

UCLA

Information and Technology

Title

Sixteenth Annual UCLA Survey of Business School Computer Usage: Business School Dean's Issues

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4cr7p4kq>

Authors

Britt, Julia A.
Fisher, Dorothy M.
Levine, Gary R.
et al.

Publication Date

1999-09-01

THE JOHN E. ANDERSON GRADUATE
SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT AT UCLA

BUSINESS SCHOOL DEANS' ISSUES

**Sixteenth Annual UCLA Survey
of
Business School Computer Usage**

**Conducted in cooperation with
AACSB - The International Association for Management Education**

November 1999

**Julia A. Britt
Dorothy M. Fisher
Gary R. Levine
Jason L. Frand**

BUSINESS SCHOOL DEANS' ISSUES

Sixteenth Annual UCLA Survey of Business School Computer Usage

**Conducted in cooperation with
AACSB - The International Association for Management Education**

November 1999

**Julia A. Britt
Dorothy M. Fisher
School of Management, California State University, Dominguez Hills**

**Gary R. Levine
Extended Education, California State University, Dominguez Hills**

**Jason L. Frand
The John E. Anderson Graduate School of Management at UCLA**

The authors wish to thank those individuals who took the time to gather the extensive data necessary to complete the questionnaire. Without their efforts this survey would have been impossible. Appreciation also is extended to the business school deans and computing services directors who reviewed the draft questionnaire. A very special thank you is given to Susan Gutman for her assistance with every aspect of the survey process.

**The John E. Anderson Graduate School of Management at UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1481
(310) 825-2870
Fax (310) 825-4835**

Executive Summary

The 1999 Sixteenth Annual UCLA Survey of Business School Computer Usage is a continuation of a series of surveys whose purpose is to provide a comprehensive overview of the business school computing, communication, and information technology environment. This year's survey replicated one from twelve years ago, with deans from 215 business schools from eight countries identifying their three most critical general issues and their three most critical information technology issues. The sample is demographically very similar to samples from the last six surveys.

Findings

Content analysis was used to interpret the deans' qualitative responses regarding the top three **general issues** facing their business schools and to transform them into a quantitative format. Disregarding priority rankings, 34% of their responses had some sort of a strategic component, indicated by the use of such words and/or phrases as planning, raising, increasing, continuous improvement, outcomes assessment, leading, strategic focus, reaching the top rank, comparative advantages, or market place competition. Faculty issues (31%) followed closely, with financial (25%), curriculum (20%), technology (15%), and student (14%) issues completing the general issues apparently of most concern to the deans. When the general issues were considered by priority rankings, faculty issues at 34% led as the first priority. Strategic and faculty issues were about the same as the second priority (35% and 36% respectively), and strategic (38%) as the third priority.

Overall, the deans' qualitative responses were about five words in length and had an average richness factor (the number of issue categories in a single response) of 1.59. As could be expected, strategic concepts were most often combined with financial (41%), and then less often with the curriculum (17%), and the faculty (13%). Faculty issues were found in combination most often with issues concerning finances (28%), and then technology (17%), the curriculum (16%), and then strategy (14%).

Demographic data allowed analysis of the response data by several groups including accredited/non-accredited, public/private, school size by student FTE, and type of program. Significant differences in the general response categories were shown when the schools were separated by type of program and accreditation status. One major differentiating factor by the type of program analysis appeared to be related to more concern for international issues by the MBA only programs. Obviously, the major differentiating issue for the accredited/non-accredited grouping was the degree of concern for accreditation by the non-accredited schools.

Content analysis was similarly used to interpret the deans' qualitative responses regarding the top three **information technology issues** facing their business schools and to transform them into a quantitative format. Disregarding priority rankings, 42% of their responses had some sort of a strategic component, again indicated by the use of such words and/or phrases as given above. And, faculty issues (30%), technology changes (20%), financial (16%), training (16%), staff (15%), Web/networking (13%), curriculum (12%), and student (11%) issues followed. When the information technology issues were considered by priority rankings, strategic issues were consistently the major issue at any of the priority rankings, followed by faculty and technology change issues.

On average, the deans' qualitative information technology responses were a little longer and richer than their general issues responses. The information technology responses averaged just over six words long and had an average richness factor (the number of issue categories in a single response) of 2.08. The information technology responses strategic issues were most often combined with faculty issues, and continuing, faculty issues were then most often combined with training.

When using the demographic data to analyze the information technology response data by various groupings, significant differences were seen when the schools were separated by type of program and school size. One major differentiating factor by the type of program analysis appeared to be related to more concern for Web-related issues by the MBA only programs. Additionally, the business schools with 1,000 to 2,000 full-time equivalent students seemed to show more concern with strategic issues, regardless of priority ranking.

Comparisons between the dean's responses to the Third Survey and the Sixteenth Survey showed that the same **general issues** were recurrent - faculty, money, curriculum, management, facilities space, and technology. Faculty recruitment, retention, salaries, research productivity, and development which were delineated in the Third Survey remained a high priority, yet the Sixteenth Survey responses tended to point toward even more emphasis on faculty salaries in a competitive sense, not only between business schools but also with industry. Faculty development remained an ongoing issue, but the Sixteenth Survey responses seemed to reflect more demand for depth and integration of technology. As pointed out in the Fifteenth Survey, computers are now ubiquitous, and the issue is not in their acquisition, but rather in the integration of the potential of information technologies into daily life. And, curriculum issues appear in both surveys with concern shown for curriculum development and keeping the curriculum current. Yet, as for the faculty issues above, there appears to be an emphasis on the breadth of curriculum change needed, as well as its urgency. Further, business school administration issues now seem to have taken on even more priority than before, but with an emphasis on a strategic orientation and an emphasis on leadership and response to competitive pressures rather than being focused on management issues and maintaining the status quo. One of these sources of new competition, as well as opportunity, is distance learning. And, as common as the issue of internationalization has become, it was interesting to look back and find that it hadn't even surfaced as an issue in the Third Survey.

Terminology for the second set of issues has changed between the surveys and reflects the change from a focus on the hardware itself to broader utilization and applications. In the Third, "Computer-Related" was used, whereas in the Sixteenth the term is now "Information Technology." As has been pointed in the last several surveys, most business schools now have acquired the basic infrastructure, including the underlying network. Technology acquisition, a central issue of the Third Survey, although not ever a non-issue, has been replaced by concerns for keeping the technology maintained and upgraded, including the problems of finding adequate staff to handle the constant changes and improvements. A more central issue involves the real integration of information technology into the business school curriculum and the problems of providing students with the requisite skills necessary to make an impact in a world that often seems to be moving ahead of business schools in actual applications. The issue no longer is concerned with the development of an MIS major, but rather the development of an entire E-commerce MBA and getting faculty and students to be as information technology savvy as their corporate counterparts. As with the general issues, the information technology issue responses seemed to project a sense of urgency, as well as a

need for a real balance between the traditional business school curriculum and the education being demanded by the information technology market place.

Both the Third and Sixteenth Survey General Issues and the Information Technology Issues simultaneously seemed to be similar and different. The major categories were the same, but the realities within the categories have changed. These changes mirror the context within which business schools operate. It is hard to imagine, but the world is even more competitive, chaotic, rapidly changing, deeper and broader than it was in 1986, only thirteen years ago. Business school deans have to address the same issues, such as recruiting and retaining high quality faculty, motivating faculty to continually embrace new developments, acquiring financial resources, making innovative and relevant curricular changes, and integrating information technology into both teaching and learning. Yet, now there is a broader scope to the issues and additional competitive pressures such as internationalization, world-wide connectivity, instant communication, technological advances that enable distance learning, and the blurring of boundaries between the traditional and the technologically possible. Evidenced by the richness and quality of the responses, business school deans seem to be making admirable progress, even though they have to repeatedly address many of the same issues while at the same time managing and leading within a much more difficult context.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Profile of Participating Schools	2
Table 1: Demographics of Participating Schools	3
3. General Issues	2
Table 2: General Issues	4
Table 3: General Issues Response Combinations	6
Table 4: General Issues - Responses by Demographic Groupings	7
4. Information Technology Issues	8
Table 5: Information Technology Issues	8
Table 6: Information Technology Issues Response Combinations	10
Table 7: Information Technology Issues - Responses by Demographic Groupings	11
5. Issues Comparison - Third and Sixteenth Surveys.....	12
Table 8: Comparison of Deans' Issues - Third and Sixteenth Surveys	13

Appendices

A. General Business School Data	
B. General Issues:	
Table 1: Priority Rankings and Total Responses for Non-accredited and Accredited Business Schools	
Table 2: Priority Rankings and Total Responses for Public and Private Business Schools	
Table 3: Priority Rankings and Total Responses for Business Schools of Different Sizes	
Table 4: Priority Rankings and Total Responses for Business Schools with Different Programs	
C. Information Technology Issues:	
Table 1: Priority Rankings and Total Responses for Non-accredited and Accredited Business Schools	
Table 2: Priority Rankings and Total Responses for Public and Private Business Schools	
Table 3: Priority Rankings and Total Responses for Business Schools of Different Sizes	
Table 4: Priority Rankings and Total Responses for Business Schools with Different Programs	
D. Tables from Third Survey:	
Table 2: General Issues Facing Business Schools	
Table 3: Computer-related Issues Facing Business Schools	

1. Introduction

What are the issues facing business school deans? The goal of this, the Sixteenth UCLA Survey of Business School Computer Usage, conducted in cooperation with AACSB - The International Association for Management Education, is to continue to monitor, report, and reflect on the changing nature of the business school computing environment.¹ The purpose over the years has remained the same - to provide information that can assist with business school program plans and technology allocation decisions. As always, it is stressed that the focus of these surveys is to summarize what the schools report they are doing, rather than project what they should be doing.

Business school deans face a wide variety of issues and only some of these are directly related to information technology. Deans must achieve an awareness of the present and insight into the future of the constantly changing business environment in order to prepare their students for productive leadership responsibilities. The schools also must meet competitive pressures, not only from other business schools, but from the newly emerging in-house corporate universities and on-line education providers. Budget constraints are forcing many schools to seek external funding. Continual advances in information technology are dynamic and comprehensive, expanding to include a wide scope of hardware, software, network, communication, and application alternatives. Additionally, due to experience and emergent technology options, faculty, student, administrative, and recruitment requirements and expectations continue to change. All of these dynamics, developments, and alternatives exacerbate planning and resource allocations. Policy and decision-makers continue to need information that enables a perspective beyond the boundary of the individual business school.

For the first nine years, the Annual UCLA Surveys reported on data from AACSB-accredited business schools in the United States and Canada. In 1993, because of growing international interest in the North American data and requests for a more global perspective, the survey population was extended in spite of confounding issues such as differences in culture, economics, educational structures and traditions, language barriers, funding sources, and governmental policies. In 1994, the survey population was further extended to include accredited as well as non-accredited schools. This 1999 survey continues with this expanded population.²

Each year the focus of the surveys changes. The First, Second, Fourth, Sixth, Eighth, Tenth, and Fourteenth Surveys presented information on hardware, software, and other technology resources of the schools. The Fifth, Ninth, and Thirteenth Surveys focused on business school computerization in terms of process, pointing out that the introduction, diffusion, and use of technology is ongoing and that business schools may not only be approaching computerization differently, but also at different rates. The Seventh and Twelfth Surveys detailed computer operating budgets and services to provide an overview of

¹ The Executive Summaries of past Annual UCLA Surveys of Business School Computer Usage can be found at <http://www.anderson.ucla.edu/faculty/jason.frand>. Copies of past surveys are available for US\$30 each from Computing Services, Anderson School at UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90095-14481; Fax 310-825-4835. Additional copies of the Sixteenth Survey are US\$50 each.

² Interested researchers can access the data via anonymous FTP from anderson.ucla.edu in the directory `/pub/surveys/survey1999`.

expense distribution and estimated service costs. The Eleventh and Fifteenth Surveys focused on new technologies.

This survey, the Sixteenth, replicates the entire Third Survey conducted in 1986 in order to identify possible new issues facing business schools deans, as well as to understand those issues that have remained constant over the past thirteen years. Whenever possible, historical data from other surveys are included to position the findings within a long-term context. However, these surveys do not comprise an exact longitudinal study as there is variation in the sample from year to year. The accuracy of the comparisons between years is, therefore, a function of the changing samples, yet given the overall consistency, identification of some general trends seems appropriate.

This report is divided into five sections: Introduction, Profile of Participating Schools, General Issues, Information Technology Issues, and Comparison between the Third and Sixteenth Surveys.

2. Profile of Participating Schools

The questionnaire was sent to the entire AACSB membership, this year totaling 791 business schools, including 94 from 34 countries other than the United States and Canada. Two hundred and fifteen business schools choose to participate, a 27% response rate. Appendix A presents general demographics for these respondents. The short, three-page questionnaire presented three questions. The first asked deans to identify their top three current general issues in order of importance. The second question asked for an explanation of how, if at all, information technology related to their general issues. The final question asked for identification of their three most critical information technology issues, again in order of importance. Deans, associate deans, and other directors (92%), computer center directors (6%), and department chairs/faculty (2%) completed the questionnaire.

Table 1 presents general information about the 215 respondent schools for this Sixteenth Survey, together with the demographics from all of the previous surveys. In general, this table reflects a rather consistent profile in spite of varying business school participation each year. This year's sample remains predominantly North American with a distribution of international schools similar to the Eleventh through Fifteenth Surveys. Further, the spread of school size has remained just about the same since the shift between the Tenth and Eleventh Surveys when participation was opened to the entire AACSB membership rather than being limited to accredited schools. This year's sample is comprised of 65% public schools, close to the average shown since the Tenth and Eleventh shift. The percentage of schools offering both undergraduate and graduate programs appears to be increasing slightly.

Finally, as shown in the lower portion of Table 1, the focus of this year's survey is on Deans' Issues, a topic not addressed since the Third Survey in 1986. The Sixteenth Survey questionnaire is a replication of the Third, thus allowing for some very generalized comparisons.

3. General Issues

Content analysis was used to interpret the deans' qualitative responses and transform them into a quantitative format. Twelve different categories of general issues emerged from the data. These are identified in Table 2.

Table 1
Demographics of Participating Schools
 (percent of schools)

	2nd 1985 N=125	3rd 1986 N=111	4th 1987 N=128	5th 1988 N=175	6th 1989 N=163	7th 1990 N=145	8th 1991 N=166	9th 1992 N=178	10th 1993 N=180	11th 1994 N=353	12th 1995 N=240	13th 1996 N=293	14th 1997 N=252	15th 1998 N=232	16th 1999 N=215
Type of school: Public	69%	72%	67%	68%	68%	70%	68%	71%	71%	66%	62%	60%	64%	72%	65%
Private	31	28	33	32	32	30	32	29	29	31	32	36	36	28	35
No data										3	6	4			
Degrees offered:															
Undergraduate only	2	1	2	2	3	3	5	6	6	11	14	12	10	6	5
Undergraduate & graduate	86	91	85	88	89	86	86	86	81	74	77	74	76	80	84
Graduate only	12	5	13	10	7	9	7	6	10	9	8	7	7	10	9
No data		3			1	2	2	2	3	6	1	7	7	4	2
Student enrollment (FTE):															
Less than 1000 students	22	21	25	24	22	23	22	18	18	34	43	37	36	35	34
Between 1000 and 2000	22	34	27	21	26	28	29	33	34	26	28	30	29	28	28
Between 2000 and 3000	26	24	24	23	20	20	20	20	19	16	15	14	13	17	18
More than 3000 students	30	18	24	32	31	27	27	27	26	17	12	11	15	16	18
No data		3			1	2	2	2	3	6	2	8	7	4	2
Geographic region:															
US/Canada	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	83	92	94	93	94	95
Europe									7	4	3	3	5	4	4
Asia/Australia									6	2	<1	1	<1	<1	<1
Latin/South America									3	1	1	1	<1	1	<1
Africa/Mid-East									1	1	<1	1	<1	<1	<1
Survey focus:															
What Deans' Issues	24	241	264	264	269	274	276	288	388	678	705	771	851	782	791
What Where															
What Where															
What Where															
What Budgets															
What Budgets															
What Where															
What Where															
What New Tech															
What New Tech															
What Budgets															
What Where															
What New Tech, DL															
What Deans' Issues															

**Table 2: General Issues
(sorted by percent of total responses)**

ISSUE CATEGORIES	PRIORITY						Total School Responses = 627	
	1st Schools = 211		2nd Schools = 211		3rd Schools = 205		#	%
	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Strategic	64	30	73	35	77	38	214	34
Faculty	71	34	75	36	50	24	196	31
Financial	61	29	48	23	45	22	154	25
Curriculum	33	16	53	25	38	19	124	20
Technology	18	9	34	16	39	19	91	15
Students	34	16	23	11	30	15	87	14
Research	6	3	14	7	14	7	34	5
Distance Learning	8	4	11	5	13	6	32	5
Accreditation	18	9	2	1	4	2	24	4
Space	7	3	6	3	10	5	23	4
International	6	3	9	4	3	1	18	3
Diversity	0	0	3	1	1	0	4	1

Responses with words and phrases such as planning, raising, increasing, continuous improvement, outcomes assessment, leading, strategic focus, reaching the top rank, comparative advantages, market place competition, acquisition, and fostering innovation were categorized as strategic. Similarly, those responses using faculty or professor as a keyword and those directly referencing and/or describing faculty such as workload, scheduling, world-class, qualified, skills, and expertise were categorized as faculty. The financial category included those responses with references to financial resources, such as funds, endowments, salaries, dollars, budgets, and money. The curriculum category included such responses as management education, program development, teaching, integration, current disciplines, courses, and instruction. The technology category obviously included references to hardware and software, new technologies, infrastructure, information technology, e-commerce, the internet, and computer equipment. All references to students directly or to student support such as enrollments, recruitment, career center, graduates, undergraduate, MBA, PhD, and academic advising, were placed in the student category. Placed in the research category were those responses that included phrases such as intellectual contribution, intellectual activity, research, publication record, and scholarship. Those responses identified in the distance learning category were those that directly referenced distance learning/education, as well as Web courses, on-line teaching, expansion to additional sites, electronic delivery, remote sites, and off-campus programs. Any reference to accreditation was included in the accreditation category. Responses that concerned new buildings, renovations, and/or facilities were included in the space category, while those that included some sense of globalness were placed in the international category. Finally, the several responses referencing diversity were placed in the diversity category.

Considering the total set of responses as summarized in the last column of Table 2, 34% of the business school deans' responses included some sort of a strategic reference, followed closely by responses involving faculty, 31%. However, when considering the priority ranking for these two issues shown in the middle columns of Table 2, more schools ranked faculty issues as first or second over the strategic issues. Financial and curriculum issues followed, being identified in 25% and 20% of the deans' responses respectively, and

then technology and student issues closely together at 15% and 14% respectively. Five percent or less of the deans' responses referenced issues involving research, distance learning, accreditation, space, internationalization, and diversity. And, when these issues were identified, they most commonly were found as a second or third priority, except for accreditation. Table 2 shows that the accreditation issue, although identified by a rather low percentage of the deans, is a top priority to those who identified it.

Beyond content, the deans' responses varied in several other ways. First the responses varied in length, with an average response of just under five words long (such as "curriculum review and revisions," "use of technology in classroom," or "cultivating external financial support"), and a minimum of one word (such as "funding," "IT," "enrollment," or "resources"), and a maximum of 43 ("Maintaining a curriculum that is at the leading edge of business education, in terms of preparation of students for business careers, imparting both the knowledge required for entry level positions and the skills and perspectives required to continue to learn over a career"). Additionally, the responses varied in richness, the number of categories included in a single response. Response richness varied from one ("diversity," "space," "Web site," "accreditation") to six ("technology's impact on resource needs, faculty development, curriculum (distance delivery and infusion, acceptance of transfer credits, etc.) and facilities in general"). The 627 separate responses encompassed a total of 1001 category references, an average of 1.59 different categories (such as "fund raising," "allowing curriculum to change more rapidly," or "program assessment") being included within a single response.

Table 3 summarizes these general issue response combinations, focusing on the six most commonly identified issues as shown in Table 2. As an example, reading down the strategic column of Table 3, a strategic issue was specifically identified a total of 214 times. For 75 of these responses, or 35% of the time, this issue appeared alone, as the only issue in the response. However, it appeared in combination with one or more of the other issues 184 times, summing its occurrence with each of the other issues. Continuing down the column, a strategic orientation appeared with the faculty category 23 times, or 13% of the total 184 times a strategic issue appeared in combination. As shown in the bolded cells of this column, the strategic issue was most commonly combined with the financial issues (41% of the times it was combined), with curriculum issues (17%), and faculty issues (13%).

Examples of strategic/financial response combinations were "fund raising – and the need for current, accurate information on donor prospects," "increasing endowments," and "outflow of business revenues to general university budget." Examples of strategic/curriculum response combinations included "improving standards in the curriculum," "curricular reform," and "allowing curriculum to change more rapidly," while strategic/faculty response combinations included "attracting and keeping excellent faculty" or "motivating faculty." Less than five percent of the responses involved a strategic combination with research, distance learning, accreditation, space, and/or internationalization and none with diversity.

In contrast, the curriculum issue category appeared most often in combination with technology (26%), strategic (22%), and faculty (18%) issues, but less often or never with the other issues. Examples of curriculum/technology response combinations are "integrating technology in current disciplines," "integrating new technologies and technological concepts throughout the curriculum," and "curriculum innovation, especially IT and other technology related subjects." Examples of curriculum/faculty response combinations included "getting faculty prepared to embrace changing technology as it applies to teaching" and "difficulty in encouraging interdisciplinary activities on the part of faculty." The technology issue was

most often combined with curriculum (32%) and faculty (23%) issues. Examples of these response combinations have been given in the immediately preceding discussions.

Table 3: General Issues Response Combinations

ISSUES	Strategic		Faculty		Financial		Curriculum		Technology		Students	
times identified	214		196		154		124		91		87	
as single issue	75	35%	82	42%	26	17%	33	27%	14	15%	45	52%
in combination	184		162		166		144		117		69	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Strategic			23	14	76	46	31	22	13	11	17	25
Faculty	23	13			45	27	26	18	27	23	17	25
Financial	76	41	45	28			11	8	14	12	9	13
Curriculum	31	17	26	16	11	7			37	32	11	16
Technology	13	7	27	17	14	8	37	26			7	10
Students	17	9	17	10	9	5	11	8	7	6		
Research	7	4	18	11	5	3	11	8	4	3	3	4
Distance Learning	7	4	2	1	1	1	11	8	8	7	2	3
Accreditation	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Space	3	2	2	1	4	2	2	1	4	3	1	1
International	5	3	1	1	1	1	4	3	3	3	0	0
Diversity	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3

Response differences between groups: Responses to the first section of the survey allowed the test of significant difference between groups based on the demographic characteristics. Table 4 shows the response percentages for the general issues by several demographic characteristics.

When considering all of the responses for the general issues without regard for priority ranking, the χ^2 -values showed a significant difference in responses when the business schools were grouped by accreditation and by the type of programs they offered. The general issues were very similar for the non-accredited/accredited school groupings or the public/private groupings.

This summary data in Table 4 are indicating that, as could be expected, the non-accredited schools have the most concern for accreditation (6% versus 0.1% in top pair of rows.) Summary data by priority rankings for the General Issues (Appendix B) showed that 15% of the responses by non-accredited schools included the accreditation issue (either as a single response or in a response combination) as their first priority, compared to only two percent of the responses by the accredited schools. The χ^2 -values indicate that there was no significant difference between the responses by non-accredited and accredited schools for their second and third priority rankings.

Table 4 also shows that there was a significant difference in responses when the business schools were grouped by the type of programs they offered. When the general responses were considered without priority ranking, as in this table, one major difference seems to be that the business schools that offer only MBA programs are more concerned with internationalization than the other schools (those with only undergraduate programs or those with both undergraduate and MBA programs). Another major difference appears to be related to students, with those schools offering both undergraduate and MBA programs

showing greater concern with student-related issues. The χ^2 -values by priority rankings (Appendix B) confirmed these summary interpretations, but also showed the MBA only programs included more first priority responses dealing with faculty research (7% versus 0% and 1%) and curriculum (18% versus 6% and 9%) issues than the two other groups. Additionally, the MBA only programs showed fewer first priority responses (4%) than the other groups (22% and 20%) concerning financial issues. The undergraduate only program schools included more responses dealing with strategic issues (39% versus 29% and 11%) than the other groups. Again, there was no significant difference between responses by the non-accredited and accredited schools for their second and third priority rankings. The schools were consistent with ranking some concern related to faculty as their highest priority.

**Table 4: General Issues - Responses by Demographic Groupings
(percent of responses)**

VARIABLE	Fin	Acc	Fac	Tech	Curr	Strat	Res	DL	Intl	Stud	Space	Divrs
Accreditation:												
Non-accredited	12%	6%	20%	9%	10%	22%	4%	3%	3%	7%	2%	1%
Accredited	16	1	19	9	13	21	3	3	1	9	2	0
	$\chi^2 = 22.33$ (df = 11, p < 0.05)											
Type of school:												
Public	17	2	19	10	12	21	3	3	1	9	2	1
Private	12	3	20	7	14	22	4	3	3	8	3	0
	$\chi^2 = 18.19$ (df = 11, p < 0.07)											
Size of school:												
<1000	11	8	20	9	17	15	4	1	4	8	2	0
1000-2000	34	21	49	20	46	49	8	5	11	16	5	1
2000-3000	36	20	56	23	40	46	11	3	10	20	1	1
>3000	31	16	54	39	54	33	5	18	20	18	3	0
	$\chi^2 = 34.66$ (df = 33, p < 0.38)											
Programs:												
Ugrad only	13	3	22	11	13	25	2	0	0	6	5	0
Ugrad and MBA	16	3	20	9	12	21	3	3	1	10	2	0
MBA only	13	0	16	7	15	23	6	3	10	2	4	0
	$\chi^2 = 56.11$ (df = 22, p < 0.01)											

The set of tables in Appendix B details the percents of responses for the general issues by priority ranking. The χ^2 -values indicate that the only significant difference in the first priority responses is between public and private business schools. The major source of differences appears to be that the public schools are more concerned with money than the private schools, whereas the private schools are showing more concern for curriculum-related issues.

4. Information Technology Issues

Content analysis also was used to interpret the deans' qualitative responses to the information technology issues question and to transform them into a quantitative format. Fifteen different categories of information technology issues emerged from the data. These are identified in Table 5.

**Table 5: Information Technology Issues
(sorted by percent of total responses)**

ISSUE CATEGORIES	PRIORITY						Total School Responses = 597	
	1st Schools = 208		2nd Schools = 203		3rd Schools = 187		#	%
	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Strategic	85	41	72	35	95	51	252	42
Faculty	53	25	68	33	56	30	177	30
Technology Changes	48	23	36	18	37	20	121	20
Financial	32	15	34	17	32	17	98	16
Training	28	13	36	18	33	18	97	16
Staff	32	15	27	13	31	17	90	15
Web/networking	24	12	29	14	23	12	76	13
Curriculum	33	16	22	11	17	9	72	12
Students	23	11	19	9	24	13	66	11
Software	16	8	20	10	20	11	56	9
Distance Learning	23	11	13	6	8	4	44	7
Space	7	3	14	7	11	6	32	5
CorpRelations	8	4	3	1	9	5	20	3
E-commerce	8	4	4	2	7	4	19	3
Laptops	5	2	4	2	5	3	14	2

The responses were sorted as previously discussed for the strategic, faculty, financial, curriculum, students, distance learning, and space categories. These responses identified as concerning technology changes included words and phrases such as maintain and renew, upgrade, rapidly being made obsolete by newer technology, and keeping everything current. Similarly, those responses using training, developing skills, computer literacy/illiteracy, keeping up to date, and/or currency were categorized as technology training issues. The staff category included those responses with references directly to technology staff or support staff, IT employees, qualified technicians, and/or personnel to support IT operation. The Web/networking category included direct references to the Web, internet, and/or intranet, together with words and phrases such as data connections, remote access, bandwidth delivery, or last-mile connectivity. The software category obviously included references to software and applications, direct references such as SAP or ERP, information security, viruses, scheduling and other administrative systems, and/or data management systems. Placed in the corporate relations category were those responses that included phrases such as corporate partners, industry, partnerships with industry, the private sector, and recruiters. The e-commerce category included direct references to e-commerce, as well as e-business. Finally, the laptop category included any direct responses to laptops or portable systems.

Considering the total set of responses as summarized in the last column of Table 5, 42% of the business school deans' responses included some sort of a strategic reference,

followed by responses involving faculty, 30%. However, in contrast to the general issues, strategic issues were consistently shown above faculty issues across all of the priorities. Issues dealing with technology changes were identified in 20% of the deans' responses, followed rather closely by financial (16%), training (16%), staff (15%), Web/networking (13%), curriculum (12%), and students (11%). Nine percent or less of the deans' responses referenced issues involving software, distance learning, space, corporate relations, and e-commerce.

As with the general issues, the information technology issues varied in several other ways beyond content. Again the responses varied in length, with an average response of just over six words long, slightly longer than the general issues average of five words. Average length examples included "getting and keeping up-to-date faculty," "user friendliness of software and applications," or "competition for dollars to upgrade." The minimum response was one word such as "e-commerce," "costs," "data," or "resources." The maximum response was 80 words in length: "Information technology has resulted in a wide and growing chasm between the academy and industry which must be bridged if business schools are to effectively serve their constituencies. Faculty have never been farther from the 'cutting edge' than they are now in terms of what they teach. Once industry looked to universities for leadership in using information technology, now the converse is true. Keeping courses current and applicable requires more frequent and in depth exchange between business school faculty and industry."

Again, the responses varied in richness, with a minimum of one category ("distance learning," "keeping it all in perspective," "e-commerce," "data, data, data," or "resources") to six ("college need to hire information technology management faculty to design curriculum and research for newly appointed faculty positions in e-commerce initiative"), with an average of 2.08 different categories (such as "integrating information technology into the curriculum," "off-campus Web access for students," or "maintaining adequate support services in IT") being included within a single response. The information technology issue responses were richer than the general issues. There were slightly fewer information technology responses, 596 (versus 629 for the general issues) but they encompassed a total of 1,235 category references (versus 1,001 for the general responses), an average richness of 2.08 (as compared to 1.59 for the general issues). Additionally, fifteen distinct categories emerged for the technology issues as compared to only twelve for the general issues.

Table 6 summarizes these information technology response combinations, focusing on the six most commonly identified issues as shown in Table 5. As an example, reading down the strategic column of Table 6, a strategic issue was specifically identified a total of 252 times. For 32 of these responses, or 13% of the time, this issue appeared alone, as the only issue in the response. However, it appeared in combination with one or more of the other issues 378 times, summing its occurrence with each of the other issues. Continuing down the column, a strategic orientation appeared with the faculty category 78 times, or 31% of the total 378 times it appeared in combination. As shown in the bolded cells of this column, the strategic issue was most commonly combined with the faculty issues (31% of the times it was combined), with technology changes issues (14%), with financial issues (16%), staff (19%), Web/networking concerns (10%), curriculum issues (10%), and student issues (13%).

Examples of strategic/faculty response combinations, the most common information technology combination, are "finding and retaining good IS faculty," "faculty acceptance and use of technology, IT incentives," or "motivating faculty to continually learn more technology." Examples of strategic/technology change combinations included "maintaining

up-to-date equipment and software," "guessing wrong on direction or pace of IT change," and "acquiring state-of-the-art equipment," while strategic/financial response combinations included "how much and what kind of investment must be made" or "getting funding to support initial costs." Examples of strategic/staff combinations included "acquiring and retaining capable technological managers and staff" or "keeping qualified technicians on staff." Strategic/Web/networking combinations included "effective Web presence for the college" or "acquisition of Web-based instructional technology." Examples of

Table 6: Information Technology Issue Response Combinations

ISSUES	Strategic		Faculty		TechChanges		Financial		Training		Staff	
times identified	252		177		121		98		97		90	
as single issue	32	13%	15	8%	22	18%	17	17%	3	3%	11	12%
in combination	378		246		137		118		159		112	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Strategy			79	45	35	29	41	42	23	24	49	54
Faculty	78	31			32	26	20	20	72	74	33	37
Technology Changes	35	14	33	19			32	33	19	20	12	13
Financial	41	16	21	12	32	26			10	10	23	26
Training	23	9	73	41	19	16	10	10			23	26
Staff	49	19	34	19	12	10	23	23	23	24		
Web/networking	25	10	12	7	9	7	5	5	2	2	4	4
Curriculum	25	10	20	11	5	4	6	6	6	6	3	3
Students	28	11	24	14	10	8	6	6	12	12	5	6
Software	19	8	10	6	9	7	7	7	8	8	5	6
Distance Learning	21	8	3	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	1
Space	7	3	4	2	4	3	1	1	0	0	0	0
CorpRelations	16	6	7	4	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	3
E-commerce	5	2	3	2	0	0	3	3	2	2	0	0
Laptops	6	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

strategic/curriculum combinations were "decisions about course content/curriculum related to information technology: management of information technology in the firm versus increased demands for immediately useful intermediate and advanced computing skills," "significant revision of the curriculum needed to incorporate IT competence and expertise," and "should e-commerce be central in our curriculum?" Strategic/student combination examples included "what to require of students in the way of mandatory hardware/software resources," "insuring adequate student learning of technology and information curriculum," and "making IT readily accessible to our students." Less than ten percent of the responses involved a strategic combination with software, distance learning, space, corporate relations, e-commerce, and laptops.

In contrast, the faculty issue category showed that it appeared most often in combination with training (41%), technology change (19%), staff (19%) issues, students (14%), financial (12%), and curriculum (11%), as well as the strategic/faculty (45%) combination just mentioned, but less often with the other issues. Examples of faculty/training response combinations are simply "training faculty," or more specifically, "training faculty in incorporation of technology in their teaching," "faculty skills to use IT," "faculty development and education," "training faculty in the use of new educational technologies," and "computer illiteracy among faculty." Examples of faculty/technology

change response combinations included "Keeping up-to-date with faculty computing needs," "replacing faculty PCs," "change of mindset of professors to a new learning environment," and "keeping faculty current in information technology use by practitioners in discipline." The business school technology staff as well as students were also consistently combined with these issues of faculty/training and faculty/technology change. Common examples of the faculty/curriculum issue was "working with faculty to integrate technology into the classroom" and "integration of technology with conceptual learning."

Technology change combinations with strategic (29%) and faculty (26%) issues have just been presented. As could be expected, the technological change/financial issue combinations (26%) dealt with the cost of keeping up with the changes. Examples of these are "the cost of investing in technology which is rapidly being made obsolete by newer technology," "funds for recurring upgrades," and "need additional funding to stay at the state-of -the-art." Most of the other information technology issues have been addressed.

Response differences between groups: As with the general issues, responses to the first section of the survey also allowed the test of significant difference of information technology issues between groups based on the demographic characteristics. Table 7 shows the response percentages for the information technology responses by these demographic characteristics.

**Table 7: Information Technology Issues - Responses by Demographic Groupings
(percent of responses)**

VARIABLE	Fin	Fac	DL	Web	E-com	Studs	Space	Curr	Strat	SW	Staff	Corp	Laps	Chgs	Train
Total responses:															
Non-accredited	7%	14%	2%	7%	1%	5%	3%	7%	20%	5%	6%	2%	2%	12%	9%
Accredited	8	14	4	6	2	5	2	5	20	4	8	2	1	11	7
	$\chi^2 = 12.34$ (df = 14, p < 0.58)														
Total responses:															
Public	8	15	3	6	2	5	2	6	20	5	8	2	1	9	7
Private	7	12	4	6	0	5	3	6	21	4	6	1	2	14	9
	$\chi^2 = 19.84$ (df = 14, p < 0.14)														
Total responses:															
<1000	6	13	3	6	2	7	3	7	19	5	4	1	1	15	8
1000-2000	9	14	6	7	0	4	3	5	23	4	8	1	2	9	6
2000-3000	8	15	4	5	4	7	2	5	19	5	9	2	1	8	8
>3000	10	16	2	7	1	3	1	6	19	4	10	3	0	9	10
	$\chi^2 = 63.84$ (df = 33, p < 0.01)														
Total responses															
Undergrad Only	5	21	1	3	3	7	3	7	16	4	7	0	0	11	12
Undergrad & MBA	9	14	3	6	1	5	3	6	20	5	8	2	1	10	8
MBA Only	3	10	6	12	3	7	3	7	24	4	3	2	0	16	3
	$\chi^2 = 42.64$ (df = 28, p < 0.05)														

When considering all of the responses for the information technology without regard for priority ranking, the χ^2 -values showed a significant difference in responses when the business schools were grouped by size and by the type of programs they offered. The information technology issues were very similar for the non-accredited/accredited school groupings or the public/private groupings.

This summary data are indicating that the smaller business schools have greater concerns for technological changes. Summary data by priority rankings for the information technology issues (Appendix C) showed significant differences between the size of schools on all priority rankings, first, second, and third. Sixteen percent of the smaller business schools' responses included the technological change issue (either as a single response or in a response combination) as their first priority, and 17% as their third in contrast to ten or less percent of the responses of the larger schools. Additionally, the business schools with 1,000 to 2,000 full-time equivalent students seemed to show more concern with strategic issues, regardless of priority ranking.

Table 7 also shows that there was a significant difference in responses when the business schools were grouped by the type of programs they offered. When the information technology issues were considered without priority ranking, as in this table, one major difference seems to be related to the MBA only program schools' greater concern with the Web. Summary data by priority rankings (Appendix C) confirmed this interpretation and give insight into other possible sources of response differences between schools offering different types of programs.

5. Issues Comparison - Third and Sixteenth Surveys

Issues comparison between the Third and the Sixteenth Surveys presents some interesting challenges. The Third Survey was conducted in 1986 and set within the context of the 1985-1986 academic year, whereas the Sixteenth was conducted in 1999 and set within the realities of the 1998-1999 academic year. Twelve full years passed between these two surveys. Fifty-seven business schools responded to both of these surveys; however, based on the traditional length of a business school deanship, it is highly unlikely that the same dean from those fifty-seven schools responded to both questionnaires. Therefore, there is very little actual overlap in longitudinal consistency between the respondents.

Additionally, rather than being forced into pre-existing categories and to let issues to emerge from the data, the surveys were analyzed independently. Thus the categories are not identical. Although there is a similarity between the categories, there also are differences. Table 8 from summarizes data from Tables 2 and 3 from the Third Survey and data from Tables 2 and 5 from the Sixteenth Survey. In the preparation of Table 8, however, several categories had to be collapsed to achieve consistency, indicated by the use of a comma in the category definition. The two Third Survey tables are replicated in full in Appendix D.

Further, the response percentages, as taken from each of the survey tables and presented in Table 8, were calculated differently due to categorization rules. In the Third Survey, each response was placed within a distinct category based on the macro concern of that response. However, because the Sixteenth Survey responses were much richer and encompassed multiple issues, the micro concerns were taken into consideration for categorization rather than being forced into a single category issue. An example of these differing approaches to categorization would be that the response such as "finding and recruiting CIS faculty" would have been simply placed in the Faculty category in the Third Survey, yet counted within the Faculty and Strategic categories in the Sixteenth Survey.

Thus the response percentages are relevant only to each survey's set of categories and do not allow comparison between the surveys.

Table 8: Comparison of Deans' Issues - Third and Sixteenth Surveys

Third Survey N = 114		Sixteenth Survey N = 215	
% of responses		% of responses	
General Issues:*			
Faculty	32	Faculty, Research	31
Funding (money)	22	Financial	25
Curriculum and Instruction	18	Curriculum , Students	34
B School Admin, External Relations	15	Strategic, Accreditation	38
Space	4	Space	4
Hardware and Software	3	Technology	15
		Distance Learning	5
		International	3
		Diversity	1
Information Technology Issues:**			
Management or Governance	22	Strategic	42
Curriculum and Instruction	21	Curriculum, E-commerce	15
Technical	18	Tech changes, Software, Laptops	31
Faculty	17	Faculty, Training, Students	47
Funding (money)	14	Financial	16
Computer Support Personnel	3	Staff	15
Space	3	Space	5
		Web/networking	13
		Distance Learning	7
		Corporate Relations	3

* from Table 2 Third Survey and Table 2 Sixteenth Survey

**from Table 3 Third Survey and Table 5 Sixteenth Survey

Yet, in spite of these differences and difficulties, there is data available to address some critical questions. What has changed? Are business school deans making any progress, or does their job really consist of just repeatedly addressing the same set of issues? What issues have remained the same? Have any issues gone away? What new issues are surfacing?

General issues: Initial consideration of the general issues seems to indicate that the same issues are recurrent - faculty, money, curriculum, management, facilities space, and technology. And the issues as further delineated in Table 2 of the Third Survey (Appendix D) are the same as for those given in the Sixteenth Survey responses. The single difference in the response set is very minimal, the one response in the Third Survey dealing with the legislature in the External Relations category.

Faculty recruitment, retention, salaries, research productivity, and development as delineated in the Third Survey remain a high priority. However, in the Sixteenth Survey responses such as "changing demographics of faculty - faculties are more mobile and willing to relocate for salary changes," " financial resource limitations in a period of expansion and

accelerated faculty salaries," "obtaining sufficient full-time faculty to teach the student body effectively, especially since teaching business effectively is now far more demanding than it has been in the past," and "increasing costs of new faculty" tend to point toward even more emphasis on faculty salaries in a competitive sense, not only between business schools but also with industry. Faculty development is ongoing, but the Sixteenth Survey responses seem to reflect more demand for depth, integration of technology, and perhaps tension. As pointed out in the Fifteenth Survey, computers now are ubiquitous, and the issue is not in their acquisition, but rather in the integration of the potential of information technologies into daily life. This reality is seen in Sixteenth Survey responses, such as "mismatch in faculty expertise to current teaching/research needs," "ability to train and interest faculty in utilizing technology in the classroom," "training of faculty to allow them to be more responsive to a rapidly changing market place," and "using IT to enrich the teaching and research experience of faculty."

Again, curriculum issues appear in both surveys, with concern for curriculum development and keeping the curriculum current. Yet, as for the faculty issues above, there appears to be not only an emphasis on the breadth of curriculum change needed, but also in its urgency. Examples from the Sixteenth Survey include "Literally redefining global management education for the 21st century," "new technology, the expansion of computers and worldwide communications will continue to place pressure on business schools to redesign programs," "developing new market-driven programs," "integration of IT into all aspects of the undergraduate and MBA program," "E-business - industry transformation reflected in the MBA courses," and "IT is critical, in my opinion, to maintaining curricular currency, such as through delivery of on-line, real-time content."

Business school administration issues now seem to have taken on even more priority than before, but with an emphasis on a strategic orientation. The delineation of the category in the Third Survey seemed to be related more to management issues and maintaining the status quo, rather than leadership issues and responding to competition. Sixteenth Survey responses indicative of increasing need for vision and response to competitive pressures include "reaching the top rank," "exploiting comparative advantages related to school themes of entrepreneurship, management of technology, and global business management," "how to sustain responsiveness to the market within an academic institution," "fostering innovation," "necessity to keep the organization on course while parts of the organization of their own way," and "competition from a variety of organizations that would reduce our revenue."

One of these sources of new competition, as well as opportunity, is distance learning. Relevant Sixteenth Survey responses are "coordination of a multi-site, multi-format program," "quality management of both on and off campus programs," "addressing the balance between technology and distance education with the need to provide socialization in learning," "the implication on our strategy for overall competition for students that distance education and other strong competitive issues will have on survivorship of quality in the 10 year timeframe and beyond," and "distance learning alliances between profit sector and traditional university." And, as common as the issue of internationalization has become, it was interesting to look back and find that it hadn't even surfaced as an issue in the Third Survey.

Information Technology Issues: As with the general issues, a broad similarity is found in the information technology issues that emerged from the Third Survey responses and those from the Sixteenth Survey. However, the terms used in the two surveys highlight major differences. The term used for this section in the Third Survey was "Computer-Related" whereas now the term is "Information Technology," with the use of these terms emphasizing the change from a focus on the hardware itself to its broader utilization and

applications. As has been pointed in the last several surveys, most business schools have now acquired the basic infrastructure, including the underlying network. Technology acquisition, a central issue of the Third Survey, although not ever a non-issue, has been replaced by concerns for keeping the technology maintained and upgraded, including the problems of finding adequate staff to handle the constant changes and improvements. A more central issue involves the real integration of the information technology into the business schools' curriculum and the problems of providing students with the requisite skills to be able to make an impact in a world that often seems to be moving ahead of the business schools in actual applications. The issue is no longer concerned with the development of a MIS major, but rather the development of an entire e-commerce MBA and getting faculty and students to be as information technology savvy as their corporate counterparts.

As with the general issues, the information technology issue responses seem to project a sense of urgency, as well as a need for a real balance between the traditional business school curriculum and the education being demanded by the information technology market place. Several responses reflect these points: "decisions about course content/curriculum related to information technology: management of information technology in the firm versus increased demands for immediately useful intermediate and advanced computing skills for business graduates," "making the best choice - investing in teaching new business practices and technologies that will have the greatest impact on the way business is done, and getting the greatest bang for the buck," and "need to understand the impact of Electronic Commerce on total business operations of a company - for example, how EC effects inventories, orders, AR, billing, freight rating, pricing, raw materials ordering, marketing, market research, and customer communications."

Both the Third and Sixteenth Survey General Issues and the Information Technology Issues simultaneously seem to be similar and different. The major categories are the same, but the realities within the categories have changed. These changes mirror the context within which business schools operate. It is hard to imagine, but the world is even more competitive, chaotic, rapidly changing, deeper and broader than it was in 1986, only thirteen years ago. Business school deans have to address the same issues such as recruiting and retaining high quality faculty, motivating faculty to continually embrace new developments, acquiring financial resources, making innovative and relevant curricular changes, and integrating information technology into both teaching and learning. Yet, now there is a broader scope to the issues and additional competitive pressures such as internationalization, world-wide connectivity, instant communication, technological advances that enable distance learning, and the blurring of boundaries between the traditional and the technologically possible. Evidenced by the richness and quality of their responses, business school deans seem to be making admirable progress, even though they have to repeatedly address many of the same issues while at the same time managing and leading within a much more difficult context.

APPENDIX A: GENERAL SCHOOL DATA

Business School	Type	AACSB Accreditation		FTE			Faculty	Comp op budget (1000s)	Comp op budget/ stud FTE	Comp op budget/ sch budget
		Ugrad	MBA	PhD	EMBA					
U Akron	Public	yes	1000	200		85	84	70.0	4.5	
U Alabama, Birmingham	Public	yes	1626	379	25	57	369	181.8	5.0	
U Alabama, Huntsville	Public	yes	608	83			83	120.8		
Alcorn State U	Public		250	20		17	10	37.0	0.6	
American Grad Sch of International	Private	yes		1490		62	3000	2013.4	5.0	
American U	Private	yes	868	378		56	142	114.0	1.4	
U Arizona	Public	yes	2711	537	92	176	975	291.9	4.7	
Arizona State U	Public	yes	4115	1150	87	285	1100	205.5	2.8	
U Arkansas	Public	yes	1811	145	91	90	50	24.6	0.4	
U Arkansas, Little Rock	Public	yes	937	130		44	200	187.4	2.8	
Auburn U, Montgomery	Public	yes	1300	200		48	5	3.3	4.0	
Augusta State U	Public	yes	404	44		22	30	67.0	1.1	
Barry U	Private		400	100		23	80	160.0	3.9	
Barton College	Private		300			8				
Baylor U	Private	yes	3136	176	15	112	556	167.0		
Bellarmine College	Private		450	280		21	3	4.1	1.2	
Belmont U	Private		1000	200		35	130	108.3	2.7	
Bentley College	Private	yes	3640	900		260	8000	1762.1	8.0	
Bloomsburg U	Public		45	4		48	53	1085.6		
Boston College	Private		2368	545	39	105	434	147.0	2.4	
Boston U	Private	yes	1540	638	67	116	876	390.2	4.3	
Brigham Young U	Private	yes	4500	1000		180	107	19.4	0.7	
Bryant College	Private	yes	2619	244		149	1433	500.5	2.6	
Bucknell U	Public		435			21				
U California, Berkeley	Public	yes	550	797	80	71	1700	1191.3	6.3	
U California, Davis	Public	yes		120		38	315	2625.0	5.4	
U California, Irvine	Public	yes		24	35	50	1074	18203.4	6.6	
U California, Los Angeles	Public	yes		650	390	130	2700	2596.2	7.1	
California Lutheran U	Private		300	150		20	5	11.1	0.5	
California State U, Bakersfield	Public	yes	350	75						

California State U, Chico	Public	yes	1250	50	52	155	119.1	2.9
California State U, Dominguez Hills	Public		923	147	44	150	139.7	3.7
California State U, Fullerton	Public	yes	4604	233	158	500	103.4	
California State U, Long Beach	Public	yes	2131	138	89	415	183.1	6.4
California State U, Fresno	Public	yes	1406	78	79	300	202.2	4.4
Campbell U	Private		715	325	14	195	187.5	10.1
Case Western Reserve U	Private	yes	296	814	92	1282	1041.6	4.0
U Central Arkansas	Public	yes	867	75	39	147	155.9	
U Central Florida	Public	yes	6000	650	150	335	50.4	2.1
Chapman U	Private	yes	395	165	21			
City U, Washington	Private		2510	1664		75	18.1	10.3
U Colorado, Boulder	Public	yes	3251	195	109	132	38.2	22.6
U Colorado, Colorado Springs	Public	yes	200	500	40	75	107.1	2.5
U Colorado, Denver	Public	yes	630	625	70	75	59.8	1.2
Colorado State U	Public	yes	1789	620	80	463	192.2	5.2
Concordia U, Wisconsin	Private		248	193	14	38	85.0	7.1
Creighton U	Private	yes	630	200	36	107	128.3	2.5
Dartmouth College	Public		572	31	25	130	215.6	7.9
Delaware State U	Private	yes	2994	2537	145			
Depaul U	Private	yes	691	521	30			
U Detroit Mercy	Private	yes	815	343	40	65	56.1	1.9
Drake U	Private	yes				1900	2714.3	3.8
Duke U	Private	yes	606	359	75	65	196.9	3.5
East Carolina U	Public	yes	916	125	42	125	120.1	3.6
Eeaster Washington U	Public	yes	750	50	23	5	6.3	14.3
Elon College	Private		547	667	69	873	718.9	3.5
Emory U	Private	yes	350		16			
U Evansville	Private		2200	55	84	370	164.1	33.6
Ferris State U	Public		5272	647	95	661	110.3	4.6
U Florida	Public	yes			80	200	210.5	1.0
Fordham U	Private	yes	700	230	32	65	69.9	2.6
Frostburg State U	Public		1007	1550	128	210	78.8	0.9
George Washington U	Private	yes	5000	329	110	527	97.3	3.1
U Georgia	Public	yes	870	188	37			
Georgia College & State U	Public	yes	1695	95	85			
Georgia Southern U	Public	yes	3564	1881	222	508	91.7	2.0
Georgia State U	Public	yes	953	178	63	40	35.4	0.5
Grand Valley State U	Public	yes						

U Hawaii	Public	yes	850	250	10	50	60	250	225.2	4.2
U Houston	Public	yes	3100	800	70	200	85	250	63.0	2.5
Howard U	Private	yes	500	200			15			
Husson College	Private		2800	150			99	210	71.2	2.5
Illinois State U	Public	yes	340	100			16			
Indiana State, Kokomo	Public		2185	115			38			
Iona College	Private	yes	3114	216			68	250	75.1	12.5
Iowa State U	Public	yes	3100	150			96	20	6.2	3.1
James Madison U	Public	yes	464	63			21	1268	2407.0	
King's College	Public		225	244			27	25	53.7	1.1
U LaVerne	Private		656	689			54	650	483.3	13.0
Long Island U	Private		600				19			
Longwood College	Public	yes	3700	671		22	115	422	96.5	3.8
Louisiana State U	Public	yes	3203	651	36		98	286	73.5	2.2
U Louisville	Public	yes	1050	980		170	48	200	139.1	4.8
Loyola College Maryland	Private	yes	1088	350		14	48			
Loyola Marymount U	Private	yes	650	110			15	50	79.2	2.8
Lynchburg College	Public	yes	550	81			22			
U Maine	Public		475	90			35			
Manhattan College	Private		2200	900	100		125	1200	375.0	6.7
U Maryland	Public	yes	1500	220	50		55	300	169.5	3.8
U Massachusetts, Amherst	Public	yes	1100	400			55			
U Massachusetts, Boston	Public	yes	226	708	83	105	89	2100	2064.9	3.8
Massachusetts Institute Technology	Private	yes	844	525		50	50	25	18.3	0.5
Mercer U, Macon	Private		2200				91			
Metropolitan State College, Denver	Public		4470	99				351	76.8	2.3
Miami U	Public	yes	565	1978	78		175	3500	1335.4	3.9
U Michigan	Public	yes	350	350			26	120	171.4	3.8
U Michigan, Dearborn	Public	yes	2950	240	155	154	142	300	89.7	1.2
Michigan State	Public	yes	2719	512			111	316	97.8	3.6
Middle Tennessee State U	Public	yes	2129	184	74		70	139	58.4	1.6
Millikin U	Public	yes	2600	240	41		59	150	52.1	1.3
Mississippi State U	Public	yes	1050	50			40			
U Missouri, Columbia	Public	yes								
Montana State U	Public	yes	130							
Monterey Institute International Studies	Private		380				14	18	47.4	1.5
U Montevallo	Public	yes	2833	185	90		63	300	96.5	3.0
U Nebraska, Lincoln	Public	yes								

U Nebraska, Omaha	Public	yes	1656	230	40	56	325	172.4	5.7
U Nevada, Las Vegas	Public	yes	1530	237		80	100	56.6	1.3
U New Mexico	Public	yes	1000	500	120	52	220	146.7	4.3
New York U	Private	yes	2000	3200	120	300	3000	563.9	3.0
Nicholls State U	Public	yes							
U North Carolina, Greensboro	Public	yes	183	269		74	200	442.5	3.1
U North Carolina, Wilmington	Public	yes	1650	50	110	55	270	158.8	5.0
North Carolina State U	Public		2000	250		80	612	272.0	6.2
North Dakota State U	Public		968	19		24	2	2.0	2.0
U North Florida	Public	yes	1500	500		40	140	70.0	4.0
U North Texas	Public	yes	5652	735	78	107	606	93.7	5.7
Truman State U	Public		4100	20		26	20	4.9	14.3
Northeastern U	Private	yes	2500	450	80	100			
Northern Kentucky U	Public	yes	1200	150		35			
Northwestern U	Private	yes		2000	100	150	3000	1428.6	3.3
Northwestern State U, Louisiana	Public	yes	1100			24	40	36.4	3.1
U Norte Dame	Private	yes	1800	358	110	115	770	356.8	4.0
Nova Southeastern U	Private			1853	547	123	561	233.8	3.9
Ohio U	Public	yes	1900	200	50	60	300	142.9	4.2
Ohio State U	Public	yes	2163	314	168	84	718	271.4	2.8
U Oklahoma	Public	yes	3700	150	25	60	400	103.2	2.9
Oklahoma State U	Public	yes	3171	665	60	85	200	51.3	1.7
U The Pacific	Private	yes	450	100		26	165	300.0	5.2
Pacific Lutheran U	Private	yes	350	60		21	35	85.4	1.3
Pennsylvania State U, Middletown	Public	yes	458	397		32			
Philadelphia College of Textiles	Private		600	250		22			
Pittsburg State U	Public	yes	794	102		39			
U of Pittsburgh	Public	yes	664	417	43	101	500	444.8	2.6
Fairie View A&M U	Public		412	40		18	10	22.1	0.7
Ford U	Public	yes	2386	319	106	94	870	309.5	5.4
U Richmond	Private	yes	400	275	42	30	400	1454.5	5.0
Fider College	Private	yes	1140	213		60	35	53.8	11.7
U Rochester	Private	yes	817	49	212	65	50	37.1	0.7
Rochester Institute of Technology	Private	yes	600	330	55	37	1100	1270.2	5.0
Roger Williams U	Private		420			18	197	211.8	3.9
Rutgers U, Camden	Public	yes	350	260		34	20	47.6	1.7
St Bonaventure U	Private		500	200			20	28.6	1.3

Saint Cloud U	Private	yes	2770	106	70	300	104.3	7.7
U San Diego	Public	yes	2411	155	96	350	136.4	3.5
San Jose State U	Private	yes	1100	985	29	250	119.9	3.1
Santa Clara U	Private	yes	950	550	75	125	83.3	1.4
U San Francisco	Public	yes	2563	1104	83	593	158.2	3.2
U South Carolina	Public	yes	612	10	23	45	72.3	1.6
South Carolina State U	Public	yes	1912	531	5	500	204.3	3.4
U South Florida	Public	yes	900	30	42	36	39.1	22.6
Southeast Missouri State U	Public	yes	1000	20	21	100	98.0	5.3
Southern U	Public	yes	696	200	44			
Southern Illinois, Edwardsville	Public	yes	2000	150				
U Southwestern Louisiana	Private	yes	770	95	45			
Stanford U	Public	yes	1496	412	45	600	307.2	5.0
State U New York, Buffalo	Public	yes	2212	93	59	1018	441.8	22.3
Stephen F Austin State U	Public	yes	755	76	24	280	336.9	20.8
Stockton State U	Private	yes	982	503	65	672	452.5	2.3
Suffolk U	Private	yes	360		16	15	41.7	1.1
Susquehanna U	Private	yes	1205	435	25	414	248.6	
Syracuse U	Public	yes	4100	1100	120	2319	435.9	1.4
Temple U	Public	yes	2930	279	25	73	22.7	5.4
U Texas, Austin	Public	yes	350	150	18	10	20.0	1.0
U Texas, San Antonio	Public	yes	566	40	23	50	82.5	0.8
U Texas, Tyler	Public	yes	6426	603	37	1100	154.6	3.4
Texas A&M U, Kingsville	Public	yes	1306	300	42	150	93.4	5.1
Texas A&M U, College Station	Public	yes	1361	236	21	65	40.4	3.4
Texas Christian U	Public	yes	2291		53	14	6.1	0.7
U Toledo	Private	yes	602	284	85	600	617.9	0.3
Towson State U	Public	yes	900	300	70	200	162.6	2.5
Tulane U	Public	yes	2259	304	50	175	68.3	2.4
U Utah	Private	yes	450	10	100	350	760.9	1.8
Utah State U	Public	yes	550	10	65	1450	2589.3	8.1
Vanderbilt U	Public	yes	550	70	50	1000	1612.9	12.5
U Virginia	Private	yes	370	30	30	125	312.5	3.3
U Virginia, Charlottesville	Private	yes	1500	480	75	540	262.8	3.6
Wake Forest U, SBA	Public	yes	120		22	100	833.3	5.0
Wake Forest U, Babcock	Private	yes						
U Washington	Public	yes						
Washington and Lee U	Private	yes						

U West Florida	Public	yes	650	75	43	63	86.2	1.4
Western Carolina U	Public	yes	600	100	50	25	35.7	0.7
Western Kentucky U	Public	yes	1358	55	60	26	18.7	3.9
Western Michigan U	Public	yes	2523	475	98	447	149.2	3.6
Western Washington U	Public	yes	980	50	56	85	82.5	42.6
Widener U	Private	yes	650	400	39			
College of William and Mary	Public	yes	760	370	62	370	327.3	4.0
Winston Salem State U	Public				40			2.4
Winthrop U	Public	yes	1030	190	42	90	73.8	2.5
U Wisconsin, Green Bay	Public		4800	180	10	10	1.9	0.8
U Wisconsin, La Crosse	Public	yes	1800	50	48	100	54.1	3.1
U Wisconsin, Madison	Public	yes	1395	450	85	975	505.2	3.6
U Alberta	Public	yes	1870	295	73	390	176.8	3.1
U British Columbia	Public		1470	140	90	200	118.5	2.6
U Montreal	Public		4596	1216	174	3781	644.3	4.7
Memorial U, Newfoundland	Public		1100	139	50	178	143.7	3.7
Queen's U	Public	yes	825	80	65	525	562.7	2.9
Ryerson Polytechnical U	Public		3000		85	500	166.7	9.6
Saint Mary's U	Public		1900	160	85	25	12.1	0.6
Simon Fraser U	Public		1400		46	100	71.4	2.1
Wilfred Laurier U	Public		2000	400	90	300	125.0	3.8
Aarhus School of Business	Public		1500	1800	116	927	278.4	5.9
Groupe ESCP	Public		1600		60	1000	625.0	3.3
Erasmus U	Public	yes	3600	500	172			
Maastricht School of Management	Public			80	35	500	4000.0	5.0
Ashridge Management College	Private					2217		6.1
London Business School	Public			500	96	3500	6024.1	5.8
Open U	Private			5475	69	1460	265.8	4.6
U Warwick	Public	yes	750	320	170	545	482.3	2.5
Chinese U, Hong Kong	Public	yes	1560	494	99	237	113.9	1.0
City U, Hong Kong	Public		2626	504	188	1067	337.1	3.3
TelAviv U	Public	yes	440	1260	80	255	148.8	3.4
E-AESP-FGV	Private		1654	40	185	1300	683.9	2.4

APPENDIX B: GENERAL ISSUES

**Table 1: Priority Rankings and Total Responses for Non-accredited and Accredited Business Schools
(percent of responses)**

Variable	Fin	Acc	Fac	Tech	Curr	Strat	Res	DL	Intl	Stud	Space	Divrs
First priority responses												
Non-accredited	13%	15%	20%	4%	5%	23%	3%	3%	5%	9%	1%	0%
Accredited	21	2	22	6	12	18	2	2	1	11	2	0
	$\chi^2 = 29.85$ (df = 11, p < 0.01)											
Second priority responses												
Non-accredited	13	1	21	13	13	20	3	1	3	8	1	2
Accredited	14	0	21	9	16	21	4	4	2	6	2	0
	$\chi^2 = 7.45$ (df = 11, p < 0.76)											
Third priority responses												
Non-accredited	12	1	20	10	13	24	7	5	0	5	4	0
Accredited	15	1	14	13	11	23	3	4	1	11	3	0
	$\chi^2 = 9.08$ (df = 11, p < 0.62)											
Total responses:												
Non-accredited	12	6	20	9	10	22	4	3	3	7	2	1
Accredited	16	1	19	9	13	21	3	3	1	9	2	0
	$\chi^2 = 22.33$ (df = 11, p < 0.05)											

**Table 2: Priority Rankings and Total Responses for Public and Private Business Schools
(percent of responses)**

Variable	Fin	Acc	Fac	Tech	Curr	Strat	Res	DL	Intl	Stud	Space	Divrs
First priority responses												
Public	24%	4%	22%	6%	8%	20%	1%	2%	1%	10%	1%	0%
Private	8	10	21	5	14	18	3	3	3	11	5	0
	$\chi^2 = 24.07$ (df = 11, p < 0.01)											
Second priority responses												
Public	16	0	20	10	14	20	4	4	2	6	2	1
Private	10	1	24	10	17	21	4	1	4	7	1	0
	$\chi^2 = 10.14$ (df = 11, p < 0.52)											
Third priority responses												
Public	11	2	16	15	13	22	4	3	0	11	3	0
Private	18	0	15	7	10	26	6	6	3	7	3	0
	$\chi^2 = 18.70$ (df = 11, p < 0.07)											
Total responses												
Public	17	2	19	10	12	21	3	3	1	9	2	1
Private	12	3	20	7	14	22	4	3	3	8	3	0
	$\chi^2 = 18.19$ (df = 11, p < 0.08)											

**Table 3: Priority Rankings and Total Responses for Business Schools of Different Sizes
(percent of responses)**

Variable	Fin	Acc	Fac	Tech	Curr	Strat	Res	DL	Intl	Stud	Space	Divrs
First priority responses												
<1000	11%	8%	25%	6%	14%	16%	3%	3%	1%	12%	3%	0%
1000-2000	23	7	15	5	13	23	0	0	2	8	3	0
2000-3000	20	5	32	3	7	18	5	2	0	8	0	0
>3000	24	0	17	8	3	23	0	6	5	14	2	0
	$\chi^2 = 46.41$ (df = 30, p < 0.05)											
Second priority responses												
<1000	19	1	19	9	10	24	4	0	3	8	2	1
1000-2000	9	1	24	7	17	24	4	3	1	6	2	1
2000-3000	19	0	20	7	14	23	4	1	1	7	1	1
>3000	5	0	25	18	23	7	3	11	5	3	0	0
	$\chi^2 = 51.57$ (df = 33, p < 0.05)											
Third priority responses												
<1000	1	16	16	14	29	5	6	1	10	4	0	0
1000-2000	4	19	15	10	24	4	6	3	12	3	0	0
2000-3000	0	19	11	16	25	9	4	0	11	7	0	0
>3000	0	20	14	16	33	2	2	0	12	0	2	0
	$\chi^2 = 25.28$ (df = 30, p < 0.71)											
Total responses:												
<1000	11	8	20	9	17	15	4	1	4	8	2	0
1000-2000	34	21	49	20	46	49	8	5	11	16	5	1
2000-3000	36	20	56	23	40	46	11	3	10	20	1	1
>3000	31	16	54	39	54	33	5	18	20	18	3	0
	$\chi^2 = 34.66$ (df = 33, p < 0.39)											

**Table 4: Priority Rankings and Total Responses for Business Schools with Different Programs
(percent of responses)**

Variable	Fin	Acc	Fac	Tech	Curr	Strat	Res	DL	Intl	Stud	Space	Divrs
First priority responses												
Undergrad Only	22%	0%	28%	0%	6%	39%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%
Undergrad & MBA	20	7	21	6	9	19	1	3	1	11	2	0
MBA Only	4	0	32	7	18	11	7	4	11	4	4	0
	$\chi^2 = 37.63$ (df = 20, p < 0.05)											
Second priority responses												
Undergrad Only	5	5	19	19	19	19	0	0	0	10	5	0
Undergrad & MBA	14	0	22	10	15	20	4	4	2	7	1	1
MBA Only	15	0	15	6	18	24	6	0	12	3	3	0
	$\chi^2 = 30.34$ (df = 33, p < 0.60)											
Third priority responses												
Undergrad Only	13	4	21	13	13	21	4	0	0	4	8	0
Undergrad & MBA	13	1	17	12	12	23	4	4	0	11	2	0
MBA Only	19	0	3	9	9	34	6	6	6	0	6	0
	$\chi^2 = 29.13$ (df = 22, p < 0.14)											
Total responses												
Undergrad Only	13	3	22	11	13	25	2	0	0	6	5	0
Undergrad & MBA	16	3	20	9	12	21	3	3	1	10	2	0
MBA Only	13	0	16	7	15	23	6	3	10	2	4	0
	$\chi^2 = 56.11$ (df = 22, p < 0.01)											

APPENDIX C: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ISSUES

**Table 1: Priority Rankings and Total Responses for Non-accredited and Accredited Business Schools
(percent of responses)**

Variable	\$	Fac	DL	Web	E-com	Studs	Space	Curr	Strat	SW	Staff	Corp	Laps	Chgs	Train
First priority responses															
Non-accredited	5%	12%	4%	4%	0%	5%	2%	10%	20%	9%	5%	1%	2%	10%	9%
Accredited	8	12	6	6	3	6	2	7	19	2	8	2	1	12	6
$\chi^2 = 18.61$ (df = 14, p < 0.18)															
Second priority responses															
Non-accredited	9	14	1	8	1	3	4	7	20	4	8	2	1	10	10
Accredited	8	18	4	7	1	5	3	5	18	5	6	0	1	9	9
$\chi^2 = 19.24$ (df = 14, p < 0.16)															
Third priority responses															
Non-accredited	6	16	0	8	1	7	3	5	19	3	6	2	2	14	9
Accredited	8	13	2	5	2	5	2	4	24	6	8	2	1	11	7
$\chi^2 = 10.15$ (df = 14, p < 0.75)															
Total responses:															
Non-accredited	7	14	2	7	1	5	3	7	20	5	6	2	2	12	9
Accredited	8	14	4	6	2	5	2	5	20	4	8	2	1	11	7
$\chi^2 = 12.34$ (df = 14, p < 0.58)															

**Table 2: Priority Rankings and Total Responses for Public and Private Business Schools
(percent of responses)**

Variable	\$	Fac	DL	Web	E-com	Studs	Space	Curr	Strat	SW	Staff	Corp	Laps	Chgs	Train
First priority responses															
Public	9%	12%	5%	6%	3%	6%	2%	6%	18%	4%	9%	2%	1%	12%	6%
Private	5	14	6	5	0	5	2	11	23	3	5	1	2	10	8
$\chi^2 = 14.44$ (df = 14, p < 0.42)															
Second priority responses															
Public	9	18	3	7	1	6	2	6	18	5	7	1	0	8	8
Private	7	14	5	6	0	2	6	5	17	5	6	0	2	12	12
$\chi^2 = 19.24$ (df = 14, p < 0.16)															
Third priority responses															
Public	7	15	3	6	2	4	3	5	23	5	7	1	1	8	9
Private	8	10	1	5	1	8	2	2	22	5	7	3	1	18	6
$\chi^2 = 13.29$ (df = 14, p < 0.50)															
Total responses:															
Public	8	15	3	6	2	5	2	6	20	5	8	2	1	9	7
Private	7	12	4	6	0	5	3	6	21	4	6	1	2	14	9
$\chi^2 = 19.84$ (df = 14, p < 0.14)															

Table 3: Priority Rankings and Total Responses for Business Schools of Different Sizes
(percent of responses)

Variable \$	Fac	DL	Web	E-com	Studs	Space	Curr	Strat	SW	Staff	Corp	Laps	Chgs	Train	
First priority responses															
<1000	7%	12%	4%	4%	2%	5%	2%	9%	19%	4%	6%	1%	1%	16%	8%
1000-2000	8	7	8	10	0	5	2	8	23	2	9	1	3	9	4
2000-3000	3	16	6	4	4	9	2	8	17	6	8	1	0	8	8
>3000	11	16	5	3	1	3	0	6	22	3	8	5	0	10	7
$\chi^2 = 100.95$ (df = 33, p < 0.01)															
Second priority responses															
<1000	5	15	3	8	0	8	4	8	17	7	3	0	1	12	8
1000-2000	10	19	5	5	0	3	6	5	21	2	7	0	1	10	7
2000-3000	12	16	3	6	3	4	2	3	17	4	11	2	1	5	11
>3000	9	20	1	10	1	1	0	4	17	6	9	1	0	7	12
$\chi^2 = 89.92$ (df = 33, p < 0.01)															
Third priority responses															
<1000	6	13	2	5	3	7	3	3	21	3	4	2	1	17	8
1000-2000	8	15	3	4	0	5	2	2	27	7	7	2	1	8	8
2000-3000	10	13	2	5	3	7	2	3	23	5	8	3	1	10	4
>3000	8	11	0	8	0	4	3	9	19	3	14	1	1	8	11
$\chi^2 = 64.00$ (df = 33, p < 0.01)															
Total responses:															
<1000	6	13	3	6	2	7	3	7	19	5	4	1	1	15	8
1000-2000	9	14	6	7	0	4	3	5	23	4	8	1	2	9	6
2000-3000	8	15	4	5	4	7	2	5	19	5	9	2	1	8	8
>3000	10	16	2	7	1	3	1	6	19	4	10	3	0	9	10
$\chi^2 = 63.84$ (df = 33, p < 0.01)															

Table 4: Priority Rankings and Total Responses for Business Schools with Different Programs
(percent of responses)

Variable \$	Fac	DL	Web	E-com	Studs	Space	Curr	Strat	SW	Staff	Corp	Laps	Chgs	Train	
First priority responses															
Undergrad Only	3%	19%	0%	3%	0%	10%	3%	3%	19%	10%	6%	0%	0%	10%	13%
Undergrad & MBA	8	12	6	5	2	5	1	9	19	3	8	2	1	11	7
MBA Only	5	14	8	11	3	3	0	5	27	5	3	5	0	8	3
$\chi^2 = 35.03$ (df = 28, p < 0.17)															
Second priority responses															
Undergrad Only	9	23	0	0	5	9	5	18	18	0	0	0	0	9	5
Undergrad & MBA	9	18	3	6	1	5	3	4	17	5	8	1	1	9	10
MBA Only	3	6	8	19	0	3	6	11	25	8	0	0	0	11	0
$\chi^2 = 46.09$ (df = 28, p < 0.05)															
Third priority responses															
Undergrad Only	5	20	5	5	5	0	0	0	10	0	15	0	0	15	20
Undergrad & MBA	9	13	2	5	1	5	3	4	23	5	7	3	1	10	8
MBA Only	0	11	2	7	4	13	2	4	20	0	4	0	0	27	4
$\chi^2 = 42.14$ (df = 28, p < 0.05)															
Total responses															
Undergrad Only	5	21	1	3	3	7	3	7	16	4	7	0	0	11	12
Undergrad & MBA	9	14	3	6	1	5	3	6	20	5	8	2	1	10	8
MBA Only	3	10	6	12	3	7	3	7	24	4	3	2	0	16	3
$\chi^2 = 42.64$ (df = 28, p < 0.0.)															

APPENDIX D: TABLES FROM THIRD SURVEY

Table 2
General Issues Facing Business Schools
A Survey of 114 Deans
 (3 issues per dean for a total of 342 responses)

Percent of Total	No. of Times Mentioned	Issue or Concern
32.2%	110	Faculty
		- Recruitment and Retention
		- Salaries
		- Research Productivity
22.2%	76	- Development
		Funding (money)
		- Fund Raising (General lack of funds)
		- For Research Support
18.4%	63	- For Faculty Salaries
		- Declining State/Local Government Funding
		Curriculum and Instruction
		- Keeping the Curriculum Current/ New Curriculum Development
		- Teaching Quality and Effectiveness
		- Shifts in Enrollments/Decreased Demand
7.9%	27	- Using Computers in the Curriculum
		- Student Recruitment and Placement
		- Miscellaneous
7.3%	25	External Relations
		- With the University
		- With the Business Community
		- With the Legislature
		Business School Administration
		- Balancing the Goals of the School
3.8%	13	- Managing Academic Personnel
		- Staff Support
		- Accreditation
		- Information Systems for the School
		- Miscellaneous
3.2%	11	Space
		- Need for Adequate Space
5.0%	17	Computer Hardware and Software
		- Acquisition, Upgrade, and Support
		No Response
		- Blank

Table 3
Computer-Related Issues Facing Business Schools
A Survey of 114 Deans
(3 issues per dean for a total of 342 responses)

Percent of Total	No. of Times Mentioned	Issue or Concern
22.5%	77	Management or Governance - Decreased Computer Access - Managing Technological Change - Policies for Managing Computing - Decreased Computer Access for Faculty - Administrative Use of Computers - Relations with Other Campus Computing
20.5%	70	Curriculum and Instruction - Integrating Computing into the Curriculum - Developing an MIS Major - Developing Computer Courses - Computer Literacy - Miscellaneous
18.4%	63	Technical - Acquiring Appropriate Hardware and Software - Networking and/or Integrating Systems - Systems Compatability and Standards - Software Licensing - Software Standards - Miscellaneous
16.7%	57	Faculty - Developing and Training in Computing - Recruiting MIS Faculty - Recruiting Other Qualified Faculty
14.0%	48	Funding (money) - Acquiring and Upgrading Hardware, Software, and Networking - Support (i.e., Staff, Equipment, etc.) for Computing Facilities - Maintenance of Computing Facilities
2.9%	10	Computer Support Personnel - Providing Support Staff - Recruiting Support Staff
2.9%	10	Space - Need for Space for Computers
2.1%	7	No Response - Blank

AACSB - The International Association for Management Education is a not-for-profit corporation of educational institutions, corporations and other organizations devoted to the promotion and improvement of higher education in business administration and management.

Organized in 1916, AACSB is the premier accrediting agency for bachelor's, master's and doctoral degree programs in business administration and accounting. AACSB also is the professional organization for management education. In addition to its accreditation function, the organization conducts an extensive array of development programs for faculty and administrators; engages in research and survey projects on topics specific to the field of management education; maintains relationships with disciplinary associations and other groups; interacts with the corporate community on a variety of projects and initiatives; and produces a wide variety of publications and special reports on trends and issues within management education. AACSB also maintains close relationships with its counterpart associations worldwide.

AACSB is located at 600 Emerson Road, Suite 300, St. Louis, MO, 36141-6762, U.S.A. Telephone: 314-872-8481; Fax: 314-872-8495. The AACSB Web site address is <http://www.aacsb.edu>