



May 21, 2020

Yim-Yu Wong
Dean
San Francisco State University
College of Business
Business, Room 321
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94132-4156
yywong@sfsu.edu

Dear Dean Wong:

It is my pleasure to inform you that the peer review team recommendation to extend accreditation for the degree programs in business offered by San Francisco State University is concurred with by the Continuous Improvement Review Committee (CIRC) and ratified by the Board of Directors. Congratulations to you, the faculty, the students, the staff, and all supporters of San Francisco State University.

San Francisco State University has achieved accreditation for five additional years. The next on-site continuous improvement review occurs in the fifth year, 2024-2025. A timeline specific to the school's visit year is available [here](#).

One purpose of peer review is to recognize initiatives that support an environment of continuous improvement of quality programs. As noted in the team report San Francisco State University is to be commended on the best practices found on **Attachment A**

The school should begin to address the concern(s) identified by the peer review team and CIRC. As part of the next Continuous Improvement Review Application, due July 1, 2022, the school is asked to update the CIRC on the progress made in addressing the concerns listed on **Attachment B**.

Please refer to the [Continuous Improvement Review Handbook](#) for more information regarding the processes for continuous improvement reviews. The handbook is evolving and will be updated frequently to provide the latest revisions to the CIR process. Continue to monitor the website for the most current version of the handbook.

Again, congratulations from the Accreditation Council and AACSB International - The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business. Thank you for participating in the continuous improvement review process and for providing valuable feedback that is essential to a meaningful and beneficial review.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "John A. Elliott".

John Elliott, Chair
Board of Directors

cc: peer review team

Americas Headquarters

777 South Harbour Island Blvd.
Suite 750
Tampa, Florida 33602-5730 USA
Main +1 813 769 6500
Fax: +1 813 769 6559

**Europe, Middle East, and
Africa Headquarters**

UP Building, Piet Heinkade 55
1019 GM Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Main: +31 20 509 1070

Asia Pacific Headquarters

331 North Bridge Road
#10-04/05 Odeon Towers
Singapore, 188720
Main: +65 6592 5210
Fax: +65 6339 6511

May 15, 2020

San Francisco State University

Attachment A

This section provides a brief description of commendations and best practices of the school that demonstrate leadership and high-quality continuous improvement in management education.

1. The Lam Family College of Business has a vibrant student-oriented culture, where faculty support students' ability to thrive in an inspiring and interactive learning environment that is reinforced by the many programs and services that are provided to its students.
2. The college has established many forums and centers such as the Women in Emerging Leadership Forum, Commercial Real Estate Certificate and Entrepreneurship Fellows Program to enhance the educational programming for its students.
3. The involvement and strong commitment of the advisory board, corporate partners and alumni are a major asset for the college. This is especially shown by the success of the fundraising activities for the college, which has generated new academic proposals in the areas off Fintech, Biomedical MBA, Entrepreneurship and Innovation.

May 15, 2020

San Francisco State University

Attachment B

This section identifies areas that the school should address during the coming review cycle. Please be prepared to discuss progress made in addressing these concerns in the continuous improvement review application.

1. The Lam Family College of Business should review the current structure of its strategic plan and consider revising it to include fewer goals that have quantifiable and measurable objectives in benchmarking its expected outcomes. The plan should have a more systematic and inclusive annual review process with an action plan detailing the responsible parties for implementation to include all major stakeholders (faculty, staff, students and alumni). (Standard 1: Mission, Impact, and Innovation)
2. The college's mission indicates that "Our mission is to prepare students for professional success through high quality teaching, innovative and relevant courses, discipline-based and pedagogical scholarship, and engagement with the academic and business communities". Thus, both teaching and discipline-based research are primary expectations. The school's guidelines specify discipline-based scholarship (basic) at 35-45 percent, contribution to practice (applied) at 35-45 percent and learning and pedagogical research at 10-20 percent. The actual results are 73.3 percent discipline based, 15.8 percent applied and 10.8 percent pedagogical. Based on the recommended targets for research, it appears that the 10-20 percent target for pedagogical research is not reflective of the college's mission statement. In the coming review cycle, the college should define specific research goals with respect to the types of intellectual contributions expected, especially in the area of pedagogical research that will better support the college's mission. (Standard 2: Intellectual Contributions, Impact and Alignment with Mission)
3. While the school has defined the faculty qualification criteria based on the 2013 standards, the Scholarly Academic (SA) and Practice Academic (PA) criteria should be reviewed and re-defined to make sure that faculty are producing the appropriate quantity and quality of peer reviewed publications (PRJs) and have the appropriate depth of industry involvement to reach these classifications. Activities that count towards SA should only include scholarly activities. The team recommends that the college review AACSB standards for guidance. A review of the criteria for PA appears to be weak as some faculty, based on the current criteria, can achieve this classification with only modest industry involvement. In the case of PA, the process for moving into this classification from the SA classification was not well defined. The process for faculty moving into the PA category has to be made clear so that faculty without PRJs are not classified as PA versus being classified as "Other." (Standard 15: Faculty Qualifications and Engagement)