

ACCREDITATION REVIEW TEAM REPORT - Business

The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology School of Business and Management

I. Team Recommendation

A. Accreditation Recommendation:

Extend accreditation for an additional five years with the next accreditation review scheduled for 2018-2019. Concurrence by the Continuous Improvement Review Committee and ratification by the Board of Directors are required prior to the confirmation of the accreditation decision. Following ratification by the Board of Directors, the applicant will be notified. The applicant must wait for this official notification before making any public announcement.

The applicant may file a statement with the Continuous Improvement Review Committee in response to the Peer Review Team Report.

B. Team Recommendation Review Schedule: The Continuous Improvement Review Committee will meet Monday, March 24, 2014.

II. Identification of Areas That Must Be Addressed:

The last review did not identify any areas to be addressed prior to this current review

Prior to the next review, the School should ensure that it fully completes its laudably thorough and impressive assurance of learning process by directly measuring achievement of learning goals in its masters programs. While the School has done an excellent job of assessing achievement of learning goals in its undergraduate program, the assessment cycle has yet not been fully completed in its masters programs.

III. Relevant Facts and Assessment of Strengths and Weaknesses in Support of the Team Accreditation Recommendation

A. Situational analysis:

When it was founded in 1991, the School made a critically important strategic choice that has been vital to its success so far. Specifically, at the time of its founding, the School faced a local competitive environment in which the leading competitors had adopted an educational model that could be characterized as largely based on the British style of business education. To differentiate itself in this environment, the School wisely chose to pattern itself after the model that emerged across the top North American schools in the 1980s. Key differentiating

features of this model included a strong emphasis on research productivity among the tenure track faculty, reliance on separate and distinct instructional faculty to ensure a high quality teaching experience, selective student admissions criteria emphasizing both intellectual ability and the ability to perform effectively on the job after graduation, high levels of student services (particularly in academic advising, student life, and career services), and attention to the media rankings and the factors that shape those rankings.

The School has executed its initial strategic choice beautifully and has achieved success on all of the differentiating criteria mentioned above. Specifically:

- The research productivity of the School's faculty, particularly in the top tier journals in each field, compares favorably to its self-identified peer group. While there are some differences in research productivity across different area of the School, all areas are at least at the mean of the School's peer group while some are at the top of the peer group or even at the level of the aspirant group. All tenure-track faculty exhibit at least some level of research productivity, and thus intellectual contributions are generated by a broad cross-section of the faculty rather than being produced by only a few superstars.
- The faculty's research productivity is supported by a fully developed research infrastructure including availability of grants to support research, strong access to databases and other research infrastructure, plentiful research assistants, a healthy and very large doctoral program (nearly as large as the full-time MBA program), and regular visits by eminent scholars. Assistant professors, who tend to be particularly sensitive to research infrastructure, reported strikingly strong satisfaction with the level of research support provided by the School.
- The School has, over time, built a complement of highly skilled instructional faculty, including both full-time and adjunct faculty, who have a strong commitment to teaching and who carry significantly greater instructional responsibilities than tenure-track faculty. Interestingly, instructional faculty reported that their contributions were valued in the School and they did not feel like second-class citizens, arguably in relatively striking contrast to a number of leading research-driven schools.
- Where comparisons to North American admissions norms are possible (largely in the masters degree programs), the School's admissions standards are at or above the mean of their self-identified peers. For example, in the full-time MBA program, the most recent entering class had an average GMAT score of 680 and 6 years of work experience. The School is also notable in maintaining a clear distinction in work experience between its full-time MBA program and its EMBA programs (mean work experience levels for the most recent classes admitted in the Kellogg-

HKUST and HKUST EMBA programs were 14 and 19 years, respectively). The School employs an intensive interview process (using two interviewers) for MBA and EMBA admissions that places a particular emphasis on screening for employability.

- Student services are at provided at a level comparable to strong North American peers. Of particular note are very intensive academic and career advising. Students reported strong support from both academic and career advisors and particularly appreciated the professional development services provided through the School's career center. Employers were very positive about the service level at the School's career center and reported that center staff worked hard to understand recruiter needs and to channel appropriate students to the recruiters.
- Not surprisingly, given all of the investments described above, the School's performance in the *Financial Times* rankings has been extremely impressive. The Kellogg-HKUST EMBA has been ranked number one in the world every year since 2007, except in 2008 when it was ranked number two. The full-time MBA program has been in the top ten in the world every year since 2010. It currently ranks eighth in the world, joined only by CEIBS (at #15) as Asian schools in the top 25 globally.

The investments described above have also led to strong performance against the criteria required for maintenance of accreditation.

The School now stands at a strategic crossroads where it must carefully evaluate whether, given significant changes in the environment for global business education since 1991, the strategy that has ensured past success will continue to ensure success in the future. This issue is described in more detail in the Strategic Management section of the report.

B. Changes impacting Eligibility Criteria: None

C. Strategic Management

As articulated above, the School now stands at a strategic crossroads. The School's current mode of operating, grounded in the practices of the best North American business schools as of 1991, has brought the School much success. The critical questions facing the School at present are not about which tactical decisions it should take to continue at a high level of quality but instead are fundamental strategic questions about whether the strategy that has brought the School past success is sufficient to ensure future success.

In particular, the School should consider five fundamental strategic questions as it moves forward:

- 1) What is the right number of MSc programs for the School and how can the School ensure strategic coherence across its portfolio of MSc programs?

Given the size of its faculty, the School has a very large number of MSc programs (five currently operating with two launched in 2013-14 and two more scheduled to launch in 2014-15). These programs exist in addition to the full-time MBA, two part-time MBA programs, and two EMBA programs. Each of these MSc programs exists at a relatively modest scale (about 50 students) with no immediate plans to scale up any of the programs. The MSc programs provide a valuable source of flexible funding in an environment in which much of the funding comes from the government and thus has a restricted set of uses. This funding is invaluable for purposes such as bringing faculty salaries closer to market. The MSc programs also provide a way for departments to increase their intellectual presence and to serve the needs of the Chinese business community. Despite the obvious benefits of these programs, the review team urges the School to carefully consider whether the School actually has the faculty and staff capacity to operate this many programs effectively. Also, the School should carefully consider the tradeoff between many programs at a relatively small scale and fewer programs at a larger scale. Finally, the School should consider whether a possible deficiency in the strategic coherence across these programs could dilute the School's brand and muddy its identity in the marketplace.

- 2) How will the School address increasing local competitive pressures in both the EMBA and full-time MBA markets?

Chicago Booth has recently announced that it will bring its EMBA to Hong Kong and has already acquired property in a desirable central location. Given the extremely strong Booth brand and high level of resources Booth will surely bring into the marketplace, the School should not underestimate the importance of this competitive threat. The peer review team urges the School to immediately craft a detailed plan designed to address this competitive issue, drawing on the help of its partner school (Kellogg) as appropriate. Arguably no school in the world knows more about competing with Booth than its cross-town rival Kellogg.

Similarly, the two strongest local full-time MBA competitors (HKU and CUHK) began to be ranked by *Financial Times* in 2012. This move suggests that these schools are now attending carefully to the rankings and are likely to attempt to close the rankings gap between themselves and the School. Again, in a world where global MBA demand is softening, the School should not underestimate this competitive threat and should develop a clear plan for addressing it. Some of our conversations suggested that the prevailing view is that higher rankings for local competitors will grow the MBA pie for all schools. Under current conditions of flagging full-time MBA demand this

scenario seems far less likely than a more equitable splitting of the current pie between existing competitors.

- 3) How can the School best capture the benefits of school-based admission while limiting the negative effects of this process on the ability to secure the very best students?

School-based admission has much to recommend it, including choosing a major based on both deeper self-knowledge and more thorough understanding of the jobs to which that major leads. However, given that the two strongest local competitors offer admission directly into the desired major for those applicants who already know their preference, school-based admission is highly likely to be a significant competitive disadvantage in attracting the very best students, who are unusually (and perhaps irrationally) risk averse when confronted with even the most remote possibility of not being able to pursue their selected major. In order to capture more of the very best undergraduate students, the peer review team urges the School to move toward a system that captures that best of school-based admission while limiting its risk. At the limit, such a system might guarantee each student his or her preferred major choice (which was reported as what is happening in most cases at present) while assuring them the flexibility to change majors if their interests change with the experience of their first year. If this is not possible, perhaps an elite “Honors” cohort of students could be identified and guaranteed first choice of major while others might be guaranteed first or second choice. Many other options are possible that capture the benefits of School-based admissions without incurring the costs.

The review team encourages the School to pair this modification in admissions processes with two other features: (1) a required, first year course in which students actively explore different majors and careers, diagnose their own strengths and interests, and consider the best major and career for them, and (2) an active outreach program to employers promoting the School's students as the ones who truly understand the differences between different functions and careers and who make optimal career choices. Improved career choice and self-knowledge among students was the one thing employers indicated that they would value highly.

- 4) How can faculty become more connected to the world of practice (and thus more flexible and effective as instructors)?

An important trend that has been established in the School's global peers since it set its core strategy in 1991 is for leading research faculty to establish a better and more meaningful connection to the world of practice and to use that connection to create stronger teaching performance. The School's efforts in this area are quite nascent. While there is still a separation between unconnected research professors and highly connected professional

instructors in these aspirational peer schools, the pendulum has started to swing toward greater connection among the very leading research scholars, who rank among their school's most important teachers as well. It would be a shame and indeed ironic if the School continued to mirror the success model adopted from North American schools circa 1991 when those very schools have moved on and adopted a next generation strategy.

The four recently created Centers (Centre for Business Data Analysis, Center for Marketing and Supply Chain Management, Tanoto Center for Asian Family Business and Entrepreneurship Studies, and Thompson Center for Business Case Studies) are a good start in this direction, although faculty engagement in these Centers appears limited at present. Also, the School would be well served by more direct investments in developing the teaching capabilities of its faculty. Such investments might include formal training programs, classroom observation by star teachers, and personal coaching for faculty who need or desire to improve their teaching. In addition, it would be important for the School to signal that the highest contribution to the School will come from superb researchers who are also capable of inspired and inspiring teaching, rather than just one or the other.

- 5) How can the faculty, particularly the tenured faculty, develop a shared understanding of the School's strategy, competitive positioning, and funding model?

Our meetings with tenured faculty had a noticeably different tone than meetings with assistant professors. While assistant professors were quite pleased with the School and its support of them, the tenured faculty expressed repeated concerns that the School was not providing them with adequate resources to pursue their individual research agendas. Surprisingly, the faculty expressed little knowledge of or interest in the School's overall strategy, and their knowledge of the School's funding model was at best impressionistic. It struck us as unfortunate and unhelpful that this apparent lack of understanding of the School strategy and financial model produced such a level of concern and complaint from the cadre at the School – the tenured faculty – that needs to show leadership. At a time when the School is facing important strategic questions and competitive threats, it will be important for the next dean to develop among the faculty a shared understanding of the School's strategy and finances so that rather than sitting back and complaining, the tenured faculty can assist the Dean and the enthusiastic and engaged junior faculty in bringing about the changes necessary for success in a world that has altered a great deal since the School's founding.

D. Participants

- Students

As outlined in the situational analysis section, student quality is high as is the quality of student services (as assessed by the number of staff available to serve students and as reported by both students and employers).

- Faculty sufficiency (Standard 9):

The School's standards for identifying participating and supporting faculty are appropriate. The proportion of participating faculty is 97.14% overall and ranges between 92.65% and 100% across the various departments. Thus, the vast majority of the School's faculty is participating and fully engaged in the life of the School, as appropriate for their rank and role.

- Faculty qualifications (Standard 10):

While the School's standards for identifying AQ and PQ faculty are appropriate, the standards articulated in the report are rather terse and could be elaborated more fully. During discussions with the School at the time of the visit, the School provided a more elaborated version of these standards that is fully consistent with its mission. We encourage the School to include this more elaborated version of its AQ and PQ standards in the report it prepares for the next accreditation visit.

The proportion of academically qualified faculty is 86.4% overall, which is very strong. Across the six departments, the proportion of academically qualified faculty spans the relatively narrow range between 80.16% and 93.75%, which is consistent with the School's research mission. The proportion of academically qualified plus professionally qualified faculty is 92.81% overall. Across the six departments, the ratio ranges from 85.71% to 96.88%. Only two departments are below the 90% cutoff. Economics is at 89.29%, which is not materially below the cutoff. Marketing is at 85.71%, which reflects slightly greater reliance on "Other" faculty than the other departments in the School. However, given the scale and distribution of qualifications across the marketing faculty, changing one person's qualifications could bring this ratio above 90%, and thus it does not represent a material variation from the threshold.

As outlined in the situational analysis and strategic management sections of the report, the School provides very strong support for research productivity. Support for teaching excellence could be improved by offering more direct training and services for faculty.

E. Assurance of Learning:

The School has invested an exceptional and laudable amount of time and energy in its assurance of learning processes. Notably, these processes are supported by a University-wide emphasis on assurance of learning. Also of note is the fact that these processes and outcomes are quite publicly visible and are included on the school's website. Undergraduate students in particular are aware of these processes and their significance, which is rather unusual and commendable. These processes go beyond setting learning goals, mapping them to courses, and assessing student performance and also include regular external reviews of programs by peer academics and regular, documented surveys of employers about student performance related to the learning goals.

This very ambitious and comprehensive approach to assurance of learning has not quite been completed. While it has been fully implemented in the undergraduate program, it is not quite complete in the masters programs. While each masters program has learning goals and those goals have been mapped to courses, direct assessment of student performance against those goals still needs to be completed.

IV. Commendations of Strengths, Innovations, Unique Features and Effective Practices

A. Commendations for Strengths, Innovations, and Unique Features:

The School's strengths and distinctive features have been outlined in earlier sections of this report,

B. Effective practices:

The School should be commended for its commitment to the assurance of learning process at the undergraduate level including the open communication of the process and results to the students. In addition, the review team received enthusiastic assessments of the work and performance of the career services of the School from both students and recruiters. It is safe to say that this area is often a flashpoint for criticism and concern so the School should be commended on this front as well. Finally, the School has recently brought together all of its faculty and staff into a well-designed, high functioning new building that provides ample opportunities for faculty to interact with each other and well-designed spaces for student learning and support services.

V. Opportunities for Continuous Improvement

The opportunities for continuous improvement were outlined in detail in the strategic management section of the report. None of these opportunities for improvement are materially related to performance against the accreditation standards.

VI. Visit Summary

A. *Descriptive Information:* Brief description of the school including its size and institutional setting

The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (HKUST) was established in 1991. Discussions on a third university for Hong Kong began in the 1980s and it was decided this university would be specialized and research-intensive, and would assist in the economic and social development of Hong Kong. This clearly-defined mission distinguished the third university from the two comprehensive universities already established in Hong Kong.

HKUST provides facilities for more than 12,500 students and 500 faculty members in four schools: the HKUST Business School and the Schools of Science, Engineering, and Humanities and Social Science.

The School offers a full suite of degree programs including undergraduate (UG) programs (BBA and BSc), taught postgraduate (TPg) programs comprising MBA, EMBA, Master of Science (MSc), and research postgraduate (RPg) programs (MPhil and PhD), as well as non-degree executive education programs. The UG (except for World Bachelor in Business (WBB) being launched in 2013) and RPg programs are funded by the UGC, while the others are self-financing.

Within the School there are six departments: Accounting (ACCT), Economics (ECON), Finance (FINA), Information Systems, Business Statistics and Operations Management (ISOM), Management (MGMT), and Marketing (MARK). The School also operates 12 research centers which are devoted to a multitude of areas ranging from Asian financial markets to Asian entrepreneurship and investment management.

The School has recently moved to the Lee Shau Kee Business Building – a new home for the School. The purpose-built building not only provides a new learning and teaching environment with upgraded facilities, but also serves as a new platform of academic exchange for scholars and business leaders from around the world. By bringing together the School's academic departments, programs, centers and administrative units, the building also aims to provide a more engaging and caring place for both learning and work.

B. *Degree Programs*: List of all degree programs included in the accreditation review and the number of graduates in the previous year for each program:

Name of Degree Program	Major(s), Concentration(s), Area(s) of Emphasis	Graduates
BBA		616
BSc		74
MBA	Full-Time	94
MBA	Part-Time Hong Kong	111
MBA	Part-Time in Shenzhen	72
EMBA	Kellogg-HKUST EMBA	50
EMBA	HKUST EMBA for Chinese Executive	50
MSc	Economics	71
MSc	Investment Management	68
MSc	Financial Analysis	36
MSc	Information Systems Management	43
MSc	Global Management	27*
MS	HKUST-NYU MS in Global Finance	45
MPhil		4
PhD		14

*Last graduating class in 2012

C. Comparison Groups:

Comparable Peers:

University of Toronto
University of North Carolina
University of Texas, Austin
Ohio State University
University of Washington
University of Illinois
University of Sydney

Competitive Group:

The University of Hong Kong
The Chinese University of Hong Kong
China Europe International Business School
(CEIBS)
National University of Singapore
Tsinghua University
Peking University

Aspirant Group:

New York University
Northwestern University
London Business School
INSEAD
University of California - Berkeley
University of Michigan

D. *Visit Team Members:*

January 19-21, 2014

Alison Davis-Blake (Chair)
Edward J. Frey Dean of Business
The University of Michigan
Stephen M. Ross School of Business

Roger L. Martin (Business Member)
Immediate Past Dean
Academic Director, Martin Prosperity Institute
University of Toronto
Rotman School of Management

Urton L. Anderson (Accounting Chair)
Director, Von Allmen School of Accountancy
The University of Kentucky
Carol Martin Gatton College of Business and Economics

John Roberts (Accounting Member)
Professor and Chair, Accounting
The University of Sydney
The University of Sydney Business School

E. *Review Visit Schedule:* See attached visit schedule

F. *Materials Reviewed:*

- a. Maintenance of accreditation report and appendices prepared by the School
- b. Resumes of School faculty (both tenure-track and non-tenure-track)
- c. School website
- d. Annual reports on teaching and learning prepared by all academic departments and programs
- e. Student satisfaction and employment surveys
- f. Minutes of meetings of School Board (internal)
- g. Minutes of meetings of School Advisory Council (external)

HKUST BUSINESS SCHOOL
AACSB Maintenance of Accreditation Review (Business & Accounting)

Visit Schedule
(19-21 January 2014)

Sunday 19 January 2014	
3:00pm (To be coordinated among PRT)	Peer Review Team Meeting Business Center, 3/F, Crowne Plaza Hotel (The Center has been reserved from 3:00pm – 6:00pm)
6:30pm	Dinner with Dean, Associate Deans & Accounting Department Chair Tze Yuet Heen Chinese Restaurant, 2/F, Crowne Plaza Hotel Acting Dean Kalok Chan DH of ACCT Kevin Chen Senior Associate Dean JT Li Associate Dean (UG Programs) Emily Nason Associate Dean (Master's Programs) Sean Ferguson Associate Dean (HKUST EMBA Program, Executive Programs and China Strategy) Xu Yan Head of Communications and External Affairs Janice Man
Monday 20 January 2014	
7:45am – 8:30am	Parallel Sessions Breakfast meeting on career services & academic advising Chef's Table, 1/F, Crowne Plaza Head of MBA/MSc Career Services Joseph Palumbo Head of MBA Student Development Etta Wong Assistant Director of MSc Programs Catherine Lo Assistant Director of UG Academic Affairs and Advising Ka Yee Lee Assistant Director of UG Student Development & Career Services Sophia Wan Breakfast meeting on alumni relations and development Chef's Table, 1/F, Crowne Plaza Head of Alumni Development Kitty Chong
8:35am	<i>Departure for Lee Shau Kee (LSK) Business Building, HKUST</i>

9:00am – 9:45am	<i>Business Team</i> Meeting on school strategic management planning and financial strategies Room 7012, LSK Business Building Acting Dean Kalok Chan Senior Associate Dean JT Li School Administrator Elaine Tam <i>Accounting Team</i> Meeting on accounting strategic management planning Room 7011, LSK Business Building DH of ACCT Kevin Chen ACCT Executive Committee: Guochang Zhang, Mingyi Hung and Peter Chen
9:45am – 10:30am	<i>Business Team</i> Meeting with Department Heads Room 7012, LSK Business Building DH of ECON Siu Fai Leung DH of FINA Sudipto Dasgupta DH of ISOM James Thong Deputy DH of ISOM Shaohui Zheng DH of MGMT JT Li Acting DH of MARK Kristiaan Helsen <i>Accounting Team</i> Meeting on program leadership Room 7011, LSK Business Building DH of ACCT Kevin Chen
10:30am – 11:15am	<i>Combined Business and Accounting</i> Meeting on UG Programs Room 7012, LSK Business Building UG Program Director/ CUP Chair Emily Nason CUP member Ronald Lau CUP member Yan Yu School Rep at University's Teaching and Learning Quality Committee Larry Farh ACCT UG Programs Coordinator Kelvin Mak
11:15am – 11:30am	<i>Break</i>

11:30am – 12:15pm	Parallel Session Meeting on EMBA and MBA Programs (to be hosted by Prof Alison Davis Blake) Room 7011, LSK Business Building Former Academic Director of Kellogg-HKUST EMBA Program Vidhan Goyal Academic Director of Kellogg-HKUST EMBA Program Christopher Doran Associate Dean (HKUST EMBA Program, Executive Programs and China Strategy)/ Director of HKUST EMBA Program Xu Yan Associate Deans Master's Programs/ MBA Program Director Sean Ferguson MBA Committee Chair/ Academic Director Albert Ha Meeting on MSc and PhD Programs (To be hosted by Prof Roger Martin) Room 7012, LSK Business Building MSc Committee Chair Theodore Clark (also Academic Director of MSc in Information System Management) Executive Director (School Development & MSc Programs) Chris Tsang Academic Director of MSc in Economics Tao Zhu Academic Director of MSc in Financial Analysis and MSc in Investment Management Peter MacKay Academic Director of MSc in Global Management Elizabeth George Committee on Postgraduate Programs Chair/ Director of PhD/MPhil Programs Inchi Hu Meeting on Accounting Programs Room 6045, LSK Business Building Academic Director of new MSc in ACCT Tony Shieh ACCT PhD/MPhil Program Coordinator Tai Yuan Chen
12:15pm – 12:45pm	Combined Business and Accounting Meeting with School Appointment and Substantiation Committee Room 7012, LSK Business Building Mingyi Hung (ACCT) Kai Lung Hui (IS) Albert Ha (OM) Prithviraj Chattopadhyay (MGMT) Jaideep Sengupta (MARK)

12:45pm – 1:35pm	<i>Business Team</i> Lunch meeting with selected senior faculty Room 3028, LSK Business Building Juanyi Xu, Associate Professor, ECON Jialin Yu, Associate Professor, FINA James Lancelot, Professor, ISOM Michael Zhang, Associate Professor, ISOM Yaping Gong, Associate Professor, MGMT Ying Zhao, Associate Professor, MARK <i>Accounting Team</i> Lunch meeting with selected senior faculty Room 3028, LSK Business Building Charles Hsu, Associate Professor, ACCT Zhihong Chen, Associate Professor, ACCT
------------------	---

1:35pm – 1:45 pm	<i>Break</i>
1:45pm – 2:30pm	<i>Business Team</i> Meeting with selected junior faculty Room 7012, LSK Business Building Kam Wing Siu, Visiting Assistant Professor, ECON Darwin Choi, Assistant Professor, FINA Abhiroop Mukherjee, Assistant Professor, FINA Man Yu, Assistant Professor, ISOM Hong Xu, Assistant Professor, ISOM John Li, Assistant Professor, MGMT Wenbo Wang, Assistant Professor, MARK <i>Accounting Team</i> Meeting with selected junior faculty Room 7011, LSK Business Building Xi Li, Assistant Professor, ACCT Derrald Stice, Assistant Professor, ACCT Shiheng Wang, Assistant Professor, ACCT Haifeng You, Assistant Professor, ACCT Amy Zang, Assistant Professor, ACCT
2:30pm – 3:15pm	<i>Combined Business and Accounting</i> Meeting with Executive Education Teachers Room 7012, LSK Business Building Guochang Zhang, Professor, ACCT Vidhan Goyal, Professor, FINA Stephen Nason, Professor of Business Practices, MGMT Caroline Wang, Professor of Business Practices, MGMT Joseph Salvacruz, Professor of Business Practices, MARK
3:15pm – 3:30pm	<i>Break</i>
3:30pm – 4:15pm	<i>Combined Business and Accounting</i> Meeting with Research Committee and Research Center Directors Room 7012, LSK Business Building Research Committee Members: Peter Chen, Songnian Chen, Ellick Wong Director of Center for Business Data Analysis Inchi Hu Co-Director of Center for Marketing and Supply Chain Management Ying Zhao Director of Tanoto Center for Asian Family Business and Entrepreneurship Studies and Thompson Center for Business Case Studies Roger King

4:15pm – 5:00pm	<i>Business Team</i> Meeting with UG students Room 7011, LSK Business Building Chau Gia-yi, Jessica, BBA (Marketing) Year 3 (3-year program) Law On Yee, Angele, BBA (GBUS), Year 3 (3-year program) Leung Zin Yun, April BSc (Quantitative Finance) Year 3 (3-year program) Tong Hong Shing, Arthur, BBA(Finance) Year 3(3-year program) Chan Wing Tung, BBA (Undeclared), Year 2 (4-year program) Ng Sze Wah, Timothy, BBA (GBUS), Year 2 (4-year program) Meeting with PG students Room 7012, LSK Business Building Yuan Lee Chung (FTMBA) Ted Mylonas (FTMBA) Tommy Cheng (PTMBA-SZ) Freya Xie (PTMBA-SZ) Adam Nelson (PTMBA-HK) Flora Sze (PTMBA-HK) Chan Man Hing (MSc Econ) Yong Kil Ahn (PhD - FINA, year 3) Gilad Feldman (PhD - MGMT, year 6) Geetanjali Saluja (PhD - MARK, year 4) <i>Accounting Team</i> Meeting with UG students Room 3042, LSK Business Building Cheung Ka Shun, Christine (ACCT/MGMT year 2) Ho Wing Yee, Winnie (ACCT/MARK year 3) Hui, Cheuk Yu, Cherrie (ACCT/MGMT year 3) Lau Yee Man, Mole (ACCT/MGMT year 3) Meeting with PG students Room 3043, LSK Business Building Gyebi Kwarteng, PhD - ACCT Zhiyang Li, PhD - ACCT Wei Shi, PhD - ACCT
-----------------	---

5:00pm – 5:45pm	Business Team Meeting with employers Room 7012, LSK Business Building <i>Employers of UG Programs</i> Eliza Chan, Senior Vice President, Human Resources, Citi Hong Kong Jackie Kam, Assistant Vice President, Graduate Recruiter, Deutsche Bank <i>Employers of PG Programs</i> Deepak Devendrappa, Global Marketing Planning Manager, Methanex Asia Pacific Joanne Ho, Program Director, Program for Management Development, Fung (1937) Management Ltd James Lee, Corporate HR Development Manager, LVMH Asia Pacific Accounting Team Meeting with employers Room 7011, LSK Business Building July Kong, Director, Human Resources, Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Annie Lui, Manager, Human Resources and Development, PricewaterhouseCoopers Ltd Margaret So, Director, Human Resources, KPMG
5:45pm	Departure for Crowne Plaza
6:30pm	Peer Review Team Dinner Meeting Diamond Room 3, 2/F, Crowne Plaza
Tuesday 21 January 2014	
8:00am – 9:45am	Peer Review Team Meeting Diamond Room 3, 2//F, Crowne Plaza Hotel
9:45am	<i>Departure for HKUST Campus</i>
10:15am – 11:00am	Combined Business and Accounting Meeting with Dean and Accounting Head Room 7332, 7/F Main Academic Building, HKUST Acting Dean Kalok Chan DH of ACCT Kevin Chen

11:00am – 11:45am	<i>Combined Business and Accounting Meeting with HKUST Senior Management</i> Room 7332, 7/F Main Academic Building, HKUST President Tony Chan Executive Vice-President & Provost Wei Shyy Vice-President for Administration and Business Yuk-Shan Wong Vice-President for Institutional Advancement Eden Y Woon
11:45am	<i>Departure for Wrap-up Lunch Meeting</i>
12:00pm – 1:30pm	<i>Combined Business and Accounting Lunch Meeting with Dean, Associate Deans & Accounting Department Chair</i> Chinese Restaurant, HKUST Campus Acting Dean Kalok Chan DH of ACCT Kevin Chen Associate Dean (UG Programs) Emily Nason Associate Dean (UG Programs) Kai Lung Hui Associate Dean (HKUST EMBA Program, Executive Programs and China Strategy) Xu Yan
1:30pm	End of visit program