

Using Adjunct Faculty to Teach Entrepreneurship at an AACSB- Accredited Business Program: Synergies and Opportunities

Kirk C. Heriot
Columbus State University

Leo Simpson
Seattle University

Harriet Stephenson
Seattle University

In 2001, Murray Low pointed out that the demand for entrepreneurship courses continued to grow unabated. Yet, he also pointed out that, “Business schools have met student demand for entrepreneurship courses by using adjunct faculty” (Low, 2001). The use of adjunct faculty presents a real challenge to universities, especially those programs accredited by AACSB International. AACSB International allows instructors to be professionals, but they are required to be professionally qualified (AACSB, 2011).

This research highlights a unique situation in which adjunct faculty were used to teach courses in a graduate entrepreneurship program at Seattle University. We address the issues associated with using adjunct faculty while ensuring they maintain their professional qualifications. We use a typical human resource management framework (Allen, et al., 2010) to highlight how the adjunct instructors were trained, assigned, and evaluated. We conclude with observations on the practical implications of this study as well as a commentary on future research issues.

In 2001, Murray Low pointed out the demand for entrepreneurship courses has continued to grow unabated. Yet, he also pointed out that, “Business schools have met student demand for entrepreneurship courses by using adjunct faculty” (Low, 2001). The use of adjunct faculty presents a real challenge to universities, especially those programs accredited by AACSB International. AACSB business programs must offer ninety percent of their courses with either academically qualified (AQ) or professionally qualified (PQ) faculty (AACSB, 2012). The number of professionally qualified faculty may not exceed forty percent of all faculty resources. If the percentage of PQ faculty as a part of overall course offerings rises above forty percent of faculty resources, the business program risks not meeting AACSB Standard 10 which regulates faculty qualifications (AACSB, 2012).

For business programs that offer multiple courses in entrepreneurship, the use of PQ faculty is particularly important. Previous research has shown that the demand for undergraduate and MBA courses in entrepreneurship far exceeds the capacity of business programs to staff these courses with doctoral-trained entrepreneurship faculty (Brush, et al., 2003). In more recent research, Finkle (2010) notes that the situation has not improved very much; the shortage of entrepreneurship faculty continues to be an issue with 1.6 jobs available per candidate.

Thus, new and existing courses must be staffed with either PQ or AQ faculty and the supply of these individuals for entrepreneurship is limited at best (Low, 2001; Finkle, 2008). Universities generally have a limited “pie” of resources available and for new entrepreneurship courses to be taught, tradeoffs may have to be made. Internally, traditional business courses such as strategic management, principles of marketing and corporate finance also must be staffed. In the short run, it is a zero sum game unless new financial resources can be identified. Yet, new resources are not likely to be realized in the short run as most American universities are being forced to slash budgets as a result of the poor state of the economy (Stripling & Fuller, 2011). The end result is that the rapid growth of entrepreneurship in higher education has led many schools to use adjuncts to deliver their programs and courses because the supply of academically qualified faculty in entrepreneurship has not kept pace with demand (Brush, et. al., 2003).

Many entrepreneurship programs are combined with a center or other outreach activities (Finkle, Kuratko, & Goldsby, 2006). Thus, academically qualified faculty have additional activities in which they are engaged other than teaching. Solomon, Duffy, and Tarabishy (2002), discussed the results of a twenty-year investigation of teaching entrepreneurial education and small business management in the U.S. Their data is based upon six national surveys. They believe a trend exists toward greater integration of practical applications and technology in entrepreneurial education. They note that new venture creation, small business management, and small business consulting remain the most popular courses in the field. However, they do not address the issue of how faculty resources can and should be obtained to meet these needs. The current paper seeks to address the gap in the literature related to how to do so. Given the aforementioned limitations with staffing entrepreneurship courses, the current study examines the way one AACSB-accredited School of Business has been able to use adjunct faculty to teach entrepreneurship in their MBA program.

In the following sections, we describe the efforts of one of the authors to offer multiple entrepreneurship courses in an MBA program at the Albers School of Business and Economics at Seattle University. In the second section, we briefly describe the extant literature with an emphasis on literature about professional qualifications of faculty in the absence of academically qualified faculty. This review briefly covers literature on entrepreneurship education in the U.S. in order to provide the proper context for this paper. The fourth section provides observations of how adjunct faculty were used to staff entrepreneurship courses to include insights gained by the process of administering this program. In the final section we offer observations on the implications of this study as well as a brief commentary on future research on using business professionals to teach entrepreneurship.

BACKGROUND

The literature on entrepreneurship education is still in a developmental stage (Fiet, 2001). This conclusion is startling when one considers just how far entrepreneurial phenomena have come in the last thirty years. Katz (2003) demonstrated that interest in entrepreneurship in colleges and universities has been nothing short of incredible. The growth rate has been phenomenal with more than 1,600 colleges and universities offering at least one course in entrepreneurship in the U.S. today. This number contrasts greatly with the fewer than 20 universities that offered entrepreneurship/small business courses in the late 1970s and early 1980s (Fiet, 2001a; Fiet, 2001b).

Efforts to assess entrepreneurship education have focused largely on pedagogical issues (Solomon, et al., 1998). Entrepreneurship education has been evaluated from a variety of perspectives including what is taught, why it is taught, how it is taught, and how well it works (Gorman & Hanlon, 1997; Vesper & Gartner, 1997; Solomon, Winslow, & Tarabishy, 1998). Not all issues in entrepreneurship education are truly pedagogical in nature. For example, staffing entrepreneurship courses is an issue that is critical to administrators tasked with this responsibility in their college or school. Yet, this topic has not been addressed by researchers.

Programs that are accredited by AACSB must abide by its standards. Thus, the task of staffing entrepreneurship courses is even more daunting as a department chair in an AACSB accredited program may not simply hire an adjunct to teach an entrepreneurship course. The typical adjunct would likely not meet the standards of AACSB. This situation leads to a conflict between the accrediting agencies and university administration as growth rates of new entrepreneurship programs exceed university administration's ability to acquire faculty with the credentials specified by the AACSB. The current paper examines new ways to staff rapid growth entrepreneurship programs with professionally qualified instructors in the absence of academically qualified faculty. It also suggests new standards for evaluation of quality beyond AQ and PQ designations.

AACSB ACCREDITATION

“Accreditation is designed to provide third-party recognition of educational program quality. AACSB accreditation is the benchmark of quality for business education worldwide” (Krueger, Shorter, and Huff, 2012, p. 2). Thus, it is considered a mark of distinction (Hedrick, Henson, Krieg & Wassell, 2010). In fact, *Entrepreneur* magazine recently recognized the fifty best undergraduate and graduate business programs in the United States (Juergen, 2011); all but two of these 50 programs were accredited by AACSB (AACSB, 2012).

The specific standard that applies to the use of adjunct faculty is AACSB Standard 10 (AACSB, 2012):

Standard 10: The faculty of the school has, and maintains, expertise to accomplish the mission, and to ensure this occurs, the school has clearly defined processes to evaluate individual faculty members’ contributions to the school’s mission. The school specifies, for both academically qualified and professionally qualified faculty, the required initial qualifications of faculty (original academic preparation and/or professional experience), as well as requirements for maintaining faculty competence (intellectual contributions, professional development, or practice). [FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS]

AACSB standards were revised in January 2012. A few items related to Standard 10 are of particular significance to the present paper:

1. Ninety percent of all faculty must be academically or professionally qualified.
2. Fifty percent of all faculty must be academically qualified.
3. Qualified faculty resources are distributed across programs, disciplines, and locations consistent with the school’s mission.
4. The burden of proof rests with the school to demonstrate high quality in such cases.

It is important to understand that using adjunct faculty to teach entrepreneurship at an AACSB accredited school or college of business is not a simple matter. Standard 10 must be followed and explanations for deviation from the standard create a significant burden of proof for the school.

As noted, the use of adjunct faculty is a rather common practice in higher education (McPherson, 2003; Hall, 2011; Townsend, 2000). Some studies suggest the percentage of adjunct faculty grew from 22% in the 1970s to 46% in the 1990s (Moser, 2001). Adjunct faculty typically teach anywhere between one and six or more courses per year. According to AACSB, most adjuncts are categorized as supporting faculty because they “participate in the intellectual or operational life of the school beyond the direct performance of teaching responsibilities” (AACSB, 2011, p. 39). There are any number of reasons supporting why adjunct faculty are used, not the least of which is the cost-benefit of paying someone far less to teach a college course than the institution would pay a fulltime faculty member.¹ Recent evidence suggests budget problems are also forcing administrators to increase use of adjuncts (West, 2011).

Yet, when it comes to teaching entrepreneurship, particularly at AACSB-accredited colleges or schools of business, the use of supporting faculty becomes problematic. As noted previously, AACSB Accreditation Standard 10 requires academically qualified faculty to be no less than fifty percent of all faculty resources and the combination of professionally and academically faculty to be at least ninety percent of all faculty resources (AACSB, 2011). Thus, an AACSB program must be careful to categorize their faculty as academically or professionally qualified.

¹ A faculty member assigned to teach six courses per academic year and paid \$90,000 annually is essentially paid \$15,000 per course. An adjunct may be paid anywhere from between \$1,500 to \$5,000 depending upon the school.

FACULTY SHORTAGE

According to Brush, et al. (2003), the demand for entrepreneurship courses is far above what can be taught by the current supply of doctoral-trained qualified faculty with an ability to teach within entrepreneurship programs. “Our study shows that the rapid and sustained growth of universities’ undergraduate and MBA offerings in entrepreneurship has far outstripped the supply of doctoral-trained entrepreneurship faculty available to deliver those programs and courses” (Brush, et al., 2003, p. 316). Kuratko (2003, 2005) echoes this shortfall in the supply of trained AQ entrepreneurship faculty, noting that there is a faculty pipeline shortage. Katz (2003) also points out the lack of Ph.D. programs established to provide pure entrepreneurship faculty. More recent studies suggest the supply of entrepreneurship faculty is improving (Finkle, 2007), but shortages exist with one study showing 1.6 jobs per candidate (Finkle, 2010). As a result, according to Low (2001), it has become a necessity for administrators in college business programs to use adjuncts in order to staff multiple entrepreneurship courses.

Part of the reason why there are so few doctoral programs in entrepreneurship is that doctoral programs tend to be by design focused on generating specialists with very strong research capability in microcosms within traditional disciplines. They rarely provide the opportunity for new faculty to be broadly trained across functional areas with the ability to integrate multiple academic disciplines into an applied framework to understand entrepreneurial phenomenon. Doctoral programs provide strong AQ faculty who can publish numerous research studies on their specific interest within entrepreneurship such as financial, behavioral, or marketing aspects. However, doctoral programs do not develop the individual ability of a faculty member to integrate broad knowledge of entrepreneurship areas generally learned through experience or consulting.

So while AQ faculty are considered to be a critical qualifier for a quality program by the AACSB, even if there were more AQ faculty available, program quality might not increase without training in the skills necessary to teach cross-disciplinary experiential learning.

TEACHING ENTREPRENEURSHIP AT SEATTLE UNIVERSITY

The focus of this study is on the use of real entrepreneurs to teach entrepreneurship courses. However, most of the extant literature has focused on pedagogical issues in entrepreneurship education (Solomon et al., 2002). Very little research has addressed the issue of staffing entrepreneurship courses with adjuncts. Thus, our choice of a research design was influenced by a limited theoretical foundation.

The current research necessitated that we observe the process of using adjunct faculty to teach entrepreneurship courses. We chose to use a human resources framework to demonstrate how adjunct faculty were successfully used to teach entrepreneurship courses at an AACSB accredited school of business. This observational approach has also been used in other research about entrepreneurship education (e.g., Heriot & Campbell, 2004) and business education (West, 2010).

As part of our observations, we provide background information about Seattle University in Seattle, Washington. Then, we discuss the human resource function that serves as the basis for our observations of the use of adjunct faculty to deliver the entrepreneurship curriculum in a MBA program.

Background. One of the authors was hired as an Endowed Chair of Entrepreneurship at Seattle University. Prior to joining the university, he was the Director of Small Business Institute® programs at two other universities where he also served as an endowed chair. At the large public university where he served prior to moving to the western U.S., he was the first endowed chair in entrepreneurship and

the director of their center for entrepreneurship. In this role, he developed a new entrepreneurship program which included a minor and major in entrepreneurship and a business plan competition. In his new position at Seattle University, his role is somewhat different. There was an existing Entrepreneurship Center with an executive director and a former occupant of the endowed chair in entrepreneurship who moved back into the faculty to direct the Small Business Institute® upon his arrival.

As part of his duties, he is required to make sure entrepreneurship courses are staffed. The endowed chair position is considered to be a partnership with the Executive Director of the Entrepreneurship Center. The endowed chair is responsible for all academic issues and the Director manages the business plan competition, family business institute, and center’s activities. Since his arrival, the Minor in Entrepreneurship has been developed, a nationally competitive SIFE team has been established and new entrepreneurship courses at the MBA and undergraduate levels have been developed and stabilized. This growth has been challenging because the university relies heavily on adjuncts while still maintaining accreditation with AACSB in the School of Business.

The University and Region. Seattle University has a total student body of approximately 8,000 students. The university offers degrees in Arts, Business, Science and Engineering, Law, Theology, and Education. The School of Business recently had their accreditation with AACSB reaffirmed (See Table 1 for a summary).

Table 1. *University Overview*

	Comment	Profile
Region	Northwest	Serves large regional area.
City	Seattle, Washington	The city has a population of 608,000. The city has developed into a national and regional center for a variety of businesses, including, but not limited to manufacturing, biotechnology, communications technology, retail, food services, and beverage makers.
University	Seattle University	The university has 8,000 students and offers degrees in Arts, Business, Science and Engineering, Law, Theology, and Education. The College of Business is accredited by AACSB.
Faculty	Fourth year at university	Terminally degreed at the Ph.D. level, with corporate managerial experience as well as entrepreneurial experience (including the prior ownership of a marketing firm).
Programs	Undergraduate and MBA	The MBA Specialization in Entrepreneurship requires 12 credit hours, a practicum course, and a written business plan.

Program. The Entrepreneurship Program includes a Minor in Entrepreneurship which requires six courses, including an entrepreneurship essentials course, a business plan course, finance and marketing courses, and two elective courses. The MBA program has a specialization in entrepreneurship. This program requires the graduate students to take 18 credit hours, including a practicum, and the completion of a “high-quality” written business plan which must be entered into the business plan competition.

Faculty. The university has only one dedicated professor who teaches entrepreneurship. An additional faculty member teaches a course dedicated to field-based consulting (Heriot & Campbell, 2004). Thus, the capacity to offer several entrepreneurship courses in the graduate program as well as 4 sections of undergraduate entrepreneurship courses is quite constrained due to a lack of faculty qualified in entrepreneurship and consulting.

A HUMAN RESOURCE FRAMEWORK

Staffing a business program with adjunct instructors can be a real challenge, especially for a business program concerned about percentages of faculty who are academically qualified and professionally qualified. What follows is a description of the process used to ensure the adjunct faculty were prepared to actually teach entrepreneurship courses. In many respects, the use of adjuncts in this setting parallels the human resource function in any organization (e.g., Allen, Bryant, & Vardaman, 2010). Allen, et al. (2010, p. 56) point out that human resource management may be divided among “managing organization entry and the work environment.” Adjuncts, like employees, must be recruited and selected, trained and developed, assigned to courses, evaluated and compensated. Thus, we will describe the process used to ensure the entrepreneurs were professionally qualified as a series of activities or steps much like the traditional human resource function (Allen, et al., 2010). In addition we will address a set of skills any faculty member must possess, whether AQ or PQ, that is not currently part of the evaluation of quality as defined by the AACSB. We follow this procedure in the interest of explaining the different aspects of employing the entrepreneurs as adjunct faculty. The actual process the university used was not organized in such a deliberate manner from the onset. It evolved over time at the university. Table 2 summarizes the ten major activities engaged in by the business program.

Table 2. *Summary of Model Used to Effectively Integrate Entrepreneurs as PQ Qualified Faculty*

Phase	Activities
Program Evaluation	Established need to use adjuncts.
Selection	The adjuncts who teach in the MBA program have MBA degrees and at least 30 years of entrepreneurial and/or consulting experience. They have either worked for Accenture for a long time (ex-CIO) or have had their own business ventures and are now venture capitalists, angel investors, or otherwise financially independent.
Orientation	Each fall all the adjuncts take an orientation where they are taught all the necessary standards, approaches, expectations, etc. of the School of Business.
Training & Development	Their first experience in teaching a course is typically done in conjunction with an AQ faculty member to learn the various techniques and approaches used by AQ faculty. After one quarter of co-teaching with an AQ faculty member, they then teach courses with strong support from the AQ faculty member.
Staffing	After teaching a course twice, the adjunct’s performance is evaluated to determine if they are prepared to teach on their own. At this point, the adjuncts are given full control of their course subject to student course evaluations.
Performance Appraisal	Adjuncts are evaluated using they university’s course evaluation form. The adjuncts teaching in the program over the past two years have averaged between 4.4 and 5.0 on courses taught in the MBA program. AQ faculty averaged 3.9 to 4.8 on the same classes...all on a 5.0 scale.

Compensation	The adjuncts are paid \$4,100-4,600 per course. The university uses a quarter-system with each class meeting 3 hours a week for 3 credits. A quarter is approximately ten weeks long as compared to a typical semester which is 15-weeks in length.
Continuous Improvement	This activity is not really part of a typical HR process, but it is consistent with the expectations of AACSB.
Strategic Issues	This activity is on-going. The business program has had to make adjustments in staffing due to the economy. As a private university, they have seen a decline in enrollments in their MBA program. Yet, they have also observed many benefits of employing entrepreneurs as PQ adjunct faculty. These benefits extend far beyond the classroom to which the adjuncts are assigned.

Program Evaluation. The endowed chair in entrepreneurship in partnership with the Executive Director of the Entrepreneurship Center was largely responsible for staffing all of the entrepreneurship courses in the MBA program. Thus, it was important to take stock of the situation he faced before moving forward. His evaluation revealed that he was required to develop a minor in entrepreneurship, publish in peer-reviewed journals, develop a nationally competitive SIFE team, complete university and community service, and also teach four (five quarter hour) entrepreneurship courses per year. He also observed that the Executive Director of the Center was responsible for acquiring self-support contributions for a \$300,000+ budget, develop a major business plan competition, create a successful family business institute program, and numerous other responsibilities. As a result, it was apparent using adjunct faculty was the best solution. It was a simple reality that professionally qualified entrepreneurs would need to be hired to teach entrepreneurship courses. In considering this need, the human resource process noted previously was utilized. The program evaluation led to a need to forecast how many adjunct faculty would be needed to staff the entrepreneurship courses in the MBA program.

The following activities were used to ensure the business program met the requirements of AACSB Standard 10 (Faculty Qualifications). As noted, these activities are described using a human resource management framework because that best describes how the process was organized. However, we must point out that HR function is used as a framework for describing how adjunct faculty were used. It does not reflect an a priori plan that was formulated and implemented. The actual process of using adjuncts was much more trial and error by nature. It was a process that evolved into something akin to the typical HR function.

Selection. Once a need to use adjunct faculty was identified, there was a need to identify and select these individuals. The adjuncts who teach in the MBA program have MBA degrees and at least 30 years of entrepreneurial and/or consulting experience. They have either worked for an entrepreneurial firm like Accenture for a long time (ex-CIO) or have had their own ventures and/or are now venture capitalists, angel investors, or otherwise financially independent. Their interest is to give back to young people the excitement associated with consulting or entrepreneurship. The primary motivation for teaching is not the financial compensation. They are part of the Management, Finance, and Marketing Departments.

Orientation. Each quarter all new adjuncts are provided an orientation where they are taught all the necessary standards, approaches, expectations, etc. utilizing best practices of present AQ and PQ faculty. This was considered an important activity not just because of the obvious need to explain administrative issues, but to truly make the adjuncts feel like they are valuable members of the faculty and to improve the probability of a quality performance.

Training and Development. Quite a bit of energy is spent making new adjuncts are in compliance with the PQ standards of the AACSB and that sufficient numbers of AQ faculty are used to offset their percentages. Their first experience in teaching a course is typically done in conjunction with experienced faculty to learn the various techniques and approaches used by AQ and experienced PQ faculty. After one quarter of support and guidance, they then teach courses with strong support from the other faculty.

The quality of teaching in entrepreneurship, particularly at the graduate level, is less dependent upon AQ and PQ certification than other factors such as: 1) mastery of cross-disciplinary integration; 2) operating effective teams doing complex real-world projects; 3) experienced in developing business plans and able to teach that skill in detail; and 4) able to deal with real world application, etc. A good term to represent this might be “Entre-Q”. It is not a given that AQ or PQ faculty will have these abilities, yet they are critical to a high quality entrepreneurial program. Some “old school” (Ronstadt, 1985) AQ faculty have this “action oriented” orientation, but doctoral programs tend to fall short on teaching methods including these abilities. Many doctoral entrepreneurial graduates have never written a business plan, started a business, or consulted with real world businesses. Likewise, PQ faculty do not usually have knowledge of how to work with students to transfer their knowledge. One objective of the program being described is to increase the number of faculty in the MBA program with “Entre-Q”.

Staffing. Initially the adjuncts were used to staff two consulting courses: New Venture Consulting and International Consulting. This effort was rather practical because the classes were taught at the same time each week so both classes could be combined to take advantage of special skills of AQ tenured faculty and PQ adjunct faculty. This is still a common practice early in the quarter to take advantage of “research” presentations by library personnel, etc. Since its inception, the program to use professionally qualified faculty to teach entrepreneurship courses has expanded beyond the consulting courses. They also teach the Business Plan Development, New Venture, and other related entrepreneurship courses at the graduate level.

Care was taken to provide the adjunct professors “Entre-Q” orientation prior to having full responsibility for the course. During the first term and at the end, performance was evaluated to determine if the adjuncts had sufficient “Entre-Q” skills to continue without further assistance. Generally the learning curve was rapid with adjuncts due to the selection of individuals with high “Entre-Q” skills from their life experience.

Performance Appraisal. Performance appraisal is a critical component of most human resource management systems (Robbins & Coulter, 2009). Like many universities, student evaluations are a critical component of the performance appraisal process. The results have been outstanding with the adjuncts often scoring higher on their teaching evaluations than the long term AQ faculty. The adjuncts teaching in the program over the past two years have averaged between 4.4 and 5.0 on courses taught in the MBA program. AQ faculty averaged 3.9 to 4.8 on the same classes, all on a 5.0 scale.

Compensation. MBA adjuncts are paid between one fourth and one tenth of the pay of AQ faculty per course without fringe benefits. The university uses a quarter-system with each class meeting 3 hours a week for 3 credits. A quarter is approximately ten weeks long as compared to a typical semester which is 15-weeks in length.

Continuous Improvement. This issue is important because AACSB stresses continuous improvement. It is certainly not a term associated with typical university HR practices. Within the School of Business, best practices were shared among all faculty to improve overall classroom performance. Overall classroom performance has increased in terms of the ratings of teaching evaluations over the past two years as a somewhat competitive environment has evolved with adjunct faculty proud of their

performance ratings and AQ faculty trying to remain relevant. The competitiveness is supportive and good-natured leading to benefits for all faculty. The adjuncts and the AQ faculty challenge one another to do well in their respective courses.

Strategic Issues. The extant literature emphasizes the strategic nature of the HR function. It has evolved from a business function that was called “personnel” to a function that is critical to the long-term success of an organization (Robbins & Coulter, 2009). In that regard, the use of professionally qualified faculty to teach entrepreneurship courses at Seattle University has had implications that go beyond simply ensuring a sufficient number of instructors are available to teach the entrepreneurship courses that are offered in the MBA program.

The most obvious benefit is that students are able to see professional members of the business community who have been successful in their entrepreneurial careers. The AACSB recognizes this qualification for PQ under Standard 3.7.1(d) providing that, “In exceptional cases, significant entrepreneurial experience in the profit or not-for-profit sector may substitute for the academic preparation in (1) 18 graduate semester hours in the discipline and hold a master’s degree in any field or (2) hold a master’s degree with a major in the discipline.” In addition to qualification, another issue has been the actions of these adjunct faculty outside the classroom. For example, the adjunct professors have agreed to contribute pro bono to other aspects of program management. They have served on the Board of Advisors for the Entrepreneurship Center, been speakers in other classes, served as mentors for students doing business plans for the business plan competitions, been judges for the business plan competition, and donated to the entrepreneurial program, etc. In fact, one of the senior members of the adjunct faculty donated sufficient funds to the University to create an endowed chair. Having engaged these experienced individuals in teaching entrepreneurship courses, there has been a programmatic increase in performance overall.

The period of time using entrepreneurs as adjuncts has not been entirely positive. The recent issues with the US economy have had a tremendous impact on Seattle University and its budgets. The downturn in the economy has hurt enrollments. MBA enrollment has declined. As a result, class sizes have decreased in the two consulting courses. The combination of regular AQ faculty making salaries in excess of \$100,000 per year and adjuncts making roughly \$4,400 per course has required the business program leadership to be more efficient with respect to scheduling courses. As enrollment numbers have dropped off; for example, two sections of New Venture and International consulting were combined. The combined course was taught by a professionally qualified faculty member. Academically qualified faculty normally assigned to these courses were reassigned to other courses. This flexibility in scheduling and continued use of adjuncts significantly reduced the overall cost of operation of the School of Business and Economics. In fact, what could have become a real disaster has yielded a measured improvement in the quality of performance and a significant reduction in labor cost. Yet, this situation may not be sustainable with expansion of the graduate entrepreneurship curriculum beyond the current levels; the potential for a violation of Standard 10’s requirements for the percentage of faculty resources that are professionally and/or academically qualified exists.

IMPLICATIONS

For those tasked with staffing courses in an AACSB accredited program, the answer to the question of “so what?” is quite simple, but powerfully important. This paper reviews the effective use of professionally qualified adjunct faculty to staff courses required in a specialization in entrepreneurship in an MBA program. In the fall quarter of 2011, the university’s business program had their AACSB accreditation renewed for an additional five years. This certification would likely have been in jeopardy had the adjunct faculty not been considered professionally qualified by the visiting accreditation team. Clearly, the program met the burden of proof required by AACSB (AACSB, 2012).

The challenge of using adjuncts is not unique to business or entrepreneurship courses, but it is particularly valuable given the meteoric rise in the demand for entrepreneurship courses in higher education and the lack of doctoral-trained faculty, limitations of acquiring additional faculty lines in the operating budget, and tenured faculty political territoriality. There is no evidence that business programs offering entrepreneurship courses will be able to staff all of their courses or even most of their courses with academically qualified faculty anytime in the near future. Current enrollments in doctoral programs in entrepreneurship have risen, but they remain below the levels necessary to staff current and future growth in the field (Finkle, 2007; Brush et al., 2003). Thus, this study provides a viable solution for using entrepreneurs to teach these courses while meeting AACSB standards for professionally qualified faculty. The fact that the business program's accreditation was recently reaffirmed provides strong evidence that the use of entrepreneurs as PQ was not an issue. In fact, rather ironically, AACSB White Paper Number 4 (AACSB, 2009) describes a hypothetical situation in which entrepreneurs are used to staff an MBA program's courses in order to reinforce the flexibility of Standard Number 10 as well as the burden of proof borne by the business program or business school. Perhaps the AACSB will consider factors included within the definition of "Entre-Q" in this paper as a better predictor of quality teaching than AQ or PQ in the future.

Clearly, observing a single business program is an inherent limitation of the current paper. However, we note that our purpose was to use a single business program to delineate ideas for others facing similar faculty staffing issues. We do not suggest the HR process described in this study will be applicable to all AACSB accredited business programs. We do believe this study provides a detailed look inside the process of using adjunct faculty to teach entrepreneurship courses at an AACSB-accredited business program. Thus, these observations may provide guidance to others that may need to use entrepreneurs as professionally qualified faculty.

For academic administrators facing a similar situation, this study uses observations of a single business program to delineate ideas for staffing their business courses. The activities in this study were unique to the business program observed in this study. Yet, these activities very closely paralleled what one might expect from an organization that actively managed their human resources. Thus, it provides a very practical example of the effective use of adjuncts in the role of professionally qualified faculty. In fact, this paper may be extended beyond the teaching of entrepreneurship courses. It demonstrates a systematic manner for using any experienced business executives as professionally qualified faculty. In this study, the executives were entrepreneurs, but they quite possibly could have been a former corporate CEO or senior VP in traditional programs.

The use of adjunct faculty has practical implications with respect to AACSB Standard 10. AACSB Standard 10 requires at least 90 percent of faculty resources are either academically or professionally qualified. In addition, at least fifty percent of faculty resources must be academically qualified. All of this information must be reported in Table 10-2 when the program is evaluated for accreditation (AACSB, 2011). The burden of justifying faculty resources as AQ or PQ is solely up to the administrators of a school or college of business. The general way of doing so is to arithmetically calculate these two percentages as shown below:

The ratio of academically qualified faculty to all faculty resources is as follows: $AQT / (AQT + PQT + OT) > 50\%$

The ratio of sum of professionally and academically qualified faculty to all faculty resources is as follows: $(AQT + PQT) / (AQT + PQT + OT) > 90\%$

The use of adjuncts to teach entrepreneurship represents a rather special case of the challenge faced by schools or colleges of business when AQ faculty are not available. The reason it is unique is the rather eclectic nature of the discipline. If someone is hired to teach management, then it is easy to calculate the formulas for that discipline. That is not the case with someone hired to teach entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship courses cross the functional boundaries that are still used to organize departments and programs. For the MBA program highlighted in this study, it was advantageous to assign PQ status based upon the entrepreneurship courses being taught. For example, an adjunct assigned to teach a course related to financial issues could be counted against the finance faculty resources. An adjunct assigned to teach a course related to marketing issues could be counted against the marketing faculty resources. Thus, the university in this study did not have to address the challenges of maintaining AQ or PQ ratios at the program level because the entrepreneurs could be categorized to suit the needs of the MBA program and the academic departments charged with making faculty resources available to teach courses. Clearly, this may not be the case of a particular academic department that finds itself short of faculty in a particular discipline.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research should explore the challenges of using adjunct faculty to teach entrepreneurship courses as well as other business courses. The following questions represent some, but not all, of the possible issues that researchers may wish to consider:

1. How many other business programs use entrepreneurs to teach courses on a regular basis? Do they have the same issues as the program described in this study? This research demonstrates the training and development of a unique type of adjunct faculty member that we label, “Entre-Q”, which requires a combination of skills to teach both the theory and the practical aspects of entrepreneurship education.
2. What processes are employed to ensure these individuals are professionally qualified? Is the HR process described in this study unique or is it used rather often? Anecdotal evidence of one of the authors demonstrates that the systematic approach highlighted in this study is rather unique. This author observed the use of adjunct faculty at more than six universities, including the one in this study. The program in this study was the only one that used a systematic process to effectively employ professionally qualified adjunct faculty.
3. What are the implications for accreditation of employing numerous adjuncts in a PQ status? In particular, the formula used by AACSB to count the ratio of AQ to PQ faculty is precise. The qualifications of faculty are measured at the discipline level rather than the departmental level. Thus, a business program may not adhere to Standard 10 because they do not do so at the departmental level rather than at the program level. Should AACSB consider “Entre-Q” as an additional evaluation in addition to AQ and PQ to certify entrepreneurial professors teaching highly integrated cross-disciplinary courses?
4. What performance outcomes are associated with an extensive use of adjunct faculty? Carter (2012) suggests that budget cuts to higher education in some states may have an impact on the quality of instruction. An obvious response to any organization facing the need to cut their budget is to replace higher cost employees with lower cost employees. Recent evidence suggests universities are doing just that by outsourcing professors to cut costs (Driscoll, 2012). To what extent is that an issue in schools and colleges of business that employ adjuncts? Are they using adjuncts because their programs are growing or are they using them in response to the economic woes faced in their

state? The recent economic downturn has had a profound effect on higher education in some states (Carter, 2012). Budget cuts have been felt by many universities and colleges as states have had decreased revenues generated. This issue may continue to affect administrators responsible for staffing courses in business with qualified faculty. Thus, it will be interesting to observe if more and more business schools and colleges begin to use adjunct faculty, pushing the limits of the ratio of PQ and AQ faculty required by AACSB Standard 10. To the extent that this happens, then it will be even more critical to study the effects of employing adjunct faculty to teach business courses.

CONCLUSION

While using adjuncts is not always preferred, it has become a necessity for many administrators seeking to schedule multiple entrepreneurship courses (Low, 2001). This problem is particularly acute in the field of entrepreneurship which has seen an incredible demand for courses while the supply of academically qualified faculty has not been available (Brush, et. al., 2003). With this paper we address the issues associated with using entrepreneurs to teach entrepreneurship courses. This case indicates the use of adjuncts not only makes fiscal sense, it can lead to high quality outcomes.

The model examined here provides a new perspective on credentialing adjunct faculty to teach entrepreneurship courses, particularly applied courses (e.g., small business consulting). If the “professional quality” of faculty can be reviewed in the light of one university’s experience, faculty performance in the classroom, and program cost, new combinations of AQ and PQ faculty might provide a win-win situation for university programs seeking to expand entrepreneurial offerings and provide for increasing student demand with limited resources. AQ faculty should give serious consideration to becoming “Entre-Q” with more direct experience and cross-disciplinary training.

The experience of this university’s program suggests the use of entrepreneurs must be done using a systematic approach. In many respects, the experience of using entrepreneurs to teach courses of the business program observed in this study paralleled the human resource practices in an organization (Allen, et al., 2010). As noted earlier, Table 2 highlights the ten major activities engaged in by the business program. It demonstrates that these adjunct faculty (entrepreneurs), much like employees for any organization, must be recruited, selected, trained & developed, assigned to courses, and compensated to ensure they are professionally qualified faculty in order to meet the burden of proof of AACSB Accreditation Standard 10. Doing so ensures that a college or school of business accredited by AACSB-International may use entrepreneurs to meet their standards for teaching entrepreneurship courses with professionally qualified faculty.

REFERENCES

- AACSB International. (2009). AQ/PQ status: Establishing criteria for attainment and maintenance of faculty qualifications - An interpretation of AACSB standards – AACSB white paper number 4. Retrieved February 29, 2012 from: http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/papers/AQ-PQCriteriaPaperFinal%20Draft09%20_2.pdf.
- AACSB International. (2012). Eligibility procedures and accreditation standards for business accreditation. Retrieved April 7, 2012 from: <http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/standards-busn-jan2012.pdf>.
- AACSB International. (2012). Accreditation. Accredited Institutions. Retrieved April 2, 2012 from: <http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/accreditedmembers.asp>.
- Allen, D. G., Bryant, P.C., & Vardaman, J.M. (2010). Retaining talent: Replacing misconceptions with evidence-based strategies. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24(1), 48-64.

- Brush, C., Duhaime, I.M., Gartner, W.B., Stewart, A., Katz, M.A., Alvarez, S., Meyer, G. D. & Venkataram, S. (2003). Doctoral education in the field of entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management*, 29(3), 309-331.
- Carter, J. (2012). Quality Cutting: Perceived faculty and staff effects of state budget cuts on institutional quality. *Public Organization Review*, 12(1), 41-56.
- Driscoll, Emily (2012). Universities turn to outsourced professors to cut costs. Retrieved March 27, 2012 from: <http://www.foxbusiness.com/personal-finance/2012/03/19/universities-turn-to-outsourced-instructors-to-cut-costs>.
- Fiet, J. O. (2001a). The theoretical side of teaching entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16, 1-24.
- Fiet, J. O. (2001b). The pedagogical side of entrepreneurship theory. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16, 101-117.
- Finkle, T.A., Kuratko, D.F., & Goldsby, M. (2006). The state of entrepreneurship centers in the United States: A nationwide survey. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 44(2), 184-206.
- Finkle, T.A. (2008). Global trends in the job market for faculty and schools in the field of entrepreneurship. *Proceedings of the 2008 Annual American Society of Business and Behavioral Sciences National Conference*, 803-810.
- Finkle, T.A. (2007). Trends in the market for entrepreneurship faculty from 1989 to 2005. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 10, 1-25.
- Finkle, T. A. (2010). Entrepreneurship education trends *Research. Business and Economics Journal*, 1, 35 – 53.
- Gartner, W. B. (1988). Who is an Entrepreneur? is the wrong question. *American Journal of Small Business*, 12(4), 11-32.
- Gorman, G. & Hanlon, D. (1997). Some research perspectives on entrepreneurship education, enterprise education, and education for small business management: A ten-year literature review. *International Small Business Journal*, 15(3), 56-77.
- Hall, J.D. (2011). Part-time employment hurts the entire profession. The organization of American historians. Retrieved July 1, 2011 from: <http://www.oah.org/pubs/nl/2003aug/hall.html>.
- Hedrick, D.W., Henson, S.E., Krieg, J.M., & Wassell, Jr., C.S. (2010). The effects of AACSB accreditation on faculty salaries and productivity, *Journal of Education for Business*, 85, 284-291.
- Heriot, K., Austin, W., & Franklin, G. (2009). Applying for initial AACSB accreditation: An exploratory study to identify costs. *Journal of Education for Business*, 84(5), 283-289.
- Heriot, K. C. & Campbell, N.D. (2004). Starting a small business outreach Program: The experience of a small southeastern university. *Coastal Business Review*, 3(1), 36-46.
- Juergen, M. (2011). The Top 50 entrepreneurship programs. Retrieved March 27, 2012 from: <http://www.entrepreneur.com/topcolleges/index.html>.
- Katz, J.A. (2003). The chronology and intellectual trajectory of American entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(2), 283-300.
- Krueger, T., Shorter, J., & Huff, K. (2012). International differences in business journal acceptance rates across business disciplines. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(3), 1-17.
- Kuratko, D. G. (2003). *Entrepreneurship education in the 21st century: From legitimization to Leadership*. 2003 Coleman White Paper on Entrepreneurship Education. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the U.S. Association for Small Business and Entrepreneurship.
- Kuratko, D. G. (2005). The emergence of entrepreneurship education: Development, trends, and challenges. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(5), 577-598.
- Low, M. B. (2001). The adolescence of entrepreneurship research: Specification of purpose. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 26(4), 17-25.
- McPherson, J. M. (2003). Budget cuts and history jobs: Many problems, no easy solutions. *Perspectives* Retrieved August 1, 2011 from: <http://www.theaha.org/perspectives/issues/2003/0301/0301pre1.cfm>.

- Mohan, N. (2011). On the use of non tenure track faculty and the potential effect on classroom content and student evaluation of teaching. *Journal of Financial Education*, 37(1), 29-42.
- Moser, R. (2001). The new academic labor system, corporatization and the renewal of academic citizenship. Retrieved August 1, 2011 from: <http://www.aaup.org/Issues/part-time/cewmose.htm>.
- Robbins, S. P. & Coulter, M. (2009). *Management*, 10th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Ronstadt, R. (1985). The educated entrepreneur: A new era of entrepreneurial education is beginning. *American Journal of Small Business*, 10, 7-24.
- Solomon, G. T., Winslow, E. K., & Tarabishy, A. (1998). Entrepreneurial education in the United States: An empirical review of the past twenty years. *Proceedings of the 1998 International Council for Small Business World Conference*. Retrieved December 15, 2001 from: <http://www.sbaer.uca.edu/Research/1998/ICSB/i002.htm>.
- Solomon, G. T., Duffy, S., & Tarabishy, A. (2002). The state of entrepreneurship education in the United States: A nationwide survey and analysis. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 1(1), 1-22.
- Stripling, J. & Fuller, A. (2011). Presidents defend their pay as public colleges slash budgets. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved March 27, 2012 from: <http://chronicle.com/article/Presidents-Defend-Their-Pay-as/126971>.
- Thomas, H. & Peters, K. (2012). A sustainable model for business schools. *Journal of Management Development*, 31(4), 377 – 385.
- Townsend, R. B. (2000). Part-time faculty surveys highlight disturbing trends. *Perspectives*. Retrieved August 1, 2011 from: http://www.theaha.org/perspectives/issues/2000/0010/pt_survey.htm.
- Vesper, K. & Gartner, W. B. (1997). Measuring progress in entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Business Venturing*. 12(5), 403-421.
- West, E. (2010). Managing adjunct professors: strategies for improved performance. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal* 14(4), 21-36.