



**AQ/PQ Status: Establishing Criteria for
Attainment and Maintenance of Faculty
Qualifications - An Interpretation of AACSB
Standards**



AACSB White Paper No. 4 issued by:

**AACSB International Accreditation
Coordinating Committee
AACSB International Accreditation Quality
Committee**

November 2009

AQ/PQ Status: Establishing Criteria for Attainment and Maintenance of Qualifications - An Interpretation of AACSB Standards

Introduction

Purpose

This document provides guidance consistent with the spirit and intent of AACSB International standards as revised through 1 July 2009 relative to Standard 10 dealing with earning and maintaining academic or professional qualifications. It is based on an assessment of the spirit and intent of the standards, experiences of peer review teams, feedback from accreditation committees, and significant discussions at AACSB conferences, seminars, and other related events. Another purpose of the paper is to clarify the relationship between Standard 2 (Intellectual Contributions) and Standard 10 (Faculty Qualifications) based on historical development of the accreditation standards. The need for clarification was reinforced by the Strategic Directions Committee in 2008 in its recommendations to the AACSB Board of Directors and the Accreditation Quality Committee (AQC), which oversees the development of AACSB's accreditation standards. In addition, the document captures the changes in the standards as adopted by the Accreditation Council in April 2009. This document is not a change to the standards, but it is intended to facilitate additional dialogue within the context of the existing standards regarding the importance of maintaining academic and professional qualifications in support of the mission of AACSB accredited business schools/accounting programs. For clarification, the term "business schools/accounting programs" is used throughout the paper in reference to AACSB accredited business schools and accounting programs that hold separate AACSB accounting accreditation.

Background

Philosophically, AACSB's concept for faculty resources can be characterized as a "portfolio" approach. That is, depending on the mission of the business school/accounting program, faculty resources (Academically Qualified (AQ), Professionally Qualified (PQ), or other) should be deployed in sufficient numbers and with appropriate qualifications to support "overall high quality" in all academic programs and other mission components. The programs that are offered and faculty that are deployed should result from strategic decisions made within the business school/accounting program.

AACSB standards do not prescribe a "one size fits all" approach to the blend of AQ and PQ faculty resources. However, Standard 10 establishes a 50% minimum floor for AQ faculty resources supporting the mission of an undergraduate-only institution. AQ expectations increase as graduate programs are added to the program portfolio. A second quantitative expectation for all schools states that combined AQ and PQ faculty resources should not fall below

90% of total faculty resources. For more information, see earlier white papers on the deployment of AQ and PQ faculty (2006 and 2009c).

As noted above, the percentage of AQ faculty should increase as graduate programs are added to the portfolio of degree programs. In a previous AACSB white papers (AACSB, 2006), deployment of AQ and PQ faculty was discussed as an important strategic choice. Both AQ and PQ faculty member can make significant and positive contributions to the successful mission achievement for any business school and/or accounting program.

A business school/accounting program may make a strategic decision, consistent with its mission, on the distribution of AQ and PQ faculty by discipline, program, or location that varies from the overall percentages outlined in Standard 10. For example, a school may decide to strategically deploy a higher percentage of PQ faculty in support of a masters' program in taxation or entrepreneurship (e.g., in the range of 70-80%). In doing so, the business school/accounting program would still need to ensure that its overall deployment of AQ and PQ faculty meets AACSB guidelines. The burden of proof is on the business school/accounting program to demonstrate the delivery of overall high quality in such cases.

The significance of AQ and PQ faculty resources to the success of business school/accounting programs can be found in the preamble to the standards stating, "...academic quality is created by the educational standards implemented by individual faculty members in interactions with students." The central tenet of the standards is that all faculty members, AQ, PQ and other, are necessary to support high quality academic programs, continuous improvement, and high quality graduates. These outcomes are delivered by faculty members that:

- are experts in the subject matter of their teaching and research fields;
- understand the educational process and student learning; and
- are current in their teaching field through their research, professional experience, and/or other development activities.

AACSB Standard 10 outlines expectations regarding all faculty members, and requires business schools/accounting programs to demonstrate that "... the academic preparation and subsequent activities demonstrate currency and relevance in the field of teaching." Academic or professional qualifications require a, "...combination of original academic preparation (degree completion) augmented by subsequent activities that maintain or establish preparation for teaching responsibilities" (AACSB, 2009a). Therefore, documentation of faculty qualifications is an important dimension of AACSB accreditation reviews. The interpretive materials supporting Standard 10 require business schools/accounting programs to develop and implement appropriate criteria by which AQ and PQ status is granted and maintained. The criteria should be consistent with the business school/accounting program's mission and programs offered and should address:

- The academic preparation and/or professional experience required to attain each status;
- Consistent with the stated mission, the types of developmental activities that are required to maintain academic or professional qualifications on an ongoing, sustained basis addressing:
 - The priority and value of different development activities reflecting the mission and strategic management processes;
 - Quality standards required for various, specified development activities and how quality is assured; and
 - The quantity and frequency of development activities and outcomes expected within the typical five-year AACSB review cycle to maintain each status. (AACSB, 2009)

Tables 10-1 and 10-2 (See Appendix B) must be completed for each AACSB review to provide a summary of the school and/or accounting program's faculty resources relative to their individual AQ, PQ, or other status. Table 10-1, modified in 2009, identifies multiple categories of activities and/or outcomes that may support qualifications including intellectual contributions, professional experience, consulting, professional development, and other professional activities. The key is to demonstrate the currency and relevancy of the intellectual capital of each and all faculty members regardless of the type of contractual relationship between the faculty members and the school (e.g. full-time/part-time, tenured/non-tenured, permanent/temporary, academic/clinical, etc.).

This paper explores some important principles and guidance relative to the development and implementation of the criteria for granting and maintaining AQ and PQ status. Appendix A includes a series of frequently asked questions to further enhance the discussion surrounding this important topic.

The Importance of Quality and Continuous Improvement

AACSB accreditation reviews are expected to address whether the applicant business school/accounting program demonstrates "overall high quality" and supports "continuous improvement" in support of the degree programs offered. Quality is the key. The professional judgment that is applied by peer review team members, accreditation committee members, and the Board of Directors to accreditation decisions must be based on a qualitative assessment of these two factors. It is in this spirit that the remainder of this paper is developed.

The Importance of Mission

As is the case throughout AACSB standards, the business school/accounting program's mission sets the context for establishing guidance for developing and implementing criteria that guide the achievement and maintenance of faculty

qualifications. The mission and/or supporting documents should drive strategic decision-making and clearly articulate:

- The types and levels of academic degree programs offered and students served;
- Types of scholarly and professional activities expected of faculty;
- Other mission components unique to the institution (e.g., economic development, executive education, community service, etc.); and
- Learning goals for each degree programs and learning outcomes demonstrating goal achievement

If programs, activities, and learning goals are aligned with the mission, criteria for establishing and maintaining faculty qualifications should also be in alignment.

Establishing Initial AQ/PQ Status

Educational Background

The foundation for establishing initial faculty qualifications is academic preparation. This generally means an appropriate degree that supports the field of teaching and other mission-related responsibilities. For AQ faculty, a doctoral degree is normally expected representing "...completion of a degree program intended to produce scholars capable of creating scholarly contributions through advances in research or theory" (AACSB, 2009a). Normally, for PQ faculty, "...academic preparation should consist of a master's degree in a field related to the area of teaching assignment" (AACSB, 2009a).

Previous white papers on deployment of AQ (AACSB, 2006) and PQ faculty (AACSB, 2009c) provide extensive discussions of variations on the above expectations that may be sufficient to establish appropriate, initial academic preparation for respective AQ or PQ status.

Experience

If academic preparation is not obviously and clearly linked to the area of teaching responsibilities, additional preparation must be documented. For AQ faculty without academic preparation in the field of teaching, research activity leading to publications in the teaching field or additional academic preparation/professional experience should be demonstrated. For PQ faculty without academic preparation in the field of teaching, significant professional experience, additional academic preparation, or other professional development activities linked to the teaching field would be expected. The general principle is that the further the academic preparation is from the teaching field, the more extensive additional educational or other development activities have to be to establish a credible case for initial attainment of AQ or PQ status.

Maintaining Qualifications

Once initial qualifications are established, development activities must be continued to demonstrate that each faculty member is current and relevant in his/her teaching field and for support of other mission components. That is, the initial qualification as AQ or PQ is not guaranteed in perpetuity. Continued development activities must be demonstrated.

Priority and Value of Different Activity and Quality Standards

In support of sustaining faculty qualifications, each business school/accounting program must provide its own interpretation of the spirit and intent of Standard 10 in establishing what outcomes are most important to support its mission. For example, a business school/accounting program that has a large graduate program, including significant doctoral enrollments, may place high priority on discipline-based intellectual contributions and even specify specific journals that are target outlets for the research work. A business school with a strong focus on professional programs and on contributions to practice may identify practice and trade-oriented journals as priorities for intellectual contributions and recognize consulting or professional service as appropriate.

For development activities that do not involve research and publication, guidance should be provided in terms of the expectations regarding quality, duration, outcomes, etc. for the experience or activity to support AQ or PQ status. Quality standards related to intellectual contributions may relate to journal acceptance rates and/or external validation of journal status. For other developmental activities, quality may be assessed on the basis of impact, length of activity, complexity, and clear link to teaching responsibilities. Specific developmental activities may be validated by other activities that demonstrate recognition of the experience, academic record, publications, etc. of the faculty member. Validation activities might be consulting engagements that involve substantive applications of research outcomes. Successful translation of theoretical work to a successful application that is also published may also provide evidence of validation.

Standard 10 states:

All faculty members are expected to demonstrate activities that maintain the currency and relevancy of their instruction. Faculty members can maintain qualifications through a variety of efforts including production of intellectual contributions, professional development, and current professional experience. The choice of activities to maintain currency and relevance may change at different times during a faculty member's career... (AACSB, 2009a).

A natural extension of the participant standards is an appropriate focus on the recruitment, management, and development of faculty and other human resources to support mission achievement as outlined in Standard 11. Providing clear guidance for faculty in terms of the business school/accounting program's mission and its link to faculty development initiatives is critical to successful mission related outcomes.

As noted earlier, business schools/accounting programs may choose, in accordance with mission and degree programs, to more narrowly define expectations or allow a broader set of activities. For example, a doctoral granting business school/accounting program may choose to set expectations that all academically qualified faculty members will be qualified on the basis of their research outcomes and recognize no other activities. A business school/accounting program with only an undergraduate program may allow a broader set of activities consistent with its mission. The business school/accounting program must be prepared to document that its expectations for maintaining academic and professional qualifications are substantive, meaningful, linked to mission, and support currency and relevancy in the classroom and in support of other mission-related functions. In all cases, these decisions should be made consistent with the business school/accounting program's mission and in a way that ensures the school also meets AACSB standards. Furthermore, with regards to AACSB expectations for intellectual contributions including peer reviewed journal publications (also includes scholarly books, research monographs, and/or chapters or sections of such publications that are subject to a peer review process) as outlined in Standard 2, business schools/accounting programs must develop and implement appropriate policies and criteria to produce outcomes as outlined in Standard 2.

Expectations for Academic Administrators

A 2008 revision in the standards also recognized the uniqueness and significance of the professional activities of key academic administrators such as deans, department chairs, associate deans, center directors, etc. The revision states:

*The criteria for granting and for maintaining academic or professional qualifications for those individuals holding faculty status and also holding significant administrative appointments (e.g. deans, associate deans, department heads/chairs, center directors, etc.) **may** reflect these important administrative duties (AACSB, 2009)*

Based on this revision, business schools/accounting programs may incorporate developmental activities for academic administrators that vary from faculty members who have traditional teaching and research responsibilities. This is up to each business school/accounting program and is not a requirement. However,

if an academic administrator has teaching responsibilities, sustaining qualifications to support this function should be expected to be appropriate for that role and consistent with the expectations of other faculty who have teaching responsibilities.

Quantity and Frequency of Activities and Outcomes

AACSB standards do not specify the quantity or frequency of activities necessary to earn or maintain academic or professional qualifications over an AACSB review period. There are a number of “urban myths” that imply unwritten, formally approved expectations exist (e.g. each faculty must produce two peer reviewed journal articles every five years to be AQ), **but there are no such unwritten rules or standards.** Peer and aspirant schools, however, form a relevant context for judgments about quantity, quality, and frequency of activities and expected outcomes.

Mission and programs offered provide starting points for development of AQ/PQ criteria, and since these vary significantly across business schools/accounting programs, each business school/accounting program should be viewed separately to determine appropriate quantities, frequencies, and outcomes to maintain qualifications. Quantity and frequency should be influenced by qualitative factors. For example, a major research project that involves a multi-year effort that produces one major outcome such as a publication in a leading discipline-based, scholarly journal may be sufficient for one or more faculty members. On the other hand, a multiple set of activities and outcomes may not be sufficient if they are not clearly linked to the field of teaching and/or lack depth, sophistication, and substance that truly contribute to the professional development of the faculty member or members. The standards are not intended to limit or prescribe the types of activities that fit every faculty member; therefore, flexibility is allowed along with the fact that the activities may change over an academic career. The key is to:

- Demonstrate intellectual vibrancy across the business school/accounting program that documents the faculty is actively and broadly engaged in development activities that support high quality, relevant, and current teaching and support for other mission components; and
- Demonstrate development activities are substantive, sustained, and appropriate for faculty members in an institution offering baccalaureate, masters, and/or doctoral degrees in business (i.e., mission-link is the key).

In establishing AQ/PQ expectations, business school/accounting programs should consider criteria that are sufficient, reasonable, and defensible to external stakeholders such as students, parents, employers, and alumni. The risk of setting expectations that are perceived as too low may lead to appropriate questions regarding the school’s commitment to quality.

Peer institutions, as identified by each school/accounting program, may provide a context for discussions regarding AQ/PQ criteria. AACSB does not require peer business school/accounting programs to have the same AQ/PQ criteria. Variations are expected. However, a business school/accounting program's choice of peer schools provides a reference point of how the business school/accounting program sees itself within the community of business schools/accounting programs. If a business school/accounting program's AQ/PQ criteria are significantly different from those of the self-selected peer group, the variation is an appropriate point for discussion during an accreditation review.

Standard 10 and Standard 2: Connects and Disconnects

Since the adoption of revised standards in April 2003, AACSB standards have continued to evolve based on practice and application. In the development of the 2003 standards by the Blue Ribbon Committee on Accreditation Quality, the importance of deploying qualified faculty (a key attribute of AACSB standards carried over from the pre-2003 standards) was deemed to be a key attribute of high quality business schools/accounting programs. Hence, the 2003 standards focused on faculty development and deployment of qualified faculty in support of the mission. The intent was also to recognize that development activities for faculty members could change (and vary) with the evolution of a faculty member's career. The standard also more formally introduced and clarified the concepts of AQ and PQ faculty which were also in the pre-2003 standards.

The original template for Table 10-1 included in the standards produced a disconnect with the original spirit and intent of Standard 10. Table 10-1 provides a template for business schools/accounting programs to summarize AQ and PQ faculty with supporting information about each faculty member. Though the table was viewed as a guide, the only item listed in the table template related to documenting AQ/PQ status was "peer reviewed journal" (PRJs) articles and "Other Intellectual Contributions" (OICs). The suggested template did not provide columns for other development activities. Some inconsistent interpretive language in the standard also contributed to this view.

As a result, since 2003, there has been an informal (but sometimes emphatic) interpretation in practice by business schools/accounting programs and peer review teams that intellectual contributions were the only basis for satisfactory AQ/PQ criteria. This was not the original intent. Also contributing to this situation was that Standard 2, which includes the discussion on intellectual contributions, also addressed "mission appropriateness." AACSB's emphasis on intellectual contributions was not clear in this mixed standard. Therefore, following recommendations from AACSB's Strategic Directions Committee, the Accreditation Quality Committee revised the standards for 2009 with the goal of reinforcing the original intent of Standard 10 and appropriately emphasizing the importance of intellectual contributions in Standard 2. Rewording of Standard 2 and 10 were approved in April 2009 by the Accreditation Council. Interpretive

materials supporting Standards 2 and 10 were approved by the Accreditation Quality Committee in January 2009. All changes were implemented effective July 1, 2009.

The 2009 revisions lead to the following expectations and intent that should be reflected by business schools/accounting programs going through AACSB review processes and by peer review teams and committees as they carry out AACSB's peer review process:

- In accordance with Standard 2, a business school/accounting program must include in its mission an appropriate focus on the production of quality intellectual contributions that advance knowledge in business/accounting in accordance with its mission and programs offered.
- As evidence of this mission focus, the business school/accounting program must demonstrate that its faculty produced a portfolio of intellectual contributions (ICs) that:
 - (1) Emanates from a "substantial cross-section of faculty in each discipline;"
 - (2) Includes as a substantial proportion of the portfolio of ICs presented for each review, peer reviewed journal publications or equivalent as outlined in the interpretive materials supporting Standard 2; and
 - (3) Table 2-1 (required) and Table 2-2 (optional) are introduced to assist in the documentation of alignment with Standard 2 for each review (see Appendix C for Standard 2 tables).
- Business schools/accounting programs should have appropriate criteria to guide faculty members in the production of ICs in accordance with the mission and programs offered and the Standard 2 expectations.

The re-focus of Standard 2 on scholarship flows from the original expectation that AACSB accredited business schools and accounting programs must have as part of their stated mission a focus on scholarship consistent with mission and degree programs. This is an attribute that must be demonstrated and if not, AACSB accreditation should not be granted or sustained. In essence, with this focus, scholarship stands on its own and the peer review process should assess if a business school/accounting program demonstrates IC outcomes that address the spirit and intent of Standard 2. Such an assessment is part of the assessment of "overall high quality" and "continuous improvement" within the context of all 21 standards in business and 15 accounting accreditation standards.

The 2009 standard's revision also modified Standard 10 with the goal of refocusing on the original spirit and intent of the Blue Ribbon Committee on Accreditation Quality. The changes include a revision of the Table 10-1 template allowing business schools/accounting programs to present a "Summary of Development Activities Supporting AQ or PQ Status" to include "intellectual contributions, professional experience, consulting, professional development, and other professional activities." The interpretive language supporting Standard

10 is also revised to remove wording that implied the only outcomes that supported AQ/PQ status are intellectual contributions.

Business schools/accounting program are expected to adopt criteria that guide faculty members toward those development activities that it believes are appropriate to support relevancy and currency in the teaching function and support other mission components. The implication that these activities had to be solely research focused is removed.

The decision on what development activities support AQ/PQ status clearly becomes the responsibility of the business school/accounting program based on its mission and programs. Conceptually, AQ/PQ criteria may not require ICs and this could be viewed as being in alignment with AACSB Standard 10; however, the business school/accounting program would have to make its case that faculty members are involved in substantive development activities that are material in nature, linked to the various teaching fields, and sustained appropriately over each review period. In addition, the business school/accounting program would have to demonstrate its alignment with Standard 2 in regards to its intellectual contributions portfolio. Of course, business schools/accounting programs may include intellectual contributions as a key component of their expectations for AQ and/or PQ status. Business schools/accounting programs may be even more restrictive in regards to AQ/PQ expectations and agree that only ICs will count. But, most importantly, this is a business school/accounting program's choice and not a prescriptive mandate by AACSB. Applicant business schools/accounting programs, peer review teams, and accreditation committees must understand this important dimension of Standard 10 and the revisions to Standard 2.

Finally, the connections between the standards should be noted. Standard 9 expects business schools/accounting programs and reviewers to consider faculty sufficiency and assess the business school/accounting program's support of all activities that support classroom instruction including development activities. Also, standard 9 expects the business school/accounting program to have processes to support faculty members regardless of the employment relationship. Standard 10 expects the business school/accounting program to have clearly defined processes by which it evaluates how faculty members contribute to the mission and maintain their qualifications. Standard 11 expects well-documented and communicated processes to be in place to manage and support faculty members over the progression of their careers consistent with the mission. These include maintaining overall plans for faculty resources. The responsibility is on the business school/accounting program to manage faculty resources, including the effective deployment of those resources. Standard 13 expects the business school/accounting to have processes to support, encourage, and assess faculty members in their own knowledge development. Each faculty member is expected to be personally responsible to continuously update, expand, and hone personal knowledge and skills. Thus, in maintaining the business school/accounting program's faculty resource plans, the individual faculty member, working with the

business school/accounting program administration, would plan faculty development activities to maintain AQ or PQ status during the typical five-year AACSB review cycle. This faculty development plan process would support all faculty members regardless of the employment relationship.

Summary

This paper explores AACSB's expectations for business schools/accounting programs for developing and implementing criteria that guide faculty in the attainment and maintenance of faculty qualifications, AQ or PQ. The frequently asked questions which follow provide some expanded discussions that hopefully provide additional guidance to assist business school/accounting programs in the development of their criteria.

References:

AACSB 2009a, Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation (AACSB International), as amended July 1, 2009

AACSB 2009b, Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Accounting Accreditation (AACSB International), as amended July 1, 2009

AACSB 2009c, "Deploying Professionally Qualified Faculty: An Interpretation of AACSB Standards" (AACSB International), March 2009

AACSB 2006, "Deploying Academically Qualified Faculty: An Interpretation of AACSB Standard" (AACSB International), February 2008

APPENDIX A

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Do all faculty members have to produce intellectual contributions to be qualified?

Standard 10 does not state and has never stated that "all" faculty members must produce intellectual contributions as a condition of accreditation. It states that "all" faculty members should be current in the field of teaching and in support of the business school/accounting program's mission as a consequence of appropriate development activities. Standard 10 notes a number of activities that may lead to the professional development of faculty including intellectual contributions, professional experience, and consulting. The interpretive materials for Standard 2 state that "intellectual contributions should emanate from a substantial cross-section of faculty in each discipline." This does not state "all" faculty must contribute. Of course, each individual business school/accounting program is expected to provide guidance for faculty as to the activities that are

appropriate to ensure the currency of qualifications as well as the production of intellectual contributions. If the business school/accounting program wants “all” faculty involved in the production of intellectual contributions, it may do so, but this is not mandated in AACSB standards. The minimum expectation is “substantial cross section of faculty in each discipline.”

Can the criteria for attaining and maintaining qualifications for AQ faculty be different from those for PQ faculty?

AACSB standards allow business schools/accounting programs to deploy a combination of academically and professionally qualified faculty to carry out their mission within the framework of the interpretive guidance found in Standard 10, i.e., total faculty resources devoted to the mission should include a minimum of 50% AQ and AQ+PQ faculty resources should be at least 90% of total faculty resources. The deployment of AQ and PQ faculty should be the consequence of strategic decisions taken by the business school/accounting program that fulfill the mission. Since the grounds for initial attainment of academic or professional qualifications differ (i.e., AQ: doctorate, preparation for scholarly contributions, significant advanced study in the field, etc; PQ: normally a masters degree and professional experience at the time of hiring that is significant in duration and level of responsibility), the basis for sustaining qualifications may also differ. Furthermore, the interpretive materials recognize that development activities may vary over a faculty member’s career.

Do PQ faculty members have to do research and publish to be qualified?

AACSB standards do not require PQ faculty members to produce intellectual contributions. It is up to each individual business school/accounting program to decide whether PQ faculty should be required to do so. As noted above, a likely relationship between the development expectations for PQ faculty and the original professional experience that led to the hiring of the PQ faculty member such as continuing professional work, consulting, etc. may be appropriate. Expectations for AQ faculty may differ. However, Standard 2 states that business schools/accounting programs should demonstrate intellectual contributions emanate from a “substantial cross-section” in each discipline.” If a business school/accounting program has a large percentage of PQ faculty members, it may have to expect some intellectual contributions to be produced by PQ faculty in order to demonstrate the “substantial cross-section” expectation.

Can the criteria for attaining and maintaining qualifications be different for faculty members who teach only undergraduates versus those that teach in graduate programs?

The key issue is that original credentials and subsequent development activities should be substantive, aligned with the teaching field, and sustained over time. A business school/accounting program may choose to require different

development activities (in terms of priority, quantity/frequency, and quality) for faculty deployed to teach at different levels. Another approach would be to establish AQ/PQ criteria that provides a minimum floor or baseline for all faculty members and allows for different activities beyond the floor depending on the level of teaching. Business schools/accounting programs should take care to ensure that differences in criteria do not lead to the conclusion that one group of faculty has lower expectations than another or that one group of students, for example undergraduate students, receive instruction from a less qualified group of faculty. Business schools/accounting programs with different criteria for maintaining AQ/PQ qualifications would need to demonstrate the criteria are appropriate to support high quality instruction at all levels as well as support other mission components.

Do deans, associate deans, department chairs/heads, center directors, etc. have to do the same developmental activities as all faculty members?

Interpretive materials to Standard 10 allow AQ/PQ criteria to recognize development activities that are aligned with the administrative duties carried out by such individuals. The key operating word is business schools/accounting programs **“may”** include such development activities in their AQ/PQ criteria. There is no requirement for such an approach, but it is an option. Development expectations for administrators that support these leadership positions should meet the same expectations to be substantive and sustained. The intent is not to grant AQ/PQ status to administrators by default just because the individuals hold such positions, and this provision is not intended to be seen as an “exemption” for administrators, but a key, integral part of the AQ/PQ expectations. As well, if administrators have teaching responsibilities, development activities should also be linked to ensuring currency and relevancy for the teaching function regardless of other duties.

What does the term “substantial cross-section of faculty in each discipline” mean in the context of documenting the portfolio of intellectual contributions?

Standard 2 establishes an important aspect of AACSB accreditation: a key attribute of business schools and accounting programs earning and maintaining AACSB accreditation is that they must demonstrate a commitment to advancing knowledge in business and accounting, respectively. To demonstrate this, business schools/accounting programs should show that research and publication is an integral part of the mission and that it is embraced across the entire organization. This leads to the expectation that a “substantial cross-section of faculty in each discipline” should be producing intellectual contributions. Standard 2 does not contain a finite, specific numerical expectation to define “substantial cross-section;” however, **“substantial cross-section,” has been interpreted in practice to mean that at least a majority of the faculty in each**

discipline should be making intellectual contributions as described in Standard 2.

Why is research so important to AACSB?

Business schools/accounting programs have become highly integrated, significant participants throughout the higher education community. In recognizing business schools/accounting programs' role in higher education, AACSB has committed to supporting the responsibility of its constituency to be full participants in the full range of activities of an academic enterprise, and this includes research. AACSB accredited business schools/accounting programs are expected to demonstrate on a sustained basis that they are advancing knowledge in the fields of business and accounting, respectively. Moreover, research is important to:

- Demonstrate that business schools/accounting programs contribute to advancing knowledge within and across business disciplines;
- Create an intellectual vibrancy among faculty that supports and contributes to an active learning environment; and
- Demonstrates the business school/accounting program's contributions as a full participant in a community of scholars within an institution and in a larger context.

Why is emphasis placed on the portfolio of intellectual contributions to include a significant proportion of “peer reviewed journal” articles?

“Peer reviewed journal” articles (including equivalents as scholarly books, research monographs, or sections/chapters of such publications subject to peer review) have traditionally been the most respected form of research and publication outcomes across the academic community. Business schools/accounting programs traditionally grant the most credit in faculty performance reviews to such research outcomes in recognition of the quality that result from an independent review of the work of individual or groups of faculty.

Do the criteria for attaining and maintaining AQ or PQ status have to be the same as expectations for promotions, granting tenure, or other status?

AACSB standards do not require alignment of AQ/PQ criteria with expectations for promotion, granting of tenure, or other rewards systems. Business schools/accounting programs may establish different expectations for such purposes. Alternatively, business schools/accounting programs may make them the same. This is up to each business school/accounting program.

What are the “unwritten” guidelines for peer reviewed publications to meet AACSB expectations for AQ or PQ status?

There are no “unwritten” or “secret” standards or expectations for the number of peer reviewed journal publications that must be demonstrated for each review period by applicant business schools/accounting programs. Furthermore, AQ/PQ criteria of an applicant business school/accounting program should not be expected to be the same as those at the schools of peer review team members. However, the criteria of peer and aspirant schools form a relevant context for judgments and discussions.

What metrics should be used to document professional experience, consulting, other professional experience, etc. in Table 10-1 in support of AQ and/or PQ status?

AACSB Standard 10 and its supporting interpretive materials do not specify metrics for various development activities that can be reported in Table 10-1. For intellectual contributions, the supporting data from Table 2-1 should be included in Table 10-1. Consistency and accuracy are important. For other forms of development activities that support AQ or PQ status, each business school/accounting program may choose appropriate metrics. For example, for initial PQ status for a newly hired faculty member, the number of years of professional experience may be an appropriate metric along with a qualitative assessment of the experience in terms of “duration and level of responsibilities.” For continuing PQ status, if the person continues to be professionally involved, such a statement would be appropriate (e.g. full-time employment as CPA). For consulting activities, the number of engagements or the approximate number of total hours devoted to them may be appropriate. For other forms of professional development such as continuing professional education activities, number of hours of participation or “continuing education units” (CEUs) could be used. Other activities may be documented as number of speeches delivered, conferences attended, etc. However, these are only suggestions. The key is transparency and clear link to accurate documentation that should be found in faculty vitae that will allow a peer review team to understand and review how the business school/accounting program chose to measure the activity. This is consistent with the approach for Standard 9 which suggests a number of metrics (credit hours, clock hours, courses, etc.) that may be used to demonstrate deployment of participating and supporting faculty.

What is meant by “percent of time devoted to mission?”

Standard 10 tables must be developed to include a numerical metric describing the amount of time, in percentage terms, each faculty member devotes to supporting the mission of the business school/accounting program. The “percent of time devoted to mission” is intended to broadly represent and encompass all professional responsibilities of each faculty member, including teaching, research,

and other professional responsibilities that may be assigned. Standard 10 tables should **not** be developed using a metric that only captures teaching.

Clearly, for full-time faculty members including those holding administrative roles within the business school/accounting program that are also full time, the “percent of time devoted to mission” is 100%. For part-time faculty members, something less than 100% should be specified. If the school uses a full-time equivalent (FTE) model for its human resource system, then FTE may be a reasonable approximation of “percent of time devoted to mission.” However, in the absence of an FTE model, the school will need to have a rational way of assigning the percentage to part-time faculty.

One way of doing this is to relate the percentage of time the part-time faculty member, on average, spends on professional responsibilities for the business school/accounting program relative to a normal work week (e.g. 40 hours, 35 hours, etc). Another possible approach is to outline the duties of a normal, full-time faculty member (e.g., on the average a full-time faculty member devotes 60% of time to teaching 6 courses per year, 30% of time devoted to research, and 10% of time devoted to other professional responsibilities). With this example, one course is equivalent to 10% of time for a year. Therefore, if a part-time person teaches only one class per year and has no other duties, the “percent of time devoted to mission” would be 10%. This is only an example and other constructs may be used. It is important for business school/accounting programs under review to work with the peer review team in selecting how the metric is measured and then being consistent in its application.

APPENDIX B
TABLE 10-1:
SUMMARY OF FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS, DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES, AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES
(RE: Standard 10)¹

(Note; In a footnote to Table 10-1, summarize the school's criteria for determining academic and professional qualifications)

Name ²	Highest Degree Earned and Year	Date of First Appointment to the School	Percent of Time Dedicated to the School's Mission ³	Academically Qualified ⁴	Professionally Qualified ⁴	Other ⁴	Five-Year Summary of Development Activities Supporting AQ or PQ Status ⁵					Normal Professional Responsibilities ⁶
							Intellectual Contributions	Professional Experience	Consulting	Professional Development	Other Professional Activities	

1 The summary information presented in this table, supplemented by information in individual faculty members' vitae, is useful in making judgments relative to Standard 10. The table as a whole will assist the peer review team in judging whether "The faculty has, and maintains, intellectual qualification and current expertise to accomplish the mission...."

2 Faculty members should be listed alphabetically by discipline following the organizational structure of the business school. Administrators who hold faculty rank and directly support the school's mission should be included relative to their percent of time devoted to the mission including administrative duties. If a faculty member serves more than one discipline, list the individual only once under the primary discipline to which the individual is assigned and where his/her performance evaluation is conducted. Provide a footnote explaining the nature of the interdisciplinary responsibilities of the individual. Graduate students who have teaching responsibilities should be included in accordance with the guidance provided in Standard 10.

3 This column should show the percent of total time devoted to teaching, research, and/or other assignment represented by the faculty member's contribution to the school's overall mission during the period of evaluation (i.e., the year of the self-evaluation report or other filing with AACSB International). Reasons for less than 100% might include part-time employment, shared appointment with another academic unit, or other assignments that make the faculty member partially unavailable to the school.

4 Faculty members may be academically qualified (AQ), professionally qualified (PQ), AQ and PQ, or other. Indicate by placing "YES" in the appropriate column(s) or by leaving columns blank. Individual vitae should be provided to support this table. The "Other" category should be used for those individuals holding a faculty title but whose qualifications do not meet the criteria for academically and/or professionally qualified. A faculty member should be counted only once for use in Table 10-2 even if the individual is AQ and PQ.

5 The number of development activities should be noted in these columns. This summary information should be consistent with information presented in Table 2-1 as well as supported by faculty vitae.

6. Indicate the normal professional responsibilities the faculty member is expected to perform, e.g., (UG for undergraduate teaching; GR for graduate teaching; UG/GR for teaching at both levels; ADM for administration; RES for research; NCR for non-credit teaching; SER for service and outreach activities) A faculty member may have more than one category assigned.

NOTE: Tables presented in support of standards 9 and 10 should be presented for the two most recently completed academic terms (semesters or quarters) at a minimum. The peer review team has the right to request the information for additional time periods

**TABLE 10-2. CALCULATIONS RELATIVE TO DEPLOYMENT OF QUALIFIED FACULTY
(RE: Standard 10)¹**

NAME	QUALIFICATION (ACADEMIC-AQ, PROFESSIONAL-PQ OTHER-O) (FROM TABLE 10-1)	AQ FACULTY- % OF TIME DEVOTED TO MISSION (FROM TABLE 10-1)	PQ FACULTY- % OF TIME DEVOTED TO MISSION (FROM TABLE 10-1)	OTHER² FACULTY- % OF TIME DEVOTED TO MISSION (FROM TABLE 10-1)	QUALIFICATION RATIOS PER STD 10
Accounting					
James Whitehead	AQ	100			
Terri Brunsen	PQ		100		
John Smith	AQ	50			
TOTAL ACCOUNTING		AQ_A	PQ_A	O_A	$AQ_A/(PQ_A+AQ_A+O_A) \geq 50\%$ $(AQ_A+PQ_A)/(AQ_A+PQ_A+O_A) \geq 90\%$
<i>(Repeat for discipline consistent with business school organization)</i>					
TOTAL FOR SCHOOL		AQ_T	PQ_T	O_T	$AQ_T/(AQ_T+PQ_T+O_T) \geq 50\%$ $(AQ_T+PQ_T)/(AQ_T+PQ_T+O_T) \geq 90\%$

NOTES: Table 10-2 addresses the ratios described in Standard 10 regarding deployment of academically and professionally qualified faculty. It should be developed for the peer review team to confirm that qualified faculty resources are deployed in support of the school mission. Faculty should be listed by discipline consistent with the organizational structure of the business school. It is expected that qualified faculty will generally be distributed equitably across each discipline, each academic program, and location consistent with the school's mission and student needs. Distance delivered programs are considered to be a unique location. The threshold for deployment of academically qualified faculty resources is higher for a school with graduate degree programs than for a school with no graduate degree programs and is higher for a school with a research doctoral program than for a school without a research doctoral program.

1. The metric used is the "percent of time devoted to mission" as derived from Table 10-1.
2. The "Other" category should be used for those individuals holding a faculty title but whose qualifications do not meet the definitions for academically or professionally qualified.

APPENDIX C

Table 2-1:
Five-Year Summary of Intellectual Contributions (Note: Please add a footnote to this table summarizing the school’s policies guiding faculty in the production of intellectual contributions.)

	Portfolio of Intellectual Contributions									Summary of Types of ICs ¹⁰		
	Peer Reviewed Journals ¹	Research Monographs ²	Books ³	Chapters ⁴	Peer Reviewed Proceedings ⁵	Peer Reviewed Paper Presentations ⁶	Faculty Research Seminar ⁷	Non-Peer Reviewed Journals ⁸	Others ⁹	Learning & Pedagogical Research	Contributions to Practice	Discipline-Based Research
Faculty												
List alphabetically by academic discipline as defined in the organizational structure that is used by the school identifying each faculty member												

1. Peer reviewed journal articles (learning and pedagogical research, contributions to practice, and/or discipline-based scholarship)
2. Research Monographs (teaching/pedagogical, practice/applied and /or discipline-based research)
3. Books (textbooks, professional/practice/trade, and/or scholarly)
4. Chapters in books (textbooks, professional/practice/trade, and/or scholarly)
5. Peer reviewed proceedings from teaching/pedagogical meetings, professional/practice meetings, and/or scholarly meetings
6. Peer reviewed paper presentations at teaching/pedagogical meetings, professional/practical meetings, and/or academic meetings
7. Faculty Research Seminar (teaching/pedagogical, practice oriented, and/or discipline-based research seminar)
8. Non-peer reviewed journals (learning and pedagogical, contributions to practice, and/or discipline-based scholarship). School must provide substantive support for quality
9. Others (peer reviewed cases with instructional materials, instructional software, publicly available material describing the design and implementation of new curricula or courses, technical reports related to funded projects, publicly available research working papers, etc. please specify)
10. Summary of ICs should reflect total number of ICs in each category (learning and pedagogical research, contributions to practice, and/or discipline-based scholarship)

