

Beyond AACSB: Anticipating Best Practices for Students' Engagement in the College of Business and Economics in Alqassim University

By: Mahmoud Al-Fayyad*

Abstract

College of Business and Economics (CBE) in Alqassim University (QU) has been internationally accredited on November 19, 2015 by Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). Beyond international accreditation (IA), CBE is required to maintain its performance and uphold IA through sustainable engagement (SE) as an important indicator of achieving its mission and adopting AACSB standards. This research, thus, aims at scouting viewpoints of teaching committee in CBE about best practices expected to continue academic and professional engagement and to retain IA. To achieve research objectives, 121 copies of the questionnaire allocated by e-mail to all members of teaching staff at CBE of which 56% responded and returned 68 e-copies of the questionnaire. Results show priorities of listed engagement activities.

Key Terms: Ecological Systems, AACSB Standards, and Universities Engagement.

* Assistant professor: business Administration section, Alqassim University, Buraydah-KSA.

Introduction

This research traced SE briefly to its earlier grand premises “ecological systems” and its later version “ecosystems”. Recently, AACSB assessed business schools through its missions and participation in developing its communities. AACSB (2013) standards for IA are stemmed from ecosystems theories and tolerated within three broad and related preambles: engagement, innovation, and impact. Ecosystems are multidimensional and multi-disciplinary area of studies. A researcher should choose a well specified topic of ecosystems in order to reach sound and beneficial conclusions. This research represents a case study concerned with CBE's engagement activities internally and externally.

AACSB is keen for all of accredited members to prepare their students for meaningful lives through creating suitable balances between academic and professional engagement within the context of school's mission. Recently, CBE succeeded to achieve its mission through effective engagement in adopting and implementing AACSB standards and awarded its IA.

CBE recognizes that IA is the first step in its engagement procession and is eager to maintain it. This research is expected to help CBE to continue improving, innovating, and prioritizing engagement practices that have positive impact on community development. Teaching staff of CBE as experienced party in

learning practices and market requirements are surveyed to express approval and merit levels for checklist of engagement activities.

CBE problem doesn't lie in achieving IA of AACSB, but in advancing learning and professional engagement activities in order to cope with accreditation standards and demonstrate effective and quality alignment with CBE mission. IA is renewed every five years during which CBE should submit annual progress report and pass five-years strategic review. Accordingly, research problem can be expressed in the following question: "how can CBE improve students' engagement and keep progressive track to retain its IA"?

This main question could be answered through achieving the following objectives:

- 1) To anticipate the best practices for students' engagement.
- 2) To prioritize these activities starting with the most important activity.
- 3) To enlarge and enrich the activities already engaged in.

Recent study has special importance for CBE because it represents the first study post CBE accreditation. It is also expected to help CBE to maintain and renew its IA; enrich and enlarge engagement activities already adopted; and encourage future studies targeting additional engagement activities.

Literature Review

Ecological Systems

The term ecology was initiated in 1866 by Earnst Haeckel, a famous German biologist who derived it from the Greek words (Oikos logos) which means the science of comprehensive study of organisms in their natural home (McIntosh, 1985). Cambridge Dictionary admits Haeckel's initiation where "eco" prefix means "environment" and "logy" suffix means "studying". Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* defines environment as "The surroundings or conditions in which a person, animal, or plant lives or operates"*. Tansley who was an English botanist and a pioneer in the science of ecology termed physical surroundings as "abiotic" and organisms as "biotic" (Cooper, 1957). The above definition of ecology got common agreed upon among ecologists (Lincoln, Boxshall, and Clark, 1982); Hale and Margham, 1991).

Human interaction with abiotic and other biotic environmental components brings out so many fields of study such as "dietary ecology" (Torres et al. (2015). Tansley, (1920), (1923), and (1935) pointed to human positive effect on environment such as providing fresh habitats, plant communities, and opportunities for further studies; while he considered human negative effect as a probable "punctuation". Post-world war II, Charles Elton and

* Available at: <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com>

Tansley cooperated in formulating "Britain's nature conservation and research plans" (Chew, 2014).

Barker and Wright (1949) classified the domain of ecological studies into four areas: **physiological ecology** which refers to species responses to environmental conditions; **population ecology** which studies species amount and distribution in relation to environmental factors; **community ecology** which studies overall interactions found between a number of species live in a specific habitat; and **ecosystems ecology** which concerns with biotic communities interaction with one another and with their abiotic environment (Tansley, 1935; Alimov, 2003; Rieppel, 2011; Kowarik and Pys'ek, 2012; Bocking, 2013; and Lande, 2014). Sarkar (2005) added to the previous four categories another two, namely: "evolutionary" which concerns with organisms adaptation efforts to geographical and temporal environmental variation (Lande, 2014; Námeth, Bonier, and MacDougall-Shackleton, 2013); and "behavioral" which relates to variation of individuals' behavior across contexts (Wilson et al., 2014); Námeth et al. (2013). Nyhan, Ferrando, and Clare (2001/2002) reported that "population ecology theory" explains organizational survival in light of meeting or exceeding community expectations.

Ecosystems

Ecosystems, in general, have been engrained and grown up heavily in ecology science (Andrew, Wulder, and Nelson, 2014). Efforts of Sir Arthur George Tansley, a famous British botanist and ecologist, in 1920, 1923 and 1935 laid conceptual construction of ecosystems and urged biologists for more studies to improve and develop environment-population relationship (Godwin, 1977; Cameron, 1999; Dag, 2007; and Koenig, 2012).

Ecosystems based-management (EBM) is emerged initially to conduct the organisms-nature mutual effects (Yáñez-Arancibia, Day, and Reyes, 2013; Harfoot et al., 2014). Delfin (2012) implied that the relationship between an environmental factors and organisms' activities are necessarily classified ecosystems types. Ecosystems hazards, as an example, refer to natural disasters such as floods, droughts, wildfires and storm-waves which may destroy plants land- cover (Nel et al., 2014).

Ecosystems, more often, point to human-environment interrelationship, whereas ecology points to studying environmental interrelationship with plants and animals (Reiter et al., 2013; Malanson, 2014). Song, Dannenberg, and Hwang (2013) attributed "terrestrial ecosystem productivity" to "ecosystem functions" including carbon storage, provision of food and fiber, and sustaining biodiversity.

Ecosystems services, as an example, refer to benefits that nature or government provides to humans who are seeking to manage ecosystems well (Vella et al., 2014). Voelker (2012) alluded that ecosystems could be developed and diverged from prior point as well as from each other through entrepreneurial activities, nations' culture, and life outcomes. According to Giebels & de Jonge (2014), ecosystem-based management denotes the process of decision making based on complex societal systems and knowledge. Kelble et al. (2013) developed a multi-sector model for ecosystems which combines conceptual frame of six elements (Driver, Pressure, State, Impact, and Response) with management system in order to achieve societal goals, values, desires, and benefits.

Recently, organizational leadership employed EBM to coordinate integrate, and compete its activities with the other ecosystem firms and invest in new technology to reduce cost and gain mutual benefits (Kapoor & Lee, 2013).

Business Ecosystems

Business ecosystems theory is the modern sophisticated version of systems theory. Systems theory emerged as a biological branch to express equilibrium and integrated mechanisms between internal sub-systems within individual organism and external supra systems (Bertalanffy, 1951; Boulding, 1956). Later on, business academics and practitioners applied system theory to business environment where an organization is

required to adapt its internal sub-systems (resources and processes) to fit external requirements and conditions. Ecosystem theory, then, helps organizations to achieve their missions and develop their communities in continuous premises. Xiaoren, Ling, and Xiangdong (2014) inserted environmental flexibility in which business ecosystems (network of enterprises) exchange beneficial resources and information. According to them, “open innovation” refer to “continuous improvements” which are employed by those enterprises to integrate design and development processes to reduce costs and improve products' quality.

Nambisan and Baron (2013) pointed out to innovation ecosystems in organizations as cooperative interdependencies established between group of firms (entrepreneurs) to provide customers with added value and effectively achieve their goals and objectives. Robertson (2014) considered managers mind as internal organizational ecosystems which may contribute to organizational success or failure. Robbins (1990) reported that internal ecosystems (efficient size, suitable technologies, and efficient control systems) are necessary for organizational survival. Drucker (1998) assured the role of innovation and entrepreneurship for social potential in addition rather to enterprises' size and age.

Bess & Dee (2008) assured that universities can innovate and exceed public expectations when they possess suitable resources that encourage them to take risk. Akaka, Vargo, & Lusch (2013) emphasized the complexity of international “environment” and “eco-subsystems” including “international marketing”, goods’ movement across borders, international consumer preferences across cultures, international exchange of intangible resources, divergence of international communications and logistics networks, and emergence and growth of regional and global markets. According to Nyhan, Ferrando, and Clare (2001/2002); organizations strive to ensure enough environmental support from: suppliers, customers, employees, etc. Cinner and David (2011) urged enterprises to understand environmental elements such as social, economical and cultural factors; cooperate with each other; and conserve resources effectively and efficiently. According to (Priem, Butler, and Li, 2013), “effective resources conservation” includes strategic anticipation of consumers and their latent needs.

Universities’ Engagement

Engagement of universities -as service firms- represents a modern vision of ecosystems seeking transfer learning process in higher education from traditional practices to interactive process between universities and communities. According to Franz (2014), education engagement began in 1914 with Smith-Lever Act to improve people access to education where they live. Franz urged for faculty- community partnership to develop

engagement practices and suitable measurement tool to assess its outcomes.

Crookes, Else, and Smith (2015) relied on the engagement definition by “Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2015”^{1*} which states that engagement represents a collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities for mutual benefits. This definition is common among researchers and scholars (Fairclough, 2003; Chism, 2007). Sustainable is a business term first applied to workplace by Japanese (kaizen) to denote organizational behavioral pattern committed to continuous improvement in products quality, tasks, and processes (Karkoszka and Honorowicz, 2009).

According to Dostilio (2014), engagement provides institutions of higher education and their communities with effective tool for knowledge generation and problem solving in democratic ways. Web, Wong, and Hubball (2103) appreciated those initiate and support students learning practices in campus and field. Leisey, Holton, & Davey (2012) reported the pleasance of respondents of communities' partners with engagement in universities' learning activities. They also insisted community-university partners to incorporate suitable evaluative process to assess and understand mutual outcomes. Harris III, and Pickron-Davis

* Available at: <http://nerche.org/index>

(2013) used the term “anchor-based engagement” to assured that the community development is strongly established when the universities play the leadership role in collaborative teaching process. Helyer & Lee (2012) mentioned some forms of business engagement including: workplace mentoring, research consultancy and contract, innovation support, participation in business forums, working with professional bodies, guest lectures, and facilitating employer input.

AACSB Standards

Mission of CBE in QU stipulates that "CBE contributes to the society and the business community by developing graduates with current business knowledge and skills through relevant curricula, and encouraging the faculty to make continuous contribution to the knowledge base by engaging in business research". CBE had been accredited by AACSB on Safar 2, 1437 H. corresponding to Nov. 19, 2015 on the bases of “AACSB modified standards, 2015” after nearly 3.5 years of its accreditation journey. In fact, the accreditation journey of CBE just begins because it is required to engage in continuous improvements internally and externally to sustain its mission in continuous bases.

AACSB standards (2015) for business schools accreditation fall in 4 main categories:

First) Strategic management and innovation with three standards: mission, impact, innovation; intellectual

contributions, impact, and alignment with mission; and financial strategies and allocation of resources.

Second) Participants – students, faculty, and professional staff with four standards: student admissions, progression, and career development; faculty sufficiency and deployment; faculty management and support; and professional staff sufficiency and deployment.

Third) Learning and teaching with five standards: curricula management and assurance of learning; curriculum content; student-faculty interactions; degree program educational level, structure, and equivalence; and teaching effectiveness.

Fourth) Academic and professional engagement with three standards: student academic and professional engagement; executive education; and faculty qualifications and engagement.

According to the typology of Fleischman, Raciti & Lawley (2014), CBE's curricular could be classified as highly structured (deliberate and controlled activities) when yields high community collaboration and high university facilitation. Recent researches concentrate on the fourth category standards especially academic and professional engagement. CBE teaching staff is familiar with AACSB accreditation standards and qualified to suggest supporting engagement activities.

Field Study

This case study had been conducted at CBE of QU in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA). Each member of CBE teaching staff (121 members) received e-mailed copy of the questionnaire, of which 68 members responded at a 56% percentage of total community. Normal distribution of the data is tested via Colmogorov –simernove measure. Validity and reliability of the questionnaire are tested and data analyzed using point of serial analysis and central tendency measures to determine engagement priorities.

Sample Characteristics

Table (1) below exhibits sample characteristics:

Table 1: Sample Characteristics

Specialization	Characteristics Education		Sub Numbers	Average Experience (Ys)	Total Num.
Accounting	Master		3	4.3	13
	PhD.	Assistant	8	6.4	
		Associate	2	18	
		Prof	----	---	
Management	Master		7	8	22
	PhD.	Assistant	12	10.4	
		Associate	2	15	
		Prof	1	22	
Economic & Finance	Master		6	8	19
	PhD.	Assistant	10	16.6	
		Associate	2	22	
		Prof	1	22	
Other [MIS & Production Management]	Master		5	5.6	14
	PhD.	Assistant	7	13.7	
		Associate	2	15	
		Prof	---	---	
Total Summation (Sample Size)					68

Questionnaire & Coding:

Questionnaire sources are in English language, and respondents' mother tongue is Arabic, so English version translated into Arabic language and verified by 3 academic specialists, and then judged by other 3 academic researchers and modified accordingly.

Questionnaire is designed to gather data about suggested initiatives concerning students' engagement that are expected by teaching staff to serve CBE mission and sustain AACSB accreditation in a continuous basis. Table (2) exhibits 3 subcategories or factors of students' engagement: internal activities (**F1 & F2**) and external activities (**F3**). Each activity (statement/ variable/ item) received two responses. The first response represents approval degree measured at 5 categories Likert Scale, while the second response represents importance degree measured at 10 categories Likert's like scale. Accordingly, **F1** includes 10 in- class activities [odd variables V1-V19], while their importance degrees appear in even variables [V2- V20]. **F2** includes 7 activities take place outside classroom but within CBE milieu [odd variables V21-V33], while their importance degree appear in [even variables V22-V34]. Finally, **F3** includes 15 activities [odd variables V35-V63] take place with partnership of community's individuals or groups, while their importance degree appears in [even variables V36- V64]. Table (2) exhibits questionnaire items, their sources, and responses coding:

Table 2: Questionnaire Coding

S. No.	Factors	Statement (Variables)	1 st Response	2 nd Response	Source
In-class engagement (F1)					
1	F1	Students take notes during lecture	V1	V2	Lane and Harris, 2015
2		Students are assigned written activities during lecture	V3	V4	
3		Students are assigned computer-based activities	V5	V6	
4		Students participate individually in class discussion	V7	V8	
5		Students formulate research or task groups during lecture or lab.	V9	V10	Di Battista, Pivetti, & Berti (2014)
6		Students participate in group-based class discussion	V11	V12	Csajko and Lindaman (2011)
7		Students participate individually and collectively in literature review	V13	V14	Di Battista, Pivetti, & Berti (2014)
8		Students conducts class discussions and lecturer brought to be a coach	V15	V16	Olwell and Stevens (2015)
9		Using take home exams	V17	V18	Johnson et al. (2015)
10		Students put extra efforts to the lecture beyond what is required	V19	V20	Di Battista, Pivetti, & Berti (2014)
In-CBE Engagement (F2)					
11	F2	Students participate in internal CBE workshops and/or seminars	V21	V22	McKinnis et al. (2014)
12		Students to suggest some changes to improve learning process	V23	V242	Di Battista, Pivetti, & Berti (2014)
13		Students suggest curriculum improvements	V25	V26	
14		Encouraging students to suggest improvements for CBE enrollment procedures	V27	V28	

15		Students communicate effectively with students' affairs department	V29	V30	
16		Students take effective role in CBE free cultural events	V31	V32	
17		Establishing internal virtual organization to enable students to practice what is impossible in community establishments.	V33	V34	Burma, 2014
Engagement with community establishments					
18		engaging in public- service tasks as a graduation requirement	V35	V36	Mlyn (2013)
19		Establishing CBE alumni club	V37	V38	Hart & Northmore (2011)
20		Establishing students' team to identify collaborative areas with community establishments.	V39	V40	McNall et al. (2015)
21		Establishing students' team to identify research areas needed by the local community.	V41	V42	
22	F3	Establishing students-community team/s to conduct identified researches.	V43	V44	
23		Establishing students-community team/s to tackle uncertainty problems.	V45	V46	
24		Establishing students-community team/s to identify and update job vacancies.	V47	V48	Matthews et al. (2015)
25		Formulating students-community team/s to Document CBE-community Partnership Activities	V49	V50	
26		Formulating students-community team/s to consolidate "green" business practices	V51	V52	McKinnis et al. (2014)
27		Transfer field training course from the optional requirements to mandatory requirements	V53	V54	Tower & Broadbent
28		Establishing students' team to follow up community's	V55	V56	

	activity and determine what and how to participate in.			
29	Establishing mutual-consultation team to solve businesses' problems	V57	V58	McKinnis et al. (2014)
30	Conducting mutual workshops where keynote speaker one of the local community symbols.	V59	V60	Brown-Luthango, 2013
31	Establishing social work center to outreach citizens and improve the lives for those of low income	V61	V62	Harris III, and Pickron-Davis (2013)
32	Establishing mutual teaching center with directorate of education to improve secondary schools relevant curriculums	V63	V64	

Analysis and Results

The first stage analysis employed "Shapiro-Wilk test" because sample size < 2000 units. Table (3) below exhibits test results:

Table 3: Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Data	.202	68	.097	.553	68	.201

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Test's null hypothesis states: "data is normally distributed", and is accepted because sig value (= 0.201) > 0.05.

Second stage analysis employed "point by serial analysis" to refine odd items V1 through V63 (listed in column headed "1st response" in table 2). Correlations between each dimension of (F1, F2, and F3) and between its variables are examined. Only variables with correlation exceeds 0.3 are retained. Table (4)

below exhibits the retained variables (items) and related Cronbach's alpha:

Table (4): Cronbach's Alpha and Correlation Coefficients after 1st stage refinement

F1			F2			F3		
Items	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted	Items	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted	Items	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted
V1	.792	.736	V23	.401	.768	V35	.541	.938
V3	.791	.712	V25	.633	.711	V37	.801	.924
V5	.705	.752	V27	.710	.701	V39	.816	.924
V7	.539	.797	V29	.699	.702	V41	.755	.925
V19	.306	.856	V31	.362	.795	V43	.793	.924
			V33	.394	.769	V45	.759	.925
						V47	.768	.925
						V49	.821	.923
						V51	.847	.923
						V55	.592	.930
						V57	.768	.927
						V59	.534	.932
						V61	.327	.936
						V63	.649	.928
F1 Reliability Statistics			F2 Reliability Statistics			F3 Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items		Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items		Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items	
.814	6		.775	6		.932	14	

Correlation coefficients are ranging from 0.306 for V19 to 0.847 for V51. Similarly, Cronbach's alpha is ranging from 0.701 for V27 to 0.938 for V35. It is obvious also that deletion of any item from table 4 will not affect Cronbach's alpha more than 0.01.

The third stage analysis also employed "point by serial analysis" to refine all retained variables in table (4) as a holistic scale using the same rule of excluding any variable with correlation coefficient less than 0.3. Table (5) below exhibits final list of retained variables and relevant Cronbach's:

Table (5): Cronbach's Alpha and Correlation Coefficients for Overall Scale

Dimensi on	Item s	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted	Dimensi on	Item s	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted	
F1	V1	.525	.899	F3	V39	.892	.890	
	V3	.583	.897		V41	.673	.894	
	V5	.470	.899		V43	.766	.892	
	V7	.421	.901		V45	.810	.889	
F2	V23	.424	.901		V47	.650	.894	
	V25	.305	.910		V49	.653	.894	
	V29	.309	.904		V51	.642	.896	
F3	V35	.326	.907		V57	.693	.896	
	V37	.772	.893		V59	.499	.899	
					V63	.701	.894	
Total Reliability Statistics								
Cronbach's Alpha					0.902			
Number of Items					19			

Variables in table 4 are cohesive as dimensions and as a total scale. Again, the impact of deleting any single variable on Cronbach's alpha will not exceed ± 0.01 .

Agreement levels of respondents on these 19 retained variables are checked through descriptive statistical analysis according to the following decision rule concerning means:

[4.2 < extremely agree \leq 5]; [3.4 < agree \leq 4.2]; [2.6 < don't know \leq 3.4]; [1.8 < don't agree \leq 2.6]; and [1 \leq extremely don't agree \leq 1.6] .

According to this decision rule, only items with mean ≥ 3.4 are agreed upon and subjected to next step of priority analysis.

Table (6) exhibits means and standard deviation for the variables listed in table 4:

Table (6) Descriptive Statistics

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
V1	4.0000	1.03664
V3	3.9412	1.06340
V5	3.8235	.79064
V7	4.2941	.75427
V23	4.5882	.77720
V25	3.7647	.94817
V29	4.1176	.83808
V35	4.1765	1.10550
V37	4.5294	.61013
V39	4.5294	.61013
V41	4.3529	.76811
V43	4.5294	.70118
V45	4.3529	.84226
V47	4.4118	.85055
V49	4.2941	.89874
V51	4.5294	.61013
V57	4.5294	.50285
V59	4.6471	.48144
V63	4.5294	.61013

Variables 3, 5, 25 subjected to one sample t-test to assure that their means fall within agreed up categories or nt. The result is displayed in table (7) below

Table (7): One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 3.4					
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Lower	Upper
V3	4.197	67	.000	.54118	.2838	.7986
V5	4.417	67	.000	.42353	.2322	.6149
V25	3.172	67	.002	.36471	.1352	.5942

Test's null hypothesis states: "Means of tested variables = 3.4". Since sig levels < 0.05, it concludes that the means don't equal test value of 3.4, but exceed it and fall within approved categories.

Next and last step of statistical analysis aims at calculating priority value which equals to (approval level or value of odd variables) X (importance level or value of even variables). The multiplication allows flexibility in comparing and ordering priorities. The results are displayed in descending order in table (8) below:

Table (8): Priorities and Descriptive Statistics

Priorty	Variable	Dimension	Priorty Mean	Std. Deviation	Statements
1	V43	F3	43.4118	9.53898	Establishing students-community team/s to conduct identified researches
2	V59		43.3529	9.06982	Conducting mutual workshops where keynote speaker one of the local community symbols.
3	V23	F2	43.0000	9.58232	Students to suggest some changes to improve learning process
4	V51	F3	42.6471	9.60685	Formulating students-community team/s to consolidate "green" business practices
5	V37		41.7647	11.78681	Establishing CBE alumni club
6	V39		41.7647	11.90775	Establishing students' team to identify collaborative areas with community establishments.
7	V57		40.5294	10.62870	Establishing mutual- consultation team to solve businesses' problems
8	V47		40.1176	12.95172	Establishing students-community team/s to identify and update job vacancies.
9	V63		40.0588	12.80611	Establishing mutual teaching center with directorate of education to improve secondary schools relevant curriculums
10	V41		39.3529	14.20087	Establishing students' team to identify research areas needed by the local community
11	V45		39.3529	13.75670	Establishing students-community team/s to tackle uncertainty problems
12	V49		38.2941	14.05220	Formulating students-community team/s to Document CBE-community Partnership Activities
13	V35		37.1176	14.78556	Engaging in public- service tasks as a graduation requirement
14	V29	F2	35.9412	10.70902	Students communicate effectively with students' affairs department
15	V7	F1	35.4706	12.81845	Students participate individually in class discussion
16	V1		33.1176	15.72860	Students take notes during lecture
17	V3		32.8824	15.14461	Students are assigned written activities during lecture
18	V5		31.1765	11.91630	Students are assigned computer-based activities
19	V25	F2	30.8824	15.50304	Students suggest curriculum improvements

Recommendations

The above items listed in table 7 represents agreed upon and important engagement activities. Statements are ordered from most prior to least prior, where CBE can hold more than one activity simultaneously. Some of these activities are practiced by CBE so that priority means more enlargement and enrichment e.g.: activities 2, 3, 5, 14, 16, and 17.

Some activities with less priority represent prerequisite for greater priority e.g.: activity 10 before activity 1.

Activities which are not established take urgent priority for establishment e.g.: activities 4, 6, 11, and 13. Finally, when these 19 activities are established so that priorities for such activities belong to enrichment and enlargement these activity, and CBE may establish new engagement activities.

References

- AACSB International (2015). **Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation.** Available at: www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/standards/2013-business.
- Akaka, Melissa; Vargo, Stephen; and Lusch, Robert (2013). The Complexity of Context: A Service Ecosystems Approach for International Marketing. *Journal of International Marketing*: 21 (4), 1-20.
- Alimov, A. F. (2003). Territoriality in Aquatic Animals and Their Sizes. *Biology Bulletin*: 30 (1), 79–86.
- Andrew, Margaret; Wulder, Michael, and Nelson, Trisalyn (2014). Potential Contributions of Remote Sensing to Ecosystem Service Assessments. *Journal of Progress in Physical Geography*: 385 (3), 328-3537.
- Barker, R.G. and Wright, H.F. (1949). Psychological Ecology and The PROBLEM OF Psychosocial Development. *Child Development*: 20 (3), 131-143.
- Bess, James, L. and Dee, Jay, R. (2008). **Understanding College and University Organization: The state of the system.** Stylus Publishing, LLC., Virginia, USA.
- Bocking, S. (2013). The Ecosystem: Research and practice in North America. *Web Ecology*: 13 (1) p43-47.
- Boulding, kenneth (1956). General System Theory: The Skeleton of Science. *Management Science*: 2 (3), 197-208.
- Broun- Luthango, Mercy (2013). Community- University Engagement: The Philippi CityLab in Cape Town and The Challenge of Collaboration Across Boundaries. *Journal of Higher Education*, 65(3), 209-324.
- Burma, Z. A. (2014). New Organization Structures: Virtual Organizations. *International Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences*: 6 (2), 18-27.

- Cambridge Dictionaries Online. Available at: <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english>. Accessed: 6/25/2014.
- Cameron, Laura (1999). Histories of Disturbance. *Radical History Review*, Issue 74, 4-24.
- CBE Mission (2016). Available at <http://en.cbe-qu.edu.sa/index.htm>.
- Chew, Matthew K. (2014). A picture worth forty-one words Charles Elton, introduced species and the 1936 Admiralty map of British Empire shipping. *The Journal of Transport History*: 35 (2), 225-2343.
- Chism, Nancy. V. (2007). **Peer review of teaching: A sourcebook**. Anker Publishing Co., Bolton, MA, USA.
- Cinner, Joshua and Daved, Gilbert (2011). The Human Dimensions of Coastal and Marine Ecosystems in the Western Indian Ocean. *Coastal Management*: 39 (4), 351-357.
- Cooper, W. S. (1957). Sir Arthur Tansley and the Science of Ecology. *Ecology* 38 (4): 658–659.
- Crookes, Patrick; Else, Fabienne, and Smith, Kylie (2015). Embedding the Scholarship of Engagement at A Regional University. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*:19 (3), 149-170.
- Csajko, Karen & Lindaman, Kara (2011). Practice Makes Perfect: Engaging Student-Citizens in Politics Through Theory and Practice. *Journal of Political Science Education*: 7 (1), 56-78.
- Dagg, Joachim L. (2007). Arthur G. Tansley's 'New Psychology' and its Relation to Ecology. *Web Ecology*, 7 (1), 27-34.
- Delfin, Mauricio (2012). The Promise of Cultural Networks in Latin America: Towards A Research Framework for The Study of Region-specific Cultural Network Ecosystems . *Cultural Trends*: 21 (3), 239–248.
- Di Battista, S.; Pivetti, M.; & Berti, C. (2014). Engagement in The University Context: Exploring The Role of A Sense of

- Justice and Social Identification. *Journal of Social Psychology of Education*: 17 (3), 471-490.
- Dostilio, Lina (2014). Democratically Engaged Community-University Partnerships: Reciprocal Determinants of Democratically Oriented Roles and Processes. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*: 18 (4), 235-244.
- Drucker, Peter. (1998). The discipline of innovation. *Harvard Business Review*: 76 (6), 149-157.
- Giebels, Diana & de Jonge, Victor (2014). Making Ecosystem-based Management Effective: Identifying and Evaluating Empirical Approaches to The Governance of Knowledge. *Complexity & Organization*: 16 (1), 60-76.
- Fairclough, Norman. (2003). **Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research**. London: Routledge, London.
- Fleischman, David; Raciti, Maria; and Lawley, Meredith (2014). A Typology of International Student Community Engagement. *e-Journal of business Education & Scholarship of Teaching* : 8 (1), 1-17
- Franz, Nancy (2014). Measuring and Articulating the Value of Community Engagement: Lessons Learned from 100 Years of Cooperative Extension Work. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*: 18 (2), 5-15
- Godwin, Sir Harry (1977). Sir Arthur Tansley: The Man and The Subject. *Journal of Ecology*: 65 (1), 1-27.
- Hale, W. G. and Margham, J.P. (1991). **The Harper Collins Dictionary of Biology**. Harper Perennial, NY.
- Harfoot, Michael B. et al. (2014). Emergent Global Patterns of Ecosystem Structure and Function from a Mechanistic General Ecosystem Model. *PLoS Biology*: 12 (4), 1-24.
- Harris III, James & Pickron-Davis, Marcine (2013). A Ten-Year Retrospective of Widener University's Journey to Reclaim Its Soul and Fulfill Its Mission as a Leading Metropolitan University. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*: 17 (3), 47-67.

- Hart, Angie & Northmore, Simon (2011). Auditing and Evaluating University-Community Engagement: Lessons from a UK Case Study. *Higher Education Quarterly*: 65 (1), 34-58.
- Helyer, Ruth & Lee Dionne, Lee (2012). Mentoring for Business Engagement as Continuing Professional Development of University Academic Staff. *International Journal of Training and Development*: 16 (3), 217-227
- Ivits, Eva; Horio, Stephanie; Fensholt, Rasmus; and Cherlet, Michael (2014). Global Ecosystem Response Types Derived from The Standardized Precipitation Evapotranspiration Index and FPAR3g Series. *Remote Sensing Journal*: 6 (5), 4266-4288.
- Johnson, Corey; Green, Kimberly; Galbraith, Betty; and Anelli, Carol (2015). Assessing and Refining Group Take-home Exams as Authentic Effective Learning Experiences. *Journal of College Science Teaching*: 44 (5), 61-71.
- Kapoor, Rahul & Lee, Joon (2013). Coordinating and Competing in Ecosystems: How Organizational Forms Shape New Technology Investments. *Strategic Management Journal*: 34(3), 274-296.
- Karkoszka, T. and Honorowicz, J (2009). Kaizen Philosophy A Manner of Continuous Improvement of Processes and Products. *Journal of Achievements in Materials and Manufacturing Engineering*: 35 (2), 197-203
- Kelble, C. R. et al. (2013). The EBM-DPSER Conceptual Model: Integrating Ecosystem Services into the DPSIR Framework. *PLoS One*: 8 (8), 1–128.
- Koenig , Gérard Robinson (2012). Business Ecosystems Revisited. *Management*: 15 (2), 209-224.
- Kowarik, Ingo and Pys̆ek, Petr (2012). The First Steps Towards Unifying Concepts in Invasion Ecology Were Made one Hundred Years Ago: Revisiting The Work of The Swiss Botanist Albert Thellung. *Diversity and Distributions*: 18 (12), 1243-1252.

- Lande, R. (2014). Evolution of Phenotypic Plasticity and Environmental Tolerance of a Labile Quantitative Character in a Fluctuating Environment. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*: 27 (5), 866-875.
- Lane, Erin S. & Harris Sara E. (2015). A new Tool For Measuring Student Behavioral Engagement in Large University Classes. *Journal of College Sciences Teaching*: 44 (6), 83-91.
- Leisey, Monica; Holton, Valerie; & Davey, Timothy (2012). Community Engagement Grants: Assessing the Impact of University Funding and Engagements. *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship*: 5 (2), 41-47.
- Lincoln, R.J.; Boxshall, G.A.; and Clark, P.F. (1982). **A Dictionary of Ecology, Evolution and Systematics**. England, Cambridge University Press.
- Malanson, George (2014). Physical Geography on The Methodological Fence: David Stoddart (1965) Geography and The Ecological Approach: The Ecosystem as A Geographic Principle and Method. *Progress in Physical Geography*: 38 (2), 251-258.
- Matthews, Paul; karls, Anna; Doberneck, Diane; & Springer, Nicole (2015). Portfolio and Certification Programs in Community Engagement as Professional Development for Graduate Students: Lessons Learned From Two Land-Grant Universities. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*: 19 (1), 157-183.
- McIntosh, Robert P. (1985). **The Background of Ecology: Concept and Theory**. England, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- McKinnis, David; Sloan, Mary; Snow, L. D.; & Garimella, Suresh (2014). A University Engagement Model for Achieving Technology Adoption and Performance Improvement Impacts in Healthcare Manufacturing, and Government. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*: 18 (1), 187-213.

- McNall, Miles; Barnes-Najor, Jessica; Brown, Robert; Doberneck, Diane; and Fitzgerald, Hiram (2015). Systemic Engagement: Universities as Partners in Systemic Approaches to Community Change. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*: 19 (1), 1-25.
- Mlyn, Eric (2013). Higher Education and Civic Engagement: The Example of DukeEngage. *Journal of Change*: 45 (5), 36-42.
- Nambisan, Satish and Baron, Robert (2013). Innovation Ecosystems: Entrepreneurs' Self-Regulatory Processes and Their Implications for New Venture Success. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*: 37 (5), 1071-1097.
- Námeth, Zoltán; Bonier, Frances; and MacDougall-Shackleton, Scott (2013). Coping with Uncertainty: Integrating Physiology, Behavior, and Evolutionary Ecology in a Changing World. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*: 53(6), 960–964.
- Nel, Jeanne et al. (2014). Natural Hazards in a Changing World: A Case for Ecosystem-Based Management. *PLoS ONE*: 9 (5), 1-12.
- Nyhan, Ronald; Ferrando, Mary; & Clare, Donald (2001/2002). A Population Ecology Study of Hospital Closures in Florida Between 1965 and 1995. *Journal of Health & Human Services Administration*: 24 (3/4), 295–319.
- Olwell, Russell & Stevens, Azibo (2015). I Had to Double Check My Thoughts: How The Reacting to The Past Methodology Impacts First-Year College Student Engagement, Retention, and Historical Thinking. *The History Teacher*: 48 (3), 561-572.
- Priem, Rchard; Butler, John; and Li, Sali (2013). Toward Reimagining Strategy Research: Retrospection and Prospecption on The 2011 AMR Decade Award Article. *Academy of Management Review*: 38 (4), 471-489.
- Reiter, Michael A. et al. (2013). An Integrated Framework for Informing Coastal and Marine Ecosystem Management

- Decisions. *Journal of Environmental Assessment Policy and Management*: 15 (1), 1-22.
- Rieppel, Olivier (2011). Ernst Haeckel (1834–1919) and the monophyly of life. *Journal of Zoological Systematics & Evolutionary Research*: 49(1), 1-5.
- Robbins, S. P. (1990). **Organization Theory: Structure, Design, and Application**. Prentice Hall Inc., NJ, USA.
- Robertson, Peter (2014). Why Top Executives Derail: A Performative-Extended Mind and a Law of Optimal Emergence. *Journal of Organizational Transformation and Social Change*: 11 (1), 25-49.
- Sarkar, S. (2005). **Biodiversity and Environmental Philosophy**. England, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Song, Conghe; Dannenberg, Matthew; Hwang, Taehee (2013). Optical Remote Sensing of Terrestrial Ecosystem Primary Productivity. *Progress in Physical Geography*: 37(6), 834-854.
- Tansley, A. G. (1920). The Classification of Vegetation and the Concept of Development. *Journal of Ecology*, 8 (2), 118-149.
- Tansley, A. G. (1923). **Practical Plant Ecology: A Guide for Beginners in Field Study of Plant Communities**. London, Allen & Unwin.
- Tansley, A. G. (1935). The Use and Abuse of Vegetational Concepts and Terms. *Ecology*, 16(3), 284-307.
- Torres, Rita; Silva, Nicole; Brotas, Gonçalo; and Fonseca, Carlos (2015). To Eat or Not To Eat? The Diet of the Endangered Iberian Wolf in a Human-Dominated Landscape in Central Portugal. *PLoS ONE*: 10 (6), 1-12.
- Tower, John & Broadbent, Robyn (2011). University and Community Partnerships: Building Social Capital and Community Capacity. *Journal of Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning*: 13 (2), 51- 67.
- Vella, Ferdinando et al. (2014). A Methodology for Adaptable and Robust Ecosystem Services Assessment. *PLoS ONE*: 9 (3), 1-8.

- Voelker, Troy A. (2012). Entrepreneurial Ecosystems: Evolutionary Baths or Differentiated Systems. *Business Studies Journal*: 4 (2), 43–61.
- von Bertalanffy, Ludwig (1951). General System Theory; A new Approach to Unity of Science: 1, 2, 3 (Three consecutive articles). *Journal of Human Biology* : 23(4), 302-335.
- Webb, Andrea; Wong, Tracy; & Hunbball, Harry (2013). Professional Development for Adjunct Teaching Faculty in a Research-Intensive University: Engagement in Scholarly Approaches to Teaching and Learning . *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*:25 (2), 231-238.
- Wilson, Alexander; Krause, Jens; Herbert-Read, James; & Ward, Ashley (2014). The Personality Behind Cheating: Behavioural Types and the Feeding Ecology of Cleaner Fish. *Ethology*: 120 (9), 904-912.
- Xiaoren, Zhang; Ling, Ding; and Xiangdong, Chen (2014). Interaction of Open Innovation and Business Ecosystem. *International Journal of u- and e- Service, Science and Technology*: 7 (1), 51-64.
- Yáñez-Arancibia, Alejandro; Day, John; and Reyes, Enrique (2013). Understanding the Coastal Ecosystem-Based Management Approach in the Gulf of Mexico. *Journal of Coastal Research*: 63(1), 244-262.