

## Exploring Teaching Effectiveness and Research on Teaching and Learning at AACSB Accredited Business Schools in Canada and the US

### Abstract

**Purpose:** This study explores the implementation of two AACSB standards by business schools across Canada and the US. First, this study examines how **teaching effectiveness is defined and measured** in light of Standard 7 (Teaching Effectiveness and Impact). Second, this study **explores the value of research on teaching and learning** in relation to Standard 8 (Impact of Scholarship).

**Design/Methodology/Approach:** This study adopts a thematic analysis framework based on data obtained from an online survey, semi-structured interviews, and policy documents.

**Findings:** The results reveal that business schools rarely define teaching effectiveness; instead, they adopt various measures to evaluate teaching effectiveness. **The results reveal that research on teaching and learning alone usually does not lead to tenure; however, it is valued if part of a portfolio that includes discipline-specific research. Lastly, this research highlights a stigma associated with research on teaching and learning relative to discipline-specific research.**

**Originality:** This is the first study to explore how AACSB standards related to teaching effectiveness and research on teaching and learning are interpreted and implemented at AACSB accredited business schools.

**Practical Implications:** This study introduces a comprehensive and integrated teaching evaluation framework that can be adopted to define teaching effectiveness and elevate the teaching function. In addition, we argue that business schools should nurture a niche set of academics who hold PhDs in their respective disciplines and are education experts to increase the production of research-informed instructional strategies curated for business schools.

**Key Words:** teaching effectiveness; research on teaching and learning; AACSB accreditation; business school tenure; **thematic analysis.**

## Introduction

The past two decades have witnessed a significant increase in the number of business schools seeking accreditation from the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). **Nevertheless**, empirical research examining AACSB accreditation is sparse, especially **studies of** teaching quality (Hunt, 2015). This paper is unique as it is the first known to explore how the AACSB standards related to teaching effectiveness and research on teaching and learning (RoTL) are interpreted and implemented at AACSB accredited business schools. In exploring these topics, we propose two research questions. The first research question focuses on the definition and measurement of teaching effectiveness, and the second explores whether or not RoTL can lead to tenure at AACSB accredited business schools.

We adopt a **research design based on a thematic analysis** of primary data collected through surveys and semi-structured interviews from faculty and administrators at AACSB business schools in Canada and the United States (US). We first administered an open-ended survey and received 78 responses. Next, we conducted 11 semi-structured interviews to augment the survey data. Finally, we undertook a thematic analysis on the combined data consistent with Robinson's (2021) structured tabular approach to identify the main themes.

**The findings make several** significant contributions to the research related to business school accreditation. First, this research reveals that most AACSB accredited business schools do not have a formal definition of teaching effectiveness, and the definition and measurement of teaching effectiveness are often intertwined and difficult to disentangle. According to Weissberg (1993), "there is a principle in measurement theory that you cannot measure what you cannot define" (p. 6). Therefore, we put forward examples of rigorously designed teaching evaluation

1  
2  
3 frameworks that could be adopted by AACSB accredited business schools to help define and  
4  
5 measure teaching effectiveness at their institutions.  
6  
7

8 Our results also reveal that a stigma continues to be associated with RoTL in certain  
9  
10 business schools and among academics. As a result, we put forward the idea of business schools  
11  
12 nurturing a niche set of academics who hold PhDs in their respective disciplines and are  
13  
14 education experts. Nurturing these niche academics could advance research-informed and  
15  
16 evidence-based educational theories and instructional strategies specifically curated for business  
17  
18 school audiences. Lastly, this study contributes to the much larger literature on teaching  
19  
20 effectiveness (Mckeachie, 1979; Stehle, Spinath and Kadmon, 2012) by exploring the practical  
21  
22 implications of accreditation bodies from their definitions and measurements.  
23  
24  
25

26 The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides the background  
27  
28 and research questions. Section 3 outlines the research design. Section 4 discusses the findings  
29  
30 and implications, and Section 5 presents a brief conclusion.  
31  
32  
33

### 34 **Background and Research Questions**

#### 35 **AACSB**

36  
37  
38  
39 In 1916, AACSB International created a voluntary self-governing body to accredit  
40  
41 business schools worldwide. Over the years, the AACSB has become a premium accrediting  
42  
43 body for business school education (Tullis and Camey, 2007; Hunt, 2015), and in the US and  
44  
45 Canada, 532 and 24 business schools, respectively, have been accredited by the AACSB  
46  
47 (AACSB, 2020).  
48  
49

50  
51 The AACSB established guiding principles and standards that form the basis of the  
52  
53 accreditation process for business schools. The standards continue “to be revised to improve  
54  
55 relevancy, maintain the currency, and increase value” (AACSB International, 2020b). The most  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 recent revision of the standards occurred in 2020 when the 2013 standards were updated.  
4  
5 Business schools can continue to follow either the 2013 standards or adopt the new 2020  
6  
7 standards. All accredited schools must convert to the 2020 standards by June 2023.  
8  
9

### 10 **Teaching, Characteristics of Effective Teaching, and Teaching Effectiveness**

11  
12 One of the earlier conceptions of teaching referred to the transfer of knowledge through  
13 lecturing (Hight, 1957); however, this conceptualization is highly contested. According to  
14 Guskin (1994), “the primary learning environment for undergraduate students, the fairly passive  
15 lecture-discussion format where faculty talk and most students listen, is contrary to almost every  
16 principle of optimal settings for student learning” (p. 20). A paradigm shift in higher education  
17 from the “instruction” to “learning” was proposed by Barr and John (1995, p. 13). In short,  
18 teaching is the art of creating knowledge in the learner’s mind through any means possible.  
19  
20 Teaching should be excellent and effective to ensure that the students grasp the subject matter  
21 and are competent when hired by future employers. Quality teaching allows students to develop  
22 critical thinking, problem-solving, communication, and other skills to become part of a proficient  
23 workforce in the future (Drummond *et al.*, 2012). Thus, the importance of teaching cannot be  
24 overemphasized.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 Next, we describe the characteristics of effective teaching found in the literature. Multiple  
41 frameworks discuss the characteristic of effective teaching (Demmon-Berger, 1986; Chickering  
42 and Gamson, 1987; Ramsden, 2003; Onwuegbuzie *et al.*, 2007; Fink, 2008). Appendix 1 loosely  
43 ties the themes into broad characteristics of effective teaching as: a) faculty characteristics; b)  
44 faculty love of the subject; c) pedagogical repertoire; d) student motivation and learning; e)  
45 timely feedback; and f) scholarly teaching. The above studies help capture the characteristics of  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 effective teaching in the higher education context. After establishing a sound foundation of  
4  
5 effective teaching characteristics, we next examine teaching effectiveness.  
6

7  
8 According to Mckeachie (1979), teaching effectiveness is defined as “the degree to which  
9  
10 one has facilitated student achievements of educational goals” (p. 385). In the same vein,  
11  
12 Mantzicopoulos *et al.* (2018) illustrated teaching effectiveness as “teaching that boosts student  
13  
14 achievement” (p. 214). No consensus can be found in the literature with a precise definition of  
15  
16 teaching effectiveness, though one criterion for understanding teaching effectiveness is viewed  
17  
18 through the prism of student learning (Stehle *et al.*, 2012). Thus, the above definitions can be  
19  
20 used as a starting point to discuss what teaching effectiveness entails for various business  
21  
22 schools. Establishing a description of teaching effectiveness and articulating practical and  
23  
24 valuable teaching characteristics can lead to transparency and clarity for all academics wishing to  
25  
26 understand the expectations in university settings.  
27  
28  
29

### 30 31 **Measures of Teaching Effectiveness** 32

33  
34 Measures of teaching effectiveness refer to different assessment mechanisms that provide  
35  
36 a basis for summative or formative decisions about academics (Berk, 2005). For AACSB  
37  
38 accredited schools, measuring teaching effectiveness is essential as it allows for evidence for  
39  
40 Standard 7 of the 2020 AACSB accreditation process. Prior literature reveals a consensus  
41  
42 regarding the importance of using multiple measures of teaching effectiveness (Gravestock,  
43  
44 2011). Centra (1979) asserted that multiple forms of evidence provide a more comprehensive  
45  
46 picture of what is occurring within classrooms. Berk (2005) further articulated that “multiple  
47  
48 sources can provide a more accurate, reliable, and comprehensive picture of teaching  
49  
50 effectiveness than just one source” (p. 49).  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Assuming that multiple measures of teaching effectiveness can be routinely gathered, an  
4 alignment among various sources can provide a more comprehensive and objective evaluation of  
5 the teaching effectiveness. For example, Berk (2005) highlighted that “triangulation of sources is  
6 recommended given the complexity of measuring the act of teaching and the variety of direct and  
7 indirect sources... [as they] compensate for the weakness of any one source” (p. 48).

8  
9  
10 The AACSB standards do not explicitly require an institution to define teaching  
11 effectiveness. Instead, AACSB Standard 7.1 requires a school to have “a systematic, multi-  
12 measure assessment process for ensuring the quality of teaching and impact on learner success”  
13 (AACSB International, 2020a, p. 46). Although the literature speaks of the importance of  
14 describing teaching effectiveness, no generally accepted framework is available to evaluate  
15 teaching effectiveness at AACSB accredited business schools (Bieker, 2014). As a result, we put  
16 forward the following first research question:

17  
18  
19 *RQ1 - What is “teaching effectiveness” according to Standard 7 at AACSB accredited*  
20 *business schools in the US and Canada?*

21  
22  
23 Many scholars argue that one of the **measures** of teaching effectiveness is to complete  
24 rigorous RoTL (Fanghanel *et al.*, 2015). **RoTL is also captured by Standard 8, which asserts**  
25 **that business schools should produce high-quality, impactful intellectual contributions.**  
26 **Specifically, Standard 8 defines RoTL as exploring “the theory and methods of teaching**  
27 **and advances new understandings, insights, content, and methods that impact learning**  
28 **behavior” (AACSB International, 2020a, p. 50).**

29  
30  
31 Still, it is unclear how RoTL is perceived in AACSB accredited business schools. For  
32 example, **Stout (2018)** stated, “one possible starting point is to document how publications in  
33 (accounting) education are currently viewed/counted at a variety of institutions today...  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Currently, the available evidence is purely anecdotal ... and warrants formal research” (p. 80).

4  
5 Mu and Hatch (2021) also discussed the problems associated with publishing educational  
6  
7 research within AACSB accredited business schools and its impact on individual tenure and  
8  
9 promotion systems. As a result, we put forward the second research question to explore the value  
10  
11 of RoTL at AACSB accredited business schools concerning Standard 8:  
12  
13

14 *RQ2 - Can research on teaching and learning lead to tenure at AACSB accredited*  
15  
16 *business schools in Canada and the US?*  
17  
18

## 19 20 **Research Design**

### 21 22 **Survey Instrument**

23  
24 We used a survey instrument in the first data collection phase.  
25  
26

#### 27 28 *Survey Development*

29  
30 The survey questions were mainly open-ended and developed based on prior literature in  
31  
32 conjunction with the AACSB standards. The survey was pilot-tested with a small group of  
33  
34 professors to obtain feedback on question clarity and time commitment. The pilot test resulted in  
35  
36 minor revisions to the survey questions. Once pilot-testing was complete, we administered the  
37  
38 survey to the target population. The survey asked respondents to discuss how their school defines  
39  
40 and measures teaching effectiveness and the value of RoTL.<sup>1</sup>  
41  
42  
43

44 Potential respondents were emailed a cover letter, consent form, and link to the survey.  
45  
46 The cover letter included a brief description of the research, details of research ethics approval,  
47  
48 and a request for informed consent. The sample group in Canada was provided with the option to  
49  
50 complete the survey in French or English.  
51  
52  
53

---

54  
55 <sup>1</sup> The survey instrument is available upon request from the corresponding author.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### ***Respondent Population***

The survey targeted professors and accreditation administrators from AACSB accredited post-secondary institutions across the US and Canada. We restricted our survey respondents to the US and Canada as these institutions share similar cultural traits and approaches to teaching commonly found in North America (Fantini, Arias-Galicia and Guay, 2001). We compiled email addresses from publically available sources: a) the AACSB member forum website<sup>2</sup>; b) key authors in business and management education (Arbaugh *et al.*, 2017); and (c) university websites and faculty directories of AACSB accredited schools.

### ***Respondent Profile***

We administered the survey from February to April 2021. Potential respondents were sent reminder emails two weeks and one month following the initial email. Emails were sent to 2,322 professors and administrators, resulting in 78 usable responses (i.e., a response rate of 3.4%). Although the response rate was relatively low, the resulting sample size was adequate for two reasons. **First, adequate sample sizes are much lower in qualitative research to develop deep critical insights and do not have the same meaning as quantitative studies whose aim is generalizability (Patton, 2015; Bhattacharya, 2017). Second, we augmented the survey responses by collecting more in-depth data through semi-structured interviews (see below).**

Table 1 outlines the survey participants' academic ranks and reveals that 60% of our respondents were tenured faculty members (i.e., Associate or Full Professors).

Table 1. *Survey Participants' Academic Rank*

	<b>Academic Rank</b>	<b>Percentage of Survey Respondents</b>
1.	Assistant professors	21%
2.	Associate professors	27%

<sup>2</sup> <https://theexchange.aacsb.edu/communities/>



3.	Full Professor	33%
4.	Other	19%

Unt

abulated results also revealed that most respondents held doctoral degrees (i.e., 87%). In addition, most respondents were from schools accredited with the business accreditation standards (60%), while some schools also met the accounting accreditation standards (31%) or both sets of standards (9%). Lastly, we note that 57% of our respondents had taken a professional development course in teaching or held an educational degree, certificate, or diploma (42%).

### Semi-Structured Interviews

#### *Interview Protocol*

Semi-structured interviews were conducted during the second phase of data collection. We conducted interviews to supplement the survey responses as multiple data-gathering instruments can provide a more comprehensive perspective to answer the research questions. Relative to the survey data, interview data can provide more in-depth insights on respondent attitudes, thoughts, and actions (Harris and Brown, 2010).

Prospective participants were chosen based on snowball sampling techniques and their positive inclination to participate based on their survey responses and from leading authors in business and management education. We emailed prospective participants a cover letter, consent form, and the interview protocol. The cover letter included a brief description of the research, details of the research ethics approval, and a request for informed consent.

Participants were emailed the interview questions before the interview (see Appendix 2 for interview questions). Interviews were conducted over Zoom or telephone and immediately transcribed using Otter.ai transcription software. Each transcribed interview was shared with the

participant within two days of the interview to allow for necessary edits. All participants confirmed the accuracy of the transcript.

### *Interviewee Profile*

We conducted 11 semi-structured interviews between April and July 2021. A saturation point was attained after the 11th interview, as the same general comments and discussions were recurring.

Table 2 provides the interview participants' demographic profiles, revealing a relatively even mix of male and female participants. The participants were more likely to be from Canada (64%) relative to the US (36%), and they were more often faculty members (64%) relative to administrators (36%).

Table 2. *Interview Participants' Demographic Profiles*

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Faculty/ Administration</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>University Location</b>	<b>Policy Documents Submitted</b>
1.	Female	Faculty	Associate Professor	Canada	Yes
2.	Male	Administration	Dean	Canada	No
3.	Male	Faculty	Full Professor	Canada	No
4.	Male	Administration	Accreditation Manager	Canada	Yes
5.	Female	Administration	Accreditation Manager	Canada	Yes
6.	Female	Administration	Accreditation Manager	Canada	Yes
7.	Female	Faculty	Independent Scholar	US	No
8.	Male	Faculty	Associate Dean	US	Yes
9.	Male	Faculty	Full Professor	US	No
10.	Female	Faculty	Full Professor	Canada	No
11.	Male	Faculty	Associate Professor	US	Yes

### *Document Analysis*

We asked the participants if they would be willing to share any policy documents that supported their claims made during the interviews. The submitted policy documents provide another source of data to identify themes related to the research questions. Two interview participants shared documents related to tenure policies, and three participants shared teaching impact and evaluation documents.

### *Thematic Analysis*

The data collected from the surveys, interviews, and policy documents provided rich, in-depth data to identify patterns and meaningful themes (Patton, 2015). **We analyzed the data with a recursive thematic analysis framework from an inductive perspective consistent with Robinson's (2021) structured tabular approach.** Nvivo 12 for Mac and MS-Excel were used to organize, categorize, and generate the themes. The thematic analysis began with each author and a research assistant independently coding the data. Next, the three independent codes for each research question were compared to determine the consistency across the identified themes. Inconsistencies were discussed until an **inter-analyst** agreement was reached (Robinson, 2021).

## **Findings**

### **Teaching Effectiveness at AACSB Accredited Schools**

We asked respondents to discuss their institution's definition and measures of teaching effectiveness. Overall, our results suggest that the definition and measurement of teaching effectiveness are often intertwined and difficult to disentangle. Most respondents were unaware of an explicit teaching effectiveness definition at their business schools (**42% of the survey**

1  
2  
3 **respondents)**; however, they could discuss several measures that formed their institution's  
4 implied definition **(58% of the survey respondents)**.  
5  
6

7  
8 The responses suggest that many institutions do not provide a clear, well-understood  
9 definition of teaching effectiveness. Only one survey respondent among all participants defined  
10 teaching effectiveness by quoting from their business school's website. Our findings are  
11 teaching effectiveness by quoting from their business school's website. Our findings are  
12 consistent with the broader literature outside the AACSB accreditation setting, which does not  
13 point to a single, agreed-upon definition of teaching effectiveness (Neath, 1996; Stehle *et al.*,  
14 2012). Nevertheless, multiple studies speak about the essential characteristics that showcase  
15 effective teaching. These findings are also consistent with the wording of AACSB Standard 7.1,  
16 which does not require schools to define teaching effectiveness explicitly. Many respondents  
17 replied that they did not have a clear definition or were unaware of any established definition.  
18 One respondent stated, "I cannot think of an agreed-upon definition across the school. This is  
19 something that is rarely discussed and is treated as private and personal for individual  
20 instructors."  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 The respondents were much more comfortable discussing surrogate measures of teaching  
36 effectiveness and offered many examples. Again, this is consistent with AACSB Standard 7.1,  
37 which explicitly requires a systematic, multi-measure assessment process. Based on these results,  
38 we identified two themes. First, we found that measurement models of teaching effectiveness fall  
39 into two categories: i) single measures and ii) multiple measures. Second, we found that the  
40 adopted measures focus on either: i) individual instructors; or ii) the institutional level. Table 3  
41 summarizes these two themes.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table 3. *Measures of Teaching Effectiveness*

	<b>Individual Instructor</b>	<b>Institution Level</b>
<b>Single Measures</b>	Tend to rely heavily on SETS.	Tend to rely heavily on direct measures from the Assurance of Learning (AOL).
<b>Portfolio Approach</b>	Mandatory reliance on SETS expanded to include teaching dossier, peer reviews, and teaching PD.	AOL direct measures expanded to include indirect measures.

Schools with single measures rely heavily on the oft-criticized Student Evaluations of Teaching Surveys (SETS). Although the literature includes some studies indicating that SETS can provide valid information (Spooren *et al.*, 2013), most studies assert that SETS are heavily biased and flawed. The problems with SETS range from biases against women, people of color, and racial/ethnic groups (Chávez and Mitchell, 2020); concerns about grade inflation (Wang and Williamson, 2020); and methodological issues (Sproule, 2000). Therefore, SETS should not be the sole measure of teaching effectiveness. One respondent lamented that “the school administration talks about learning outcomes, but in reality, they only measure the student perception [SETS] survey” when evaluating a professor’s teaching.

Schools that rely on multiple measures of teaching effectiveness tend to adopt a broader, portfolio approach. These institutions focus on SETS and incorporate other measures such as teaching dossiers, peer reviews, and professional development activities in teaching. Based on the survey data, Table 4 categorizes the teaching effectiveness measures across three usage groups: i) heavy reliance (top third), ii) moderate reliance (middle third), and iii) minimal reliance (bottom third).

Table 4. *Usage of Teaching Effectiveness Measures*

Heavy reliance	Moderate reliance	Minimal reliance
1. SETS (82%) 2. Peer evaluations (54%) 3. Teaching dossier (46%)	4. Teaching PD (41%) 5. Reflective analysis (36%) 6. SoTL (28%)	7. Educational related research (23%) 8. TPI toolbox (7%) 9. External evaluations (5%)

Next, we discuss teaching effectiveness measures at the institutional level. Most respondents discussed their institution's reliance on direct measures captured by the AOL process. The measures focus mainly on the aggregate results for various learning objectives related to a course being taught. These straightforward measures are based on artifacts of student learning.

Portfolio approaches at the institutional level combine direct measures with indirect measures. For example, graduation and retention rates, employment rates of graduates, and national surveys of student satisfaction as run by governments were all mentioned as indirect measures of teaching effectiveness.

#### ***Research on Teaching and Learning at AACSB Accredited Schools***

Next, we explored the role of RoTL at AACSB accredited schools. RoTL is a measure of teaching effectiveness as discussed in the 2020 AACSB accreditation standards. We began by exploring the value of RoTL in the tenure process at AACSB accredited business schools. The survey responses revealed a relatively even split among respondents regarding RoTL being valued as part of the tenure process (**i.e., 55% of the respondents suggested that RoTL could lead to tenure**).

The open-ended survey questions and semi-structured interviews provided insights into the value of RoTL in the tenure process. First, most institutions that accept research on RoTL as part of the tenure process do not differentiate between research in teaching and learning vs.

1  
2  
3 discipline-specific research. Instead, the overall quality of journals was the focus of the tenure  
4  
5 process. Second, we noted that RoTL is generally considered part of the tenure process if it is  
6  
7 part of a larger research plan that includes discipline-based research. The only exception is  
8  
9 teaching-stream faculty members who pursue tenure with a research portfolio based solely on  
10  
11 RoTL.  
12  
13

### 14 15 ***Stigmatization of Teaching and RoTL*** 16

17 We also identified a theme concerned with a stigma with the teaching functions at  
18  
19 AACSB schools. Although not all respondents identified the stigma, the theme emerged strongly  
20  
21 from the survey and interview data even though we did not set out to explore this topic. Two  
22  
23 sub-themes were identified based on teaching responsibilities and RoTL.  
24  
25

26 One sub-theme was the minimal institutional incentives to pursue RoTL and the  
27  
28 perceived lack of respect and value for RoTL. The following quotes highlight this sub-theme:  
29  
30 “teaching and learning scholarship is not respected at my school;” “it is either a zero influence  
31  
32 or negative (distraction from publishing in research journals);” and “SoTL is irrelevant to any  
33  
34 assessment of research productivity at this business school. Only business-discipline specific  
35  
36 journals and some top-tier cognate journals are formally accepted as evidence of excellence in  
37  
38 research.” This sub-theme is aligned with prior studies showcasing the difficulty of publishing  
39  
40 educational research (Mu & Hatch, 2021; Stout, 2018) and the perceived lower quality of  
41  
42 education research in disciplines like accounting (Tharapos and Marriott, 2020).  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 The second sub-theme is based on teaching functions. The respondents lamented that  
48  
49 teaching effectiveness was perceived as the last priority of higher leadership at their business  
50  
51 school. For example, one respondent mentioned, “our school has created goals and purposes for  
52  
53 assessing teaching effectiveness, but candidly, they are largely ignored if the faculty member is  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *producing strong research and is getting published.”* Another respondent mentioned that “*to*  
4 *some degree, our department does not really care about teaching as long as you are cranking*  
5 *out strong scholarship.”* This sub-theme is perplexing as teaching responsibilities are generally  
6 considered one of three primary functions for most university professors (research and service  
7 being the other two).  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

## 16 **Implications, Discussion, and Contribution**

### 17 **Teaching Effectiveness**

18  
19  
20  
21 A significant finding is that few business schools have attempted to create a  
22 comprehensive teaching evaluation framework that allows teaching to be treated at par with  
23 research. Even though the AACSB guiding principles and standards do not require business  
24 schools to define teaching effectiveness, we argue that every business school should clearly  
25 define effective teaching. According to Weissberg (1993), a principle of measurement theory is  
26 that “you cannot measure what you cannot define” (p. 6).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34  
35 A thoughtfully created teaching evaluation framework can further elevate teaching and  
36 showcase a comprehensive way to measure teaching effectiveness at AACSB schools.  
37  
38 Gravestock (2011) stated that “to effectively and rigorously assess teaching, institutions require  
39 comprehensive, integrated, and well-articulated evaluation frameworks” (p. 86). Drawing on  
40 prior influential studies, Gravestock (2011, p. 77) developed a comprehensive, integrated and  
41 aligned evaluation framework. **We propose that business schools consider Gravestock’s**  
42 **framework as a starting point.** The following eight interrelated steps summarize the  
43 framework:  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

- 52  
53 1. Establish evaluation goals and purposes that align with the school of business mandates.
- 54  
55 2. Provide a clear understanding of faculty responsibilities.
- 56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1
- 2
- 3 3. Define teaching effectiveness.
- 4
- 5
- 6 4. Identify criteria for evaluating faculty work and articulate the related standards of
- 7
- 8 performance.
- 9
- 10
- 11 5. Use a range of evaluation mechanisms and seek multiple forms of evidence.
- 12
- 13
- 14 6. Establish clear and transparent governance structures.
- 15
- 16
- 17 7. Provide sufficient support and training for all involved in the review process.
- 18
- 19
- 20 8. Ensure effective and consistent communication to all relevant constituents.
- 21

22 Similar frameworks have also been created by universities that dived deep into  
23 establishing a framework for assessing teaching effectiveness underpinned through extensive  
24 research (Willness *et al.*, 2014; Bowman *et al.*, 2018; Todd *et al.*, 2019; Graham, 2020; Weaver  
25 *et al.*, 2020; Simonson *et al.*, 2021). These evidence-based and research-informed frameworks  
26 can evaluate effective teaching to improve student learning.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Therefore, to evaluate effective teaching, business schools should use a framework that  
35 carefully defines effective teaching, comprehensive measurement tools, effective instructors,  
36 course design requirements, and how faculty can practice teaching excellence through  
37 scholarship and leadership.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 **Research on Teaching and Learning**

44  
45 A review of how other disciplines have reconciled the role of RoTL within their  
46 respective fields may help business schools consider the stigma with RoTL. A prominent  
47 example is Carl Wieman, Nobel prize winner in physics, who established the Carl Wieman  
48 Science Education Initiative (CWSEI) at the University of British Columbia (UBC). The multi-  
49 year project aims to dramatically improve undergraduate science education by establishing what  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 students should learn, measuring the learning in classes, incorporating effective pedagogy, and  
4  
5 publically disseminating the findings (UBC, 2017). These goals are achieved by hiring and  
6  
7 training scholars with PhDs in the relevant science discipline (Science Teaching and Learning  
8  
9 Fellows, STLF) who are keen to improve learning and are interested in education research. They  
10  
11 are “content experts first and educational people later” (UBC, 2014, p. 6). The STLF combines  
12  
13 their expertise in the specific departmental disciplines with knowledge of appropriate teaching  
14  
15 methods and research on learning, which influences hundreds of faculty and tens of thousands of  
16  
17 students each year at UBC (UBC, 2017).  
18  
19  
20

21  
22         Employing experts with PhDs in the sciences coupled with capacity building in education  
23  
24 research is also consistent with the seminal work of Lee Shulman (1986, 1987), who described  
25  
26 the use of pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) as one of the seven components of teacher  
27  
28 knowledge. PCK is the “specific amalgam of content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province  
29  
30 of teachers, their special form of professional understanding” (Shulman, 1987, p. 8). Similar  
31  
32 ideas have been propagated by Wieman (2019), who demonstrated that disciplinary expertise is  
33  
34 essential, and university teaching, when underpinned with rigorous research, improves student  
35  
36 learning outcomes over traditional teaching methods.  
37  
38  
39

40  
41         Business schools can follow this approach and encourage academics with PhDs in  
42  
43 business and management to pursue more evidence-based RoTL to improve students’ learning  
44  
45 experience in their undergraduate and graduate degree programs. Such a focus will allow for the  
46  
47 development of niche business and management faculty members in unique positions in business  
48  
49 schools who are both experts in their discipline and experts in teaching and learning to enhance  
50  
51 the student classroom experience. Furthermore, research-informed and evidence-based  
52  
53 educational theories and instructional strategies that are specifically designed for business school  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

audiences should be advanced. The niche academics will have a much broader impact on teaching and learning in business schools since they will be content experts first.

### Conclusion and Future Research

This study aimed to explore the implementation processes of various AACSB accreditation standards at business schools across Canada and the US. Specifically, this research is focused on the implementation of AACSB Standard 7 (Teaching Effectiveness and Impact) and the role of RoTL for Standard 8 (Impact of Scholarship 8). The findings show that teaching effectiveness is not articulated clearly at many business schools, and it is often conflated with the measures for teaching effectiveness. SETS are the most common measure of teaching effectiveness, though they often result from collective agreement requirements. The study also found that few business schools provide tenure based solely on RoTL excellence except for teaching-stream faculty members who pursue tenure with a research portfolio based solely on RoTL. Lastly, this study highlights a stigma for teaching responsibilities and academics who pursue RoTL relative to discipline-specific research.

Future researchers are encouraged to continue exploring these topics. First, more research is needed to better understand the antecedents and consequences of the stigma with teaching and RoTL. Does the stigma exist in certain schools or with particular academics, and if so, why?

**Second, researchers should also explore whether or not tenured vs. non-tenure-track academics have different understandings and interpretations of teaching effectiveness and its measures. Further analysis could explore possible differences in the academic ranks along the tenure track. For instance, tenured professors may be willing to measure teaching effectiveness by longer-term measures (e.g., students' performance or growth), whereas untenured professors may prefer shorter-term, quantifiable measures (e.g.,**

1  
2  
3 **teaching evaluation scores**). Lastly, our thematic analysis revealed a heavy reliance on SETS as  
4  
5 a measure of teaching effectiveness due to the collective agreement requirements. Future  
6  
7 researchers are encouraged to explore the role of unionization and collective agreements on the  
8  
9 AACSB accreditation process, which may be more pronounced in Canada than in the US.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

## 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

AACSB (2020) *Business school data guide 2020*. Available at:

<https://www.aacsb.edu/publications/datareports/data-guide>

AACSB International (2020a) *2020 guiding principles and standards for business accreditation*.

AACSB International (2020b) *Development of the 2020 Business Accreditation Standards*. Available at: <https://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/standards/business> (Accessed: 25 May 2021).

Arbaugh, J. B. *et al.* (2017) 'Key authors in business and management education research : Productivity, topics, and future directions', *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, 15(3).

Barr, R. B. and John, T. (1995) 'From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education', *Change*, 27(6), pp. 12-25.

Berk, R. A. (2005) 'Survey of 12 strategies to measure teaching effectiveness', *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 17(1), pp. 48-62.

Bhattacharya, K. (2017) *Fundamentals of qualitative research: A practical guide*. 1st Edition. New York.

Bieker, R. F. (2014) 'Does AACSB accreditation provide quality assurance and foster

1  
2  
3 quality improvement for limited resource business schools whose missions are primarily  
4 teaching?', *International Journal of Management Education*, 12(3), pp. 283-292.

5  
6  
7  
8 Bowman, J. *et al.* (2018) *Recommendations for changes to the evaluation of teaching.*  
9  
10 *University of Massachusetts Amherst.*

11  
12 Centra, J. . (1979) *Determining faculty effectiveness: Assessing teaching, research, and*  
13 *service for personnel decisions and improvement.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

14  
15  
16  
17 Chávez, K. and Mitchell, K. M. W. (2020) 'Exploring bias in student evaluations:  
18 Gender, race, and ethnicity', *PS - Political Science and Politics*, 53(2), pp. 270-274.

19  
20  
21  
22 Chickering, A. W. and Gamson, Z. F. (1987) 'Seven principles for good practice in  
23 undergraduate education', *American Association of Higher Education Bulletin*, 3(7).

24  
25  
26  
27 Demmon-Berger, D. (1986) *Effective teaching: Observations from research.* Arlington:  
28 American Association of School Administrators.

29  
30  
31  
32 Drummond, D. *et al.* (2012) *Commission on the reform of the Ontario's Public Services.*  
33 Available at: <http://www.fin.gov.on.ca/en/reformcommission/chapters/ch7.html>

34  
35  
36  
37 Fanghanel, J. *et al.* (2015) *Literature review. Defining and supporting the Scholarship of*  
38 *teaching and learning (SoTL): A sector-wide study, Higher Education Academy.* York.

39  
40  
41  
42 Fantini, A. E., Arias-Galicia, F. and Guay, D. (2001) 'Globalization and 21st century  
43 competencies: Challenges for North American higher education', in *Western Interstate*  
44 *Commission for Higher Education.* Boulder, CO, p. 33. Available at:  
45  
46  
47 [https://conahec.org/Documents/WP/WP-11/WP-11\\_en.pdf](https://conahec.org/Documents/WP/WP-11/WP-11_en.pdf)

48  
49  
50  
51 Fink, L. D. (2008) 'Evaluating teaching: A new approach to an old problem', *To improve*  
52 *the academy*, 26(1), pp. 1-21.

53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Graham, R. (2020) *The career framework for university teaching.* Available at:

1  
2  
3 <https://www.teachingframework.com/>  
4

5 Gravestock, P. S. (2011) *Does teaching matter? The role of teaching evaluation in tenure*  
6 *policies at selected Canadian universities*. OISE: University of Toronto.  
7

8  
9  
10 Guskin, A. E. (1994) 'Reducing student costs and enhancing student learning- part II  
11 Restructuring the role of faculty', *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 26(4), pp. 23-29.  
12  
13

14 Harris, L. R. and Brown, G. T. L. (2010) 'Mixing interview and questionnaire methods:  
15 Practical problems in aligning data', *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, 15(1), pp.  
16  
17  
18  
19 1-19.  
20

21 Highet, G. (1957) *The art of teaching*. Vintage ed. New York: Vintage Books.  
22

23  
24 Hunt, S. C. (2015) 'Research on the value of AACSB business accreditation in selected  
25 areas: A review and synthesis', *American Journal of Business Education*, 8(1), pp. 23-30.  
26  
27

28 Mantzicopoulos, P. *et al.* (2018) 'Predicting kindergarteners' achievement and motivation  
29 from observational measures of teaching effectiveness', *Journal of Experimental Education*,  
30  
31  
32  
33 86(2), pp. 214-232.  
34

35 Mckeachie, W. . (1979) *Student ratings of faculty: A reprise*, *American Association of*  
36 *University Professors*. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40248725?seq=1>  
37  
38

39  
40 Mu, F. and Hatch, J. (2021) 'Becoming a teacher scholar: The perils and promise of  
41 meeting the promotion and tenure requirements in a business school', *Journal of Management*  
42 *Education*, 45(2), pp. 293-318.  
43  
44

45  
46  
47 Neath, I. (1996) 'How to improve your teaching evaluations without improving your  
48 teaching', *Psychological Reports*, 78, pp. 1363-1372.  
49

50  
51 Onwuegbuzie, A. J. *et al.* (2007) 'Students' perceptions of characteristics of effective  
52 college teachers: A validity study of a teaching evaluation form using a mixed-methods  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 analysis', *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(1), pp. 113-160.

4  
5 Patton (2015) *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. Sage Publications, Inc.

6  
7 Robinson, O. C. (2021). Conducting thematic analysis on brief texts: The structured  
8  
9 tabular approach. *Qualitative Psychology*.

10  
11 Ramsden, P. (2003) *Learning to teach in higher education*, 2nd edition. London:  
12  
13 Routledge: Taylor and Francis.

14  
15 Shulman, L. S. (1986) 'Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching',  
16  
17  
18 *Educational Researcher*, 15(3), pp. 1-14.

19  
20 Shulman, L. S. (1987) 'Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform',  
21  
22  
23 *Harvard Educational Review*, 1(57), pp. 1-21.

24  
25 Simonson, S. R., Earl, B. and Frary, M. (2021) 'Establishing a framework for assessing  
26  
27  
28 teaching effectiveness', *College Teaching*, pp. 1-18.

29  
30 Spoooren, P., Brockx, B. and Mortelmans, D. (2013) 'On the validity of student evaluation  
31  
32  
33 of teaching: The state of the art', *Review of Educational Research*, 83(4), pp. 598-642.

34  
35 Sproule, R. (2000) 'Student evaluation of teaching: A methodological critique of  
36  
37  
38 conventional practices', *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(50), pp. 1-23.

39  
40 Stehle, S., Spinath, B. and Kadmon, M. (2012) 'Measuring teaching effectiveness:  
41  
42  
43 Correspondence between students' evaluations of teaching and different measures of student  
44  
45 learning', *Research in Higher Education*, 53(8), pp. 888-904.

46  
47 Stout, D. E. (2018) 'Further things I have learned ... Selected reflections about  
48  
49  
50 publishing in accounting education', *Issues in Accounting Education*, 33(3), pp. 67-84.

51  
52 Tharapos, M. and Marriott, N. (2020) 'Beauty is in the eye of the beholder: Research  
53  
54  
55 quality in accounting education', *British Accounting Review*, 52(5), p. 100934.

1  
2  
3 Todd, J. *et al.* (2019) *Teaching effectiveness framework*.

4  
5 Tullis, K. J. and Camey, J. P. (2007) 'Strategic implications of specialized business  
6 school accreditation: End of the line for some business education programs?', *Journal of*  
7  
8 *Education for Business*, 83(1), pp. 45-51.

9  
10  
11 University of British Columbia (2014) *CWSEI science teaching and learning Fellows*  
12  
13 *(STLFs) reflections on their job*. Available at: [www.cwsei.ubc.ca](http://www.cwsei.ubc.ca)

14  
15 University of British Columbia, (2017) *Carl wieman science education initiative*,  
16  
17 Available at: [www.cwsei.ubc.ca](http://www.cwsei.ubc.ca)

18  
19 Wang, G. and Williamson, A. (2020) 'Course evaluation scores: valid measures for  
20  
21 teaching effectiveness or rewards for lenient grading?', *Teaching in Higher Education*, 0(0), pp.  
22  
23 1-22.

24  
25 Weaver, G. C. *et al.* (2020) 'Establishing a better approach for evaluating teaching: The  
26  
27 TEval project', *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 52(3), pp. 25-31.

28  
29 Weissberg, R. (1993) 'Standardized teaching evaluations', *Perspectives on Political*  
30  
31 *Science*, 22(1), pp. 5-7.

32  
33  
34 Wieman, C. (2019) 'Expertise in university teaching & the implications for teaching  
35  
36 effectiveness, evaluation & training', *Daedalus*, 148(4), pp. 47-78.

37  
38 Willness, C., Turner, N. and George, C. (2014) *Building a shared framework for teaching*  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
*quality at the University of Saskatchewan*.



## Appendix 1.

*Characteristics of Effective Teaching from the Literature*

Broad overarching Theme	Demmon-Berger, Debbie (1986)- 15 characteristics of effective teaching.	Chickering and Gamson (1987)- seven principles of good teaching.	Ramsden (2003) - 13 principles of good teaching.	Onwuegbuzie et al. (2007) - Four characteristics of effective teaching & nine themes.	Fink (2008) - Four key dimensions of teaching.
Faculty Characteristic	tend to be good managers.  believe in their own efficacy.  are caring.  are democratic in their approach.  are task-oriented.  are comfortable interacting with others.  are accessible to students outside of class.  are flexible and imaginative.			Communicator  advocate responsible  empowering  professional  expert  ethical  director	teacher's effort to improve over time.
Faculty Love of Subject	have a strong grasp of subject matter.		a desire to share your love of the subject with students.	enthusiastic	
Pedagogical repertoire	use systematic instruction techniques.  vary teaching strategies.  handle discipline through prevention.	using active learning techniques.	an ability to make the material stimulating and interesting.  a facility for engaging with students at their level of understanding.  a commitment to making it	Connector  Transmitter	Design of learning experience.

	<p>are concerned with perceptual meanings rather than with facts and events.</p> <p>tailor teaching to student needs.</p>		<p>absolutely clear what has to be understood at what level and why.</p> <p>using teaching methods and academic tasks that require students to learn actively, responsibly and co-operatively.</p> <p>a focus on central concepts, and students' misunderstandings of them, rather than covering the ground.</p>		
Student Motivation and learning	<p>have high expectations of students and themselves.</p>	<p>encouraging student-faculty contact.</p> <p>developing reciprocity and cooperation among students.</p> <p>respecting diverse talents and ways of learning</p> <p>communicating high expectations.</p> <p>emphasizing time on task.</p>	<p>showing concern and respect for students.</p> <p>a commitment to encouraging independence.</p> <p>a commitment to encouraging independence.</p> <p>an ability to improvise and adapt to new demands.</p>	student centered	Extent and quality of student learning
Timely Feedback		<p>providing prompt feedback.</p>	<p>giving the highest quality feedback on student work.</p>	responsive	
Scholarly teaching			<p>a desire to learn from students and other sources about the effects of teaching and how it can be improved.</p>		

## Appendix II - Research Question Aligned with Interview Questions

<p><b>Research Question 1</b></p> <p>What is considered as “teaching effectiveness” according to Standard 7 at AACSB accredited business schools in Canada/USA?</p>	<p><b>Research Question 2</b></p> <p>Can teaching and learning scholarship lead to tenure at AACSB accredited business schools in Canada/USA?</p>
<p><b>Interview Question 1</b></p> <p>Has your business school created any comprehensive, integrated and aligned evaluation framework to measure teaching?</p>	<p><b>Interview Question 8</b></p> <p>How is education-related research (i.e. RoTL) treated as part of your business schools' tenure process?</p>
<p><b>Interview Question 2</b></p> <p>How does your business school communicate faculty responsibilities in the area of teaching effectiveness?</p>	<p><b>Interview Question 9</b></p> <p>Is there anything else that you would like to add to our discussion?</p>
<p><b>Interview Question 3</b></p> <p>How does your business school define teaching effectiveness?</p>	
<p><b>Interview Question 4</b></p> <p>Has your business school established evaluation goals and purposes that align with institutional mandates for measuring teaching effectiveness? If so, what is involved? How does your business school identify criteria for the evaluation of faculty work and articulate the related standards of performance to faculty?</p>	
<p><b>Interview Question 5</b></p> <p>Does your school have a range of evaluation mechanisms, and does the school use multiple forms of evidence to measure teaching effectiveness?</p>	
<p><b>Interview Question 6</b></p> <p>Aside from Student Evaluation of Teaching surveys, what other direct measures do you use to evaluate Teaching Effectiveness at the individual instructor level?</p>	
<p><b>Interview Question 7</b></p> <p>Does your school provide sufficient support and /or training for improving teaching effectiveness?</p>	