

Chapter 66

The Role of a Chief Mission Officer in Maintaining Mission in Schools and Colleges of Business

David J. Burns

Kennesaw State University, USA

Debra K. Mooney

Xavier University, USA

Kathy S. Schwaig

Kennesaw State University, USA

ABSTRACT

In the present competitive environment, it is becoming increasingly important for schools and colleges of business to establish distinctive identities to differentiate themselves from their competition and to provide unique offerings to best prepare their students to be adept contributors in their future careers. The missions of schools and colleges of business play a key role in this endeavor. Once identified, however, maintaining a unique identity can be more difficult than initially establishing one. This chapter proposes the use of chief mission officers (CMOs) as key individuals or groups of individuals as a means to ensure continuing integrity of the mission of a school or college of business to facilitate the maintenance of a distinct position in the marketplace.

INTRODUCTION

Quality higher education is viewed as fundamental to a nation's future (American Council on Education, 2012). With over 19 percent of graduating college students receiving an undergraduate degree in business in the U.S., Schools and Colleges of Business (SCBs) play a key role in the education received by students

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-7998-5345-9.ch066

(U.S. Department of Education, 2016). Given the large number of universities offering business degrees through SCBs, business education has become a very competitive arena. As would be expected within such a competitive environment, the missions of SCBs play a critical role in differentiating a particular SCB from its competition and can be the source of its distinctive competency. Although SCBs are affected by the missions of their home institutions, the missions of SCBs are often a much more detailed application of the institution's overall mission to the business education environment.

In the past, many institutions of higher education and the academic units at those institutions did not possess unique missions besides possibly geography. The lack of unique missions did not prove to be a serious shortcoming since universities faced a seller's market with seemingly endless streams of interested qualified students (Absher & Crawford, 1996), prompting numbers of new institutions and new branch campuses (Levy, 2010). With an increasing number of competitors, new modes of competition (such as online), demographic shifts, changing students' desires/needs, increasing demands for accountability, and the need to develop new streams of revenue, however, the seller's market has arguably disappeared, replaced by a buyer's market where prospective students possess a myriad of educational alternatives (Austin, 2012). Consequently, institutions of higher education are presently facing particularly challenging times (King & Sen, 2013).

Instead of an endless stream of students, therefore, many SCBs are finding they must compete with a dizzying array of new competitors of a variety of different types using various forms of instructional delivery. Many SCBs are even finding that they are facing competitors on their own campuses as numbers of "business-like" programs are developed by other schools and colleges (e.g., communications, sports management) as other academic units try to deal with their own competitive realities. Consequently, SCBs are increasingly finding that they must establish clear positions in the marketplace to provide students with specific reasons to choose to attend their institution or program over another. In the absence of a defined niche, business education becomes commoditized and competition becomes based on price, location, or the availability of expensive "extras" that have little to do with education (e.g., luxurious dorms, exciting entertainment, gourmet food) to attract students (Morelli, 2010). As a result, SCBs are devoting growing attention to establishing and communicating positions unique from the competition they face – positions that offer students more than simply buzzwords and platitudes.

A unique position in the marketplace at a particular point of time, however, is not sufficient for the long-term success of SCBs – SCBs must ensure that they provide enduring offerings consistent with that position. In other words, the position needs to be implemented in the marketplace and maintained in and through the programs that a SCB provides. Although academic units may be good at developing positions, implementing and maintaining them is often much more difficult (Fitz & Naughton, 2013).

How can SCBs offer and maintain distinctive academic and co-curricular educational experiences consistent with their stated unique market positions? This paper looks at one alternative to do just that. The purpose of this paper is to examine how SCBs may be able to ensure academic integrity and innovation while maintaining a distinct position in the marketplace. Specifically, the role of Chief Mission Officers (CMOs) in bringing institutions' missions alive to their internal and external stakeholders is explored. The role of mission in higher education in general and specifically in SCBs is first reviewed. Then, the historic and present use of CMOs in various organizational contexts is examined. Finally, the applicability of CMOs, or closely related options, in SCBs located in any type of college or university is explored.

14 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:
www.igi-global.com/chapter/the-role-of-a-chief-mission-officer-in-maintaining-mission-in-schools-and-colleges-of-business/274421

Related Content

Self-Assessment in Building Online Communities of Learning

Karen Weller Swanson and Mary Kayler (2009). *Handbook of Research on E-Learning Applications for Career and Technical Education: Technologies for Vocational Training* (pp. 431-443).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/self-assessment-building-online-communities/19991

From Face-to-Face Education to Online Education: Challenges at a Business School in Peru

Otto Regalado-Pezua and Manuel Leonardo Toro Galeano (2022). *Global Trends, Dynamics, and Imperatives for Strategic Development in Business Education in an Age of Disruption* (pp. 149-170).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/from-face-to-face-education-to-online-education/288605

A Comparative Study on Undergraduate Computer Science Education between China and the United States

Eric P. Jiang (2014). *International Education and the Next-Generation Workforce: Competition in the Global Economy* (pp. 208-223).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/a-comparative-study-on-undergraduate-computer-science-education-between-china-and-the-united-states/80094

Integrating Corporate Education in Malaysian Higher Education: The Experience of Open University Malaysia

Anuwar Ali (2013). *Evolving Corporate Education Strategies for Developing Countries: The Role of Universities* (pp. 321-338).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/integrating-corporate-education-malaysian-higher/73760

Understanding Cross-Cultural Differences in the Work Stress Process

Marcus J. Fila and Morgan S. Wilson (2018). *Handbook of Research on Cross-Cultural Business Education* (pp. 224-249).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/understanding-cross-cultural-differences-in-the-work-stress-process/205952