourselves and those that others have of us. This is nothing new to human experience, of course, but the way in which today's business school faculty member vivifies this conflict may present a more enlightening case than most. In order to understand the difference between how faculty view themselves, their roles and their responsibilities and how institutions view those roles and responsibilities, as well as to offer ideas for bridging the gulf and reconciling the two, it is necessary first to consider how the modern structure of American business schools came to be.

It would be too simplistic to conclude that the problems of an entire discipline stem from a pair of mid-20th century reports, yet in many ways the issues facing business schools today can be read as a product of two excoriating indictments of contemporary business education released in the late 1950s. The first and somewhat milder report was penned by Frank C. Pierson, and entitled *The Education of American Businessmen: A Study of University-College Programs in Business Administration* (1959). It noted that the questionable direction of business school education required closer analysis, especially considering the leading role America played in the commercial sphere, and suggested that academic standards would have to be increased if business schools were to be truly effective and serve their students. Moreover, they would need to reduce focus on the more institutional elements of business and concentrate on courses that would build the conceptual knowledge base and analytical skills of students. The second report, authored by Robert Aaron Gordon and James Edwin Howell and entitled *Higher Education for Business*, went further. While it offered lukewarm congratulations to the United States for successfully incorporating business schools into institutions of higher learning, it critiqued the "vocational" nature of these schools and urged schools to adopt "a more rigorous professional training within the context of a liberal education" (1959). In other words, business schools had to stop teaching from the field and start teaching from the classroom.

By way of contrast, the ivory tower that comprises today's business school curriculum is built largely on the foundation of these criticisms, and unfortunately is no longer in sync with expectations of the modern world. Today, business schools face many challenges, as outlined by Gabriel Hawawini in "The Future of Business Schools" (2005). Among these challenges are (1) the increasing globalization (or expectations thereof) of business school programs and students; (2) the need for more highly qualified faculty members; (3) the need to integrate softer skills into curricula without displacing conceptual courses; (4) the effects of technology on current teaching practice; (5) the need to determine whether current or novel funding models will help institutions meet financial goals; (6) the need to determine the right governing structures and strategic approaches to remain competitive; and (7) the necessity of a competitive brand.

To greater or lesser degrees, all of these challenges reflect a problem inherent in a system that is predicated on the idea that neither the hard managerial skills obtained in the field nor the softer communication and ethical skills required to interact respectfully with people and cultures form the fundamental roots that nourish business schools. Rather, classroom learning, with the attendant attention to theory and doctrine, comprises the cornerstone of modern American business education. Even so, businesses and students are increasingly calling for schools to teach hands-on skills, fluent technology use, interpersonal dexterity and ethical decision-making, among a raft of other proficiencies, and replace some of the theoretical content with hard, measurable skills that translate directly to workplace competency. In a very real sense, the financial well-being, competitive advantage and the very brand of schools now hangs in their ability to deliver these increasingly sought-after teaching models.

Hawawini (2005) concludes that while business schools today still operate on a century-old production-based model – student enrolls, attends classes at a physical location with peers, learns from professors, is deemed fit to graduate, departs forever – this model will need to change to a more open, fluid network model. Under this latter-day framework, business school "will no longer be a place. It will consist of multiple, interconnected locations around the world [where students] will join a network, and will do so for lifelong learning and contact building ... where regular top-ups of education and networking become the norm." (Hawawini 2005, p. 779).

So where does this idealized business school of the future leave current faculty? Robin Wilson's 2012 article "Why Are Associate Professors So Unhappy?" in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* sheds some light by declaring that assistant professors on the tenure track and full professors both report greater levels of happiness than newly minted tenured professors, who experience a marked increase in their workload and reduction in the amount of time they can dedicate to research, and are therefore much likelier to report unhappiness. While some hope is offered by the fact that full professors report higher levels of satisfaction, the situation speaks poorly to the fit between faculty expectations and expectations of faculty, which they only fully assume once tenured.

Moreover, as Campbell and O'Meara (2013) point out in their *Research in Higher Education* article "Faculty Agency: Departmental Contexts that Matter in Faculty Careers," the ways in which a department responds to a new professor's research and provides scaffolding for further development matter hugely to the sense of possibility, navigability and happiness the job offers. Many of the current requirements for business schools – changing funding models, a globalized presence, softer skills, upped technological prowess – as well as traditional responsibilities – courses, committee work – require time cut directly from that which faculty have allocated to research. Because so many faculty members joined academia for research's sake, this can create significant conflict.

In an about-face from the criticisms of 1959, business school faculty today now draw fire for "failing to impart useful skills, failing to prepare leaders, failing to instill norms of ethical behavior—and even failing to lead graduates to good corporate jobs" (Bennis and O'Toole, 2005). Other commentators specifically call out the quality and modality of the teaching: over-facilitation of student learning that cripples the process; external rewards that de-incentivize students; a lack of focus on practical skills; and a "typical business school experience that is too far removed from the context of business" (Pfeffer and Fong, 2002). Outspoken critics of MBA programs, such as Henry Mintzberg (2004), advocate easing up on the obsession with numbers, educating professionals that have real-world experience to which they can relate their knowledge, and creating more hands-on programs.

The result of these conflicting trends is a gap between what faculty members expect from their jobs and how institutions expect them to perform those jobs. In either instance, faculty play many roles – some desired, some loathed, some self-imposed, some imposed by students, some by employers of students, some by peers, some by institutions, and some by the global nature of the business world. The clash between all of these is forcing change among b-school faculty, but the form it will take is not yet clear. Once the dust settles, a more obvious picture may emerge. For now, there is no doubt that the business school faculty member will be expected to wear many hats (not a new expectation, really) and to be sensitive to the expectations of his “customers” or students (very much a new expectation). For better or worse, the relevance of business schools is defined by the demands placed on their graduates in the commercial world and by the ability and willingness of faculty members to address this demand.

This places a burden on institutions to find ways to help faculty shoulder these responsibilities gracefully while still granting them the autonomy and research orientation to which they’ve grown accustomed over decades. This paper will attempt to identify the changing expectations of business faculty members and contrast them with what faculty members themselves expect, then suggest some approaches for better aligning the disparate sets of expectations to create more effective business schools and educational programs that respond to changes in the larger business education environment.

Organizational Expectations of Faculty

In the last half-century, the expectations institutions and the people that attend them hold of faculty has markedly changed. To understand this, we must first consider the changing demographics of business school student populations.

In 1968 there were 79,000 undergraduate business graduates (12.5% of all graduates; fewer than 9% women) and in 2010 undergraduate business graduates increased to 365,000 (21% of all graduates; 50% women). This not only reflects the shift in demand from more traditional undergraduate majors on campus but also has a direct impact on b-school strategic planning, budgeting, and faculty hiring going forward into the next several decades. The increase of women undergraduates has a downstream implication for graduate management program (i.e., MBA) recruitment and enrollment as well. Simply put, as more female business majors enter the workforce they will look to build their career and professional brand with graduate business degrees.

But will faculty be able to meet the challenge of increasing student demand, growing scrutiny by boards, accreditors, business partners and others, and the shift in adult learner mindset from passive student to discerning and demanding customer? Certainly faculty cannot be viewed as a monolithic tribe. There are institutions that hire and promote faculty primarily for their research, and those who hire faculty for their teaching (and as we shall see, both types of faculty have their place in the new order). There are institutions that focus on building practical skills and schools that focus on learning as an end in and of itself (the former will fare better in the face of changing student demographics and expectations). Then there is the fact that faculty who teach undergraduates encounter different challenges than those who instruct graduate students. And each academic area has its own unique set of standards and professional assumptions that sets it apart from other areas within the university.

Because there is no one-size-fits-all definition of a faculty member, it follows there is no simple catalog of faculty expectations that serves all institutions, all areas, and all working faculty. However, there are some generalizations that are important to note as increasing pressures for change, instructional efficiencies, use of technology, innovative methodologies, and other incursions are imposed on the traditional “sage-on-the-stage” profile that characterizes many among today’s front line instructors.

Hawawini (2005) notes that “In mature countries [the business school] will have to evolve to satisfy a more complex environment with peculiar demands from both students and their employers.” (p. 770). Students, and the corporate employers that often pay their tuition, will expect more specific benefits and skills to arise from the business school education. It goes without saying that colleges and universities will expect faculty to pick up at least some of the slack in finding solutions to these problems, meeting these demands and changing along with the wider business environment. In many cases this will represent a significant shift for faculty members. As such, it is crucial that they understand the roles they are expected to play. We will outline six of the most important of those roles below.

Knowledge Creator

One of the longstanding roles of a traditional faculty person has been that of a researcher who divides her time between teaching, service, and making significant contributions to the common body of knowledge of her discipline. While research activities may take on different meanings depending upon the area in which a faculty person works, the common expectation is the same at the end of the day: publications. Teaching-centered institutions may put less emphasis on publications while research-focused institutions may put lower expectations on classroom activities but the need to create publishable articles that make a contribution is a shared expectation.

Whether someone is a faculty member from a small regionally accredited private college or from a “R1” research university there is some component of research and publication that is expected in order to be evaluated as a productive member of the faculty. Certainly, research activities and publication are required for probationary faculty who are on a tenure track, which is why newly minted, newly hired, junior faculty are often given a lighter teaching load in the first year or two.

In the decade between 1997 and 2007 tenure track professors declined from fifty percent to just under forty percent at four-year institutions as reported by the American Federation of Teachers (www.aftface.org). As this trend continues it is expected that greater numbers of “freeway flyer” adjuncts will backfill the demand for instructors across the spectrum of higher education. This is more than a budgetary or economic issue. The shift to contract faculty has implications for the underlying value proposition of higher education that supersedes the classroom transaction. As Clayton Christensen and Henry Eyring observed in *The Innovative University*, (2011) “Things happen [between professor and student] face to face, especially outside the classroom, that are unique. To enter a professor’s office and discuss matters unrelated to a particular course is to join a special scholarly community. The value [is] transcendent.” (pp. 336 - 337).

It should also be noted that as the relative proportion of adjuncts and other non-tenure track faculty increases in a business department or college the fundamental culture of the department or college will shift and may potentially take on the character of for-profit education providers or, at least, of the private commercial sector where at-will employment standards prevail.

Just as productive research and publication is a performance expectation placed on a faculty member, the faculty member also expects that he or she will have adequate resources to fulfill this expectation. New faculty are often seduced by the prospect of reduced teaching load, ready access to electronic research resources, budget for travel, and, in some cases, TA or GA support to lighten their classroom and administrative responsibilities.

To return to Wilson’s observations, Associate Professors are overwhelmed by the workload in similar ways to middle managers in industry, who think life will be magically easier for them when they achieve higher status. Their complaints are similar to the typical new manager: “I never have time to just sit and think and plan.” The faculty discontent with long hours, committee work, advising, and other “non-essential” responsibilities also parallels the private sector work world with at least one major difference: managers’ expectations of their life at work is attuned to the realities of greater responsibilities, managing others, etc., but new faculty expectations may be overly simplistic and naïve about the realities of academic work life. Wilson observes that, “After tenure lots of faculty go through a crisis of meaning, where they think: ‘There has to be something more than writing research grants, publishing, and teaching.’ An associate professor starts to think: ‘Why am I doing what I’m doing?’” and “As soon as you make tenure, you go from being one of the rising young stars of the department to being one of the workhorses.”

Versatile Pedagogist

As businesses and B-schools adjust their footing in the rebound from the “Great Recession,” a growing sense of learner-appropriate programming is taking hold in the strategic planning discussions at colleges of business and at the institutional level.

Undergraduate business education is now a leading major at most institutions that offer a business track. A relatively recent indication of the push to undergraduate business education is the University of California system where business education has traditionally resided at the Master and PhD levels only.

But in recent years there has been a push to include undergraduate business education in the B-School portfolio. At the other end of the higher education spectrum a current push to expand the 2-year community college degree to a 4-year degree is an acknowledgement that the demand for business education is not being fully met by traditional four-year state institutions. This trend will undoubtedly create an increase in demand for business faculty over the next decade albeit in the form of adjunct instructors. Indeed, with the large number of MBA's that have been minted in recent decades there is a greater potential pool of clinical or adjunct instructional talent.

It should be noted that firms have simultaneously soured somewhat on snapping up recently minted MBAs and now tend to prefer hiring undergraduate business majors who are less demanding, who are more malleable about taking on grunt work assignments, and who are naively eager to take the first salary offer that comes their way, unlike "seasoned" MBAs who want to, God forbid, negotiate their hiring package.

This general push to increase undergraduate business education capacity has put additional pressure on faculty and administrators to hire instructors capable of teaching to a wide spectrum of students. Teaching an MBA class may be challenging but the instructor can rely on most of his students to come prepared or at least be somewhat engaged because they see the applicability of the subject to current job and/or long term career plans. However, Undergraduates need to be led to the 'A-Ha' moments more deliberately. Thus, it takes a different skill set of the versatile pedagogist to teach to these separate audiences.

Business education is, in sum, a practitioner discipline. Learning about business at the graduate level is enhanced by a student's failures or successes in his or her career – the content becomes real because they have practical experience. Undergraduates, for the most part, do not have practical work histories to substantiate their learning so business topics for them often are reduced to simplistic levels. Where a topic may invoke discussion and debate at the graduate level, the same topic may fall flat at the undergraduate level. Where most graduate students know that the business world is one of constant ambiguity, most undergraduates are driven to find the one right answer, the magic bullet, a kernel of truth that will make them a sure-fire success in life and probably also be on the final exam.

For this reason, there has been a longstanding debate about the efficacy of undergraduate business education. Though we will not rehash this debate, it is worthwhile to note that simply put, the increased demand for undergraduate education will change the face of business faculties whether tenure track or adjunct.

Often overlooked by management faculty is the literature discussing adult learning, which directly impacts the multiple audiences addressed by business school faculty. While the term pedagogy (child centric) is the term most often used to generally describe the instructional approach and process, a more accurate term for adult learners is andragogy (man/adult centric). More than simply a choice of correct nomenclature the theory behind adult learning (Knowles, 1980) describes how the faculty/learner relationship is best managed to maximize knowledge acquisition.

Whereas the pedagogic approach (e.g., K-12) is instructor-centric and relies on the teacher to lead and direct the entire learning process, the andragogic approach (e.g., higher ed., executive education) shifts the responsibility more to the learner. In this way the adult learner becomes an active participant in his or her learning efforts.

Designers of courses and degree programs aimed at post-secondary students have applied Knowles' andragogic tenets by articulating expectations of student responsibility, by engaging students as co-participants in the learning process, by engaging adult learners in a broad variety of team activities and real-time learning events, and by employing a facilitative teaching style instead of the more pedagogic "drill-and-kill" or "sage-on-the-stage" classroom approach. Crainer and Dearlove observe in, "Gravy Training; Inside the business of business schools," (1999) that, "Business school programs must be built around the needs of customers rather than the predilections of the faculty." The push-pull debate about demand-driven programs versus supply-side program design is ongoing.

Well-Versed and Fluent Technologist

Students at all levels from undergraduate to senior executive are conversant with technology in their lives and fully expect to encounter technology as part of their business coursework. Faculty who are unable or unwilling to integrate simple technologies in their courses are sending a signal that the course content may be as outdated as the Luddite technology used by the instructor.

The use of technology in order to augment and buttress the in-class learning process is not just a cosmetic. Students are expected to work collaboratively online, conduct research, submit reports and research papers, and even take instantaneous quizzes during class time. Technology is able to engage the learning process and create new avenues for knowledge assumption with minimal cost. Robust teaching technologies incorporate interventions that acknowledge multiple student learning styles so that the content has a greater chance of connecting with a greater number of students. The use of technology is the new normal.

Faculty are expected not just to be able to use technology well in their classrooms, but to transmit technological skills to their students. Applications that help students manage data and supply chains, programs related to social media and branding, quantitative tools for investment management ... are all crucial to a thorough understanding of today's global, connected business world. Faculty must be able to use these technologies and teach their use or risk being relegated to the past along with their overheads.

Global Citizen

Increasingly, faculty will need a grasp of not just domestic markets and labor forces, but those affecting the world as a whole. Although the North American population still produces the lion's share of undergraduate business school students, the statistics paint a different picture at the doctoral level: while 32.4% are North American, 32.9% are European, 21.7% are Asian and 10.9% are from Oceania (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, 2015). MBAs and other master's degrees are somewhere in between. Clearly the forces that will shape business and business education from here on out are global, and therefore faculty will need to maintain this global outlook.

Moreover, with specific countries exerting such force over global markets – think China, Russia, Saudi Arabia, India in addition to the United States – it is no longer sufficient for a business school to possess industry specialists; it must now have country specialists too, faculty whose expertise rests on knowledge of these individual countries and the various ways in which they shape the world and the global business climate.

Even faculty that don't specialize in a specific country will be expected to bring global flavor to the classroom. That means teaching and researching in other countries, requiring both a comfort with traveling and a willingness to take leave of ongoing research projects that depend on time at home. Without wider world experience, a business professor's suitability to teach business in a global marketplace may incur increasing doubt.

Integrator

As the economy has changed, a new focus on developing courses and programs that target industries (verticals) has emerged. Some faculty members have taken their area of specialization to a sub-specialty level (e.g., Health Care Economics) and have developed their research agenda and coursework around their unique sub-specialty.

Hybrid degree programs are another example of how curriculum has been built to accommodate the special demands of different disciplines. For example, it is not uncommon for cross-campus programs such as the JD/MBA, Health Care MBA, or Tech Management (Engineering and Business) to leverage the broader institutional faculty resources of different colleges on campus. Faculty members who teach in these hybrid programs are expected to expand their understanding of complimentary topic areas so that a sense of content integration develops over time. Likewise, as programs cross campus boundaries so, too, do new research and publication opportunities.

Students who sign up for a hybrid dual degree program expect to gain a deeper exposure to content in both areas as well as the benefit of an added credential. Further, the relationships they develop with each

different academic department and with fellow students from both content areas expands the scope of their professional relationships and increases the likelihood of job placement upon graduation.

It should be noted that the process of designing a dual degree program is often painfully arduous. Deans must resolve local and shared operating issues such as the impact on teaching loads for faculty teaching those courses taught out of the college, administrative and marketing expenses for shared dual degree programs, as well as the allocation of tuition revenues.

Launching a dual degree program partnership infuses some element of uncertainty into a college culture known for stability and resistance to change. But as local economies advance and recede the scope and breadth of business education is pressured to stay current and relevant with the needs of the professional community. Internal college resistance comes in many forms. Some faculty members may feel that participation in such a dual degree may impact their research agenda and future publication prospects. Fortunately, this concern is unfounded – while the opportunity to interact and collaborate with faculty from another college or discipline may, in fact, create new research opportunities.

Experiential Facilitator

Experiential learning in the form of providing opportunities for direct student engagement with real-world activities (instead of merely learning *about* something) have been the goal of management educators for some time. For example, the case study methods gained near universal traction because it was, in its time, considered the closest way to immerse student learners in a fuller context of a topic.

Although Aristotle is said to have initiated the concept of experiential learning, current theory and practice is attributed to Kolb (1984) who outlined much of what is currently the functional platform for such management educational activities as entrepreneurial programs, incubators, student investment clubs, and other hands-on faculty-supervised experiences. Simply put Kolb states that the student learner must engage and (1) be willing to be actively involved in the experience, (2) be able to reflect – often with faculty facilitation – on the experiences he or she is having, (3) be able to use analytical skills to characterize the experience in his or her own words, and (4) be mature enough to possess independent problem solving skills to transform the experience into a learning opportunity.

The expectation here is that faculty will be able to bring real business into the business school. Enabling students to engage in a real-world fashion with investment funds, entrepreneurship programs, incubators and business professionals answers a broader critique of individuals such as Mintzberg (2004), who claim the business degree is wildly out of touch with the needs of the corporate environment.

An excellent example of action learning, a form of Kolb's experiential model at work, is the newly launched M-School at Loyola Marymount University's College of Business Administration. This year-long undergraduate program track exposes a cohort of two dozen competitively selected students to the top advertising agencies in Southern California who partner with the college for a full immersion experience where the students develop marketing and branding campaigns for real clients. The success of this experiential process has gained tremendous notoriety for the college and the marketing faculty who manage the track, because students are graduating with a clear career path and skill set, and national advertising agencies are developing talent that fits their unique professional requirements.

Action learning relies on adult learning theory where the student assumes increasing responsibility for his or her knowledge acquisition. This approach is used to help the student address real problems that exist, requires the student to engage and take deliberate action, and then purposely to reflect on the process. Action learning is best employed as a team sport with an experienced faculty continuously debriefing. Because the learning team is expected to be self-managing, the role of the faculty is that of an advisor coach or mentor.

Mentor and Coach

The role of a faculty person as advisor who suggests courses and manages the Add/Drop process has developed into a more substantive coaching and mentoring relationship. In concise terms the coaching model follows a developmental narrative arc that steers the faculty-student dialogue along a path that advances the student's view of himself and of his next steps following his college experience.

The primary differences between coaching and mentoring are (1) locus of control and (2) accountability. In the mentoring model the faculty member is the driver of the conversation and often provides suggested solutions to critical life decisions. The mentor creates accountability expectations and often measures the success of the mentoring process by how well the student meets the metric standards set by the mentor.

On the other hand, the coaching model shifts the locus of control to the person being coached. Likewise, the person coached is a full partner in the conversation and is fully responsible for setting performance accountability expectations. The coach is there to help the student hold herself accountable to her own measures of success.

In each case the coach or mentor is there to act as a facilitating guide to the student. The conversation often starts with an informal assessment that determines the current situation. Next, the student describes where she or he expects to be in the future and what they are doing to advance that agenda. The coach identifies inevitable gaps between the current situation and the expected outcome and then helps the student create an action plan. The action plan becomes the basis for student-driven accountability.

Again we return to Hawawini's (2005) assertion that the production model of business school education will need to transform to a learning network model, in which student-faculty relationships continue after graduation and graduates consistently "top up" their learning in a lifelong process.

Above we have discussed the six major roles institutions expect their faculty to play: (1) Knowledge Creator; (2) Versatile Pedagogist; (3) Fluent Technologist; (4) Global Citizen; (5) Integrator; and (6) Experiential Facilitator. Below, we will continue the discussion of organizational expectations by addressing four additional benefits institutions expect faculty to contribute to the learning environment.

Mastery of Alternative Methods, Modalities, and Student Learning Styles

One of the faculty challenges in present day higher education is the acknowledgement that not all learners are created equally or that they are able to approach an advanced management topic with the same basic set of foundational information. This is more than the simple discrimination between the undergraduate and graduate, or between degree-bound students and non-credit executive student audiences. A faculty person in today's management education arena needs to be sensitive to diversity, be globally aware, and be technologically sophisticated.

Couple the new classroom reality with an acknowledgement that there are multiple ways for students to acquire knowledge and information, and the challenge becomes even greater for the dedicated faculty member.

Howard Gardner's work on multiple intelligences (1983) prompted further inquiry into the many ways a student can relate to course content. Among Gardner's growing catalog of intelligences/ learning styles the most noteworthy are (a) Visual (reading, observing activities), (b) Auditory (lecture), (c) Verbal-linguistic (discussion and presentation), (d) Physical/ kinesthetic (hands-on, in-class exercise), (e) Logical/ mathematical, and (f) Social/ interpersonal (group process). It should be noted that some of Gardner's posited intelligences (e.g., existential) may not have ready applicability to standard management educational interventions.

Given the nature of the content, a diligent faculty person might create outside assignments or in-class experiences that are built around one or more of these learning styles. The significance for business faculty is that because different individuals address and engage with content in different ways it falls to the conscientious educator to create multiple connecting points between her course content and the student. Certainly this is a daunting expectation.

Into the current mix of faculty issues is the significant emergence of technology-mediated instruction. No matter the platform, the integration of technology with instructional methods is growing and will continue to dominate curriculum design and program review. Certainly students at all levels expect their instructor to not only know and deliver the content in an engaging way but also be able to demonstrate that she is up to speed with all the latest tech tools that the student uses either in their dorm or in their work place.

The axiom “form follows function” is relevant in current management education. Admittedly, program and course designs are limited by functional constraints of resources and materials, but their acceptance is constrained by the constantly changing social/ cultural expectations of students.

Part of the theater of the classroom is building credibility, and today’s commercial work world is highly technologic and apace with constant change. The faculty person who persists in employing a droning lecture approach will telegraph that his content is as out of date as his teaching style.

Managerial Relevance

There is a longstanding “*Tomato-Tomahto*” debate about faculty qualifications, especially at the undergraduate or survey course level. Are students better served by faculty who are steeped in research and theory or by instructors who are recent or current experienced practitioners in their area? Horror stories of practitioners droning on about their past corporate war glories are just as bad as faculty digressions into arcane references to theory that leave students numb and confused.

Likewise, faculty who are devoted to a life in the academy may be well-versed in theory and substantive research literature but they may not always provide their working professional students with solutions and applications to real world corporate dilemmas. The topics of business and commerce are, after all, meant for real world application. This disconnect sometimes becomes most acute when the audience consists of thirty-six-year-old EMBA students or, worse yet, senior executives attending a customized Executive Education program.

While on the subject of faculty/student alignment, it should be noted that the major complaint about university faculty by corporate learning leaders is a lack of relevance and applicability to the day-to-day business. B-schools contemplating entering the Executive Education arena take note.

Certainly faculties are expected to transfer knowledge and evaluate learning performance but some due consideration must be given to the theater of the classroom. Either extreme of the two approaches – employing all theory or all practice – doesn’t provide an adequate balance. The current business faculty person must have some real world experiences (both good and bad) to anchor his or her examples and extend the course material into the working lives of the students. Working learners want learning that works.

Business programs have recently been under attack because business curricula are slow to revise and reflect current trends. Part of this is a reluctance to invest in themes and topics that, in the end, are merely a fad (the rush to set up E-Commerce departments immediately comes to mind). But another inhibitor is the faculty expectation that they will remain the primary source of content in the programs offered by the college.

But for every course deemed no longer vital to today’s business curriculum and either eliminated or reduced in course units, there is a faculty person who fights to maintain his or her domain. And every time that fight is won there are fewer opportunities for curriculum improvement or enhancement. Or change. While some adamant faculty may win these skirmishes the students who trust the program to provide a learning platform to keep their careers competitive are shortchanged. And as internet technology makes it easier for prospective students to learn more and more about the value of program content during their application process, those schools who are unwilling or unable to update their course offerings steadily lose credibility and competitive standing in their market.

While faculty may expect some constancy and security teaching the courses with which they are most familiar, students expect their faculty to behave as dedicated agents of the learning process on their behalf. When this doesn’t happen students feel slighted, manipulated, and short-changed.

It is important to note, however, that business school faculty with considerable real-world experience can raise other questions. Consider outside consulting. Not only is it an attractive feature of business professor life, it is often encouraged as a way to stay up-to-date with current corporate practice. As Crainer and Dearlove (1999) observed,

The consulting system means that averagely motivated academics at averagely ranked business schools should be able to double their salary through consulting and other external opportunities such as seminars and speeches. [Further,] the potential pitfalls of

academics-as-consultants are many and varied. How do students know that the diagnostics offered by academics aren't driven by consulting interests and vice versa? (p. 110).

Similar potential conflicts of interest may also occur when working adjuncts employ personal cases based on their consulting successes in the classroom with the not-so-subtle message they are for hire. That this is a primary way of engaging with the contemporary business world, and so in some ways meets the need for faculty to stay up to date with current business practice and therefore relevant, muddies the waters somewhat. Nevertheless, it would seem to compromise faculty accountability (at least sometimes), which is another very important institutional expectation regarding its faculty.

Accountability

More than ever before the issue of faculty accountability has come to the business school faculty. No longer can a faculty member just teach his or her course load, advise a few students, research and publish, do some occasional consulting, and engage in campus related service activities. Now there is an increasing catalog of metrics against which the faculty person must be formally measured. Some of the pressure for increased accountability comes from within the institution and the college. But some influence also comes from regional and professional accreditation organizations (e.g., AACSB) that set benchmark minimal standards for a range of measurable faculty activities in the form of the Assurance of Learning (AOL) component of the (re)accreditation review standards. A faculty member's success may be measured differently according to any one of his roles.

In the role of a teacher, a faculty member is now often measured on the effective impact of their teaching. This focus on learning outcomes is often measured over several semesters/quarters to demonstrate effectiveness trends.

As a productive scholar the faculty person is expected to add to the discipline's body of knowledge. This is often through research and the publications that follow. From these activities the faculty person contributes to building his/her professional reputation as well as adding value to the overall reputational capital of the college. It is not uncommon for specific publication targets to be set and measured.

Faculty are required to participate in college and campus service activities as part of their professional obligations. This contribution to the general academic community cements the social and political integration of the faculty person and is a solid measure of his/her commitment to the growth and development of the campus community. Service activities, too, are accounted for on an annual basis.

Harder to quantify and measure is how impactful a faculty person may be in assisting current students and alums with career advice and placement help. Many faculty members in professional disciplines have developed significant relationships with firms and hiring managers, sometimes through past work experience, through consulting activities, or simply through professional association. These relationships are a powerful tool for helping an aspiring student to launch his or her career.

Although most faculty members typically shun participating in college administrative roles, those that do are able to provide council to key administrative staff personnel, help build the school's brand awareness by participating in highly visible external activities, and help generate much-needed additional funds for student scholarships, program support, and research. Faculty who donate time and energy in externally focused activities have an impact on building the visibility of the school which, in turn, often impacts such important metrics as local, regional and national rankings and the brand of the individual business school.

Expectations by Faculty

With the changing face of higher education many business school faculty members are faced with a different workplace reality than when they began their career. In simpler times faculty members were expected to do a simpler set of activities that served the mission of the college, their career, and the development of students. While those elements fundamentally remain the same for most working faculty, a life in the academy today challenges old assumptions and has created a growing sense of dissatisfaction along with serious concern about the future of the profession.

Against this background of increasing scrutiny about how faculty spend their time and how effective their activities are, there are expectations that the faculty have about their professional life, how they are treated, and what is important to them. Below we consider several of the most important expectations faculty hold for their careers, and what each ideally contributes.

Autonomy and Flexibility

Similar to other present-day professional organizations such as law firms, consultancies, and medical practices, faculty members view themselves as privileged partners in the business and governance of the college. As such, they expect to have a say in decisions that may impact the brand and budget of the school and how major initiatives will impact their own professional branding. Clayton Christensen, writing in his book, “The Innovative University” (2011), observed that:

Many [faculty] have chosen academic life and a particular academic institution over higher-paying opportunities and with a sense of commitment that goes beyond what the typical company can expect. The quid pro quo for this faculty commitment is [an active] voice in the decisions that affect not only their work but their professional lives. (p. 380).

To an outsider the faculty may be sometimes viewed as independent contractor with guaranteed employment. Unlike most other professional knowledge workers, college professors seem to make their own hours, often have extra consulting income, are notorious for not being a willing team member, and are sometimes best characterized as counter-dependent. Moreover, senior faculty are notorious for displays of arrogance, mistreatment of junior faculty and of college staff, and of general asocial behavior “because the stakes are so low.” Occasionally, faculty diffidence puts them at odds with their students.

Still, most career faculty take their position in the college and their role in society most seriously. Tenure, or the prospect of it, has removed much of the insecurity concerning employment that other professionals in western society must face. Along with the financial security of tenure is the assured promise of academic freedom, which affords members of the professoriate the rare guarantee that they can speak their mind without fear of retribution or censure – a protection the US constitution guarantees but for which many private sector colleagues may face political reprisal.

Compensation may be relatively low when compared to private sector professionals but business faculty often receive salaries at a higher rate than other professors on campus, the rationale being that business faculty could earn much more working in the private sector unlike English or History professors. (Note: supporting this reasoning, the highest paid faculty in most universities are MD/PhDs. It would be irrational to expect a fully competent surgeon to earn just \$75K per year. Of course, this conflicts somewhat with the widespread academic view that faculty should remain aloof from free market forces that shape other aspects of society, teaching the classes that students “ought” to learn and dodging the capitalistic notion of student as consumer.)

At the far end of the autonomy scale, some faculty are even able to manage their research and teaching schedules such that they are free of campus obligations for entire semesters, thus leaving time for outside consulting or other remunerative activities. Playing into this is a cultural difference that colors how members of faculty view their professional identity. Noted sociologist Howard Becker observed that, “French professors think of themselves as civil servants while American ones imagine themselves as Entrepreneurs” (1963). While civil servants give unstintingly, entrepreneurs need time to think, create, recharge. Such things require autonomous decision-making and considerable flexibility.

Unfortunately, in many ways the flexibility faculty desire directly contradicts with the flexibility faculty *provide* in the most successful programs. Because many students (and often the ideal business student) emerge from strong work backgrounds, they are likely to benefit from alternative times, meeting places, and technological approaches that take into consideration the demands of work and family. Faculty who have a hard time adjusting their own schedules do not contribute to the most successful business school programs; and yet, the happiest faculty members are those who feel their *own* needs are being met.

Limited Constraints

At first blush, valuing limited constraints might seem the same as valuing autonomy, and in some ways the two are closely related. However, while autonomy dictates the room to make one's own decisions as a faculty member, limited constraints addresses the fact that faculty often seek out schedules free of burdens which take time away from the research that drew them to the academy.

Faculties are not unlike most working professionals in that they desire more administrative resources, fewer nonacademic tasks, and minimal operational responsibilities. Because most successful college faculty members tend to be self-motivated and self-directed actors, the more time-consuming activities – advising, mentoring, administrative duties, and general community service – asked of them, the greater their resistance. For the most part, faculty at primarily research institutions would rather spend more time with their research and writing while faculty at primarily teaching colleges would rather simply teach. Neither is enamored of service commitments, helping to raise funds for scholarships, or spending time building external relationships.

“Good and Better” Students

Howard S. Becker, a major figure in Sociology for more than sixty years, observed in his book on the shared values and behaviors of deviant groups, *The Outsiders* (1963), that any social group, insider or outsider, ends by divorcing itself from the group it's supposed to be serving. He continues that, “Everyone has an ideal student or audience in mind, and [is disappointed that he] never gets them.” Becker concludes that this sense of disappointment and separation from students makes professors impatient and occasionally at odds with their students.

A persistent challenge for any teacher is creating and executing a curriculum that serves a broad distribution of student needs. The student readiness profile of most business classes is not homogeneous; students come to the topic with a range of minor and significant work experiences and thus address the subject matter with different foundational assumptions. The more experienced student who has worked for several years expects more from his or her instructor than the novice. Likewise, some students come with different capabilities, learning styles, and motivations for learning. This means that “one size fits all” teaching serves only a segment of the entire class and, as such, the professor is challenged to find multiple connection points with the multiple student profiles that may attend class on a given day.

Because the admissions process is often more art than science, there is no sure way to ensure that all students have an adequate level of literacy or numeracy to successfully engage with the course content, regardless of what the faculty member might ideally expect. Nor is there a guarantee that each student enrolled in a class will share the same degree of enthusiasm and commitment to learning the subject matter. If a student believes that a particular course will serve his personal career objective or if he simply “feels” a natural affinity with the subject, then he will apply himself and perform well in the course. A student who fails to see the utility or relevance of the course will quickly lose interest and motivation to perform. It is the rare self-motivated student who is able to surpass his own bias or technical prejudice and devote the required commitment needed to excel in every course he takes.

These facts, of course, do not stop faculty from wishing for students with that rare combination of ability, attitude, motivation, and interest. Failing to get them may result in professorial disillusionment and an even more dogged desire to focus on research and other solo activities, but ideally good students can help combat this pessimistic view and keep faculty engaged in the hard work of teaching.

Organizational Commitment

Earning the commitment and loyalty of their organization frequently motivates faculty members. They crave career advancements both for personal reward and to earn tenure, which guarantees lifelong employment and, as mentioned above, frees them from a main professional woe in developed society: job uncertainty.

They also desire congenial and collegial work environments, where they are appreciated, do not frequently experience conflict, and get what they want from their jobs without undue wrangling. Campbell and O'Meara (2013) paint a fictional but nevertheless illustrative picture of two different assistant professors, one of whom experiences support, encouragement, and opportunity, and the other of

whom faces closed doors, restrictions of opportunity, and little backing. Of the two, it is easy to see which would be unhappier, and easy to see why. Beyond the tangible lacks, the second assistant professor also receives little ongoing reassurance that her institution cares about her or her career at all. Faculty who feel this way are likelier to look elsewhere for satisfaction and fulfillment.

Resources

Given the right resources, however, faculty can find a lot of fulfillment from their positions. Especially when tenure is added to the formula, being a working faculty person is a desired role in society. The positive side of an academic life is the ability to control multiple variables in a professional setting, unlike peer industry professionals. For example, a typical tenure track faculty member is able to flexibly manage his or her time away from the classroom to take on consulting engagements, work from home if desired, and conduct research. Many faculty members receive financial assistance to support research projects, prep for new course development, and acquire relevant technology to help them with instruction or research agenda. Faculty who work in larger research-oriented institutions often have assistance from TAs, RAs or GAs for assistance managing classroom administrative functions and help with research tasks.

Finally, in addition to the more tangible elements of faculty support, resource availability, and compensation, a faculty member typically enjoys enhanced prestige and recognition from their role. Being a professor provides the intrinsic satisfaction of eliciting respect and deference from others in the community.

Aligning Personal and Organizational Expectations

To this point the majority of this article has focused on the ways in which faculty expectations and expectations of faculty do not align. While it is unlikely these divides will evaporate any time soon, it is a problem that is far from insoluble and there are forces at work that may motivate such changes (Byrne 2015). Several approaches offer potential reconciliation.

Candid Dialogue and Proactive Career Management of Faculty

One of the first ways to align the needs of faculty with the needs of the institution is, as cliché as it might sound, to keep an open line of communication about the requirements of each. Only when both sides feel free to speak candidly does each have the best chance of supporting the other and meeting her/its needs.

More specifically, there is a marked need to manage the career life cycle of each faculty member in a way that works for that specific faculty member, ensures engagement at every stage of the career, and increases the chance that that faculty is able to successfully give back to the institution at each stage. In this way, the needs and abilities of an associate professor will differ from that of an assistant professor, and that of a full professor.

Allowance must also be made for the various emphases faculty may be suited for and desirous of in their careers. While some may be better suited to research, others may feel called to spend more of their time teaching, and still others might benefit from a proportionally greater amount of time devoted to service than their peers. So long as faculty feel suited to their roles, they are likelier to be happy. However, these roles – whether research- or teaching-oriented or otherwise – must fit the needs of the organization, or else the possible alignment will fail.

This has significant implications for hiring, in that organizations and the programs they offer should actively seek to cultivate a mix of faculty specializations and roles, the combination of which can meet overall needs. It is, however, possible to re-tool existing faculty so that they cleave closer to those needs as well; no need to throw the baby out with the bathwater.

Match Programs to Faculty Competences with Clear Linkage to Resource Allocation

Heads of programs must be prepared to unambiguously articulate the business model, including the sources of revenue and costs, in order for this approach to work. Faculty must understand where revenue comes from (i.e. the number and type of students, grants, etc.), thereby clarifying their responsibilities to

the institution; by contributing to revenue, faculty create value. They should also be privy to costs of various activities, travel, specialized facilities, and more, as well as which faculty activities and outcomes influence brand most strongly (thereby attracting students, and earning revenue and other resources).

By so doing, faculty gain an understanding of how to influence revenue in order to facilitate getting what they want (covering their desired costs and earning privileges), as well as how to help the college achieve its mission and bolster its brand.

Refocus on Educational and Research Program(s) as Planning Unit

The current approach for program planning is bottom-up: faculty define courses that they believe contribute to programs, as well as individual research projects that combined comprise the organization's research output.

While faculty should certainly have a say in the design of the program, it is *the program itself* that should define the planning unit, thereby bringing faculty members together and unifying their goals: to create a stronger and better branded program. Courses should be designed to match program needs and programmatic learning outcomes, and research that is consistent with identified strategic foci should take priority over other types.

Proactively Facilitate Interaction of Faculty and Business

By bringing together faculty and business, programs and students not only benefit from the real-world knowledge of business leaders and corporate environments, but faculty will gain valuable insight from businesspeople who can teach them and help them develop outside the traditional academic setting.

Further, by bringing industry leaders and trendsetters into the college setting and seeing firsthand how cutting-edge technology and business practices are put to work, both faculty and their students benefit. Interesting problems that require solutions – and that extend beyond the realm of traditional case studies, without tidily prepackaged answers – inject business schools with much-needed real world application. Especially valuable are businesspeople who can collaborate with faculty to produce an enriching, novel experience for their students.

It is perhaps easier to see how such collaboration benefits the students and the program than it is to understand how it benefits faculty, but the boons are certainly there. For one thing, faculty can use such approaches as their contributions to brand and revenue, banking privileges and funds for their own use. For another, enrichment of faculty also occurs in this environment, deepening research work, cultivating connections, and providing opportunity for “extracurricular” work in the business world (for instance, speaking or consulting).

Rethink Artificial Distinctions Between Faculty and Staff

A collegiate culture is really multiple cultures coexisting. Students, faculty, and staff each tend to view the institution from their unique perspective and may be insensitive to the goals and commitments of their colleagues. At many colleges and universities, a rife conflict unfortunately exists between faculty and staff. Clearly a university is a faculty-centric construct with staff orbiting the faculty's central role. However, the distinct caste strata that exist from this often creates contention, conflict, and even abuse for those staff persons who are without organizational influence.

This sad reality has been universally recognized and attempts to remedy perceptions and reality of faculty abuse and disrespect of staff have emerged at various institutions. Successful efforts made to address faculty/staff relations generally acknowledge that there are differences in roles, but that both faculty and staff bring value to the college and equally share responsibility for creating and sustaining a positive work environment.

The changing scope of higher education is bringing the roles of faculty and staff closer together. The question of who reports to whom will become increasingly ambiguous. For example, the increased use of experiential learning and action learning activities often rely upon non-faculty for logistical and operational support. Here, the faculty person will manage and control the educational process while staff will manage the operational support activities. Likewise, staff-driven design, development and

implementation of program cross-campus partnerships, program tracks, custom executive education, and other administrative-centered responsibilities will often place faculty in a collegial supporting capacity.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Crainer and Dearlove (1999) suggest several recommendations that are meant to address faculty issues in twenty-first century business schools. These include (1) involving working executives in teaching because, “the nuts and bolts of business need to be introduced into classroom teaching,” instead of relying on the abstractions of theory; (2) recruiting faculty from a broader base because, “the shortage of high-caliber business academics means that in the future business schools will [suffer from this lack of supply unless] they cast a wider net,” and reach out to colleagues in other disciplines and to practitioners; (3) revisit the tenure system because this imposes pedagogic (or andragogic) constraints over the long term; (4) end faculty consulting because the impact is that, “at present, both students and business schools are being shortchanged,” by permitting this practice; and (5) revisit the ways that faculty are rewarded because, “measuring academics by their publications is limited and limiting.” As such, schemes such as performance-based compensation as measured against college priorities should be employed.

Datar, Garvin, and Cullen, writing in, *Rethinking the MBA: Business education at a crossroads*, (2010) argue that business schools must become more responsive to the market. They recommend (1) building a faculty with a global perspective who are able to engage with issues of international commerce; (2) selecting faculty who are capable of integrating course content by function and discipline; (3) choosing faculty who are able to discuss today’s organizational realities due to their own practical experience because graduates of business programs often do not understand how business works or how management decisions are made. In short there is a gap that business faculty must fill between the simplistic learning objectives in a typical functional course and the realities of the twenty-first century workplace; and (4) faculty must take the lead in setting high standards for creative and innovative thinking because, “lectures and case studies provide only limited training in these skills.” (Datar, Garvin and Cullen 2010, p. 95). Further, “the most important thing that business [faculty] do is prepare students for a world that is unpredictable.” (Datar, Garvin and Cullen 2010, p. 96).

Henry Mintzberg (2004) adds that business schools “need faculty ... who are seasoned, attuned to the concern of the practitioners, and knowledgeable about management and business issues in general ... They also need to be able to think on their feet, which means they have to be good scholars, willing to go with the flow in the classroom, with the confidence to shift gears when something [new] and interesting comes up.” (p. 355).

To find such faculty, of course, institutions of higher learning will need to maintain the sort of attractive academic environment to which quality professors (and staff, and students) will be drawn. While requiring that faculty people take on a wider variety of roles and play a larger hand in propping up program aims and generating revenue is reasonable – and in the long run will likely result in more engaged, more productive and happier faculty – in the short term the risk is that faculty may feel overwhelmed by responsibilities that veer too sharply from the expectations they held in becoming professors.

Using the suggestions above will help remediate this, certainly, but drawing faculty into the conversation is also crucial. While conversation is neither panacea nor substitution for meeting faculty needs, it does prevent the feeling of “closed doors” that Campbell and O’Meara illustrate in their vignette of the unhappy assistant professor. Bridging the gulf will not happen instantaneously, but an honest discussion of what is needed to do it and what role everyone must play in the interim and in future will go a long way toward drawing together and satisfying the expectations of all.

In response to the changing nature of business education, future faculties will look much different than today’s professors. In addition to being a teacher, a published researcher, and a service-minded participant in college governance, the successful 21st century professor will assume an active professional partnership in promoting the political and economic health of the B-school externally to the greater business community as well as on campus. As with other working professionals such as consulting firms, medical groups and law firms, the new professor will assume a greater hands-on portfolio of roles that will contribute to the greater success of the organization.

The modern faculty person will forgo the old isolated notion of complete autonomy and assume the more integrative role of a collegial team Player. It is simply not enough to teach your course load, publish, and hold office hours. Further, faculty need to adapt to new instructional technologies, become globally sensitive, participate in promoting the school's brand, take on student centric responsibilities, and support a process of curriculum revision and renewal. Finally, faculty must give up the endemic condescending arrogance and disrespect of college staff or faculty.

But it isn't enough to posit a list of new faculty responsibilities. College leadership should consider adding these, and other metrics, to the annual review process so that, with accountability over time, the college will continue to grow and compete in the changing arena of business and management education.

REFERENCES

- American Federation of Teachers (www.aftface.org).
- Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (2015). *2015 Business School Data Guide*. Retrieved from <http://www.aacsb.edu/~media/AACSB/Publications/data-trends-booklet/2015%20Business%20School%20Data%20Guide.ashx>.
- Becker, H. S. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bennis, W., & O'Toole, J. (2005). How business schools lost their way. *Harvard Business Review*, 83 (5), 96-104.
- Byrne, J. A. (2015). Are U. S. Business Schools Headed for a G-M like fall? *Poets & Quants*, Aug. 15, <http://poetsandquants.com/2015/08/17/are-u-s-business-schools-headed-for-a-gm-like-fall/>
- Campbell, C. M., & O'Meara, KA. (2013). Faculty agency: Departmental contexts that matter in faculty careers. *Research in Higher Education*, 55 (1), 49-74.
- Christensen, C. & Eyring, H.J. (2011). *The innovative university*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Crainger, S., & Dearlove, D. (1999). *Gravy training: Inside the business of business schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Datar, S. M., Garvin, D. A., & Cullen, P.G. (2010). *Rethinking the MBA: Business education at a crossroads*. Boston: Harvard Business Press.
- Gordon R. A., & Howell, J. E. (1959). *Higher education for business*. New York: Ford Foundation.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hawawini, G. (2005). The future of business schools. *Journal of Management Development*, 24 (9), 770-782.
- Knowles, M. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy*. Wilton, Connecticut: Association Press.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning as the science of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Mintzberg, H. (2004). *Managers Not MBA's*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler).
- Pfeiffer, J., & Fong, C. (2002). The end of business schools? Less success than meets the eye. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 1 (1), 78-95.
- Pierson, F. C. (1959). *The education of American businessmen: A study of university-college programs in business administration*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Wilson, R. (2012). *Why are associate professors so unhappy?* Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Why-Are-Associate-Professors/132071/>.